

MUSTAFA KEMAL ATATÜRK'S RELATIONS WITH WESTERN COUNTRIES DURING AND AFTER THE NATIONAL STRUGGLE (1919- 1938)

Girayalp KARAKUŞ
Amasya University, Türkiye
girayalp71@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6240-5490>

<i>Atf</i>	Karakuş, G. (2023). Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's Relations with Western Countries During and After the National Struggle. (1919- 1938). The Turkish Online Journal of Design Art and Communication, 13 (1), 36-47.
------------	---

ABSTRACT

Although the first thing that makes Mustafa Kemal Atatürk valuable is his military achievements, the pro-active policies he followed in the statesmanship process are also of great importance. In particular, the Young Republic, acting with the principle of "Peace at Home, Peace in the World", has reached a respected position in world politics with the successful policies followed by Atatürk. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, one of the founding leaders of Turkey, was interested in politics from his young age. He knew that being a strong state required a successful foreign policy. That's why he succeeded in pursuing an honorable policy with Western countries while he was a statesman. In this context, the Young Republic, was following rational and realistic policies, and it produced politics in real-political terms and connected its own security to the stability of its neighbors. For this policy, it established alliances against revisionist states. Atatürk's main motto was "peace". This policy also became a guide for later politicians. In this period, the main aim was to represent the achievements in the military field in the political scene, so that full independence was desired. In this period, the Republic of Turkey has ensured to establish good relations with all secular, democratic and rule-of-law states. Although Turkey was economically weak, it achieved important successes in the Straits and Hatay due to the policy it has followed. Many domestic and foreign sources were used to strengthen the thesis in our study.

Keywords: Republic, National Struggle, Atatürk, West, Diplomacy.

MUSTAFA KEMAL ATATÜRK'ÜN MİLLİ MÜCADELE DÖNEMİ VE SONRASI BATI ÜLKELERİYLE OLAN İLİŞKİLERİ (1919- 1938)

ÖZ

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ü değerli kılan ilk şey askeri başarıları olsa da devlet adamlığı sürecinde izlediği pro-aktif politikalar da önem arz etmektedir. Özellikle "Yurtta Sulh, Cihanda Sulh" prensibiyle hareket eden Genç Cumhuriyet, Atatürk'ün izlediği başarılı politikalarla dünya siyasetinde saygın bir konuma yükselmiştir. Genç yaşlarından itibaren siyasetle ilgilenen Türkiye'nin kurucu liderlerinden Mustafa Kemal Atatürk güçlü bir devlet olmanın başarılı bir dış politikadan geçtiğini biliyordu. Bu yüzden devlet adamlığı görevindeyken Batılı ülkelerle onurlu bir siyaset izlemeyi başarmıştır. Bu bağlamda akılcı ve gerçekçi politikalar izleyen Genç Cumhuriyet reel-politik açıdan siyaset üretmiş, kendi güvenliğini komşularındaki istikrara bağlamıştır. Bu siyaset için revizyonist devletlere karşı ittifaklar kurmuştur. Atatürk'ün başlıca mottosu "barış" idi. Bu politika daha sonra gelen politikacılar için de rehber olmuştur. Bu dönemde asıl amaç askeri alanda kazanılan başarıları siyaset sahnesinde de temsil edebilmektir.

Submit Date: 18.09.2022, Acceptance Date: 23.12.2022, DOI NO: 10.7456/11301100/004

36

Research Article - This article was checked by iThenticate

Copyright © The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication

böylece tam bağımsızlık sağlanmak istendi. Bu dönemde Türkiye Cumhuriyeti devleti laik, demokratik ve hukuk devleti niteliği olan bütün devletlerle iyi ilişkiler kurmayı sağlamıştır. Türkiye ekonomik açıdan zayıf olsa bile izlediği siyaset sayesinde Boğazlar ve Hatay konusunda önemli başarılar elde etti. Çalışmada tezi güçlendirebilmek için pek çok yerli ve yabancı kaynaklardan yararlanıldı.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cumhuriyet, Millî Mücadele, Atatürk, Batı, Diplomasi.

INTRODUCTION

There is a wide range of sources and archive-documents on this subject. The fact that the archives covering the period of the National Struggle and the establishment and aftermath of the Republic are very rich and inclusive in terms of source documents has provided a great advantage to historians. It is another advantageous situation that Mustafa Kemal Pasha documented every period of the period with photographs. In addition, short film shootings are among important documents in a period when limited opportunities and technology did not develop much. The studies of Turkish Historical Society Researches and Historical Studies journals, foundations and the Academy world have created a wealth of multiple sources.

It is important to make some important and serious criticisms in terms of revealing different perspectives. Since the concept of absolute truth is not used much in history, the relevant historians accept the understanding of absolute truth as a style in describing the development stages of historical events and the results. As far as we understand from the documents and sources related to the history of the Republic, it is understood that Mustafa Kemal Pasha gave great importance to the development of relations with the West. He himself had efforts to establish personal relationships and develop friendships. Mustafa Kemal also made efforts to develop friendships with the mission representatives of the West and journalists in 1918.

In this context, our study has been examined in three parts: Tension and softening processes in Western relations between 1919 and 1923, and the rivalry between the Entente states based on their interests and developments were discussed. In the study covering the period of 1923-1932, the effects of the Lausanne Conference, the development in Turkey-Western relations, the relations brought about by interest-based, commercial, political and security-dimensional concerns were investigated. In the period of 1932-1938, it was observed that relations with the West developed in a different dimension after Turkey decided to join the League of Nations. As of 1920, we can talk about a limited relationship with the opening of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, albeit with secret agreements. As of 1922, when the Great Victory was won, an acceleration in these relations is noticeable. The fact that the Entente states could not fully embrace this success and that they acted together against the Republic of Turkey at the Lausanne Conference is a proof of this. Considering that there is no concept of eternal friendship or eternal enmity in international relations despite many negative developments, it is a necessity for both sides to develop relations in the interests of nations. In this context, there are Switzerland, France and Italy among the countries to which Mustafa Kemal appointed semi-official representatives as efforts to improve relations with the West.

The National Liberation movement, led by Mustafa Kemal, is not a movement against the Sultan and the Istanbul Government. The indisputable fact is that a war of independence against Western imperialism is an ongoing war. At every stage of history, there have always been and will always be leaders with personalities who stand out on important and urgent issues that concern the fate of countries and society, the organized relationship of social forces and the relationship with each other. These leaders, brought forward by the society, actually take on the role of the society's sharp sword. Leaders brought forward by the society need to be able to sense the signs of the great events revealed by history within their unique mind and character traits and show the ability to turn the destiny of the nation to which they belong to a better direction with preliminary measures.

The New Power Order and Competition In The Western Countries After 1918

After the First World War, England became the dominant power in the world. It is the country that receives the largest share from the Middle East. Britain had consolidated its dominance in the Mediterranean, seized control of the trade routes in the Mediterranean, and established a large base in the Eastern Mediterranean. This situation gave England a great advantage in economic, political and military fields. After the war, Germany abandoned its colonies to the victorious states and was compelled to pay a heavy war indemnity. In the 23rd article of the Armistice of Mudros on 30 October 1918, it was requested to break all relations with Germany (Çalık, 2004). The victorious states detained the German soldiers remaining in Turkey at the end of 1918, and the German embassy was closed in December 1918 in accordance with the 23rd article of the armistice. Thus, the relationship between Turkey and Germany was canceled. The resumption of official relations between the two states was made on March 4, 1924, when the German Government sent its ambassador to Ankara. In Soviet Russia, the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution and the civil war that would last until the mid-1920s were the conflict between the supporters of the Monarchy and the White Army, supported by the western powers, especially England, and the Red Army, known as the Lenin Army. The country was under the attacks of the White Army, both from the south (Ukraine) and from the South-East (Trans-Caucasus and Caspian Basin). The survival of the Bolshevik revolution was a matter of life and death (Büyükkakıncı, 2012). From 1917 to the mid-1920s, Soviet Russia, striving to break the containment of the West, declared war on Western values. It did not seem possible for Soviet Russia to develop relations with the West for international recognition and receive both ideological and geopolitical support. Soviet Russia did not follow an active policy against England within the framework of the events in the Middle East within the framework of these developments.

After the First World War, Great Britain took the largest share, and Italy was disappointed in not getting the expected share from the minor partners. The Italian Government will receive a great reaction from the public opinion. Italy, who was deceived by England and France, could not achieve the desired gains in the 1919 Paris conference. With the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, a problem arose in the balance of powers in the Middle East. At the Conference held in San Remo, Syria and Lebanon fell to France's share. About a month before the San Remo conference, a large Syrian kingdom was established in March 1920, with its center in Damascus, Lebanon and Palestine. However, the Entente states did not recognize it at the San Remo Conference. Thereupon, Palestine was separated and taken under British mandate. On January 28, 1920, the borders of the National Pact, which stipulated the peace conditions accepted at the Erzurum and Sivas Congresses of the deputies who were affiliated with the Anatolian and Rumelian Defense of Rights Association, were accepted in the Istanbul Parliament. According to this decision, the Ottoman lands, where the Arabs lived in the majority, were given to the allied states during the Armistice of Mudros and the relations of the Turks in this region were cut off (Hale, 2003). The war started by the Turkish and Muslim elements of the National Struggle against the purpose of the Western Allies to divide Turkey was not resolved until 1923. The lands of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East were occupied and given to England and France under the mandate under the supervision of the League of Nations. The devastation and social unrest brought on by the first World War to the West had increased. It was started to be said that this meaningless war was the war of big interest groups. With the economic problems that started in the West, inflation increased since 1920 and took an ideological direction. Since the end of the 19th century, the majority of discourses that became obsessive thoughts and reflected in politics and the principle of survival of the strongest started a process that also determined the fate of countries. Lord Salisbury, the British Prime Minister in 1898, said that the world consisted of "*strengthened forces*" and "*weakened forces*" (Kennedy, 1990). These statements are seen as a stage of convincing and preparing the public that a great war may break out at any moment.

In the First World War, expert scientists and journalists, intelligence personnel and politicians have worked on behavior management on the masses since the first months of the war. In September 1914, it was also seen that the activities aimed at persuading and manipulating the public with propaganda

activities were intensified under the control of the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs. England was the country that used the most effectively to recruit soldiers, support the war behind the front, print posters to make the war understandable, and increase voluntary participation in the military. France also applied the method of persuading its people to war by printing posters on this issue (İşıl-Eşitti, 2015). In the occupation and exploitation system, which developed beyond their expectations and was likely to develop, it was not easy to get the consent of the people constantly. No nation-state people would tolerate invading another country without any conscience. However, barbarism is tried to be convinced by equal accusations and by imposing a law. Established in the USA in 1917 towards the end of the war, the U.S Committee On Public Information / Creel Commission succeeded in turning the pacifist American People, who were against the war, into a hysterical, warmongering people who wanted to destroy the Germans, enter the war and save the world within six months (İşıl-Eşitti, 2015). In the background of the First World War, there was a brutal rivalry and conflict of interests of Western imperialism. It seemed that the commercial interests of Germany and England, which had large industrial revolution establishments, clashed. Germany, which had completed its union, faced England in the competition to further expand the commercial market it had established with a strong industry. The prestige of the Germans in the international markets had regressed England commercially and economically. German capital flowed overseas, including Ottoman Turkey. The circles that wanted to direct the foreign policy by creating public opinion for Germany to increase its economic and political activity outside of Europe and to obtain colonies had established various associations for this purpose. Among these organizations, the German Colonial Union, which started its activities in 1887, and the Pan-Germanic Union, which was established in 1891, and the German Naval Association, which started its activities in 1898, were quite influential (Ünver, 2018). The activities of France, which had economic investments in many institutions such as education and religious institutions opened by Catholic missionaries, and the activities of the Germans in the Ottoman state were closely followed. The move, which is considered as an attempt to break the effectiveness of German goods in the market, came from the British Parliament. Although it was made compulsory to bear the "*Made in Germany*" stamp, this measure did not work. The fact that German goods were both cheap and of high quality did not have an impact on the market (Ünver, 2018). Germany's rise in economy and trade caused great concern in England and France. The German-Ottoman rapprochement was creating a situation contrary to its interests, especially in the Middle East.

The National Struggle Between 1919 And 1923 Relations with Western Countries

Although the agreements with Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria contained very heavy conditions, they at least recognized their national independence. It allowed them to exist as independent states. Although land was taken from them and they were placed in a small area, their sovereignty was maintained. Against this, not only land was taken from Turkey, on the contrary, it was planned to be divided and destroyed. Barbaric and greedy, the Entente states were thinking of implementing their actions (Çalık, 2004). England, which revealed the execution of another dimension of the accumulated hatred, would put the Greek trump card on the stage. Greece, the former province of the Ottoman Empire, occupied İzmir on March 15, 1915, and started the war of total annihilation to perpetuate its expansionist attempts against Anatolia. The hatred that started from every corner of the country, occupation of Istanbul by the allied powers under the leadership of England on February 16, 1920 accelerated the National Struggle movement. The first reaction was that Mustafa Kemal issued a British Opposing statement to the Islamic world and ordered the arrest of the British in Anatolia (Akbaş, 2012). On the same day, Mustafa Kemal had informed them of this sad event in the telegram he sent to the governors and commanders in Anatolia. He stated that the Ottoman Empire was imbedded in history. He stated that "*it is essential to open a powerful and competent parliament in Ankara*". It was also stated that the assembly to be opened would be "*the constituent assembly*" (Türkmen, 2002). Deutsche Allgemeine, one of the German Newspapers, interpreted the Treaty of Sevres as follows in its article titled "*Turning Point for Turkey*" on its page dated 9 December 1920 in the Zeitung: "*The Treaty of Sevres had definitively confirmed the end of Turkey, and in the early days, it was the intention of*

deporting the Sultan to Anatolia. But now it was desired that the Ottoman state and the Caliph stay in Istanbul by keeping them under strict control" (Çalık, 2004). The Republic of Turkey gave a war of independence between 1919 and 1923. After four years and the Great victory, the war for independence seemed to have come to a head. Even so, the upper-pitched speeches came from England in particular. There were many reasons for this behavior and discourse. They could not believe that such a decisive victory could be achieved by the Turkish Army against the Greek Army and they were greatly disappointed. Because it was England that included Greece in the war, forced the occupation of Izmir and Anatolia, and financed all the infrastructure logistics of the war. On January 23, 1915, the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Gray, telegraphed the British ambassador in Athens, Sir Francis Elliot. With this telegram, he sent instructions to suggest that if Greece joined the war on the side of the Allies, "it would make a very important territorial concession to Greece on the western Anatolian coast". Grey added: "If Mr. Venizelos makes a firm promise, I believe there will be no difficulty in making it" (Smith, 1978). In August 1914, Greece entered the war with the initiative and suggestion of the British. Upon this promise, Greece would occupy Izmir in 1919. Allied states that came together on the basis of interest were reflected in the conflict policies that had arisen among themselves. This situation also started a process in which Turkey followed tactical policies. It was understood that Turkey followed a strategy by considering the balance of power in the face of the conflicts between the powerful states of the West. During the National Struggle, Mustafa Kemal said, "Military disobedience began in the British Army. Nations no longer want war. Let's grit our teeth for three years, we will drive the enemy out of our country." It is also understood that the leaders of the National Struggle meticulously followed the general international situation and the reflections of the political and economic problems developing in the West on the Army.

During the years of the National Struggle, the expectations for the interests of France were very high. Among the reasons for the changes in their policies towards Turkey were the military, political and economic effects, as well as the fact that the state with the highest number of schools compared to the United States and England was France. In addition, the reason for the close relationship between Turkish intellectuals and French intellectuals was that many intellectuals and army officers spoke French. The first peace attempt with France was a bilateral agreement on March 11, 1921, between Turkish Foreign Minister Bekir Sami Bey and French Prime Minister Briand at the London Peace Conference. However, two articles of this agreement were against the National Pact. The first of these items was the establishment of a police force in Çukurova and the participation of French officers in this force. In the second article, it was requested that the French be given privileges and priorities in the Çukurova, Sivas, Diyarbakır and Elazığ regions (Yalçın, 2000). Due to the articles of this agreement, the Grand National Assembly of Turkey rejected it, and Bekir Sami resigned from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Yusuf Kemal, who was in talks in Moscow, was brought to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Although this process made the relations between France and Turkey tense, French Prime Minister Briand would send Franklin Bouillon, the head of the Senator Foreign Affairs commission, known as "friend of the Turks", to Turkey. During the meetings with Mustafa Kemal, it was explained what the National Pact, which was the main target of the National Struggle, was, and therefore under what conditions it would be possible to make an agreement with the French. Franklin Bouillon was told that an independent Turkey would not make concessions on the Capitulations, and that the clause of the bilateral agreement made in London on zones of influence would not be accepted (Güven, 2012). Franklin Bouillon stated that he was afraid of Soviet Russia invading Turkey. France also tried to create a buffer against the Bolshevik threat by gaining the friendship of Turkey and forming a union with the Caucasian states. France was looking for interests through Turkey. Before the First World War, French capital constituted 59.28% of the capital of other foreign countries in the Ottoman lands. These investments were mostly made in strategic areas such as railways, banking and mining sectors (Latif, 2012). In 1919, France occupied the Adana, Urfa and Mersin regions simultaneously with the other Allied Powers. The purpose of the occupation of these places was that the region wanted to have fertile lands. Çukurova region had the capacity to meet the cotton need of France for one year (Latif, 2012). In December 1919, the French

high commissioner in Syria, Georges Picot, had an informal meeting with Mustafa Kemal. In this meeting, the economic privileges that the Turkish side could give were mentioned. According to the agreement made in London in 1921 by Bekir Sami Bey and the new Prime Minister of France, Aristide Briand, it was envisaged that the Ergani mineral deposits be given to a French Company, and that Ottoman and French capital would merge to the greatest extent possible, the French Hospitals and schools would be protected, the part of the Baghdad railway between the Cilician ports and the Syrian border would be transferred to a French company (Latif, 2012).

The Relationship Between Italy and Turkey In 1920-1921, with the opening of the Turkish National Assembly, Italy, which was in the position of occupying, was seen as the "*less evil*" by the Ankara government (Yılmaz, 2012). Italy had begun to see Turkey as a market in which it could cooperate in many fields, and a process seemed to have begun in which it began to see the Ankara Government as its interlocutor in order to increase its influence. Despite this, Italy continued to act with the Western bloc despite its friendly relations with Turkey and tried to gain economic benefits. However, with the victory of the İnönü wars on 6-10 1921, the Entente Powers were disappointed and this victory strengthened Turkey's hand. Mustafa Kemal attempted to evaluate Italy's weaknesses in obtaining economic benefits. According to the agreement signed by Bekir Sami on March 12, 1921, in response to Italy's support for the ceding of Izmir and Thrace to Turkey, Italy would be granted privileges for its economic enterprises in Antalya, Burdur, Muğla, Isparta, Afyonkarahisar, Kütahya, Aydın, Konya and other regions to be determined later. In addition, the Ereğli mine concession would be given to an Italian company, and the shares of the Turks would be at most 50 percent in these companies, where Turkish-Italian capital would cooperate (Çelebi, 2002). However, with the second İnönü Victory, Italy realized that it could not achieve its spheres of influence over Turkey with military force. As of March 23-31, 1921, the Italian Government started to withdraw its soldiers from Anatolian lands and Italian forces left Anatolia as of July 1921 after the Sakarya victory. The great victory launched on August 22, 1922 was the success of the Anatolian War of Independence at the front. Another new struggle, diplomacy, would also begin.

In this period, Mussolini and the "*Black Shirts*" movement of political changes came to power in Italy. The Government of Turkey has been very distant to the relations with Italy and did not have confidence. However, the Turkish government had followed a tactical line of behavior towards Italy. After the opening of the parliament, Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent Cami Bey to Rome to develop good relations with Italy. Friendly relations were developed with the Italian commissioner Sforza, who was sympathetic to Ankara, and the Turkish-Italian friendship association established in March 1920 contributed to the Anatolian Movement. A front had not been opened against the Italians in the South East of Turkey (Oran, 2001). At the Lausanne Peace Conference, he and his allies had a negative attitude towards Turkey. It was clear in those days that Mussolini's rule would create major problems against the West. He declared his sovereignty over the Aegean Islands and said that the Dodecanese belonged to Italy. With the 15th article of the Treaty of Lausanne, Rhodes and the Dodecanese Islands and the island of Meis were left to Italy (Yılmaz, 2012). There is not enough information and evidence about whether the national struggle government has relations with secret channels. It is understood from the sources and documents that the National Struggle Government was in a full and independent movement. Mussolini was at the center of the hatred because of the Anti-Turkey policies he applied the greatest pressure on the National Struggle movement. France and Italy are in the lower ranks of hatred. To make Turkey a commercial area in line with the interests of both countries. Their intention to increase their commercial efficiency was quite understandable.

Relations of the State of The Republic of Turkey with The Western States in The Period 1923-1932

The Mudanya Ceasefire Agreement and the Lausanne Conference at the end of the National Struggle period are important in terms of the recognition of the Republic of Turkey within the National Pact and the determination of its status as a state. Based on the principle of solving the problems that could not

be resolved in the Treaty of Lausanne through diplomatic means, contributing to international peace, and announcing its existence in a way that respects mutual independence and interests in the international arena, (Mumcu, 1997) The difficulty in reaching a peaceful level in international relations was that the security problem came to the fore in the power competition based on interest. At the Lausanne Conference, England would put forward demands that Turkey would not accept. With England's showing Hakkari and its region within the borders of Turkey within the territory of Iraq, there were attempts to incite rebellion and rebellion against some ethnic groups, and it was also seen that it resorted to tactics to secure its interests on Mosul. England neglected the Mosul issue and aimed to bring it to the League of Nations. The fact that the relations between Turkey and England did not start was a situation originating from England. There was also a kind of anger, resentment and wrath in Turkey. The uprising in the East in 1925 and the turmoil of the 1930s had a connection with Britain. He always kept his policies in the interests of British interests at the forefront. Even in such an insecure environment, the Turkish government is trying to develop friendly relations with England. Turkey had developed trade relations with other European countries, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium and Czechoslovakia (Krüger, 1981). Mustafa Kemal had been careful in limiting his aims and saw where England's vital interests lay. He understood that he had to deal with the West. He refrained from assertive rhetoric about the vital interests of Britain and did not claim any rights over Arab countries. He used Islamic ideology as a limited tool. Within the framework of the recognition of Turkey within the National Pact, efforts were made to improve its relations with the West. In this context, Turkey was not supposed to pose any threat to the West. At the Lausanne Peace Conference, he set an opinion close to the British thesis on the straits. He did not spoil his relations with England on the Mosul issue. In 1919-1926, he accepted a solution in favor of England. Mustafa Kemal saw the efforts to westernize Turkey as a foreign security issue. Atatürk felt the need for a change in Turkey's internal structure in Turkey's relations with the West. For a long time, European countries tried to push Turkey away from Europe because it did not resemble them (Armaoğlu, 2017). In the period of 1923-1932, it was not immediately possible for Turkey to improve relations with Western Countries. The economic and political power of England was effective in this process. The unresolved problems created by the Lausanne Peace Treaty delayed the normalization of relations with the Western world (Eroğlu, 1981) Turkey, which closely followed international developments, tried to maintain its stability both at home and abroad. According to the Lausanne Conference, the population change was positive between Greece and Turkey, and it turned into a friendship pact between the two countries. Venizelos visit to Turkey in 1930 and Ankara Agreement dated 10 June 1930 paved the way for the normalization of relations (Soysal, 1989). Another problem between France and Turkey was the payment of debts from the Ottoman period. With the agreement signed on 13 June 1928, the repayment schedule was determined. The world economic crisis also affected Turkey, and it faced difficulties in payment. Upon Turkey's demand for flexibility, a new debt agreement was signed in Paris on April 22, 1933 (Tezel, 1982). During this period, Europe's political and power balance began to deteriorate, and it was understood that the rhetoric threatening each other increased and that it would start another process.

During the arrival of the Turkish delegates in Lausanne on 21 November 1922, the start of the Conference and the opening of the negotiations, the Western States did not want to give Turkey the right to equality. They emphasized that Turkey is an undeveloped and backward country. For the abolition of the capitulations, Ryan said, "*The Civil Code is taken from Islamic legislation.*" On the other hand, Galli said, "*The main laws are always in accordance with the fight rules. Even in various courts, mecelle (Ottoman code of civil law) is needed.*" When our chief delegate, İsmet Pasha, praised the Turkish Courthouse, Curzon was mocking him, saying, "*Unfortunately, as the whole world knows, this is not the case*" (İnalçık, 2003). On the same date, Mustafa Kemal was addressing the Turkish Nation with the following words. "*The country will in any case be modern, civilized, and reformed. For us, this is a vital situation.*" (İnalçık, 2003) While the Lausanne conference is officially called the "*Near East problems Lausanne conference*", (Oran, 2003) In Turkey, it is called the "*Lausanne Conference*". In the Lausanne Conference, there were mutual dialogues and quarrels with each other. In response to the Turkish

delegate's statement, "*We are coming from Mudanya*," Lord Curzon was reminding that "*We are coming from the Armistice of Mudros*" (Seha, 1969). It was understood that there were no changes in the colonial mentality of the proud states that were the winners of the First World War and dominated three quarters of the world. Achieving a just and honorable peace, which is our right, seemed as difficult as winning victory (Arar, 1981). The distinction between developed, underdeveloped and undeveloped is one of the most discussed topics. in the separative categorizing chart of colonialist view. With new theories and new determinations, the world economy has a privileged position in the center-periphery relationship as it is a process based on the exploitation system. Reşat Kasaba states that the Western exploitation of the Ottoman Empire was in the center-periphery relationship since 1750 (Kasaba, 1993). Hurican İslamoğlu, on the other hand, emphasizes the rewriting of Ottoman History with a new perspective. He completely rejects his ideas, which argue that "*The Ottoman Empire could not complete its economic development, could not keep up with the transformation of Europe, remained attached to traditions instead of modernizing, because Islamic civilization and culture were not suitable for this*". He says that it has no scientific side, it is just a product of the European obsession to defend its ideology and to dominate the West (İslamoğlu, 1998). Mehmet Genç looks at this issue from a different perspective in his work. He says that the development process of the Ottoman state was completely unique. He has a unique political, economic and economic system and Mehmet Genç focuses on the concept of "*subsistence*" in his work and states that "*it is a system that does not allow individual wealth and capitalist development*" (Genç, 2000). In the determinations made by political scientists and economists, it is said that "*in every period of history, human societies have had a political life and an economic order*". In the words of Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, it is stated that "*In the National Struggles, there is a contradiction and inconvenience in the form of technical developments and their possession. Not only the class fights, but also the National Liberation struggles emerge from the historical consequences of this incongruity and contradiction. Colonial and semi-colonial systems in the contemporary sense would not have arisen if there were no abnormal concentrations of industry and capital in some countries for the sake of deprivation of industry and priming of some countries in one world. If the means of production and technical forces were rationally distributed around the world, the National Liberation struggles, which are the reaction of this economic disparity and injustice, would not naturally occur.*" (Aydemir, 2011) The Lausanne peace talks were tough. The United States was most uneasy when it was interrupted on February 4, 1923. Because, since November 1922, an American capitalist group had been negotiating with the Turkish authorities in Ankara about the construction of railways and the operation of mines in Eastern Anatolia. The ratification of this agreement in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey should be viewed as a move to benefit from the American influence (Arar, 1981). On this occasion, Mustafa Kemal Pasha's message in the Hakimiyet Milliye newspaper dated February 22, 1923, which began with the phrase "*To the Great American Nation*", said, "*It has been agreed unanimously that the declaration addressed to the American people will be recorded in the congress.*" In the minutes of the 4th session of the 67th Meeting of the American Congress, dated 26 (February 26, 1923), there are the following lines: "*Before Mr. Owen-Reis, a member of the public, takes my place, I call the attention of the parliament to the attention of the Turkish President, Mustafa Kemal Pasha's address to the American people. I do not want to waste the time of the parliament by reading it. But this address is something that should be seen by all members of public and the parliament. Because although the person who said this is Turkish, he is saying it in the language of American people and this person is worthy of being listened to.*" (Arar, 1981) The copy of the declarations of Mustafa Kemal Pasha was as follows: "*To the Great American Nation: You have rejected oppression and tyranny from your homeland. You, after a long and bloody struggle, have established a democratic state and a mighty civilization based on public domination by producing your own freedom and future. There is another nation on the other side of the world, fighting for the same freedom, the same independence and the same democracy. They want to imitate the purity and loftiness of this ideal in the eyes of you. These propaganda agents are either some ignorant hypocrites or the execution of our secret and overt enemies who want to destroy our newly gained freedom and deprive us of it. Do not believe the lies and slander. Please open your heart to the Turkish people who fight for the sake of freedom and future and who, like you, are fighting*

sincerely to be the agents of progress and justice in the world” (Arar, 1981). He was giving the message, "Now we are fighting the same war against Western interests that you gave. Empathize, keep your heart open to us."

In response to the letter from Talat Pasha, titled *“I think the future of the country will be as follows:”* in 1919 before the 22nd Law, the situation was described as follows in Mustafa Kemal's letter dated February 20, 1920, which began with the phrase *“Undetailed reasoning of the situation”*: *“The French and the Italians have always, and the British from time to time, sent large and powerful political officials to Sivas in order to make an agreement with the Kuvayi Milliye. We have never approached the issue of self-sacrifice at the border and independence points. For this reason, they preferred to take advantage of the time, in the hope that they could make us make the maximum sacrifice. We talked more candidly with the Americans. The General (Harbord) personally gave a lengthy opinion in Sivas and ultimately decided to act in our favor”* (Tekeli-İlkin, 1980). Mustafa Kemal's first contact with America began with the General Harbord meeting. It was known that there were issues regarding the American mandate and support for the Allied Powers. The Founder of the American state, George Washington, stated in his farewell message when he left his post that America should develop commercial relations in relations with foreign states, not to establish political ties and not to adhere to European Policies (Armaoğlu, 1999). James Monroe, the fifth president of America, declared in the message he gave at the Congress on December 2, 1823, that he would not allow European states to intervene in the American continent, and that America would not interfere with the problems of Europe (Armaoğlu, 1999). In Political History this doctrine is known as the *"Monroe doctrine"*. However, America had prospered in commerce, finance and industry, and expanded its spheres of influence in the US continent. With the saturation of the American domestic market, large capital owners had demands and pressures to open up to foreign markets and find new markets. The Monroe doctrine was being scrapped. As of the 19th century, the United States participated in two major World Wars caused by European states within a network of indirect relations. In the later developments, the USA would be involved in world problems or would determine a position for itself in the problems it caused. Thus, it was accepted as a world power after the Second World War.

Relations And Developments with Western States Between 1932-1938

In Italy, Mussolini's coming to power in 1922 and the expansionist foreign policies he followed would cause tensions to arise. The goal of the *"Great Italy Mediterranean"*, the concentration of power it reinforced since 1926, and the start of it in the Mediterranean and the Aegean was a process that escalated the tension. Italy was also a serious threat to the Balkans. A situation would arise in which Turkey would be affected by the developments in the Balkans. At the same time, he had to be prepared for the attack that might come from Greece and Bulgaria. Securing its security In 1933, Turkey and Greece signed a border security and immunity agreement. By 1934, the Balkan pact was established, in which Greece, Romania, Yugoslavia and Turkey joined. According to the provisions of the pact, states were committed to protect the borders of the state against the aggressor when attacks were made between them (Sander, 2013). France wanted to secure its attempts to secure itself by making agreements with the Central European states. Since Italy wanted to guarantee its own security, a neutrality and reconciliation agreement was signed between Turkey and Italy on 30 June 1928 (Yalçın, 2004). The Balkan Pact agreement seemed to have brought a lot of prestige to Turkey. The visit of Iranian Shah Reza Pahlavi to Turkey in 1934 was positive, and the Turkish-Iranian border was also resolved within the mutual friendship agreement of the problems between the two states. The efforts of the Republic of Turkey to develop its relations with the Western Countries were due to the heavy economic conditions in Turkey. As German banks started to open branches in Istanbul, Italy, its industry and banks were in competition with German banks. Italy's financial aid to Turkey and the debt of five million lire had a certain effect. Italian banks were making large loans to merchants and contractors who traded with Turkey or entered into contracting business (Krüger, 1981) With the Treaty of Lausanne, the condition that the pre-war customs tariffs not be changed within five years after the Western powers recognized

the Turkish state was accepted by the Turkish Government (Keyder, 1982). It placed no legal restrictions on the entry of foreign capital in the form of direct investment or credit. On the other hand, the absence of a central bank allowed the value of the Turkish lira to be determined in the market against foreign currencies (Keyder, 1982). After the world's 1929 economic crisis, the Republic of Turkey adopted a statist economic development policy. Turkey joined the League of Nations in 1932 and its relations with the West have improved. In 1936, the straits issue was resolved with the Montreux treaty. Turkey applied to the League of Nations on April 17, 1935, but could not get support from England. This policy change of England was due to the idea of creating a security circle in the face of increasing tensions in Germany and Italy. Another interesting aspect is that an economic bond was established with the industrial and arms loans signed on May 27, 1938, and that it coincided completely with the escalation of the world war. It is seen that Turkey took the lead in the establishment of the Sadabat Pact in 1937. The political tension in Europe showed that preparations for a great war could begin. Italy's invasion of Abyssinia in 1936 showed the extent of the threat. In the note given by Turkey on April 10, 1936, it was aimed to clarify the problem of the Straits. It was reported that in an environment where the war was approaching, the straits would also threaten their own country. When a meeting was held in Montreux, Switzerland on June 22, 1936, upon Turkey's rightful request, Turkey's rights over the straits were granted (İnan, 1986). Under the leadership of England, Turkey was protecting its interests by using diplomacy from Turkey's international tensions. The relations between England and Turkey began to deteriorate before the First World War and with the start of the war. The tension between the two countries continued in Lausanne since the period of the National Struggle and lasted until 1934. England did not support Turkey on many issues that Turkey was right

CONCLUSION

In the face of Turkey's efforts to improve its relations with the West, it is seen that the West considers the principle of power and interest. It is also clearly understood that it follows policies that will improve its relations with every country on security issues based on interest. It is known that we Turks are more emotional in these matters. Whether this is a deficiency or a surplus is a matter of debate. We can find the best example of this in Rauf Orbay's statement: "*The general opinion in our country was that England and France were countries that were loyal not only to their written agreements but also to their promises. This is what I believed. It is a pity that we are wrong in our beliefs and convictions*" (Mac Millan, 2004). There are many reasons why the National Struggle and the establishment of the Republic of Turkey and the economic and political relationship that was desired to be established with the West could not reach the desired level. Relations with England started to improve as of 1934. Due to the expansionist threat in the foreign policies of Germany and Italy, relations with Turkey have also improved. Although there were political and economic developments in the alliance agreement with England, France and Turkey on October 16, 1939, it should also be seen that there was a security agreement. Turkey's joining the League of Nations in 1932 has been a positive development in western relations. It is understood that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk attached great importance to the development of relations with the West. The developing relations with Soviet Russia, which started during the National Struggle, continued until 1930, and then there was a retreat in relations. It is also known that England and France are uncomfortable with the relations between Turkey and Soviet Russia. The fact that England was the foremost representative of Western civilization at that time reveals an unnoticed closeness of Mustafa Kemal with England. In addition, Mustafa Kemal's approach to the West was seen as a security problem.

REFERENCES

- Akbaş, H. (2012). *İngiltere ile İlişkiler*, (ed). Haydar Çakmak. Türk Dış Politikası, 1919-2012, Barış Platin Kitap.
- Arar, İ. (1981). *Atatürk'ün Amerikan Milletine Seslenişi*, Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Armaoğlu, F. (1999). *19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarih (1789-1914)*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

- Armaoğlu, F. (2017). *20.Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1914-1945)*, Timaş Yayınları.
- Aydemir, Ş. S. (2011). *İnkılap ve Kadro*, Remzi Kitabevi.
- Büyükakıncı, E. (2012). *Sovyetler Birliği ile İlişkiler*, (ed). Haydar Çakmak. Türk Dış Politikası (1919-2012), Barış Platin Kitap.
- Çalık, R. (2004). *Alman Basınında Milli Mücadele ve Mustafa Kemal Paşa 1919-1923*, Özkan Matbaacılık.
- Çelebi, M. (2002). *Milli Mücadele Döneminde Türk İtalya İlişkileri*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.
- Eroğlu, H. (1981). *Türk Devrim Tarihi*, Sanem Matbaası.
- Genç, M. (2000). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, Ötüken Yayınları.
- Güven, C. (2012). *Milli Mücadelede Mustafa Kemal Paşa'nın Yabancılarla Temas ve Görüşmeleri*, Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Hale, W. (2003). *Türk Dış Politikası*, Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Işıl, M.- Eşitti, Ş. (2015). *I. Dünya Savaşı Propaganda Afişlerinde Kadın Temsilcilerinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Bağlamında Göstergibilimsel İnceleme*, Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Journal Publications, Vol.70 No:3, 655-682.
- İnalçık, H. (1963). *Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Modernleşmesi*, T.T.K. Yayınları.
- İnan, Y. (1986). *Türk Boğazlarının Siyasal Hukuksal Rejimi*, Ankara Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- İslamoğlu, H. (1998). *16.Yüzyıl Anadolu'sunda Köylüler Ticarileşme ve Devlet İktidarının Meşrulaştırılması*, Yurt Yayınları.
- Kasaba, R. (1993). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Dünya Ekonomisi*, Çev:Kudret Emiroğlu, Bilge Yayınları
- Kennedy, P (1990). *Büyük Güçlerin Yükselişi ve Çöküşü*, T.İş. Bankası Yayınları.
- Keyder, Ç. (1982). *Dünya Ekonomisi İçinde Türkiye (1923-1929)*, Yurt Yayınları.
- Krüger, K. (1981). *Kemalist Türkiye ve Ortadoğu*, Altın Kitaplar.
- Latif, H. (2012). *Fransa ile İlişkiler*, (ed) Haydar Çakmak. Türk Dış Politikası 1919-2012 Barış Platin Kitap.
- Mac Millan, M. (2004). *Paris 1919: Dünya'yı Değiştiren Altı Ay*, O.D.T.Ü. Geliştirme Vakfı Yayıncılık.
- Meray S. L. (1969). *Lozan Konferansı, Tutanaklar, Belgeler*, SBF Yayınları.
- Mumcu, A. (1997). *Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi II*, A.Ü.Yayınları.
- Oran, B. (2001). *Türk Dış Politikası 1919-1980*, İletişim Yayınları.
- Oran, B. (2003). *Türk Dış Politikası 1919-1980*, (Ed) Baskın Oran. İletişim Yayınları.
- Sander, O. (2013). *Siyasi Tarih (1918-1994)*, İmge Yayınları.
- Smith, M. L. (1978). *Anadolu Üzerindeki Göz*, Çev: Halim İnal, Hürriyet Yayınları.
- Soysal, İ. (1989). *Türkiye'nin Siyasal Antlaşmaları (1920-1945)*, Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Tekeli, İ- İ. S. (1980). *Kurtuluş Savaşında Talat Paşa Mustafa Kemal Mektuplaşmaları*, Belleten, Cilt:44, No: 174, 301-345
- Tezel, Y.S. (1982). *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisat Tarihi*, Yurt Yayınları.

- Tükmen, Z. (2002). *İstanbul'un İşgali ve İşgal Döneminde Uygulamalar (13 Kasım 1918- 16 Mart 1920)*, Journal of Atatürk Research Center, Vol:18, No:53, 319-371.
- Ünver, M. (2018). *Osmanlı Devletindeki İngiliz Ticaretinin Almanya Karşısında Gerilemesi Tartışmaları Bağlamında İstanbul'da İngiliz Erkek Lisesinin Kuruluşu*, Atatürk University Journal of Turkic Studies, No:61, 375-414
- Yalçın, D. (2004). *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi 2*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.
- Yalçın, S.E. (2000). *Atatürk'ün Milli Dış Politikası*, Berikan Yayınevi.
- Yılmaz, S. (2012). *İtalya İlişkileri*, (ed) Haydar Çakmak, Türk Dış politikası (1919-2012) Barış Platin Kitap.