

The Second Group in the First Turkish Grand National Assembly

I. Dönem Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi'nde İkinci Grup

Gülay SARIÇOBAN*

Abstract

The First Turkish Grand National Assembly, called the First Parliament in the history of our Republic, is the most significant and important mission of our recent history. In fact, it is an extraordinary assembly that has achieved such a challenging task as the National Struggle with an endless effort. The ideas contained within each community reflect the pains they have experienced during the development process. Different ideas and methods gave the Parliament a colorful and dynamic structure. We can call the struggle between the First and Second Groups in the First Parliament as the pro-secular progressives and the reigners who defended the Ottoman order. The first group represented the power and the second group represented the opposition. Therefore, the First Group was the implementing side and the Second Group was a critic of these practices. The Second Group argued that in terms of their ideas, not just of their time, has also been the source of many political conflicts in the Republic of Turkey. Thus, the Second Group has marked the next political developments. The Second Group, which played such an important role, forced us to do such work. Our aim is to put forward the task undertaken by the Second Group until its dissolution. In this study, we try to evaluate the Second Group with the ideas it represents, its effectiveness within the Parliament and its contribution to the political developments.

Key words: Second group, first Turkish Grand National Assembly, republic, history, the first parliament.

Öz

Cumhuriyet tarihimizde Birinci Meclis olarak adlandırılan I. Dönem Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi, yakın tarihimizin en anlamlı ve önemli heyetidir. Gerçekten de sonsuz bir çabayla Milli Mücadele gibi zorlu bir görevi başarmış olağanüstü bir meclistir. İçinde barındırdığı fikirler her toplumun gelişme sürecinde çektiği sancıları yansıtmaktadır. Farklı fikirler ve yöntemler Meclise renkli ve dinamik bir yapı kazandırmıştır. Birinci Mecliste Birinci ve İkinci Gruplar arasındaki mücadeleyi, laik cumhuriyet yanlısı ilericilerle, Osmanlı düzenini savunan saltanat yanlısı gericiiler olarak nitelendirebiliriz. Birinci Grup iktidarı, İkinci Grup ise muhalefeti temsil etmiştir. Dolayısıyla Birinci Grup uygulayan İkinci Grup ise bu uygulamaları eleştiren taraf olmuştur. İkinci Grup savunduğu fikirler açısından sadece kendi dönemlerinin değil, Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sindeki pek çok siyasal çatışmanın kaynağı olmuştur. Böylece İkinci Grup kendinden sonraki siyasal gelişmelere de damgasını vurmuştur. Böylesine önemli bir rol oynayan İkinci Grup, bizi böyle bir çalışma yapmaya zorlamıştır. Amacımız İkinci Grubun kuruluşundan feshine kadar Meclis içinde üstlendiği görevi tüm açıklığıyla ortaya koymaktır. Bu çalışmada İkinci Grup, temsil ettiği fikirlerle, Meclis içindeki etkinliğiyle, siyasi gelişmelere yaptığı katkısıyla değerlendirilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İkinci grup, Birinci Dönem Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi, Cumhuriyet tarihi, İlk Meclis

Introduction

XIX. Century Ottomanism, Islamism, Turkism and Westernism, which emerged in the Ottoman Empire in the 13th century, aimed to sustain the Ottoman Empire. These ideas, which are different from each other by their thoughts, methods and practices, have kept the minds of the last Ottoman intellectuals. Yusuf Akçura (Akçura, 1991), a Kazan Turk, wrote about Ottomanism, Islamism and Turkism in his article titled Three Styles of Politics in 1904, after which he decided on Turkism and started an important debate.

This idea has found supporters from different circles. Beginning with II. Mahmut, Ottomanism was active in the period until II. Abdülhamit. During his reign II. Abdulhamit supported the Islamist movement and was a practitioner of it. With the second constitutional monarchy, Turkism and Westernism were tried to be applied in Turkish politics.

Turkism and Westernism aim to combat the movements of Ottomanism and Islamism, which basically rendered the empire out of date. If we describe Turkism and Westernism as Innovative; Ottomanism and Islamism as Conservative, both groups have directed their struggle especially to the political field and organized according to political aims. In general, the innovators were organized in the Union and Progress Society and the conservatives were or-

* Doç. Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Entitüsü, gulaysaricoban@gmail.com

ganized in the Freedom and Accord Party (Tunaya, 1952, pp. 478-509).

Both parties' struggle continued in 1908 after the change of governance. The March 31 Incident was one of the biggest explosions of this struggle, but the Unionists suppressed this uprising with the Movement Army.

During the process of change in the administration of the Committee of Union and Progress in 1908, the constitutional order was established and the Constitution was declared. However, the innovative-structural changes necessary for the existence of the Empire could not be realized. Because of this feature, the 1908 incident could not be more than just a military-political coup d'état. (Berkes, 1998, p. 404). The main reason for this is that the unionist leaders break away from their bases and the subsequent battles and defeats have not provided the necessary structural changes.

During the period of armistice, the Unionists were liquidated from the state. Supporters of the Freedom and Accord Party, in this period, literally went hunting unionists. The intellectuals of this period brought up many different solutions and there was a complete confusion of ideas. With the start of the resistance movements in Anatolia and supported by the public through the countrywide resistance organizations, these very complex ideas and solutions found a place to struggle in the First Grand National Assembly of Turkey which was opened on 23 April 1920. The main reason for this diversity is the fact that the deputies who are the members of the Assembly are from the Defense of Law and Refusal Committees in the provinces. In short, all the ideas in the country took place in the First Parliament.

These ideas, which were not clear during the opening of the Assembly, led to the emergence of various groups as time passed. These are the First Group of Defense of Law and the Second Group of Defense of Law.

These two groups in the first Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) struggled for Innovative-Conservative ideas under the same roof, which had already existed in the last years of the empire, but remained ineffective when one was in power. This competition did not adversely affect the national struggle, but on the contrary, it enabled works to be done with great care and made a significant contribution to the National Struggle.

Opening of the Turkish Grand National Assembly

Before making an assessment on the opening of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, it would be useful to summarize the political developments in the period from the Sivas Congress until the opening of the Assembly. Immediately after the Sivas Congress, the relations between the Anatolian resistance movements and the Istanbul government became very tense. Mustafa Kemal Pasha had cut off all relations with the government of Damat Ferit Pasha, who was openly opposed to the Anatolia movement, and the government of Damat Ferit Pasha, whose power was limited to only a few provinces in and around Istanbul, had to resign in the face of this pressure of Anatolia. Instead, the government was established by Ali Rıza Pasha, who could establish better relations with the Sivas delegation.

The Government of Ali Rıza Paşa issued a decree on 9 October 1919 and announced that the Assembly would be reopened. The government also elected to soften relations with the Sivas delegation and the representatives of the two administrations had a bilateral meeting in Amasya on 20 October 1920. As a result of this meeting attended by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Hüseyin Rauf and Bekir Sami Bey on behalf of the Delegation of Representative, Salih Pasha, Minister of the Navy in the name of Istanbul Government, the Istanbul Government recognized the Sivas delegation and it was decided that the parliamentary elections would be held as soon as possible for the meeting of the Ottoman Parliament. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, in order

to give a legitimate ground to the movement, from the very beginning, wanted to convene an Assembly as soon as possible in Anatolia, not in Istanbul. In addition, the high-ranking commanders and some of the local administrators also attended the meeting of the delegation held in Sivas in November 1919, the Assembly meeting in Istanbul on the opinion that Mebusan should be gathered in Istanbul.

Following the elections, the last Ottoman Assembly was held in Istanbul on 12 January 1920. On January 31, 1920, Reşat Hikmet Bey was elected as the speaker of the Assembly. Upon the death of the President of the Assembly on 4 March 1920, as a result of the new election, Erzurum MP and Constitution professor Celalettin Arif Bey was appointed as president.

Although Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected as MP from Erzurum, he was not involved in any of the sessions of this council, but he was very interested in its works. He made intensive efforts to establish a group under the name of Defense of Law in order to widen the mass support of the movement in Anatolia. However, this group could not be established on February 6, 1920, Felah-ı Vatan Group was established.

The most important performance of the last Ottoman Parliament in a short period of 3 months was the acceptance of the National Pact on 28 January 1920 by documenting the military rights of the Turkish Nation. The allied powers, which were disturbed by this development, officially occupied Istanbul on 16 March 1920. After the invasion, British soldiers raided the Assembly. On the 16th of March 1920, the last meeting of the Assembly, Sinop MP Rıza Nur Bey and his sixteen friends offered to postpone the general meetings on the grounds that there was no possibility for him to do his duty. The proposal was put into practice and was accepted by alliance (Ağaoğlu, 1987, pp. 37-39).

In the meantime, Kara Vasıf Bey, Rauf Bey and eleven MPs were arrested and deported to Malta. (Arslantürk, 1977, pp. 277) On the postponement of the negotiations in the Parliament, the Sultan VI, Mehmet Vahdettin, on April 11, 1920, annulled the Assembly on the condition that new elections would be held within four months at the latest. (Selek, 1987, pp. 333). Thus, the Ottoman Parliament was closed in order not to open again.

While these events took place in Istanbul, Mustafa Kemal Pasha started the first initiatives on behalf of the Delegation of Representatives. On the day of the occupation news, the situation was communicated to the Corps Commander and Governorates (Karabekir, 1990, pp. 496). In addition, all kinds of telegraph communications with Istanbul were banned. Those who took the telegraph to Istanbul without permission, the ones who accepted the enemy communiqués to Anatolia and who gave the talks to Istanbul in Anatolia were accepted as spy and punished immediately (Karabekir, 1990, pp. 506), (H.T.V.D, 1957, Issue:22, No:567).

According to the password was taken on March 17, 1920, within fifteen days, an Ankara Assembly of Müessisan will be convened in Ankara and the members of this assembly will be formed by selecting five members from each of the Sanjaks, who will be held by the members of the Sanjak, who have the power of intellectual dignity and intellectual power, who are over the age of twenty-five, who do not have a reputation and non-Muslims will not participate in elections (Karabekir, 1990, p. 514), (H.T.V.D, 1958, Issue:23, No:592).

5th Corps Commander and 3rd Corps Commander and Sivas Governor Reşit Paşa opposed the expression "Meclis-i Müessesian". His objections convened at this point: "People know the National Assembly, but will not understand the Assembly. What is to be achieved? It is inconvenient to use such a name that the nation cannot understand and respect" (H.T.V.D, 1958, Issue:23, No:593). Mustafa Kemal Pasha did not insist on the resistance of

the Corps commanders, and on the day of March 19, 1920, he sent his statement with extraordinary powers instead of Meclis-i Müessisan and stated that the deputies from Istanbul could also participate in the Assembly.

Despite the election of the Assembly as the opening date of April 22 after the elections, the arrival of April 23 on Friday revealed the idea of such a favorable event to be held on a good day, and was accepted as the opening day of the Assembly by the Delegation of 23 April 1920. In a special meeting held on April 22, the name of the Assembly was discussed. Hamdullah Suphi Bey presented "Congres" while the president of the last Ottoman Parliament Assembly, Celalettin Arif Bey presented "Assembly-i Kebir-i Milli" proposals. However, upon the proposal of Mustafa Kemal Pasha "Turkish Grand National Assembly" was accepted as its name (Adıvar, 1987, p. 115).

Thus, on 23 April 1920, the newly elected deputies, Turkish Grand National Assembly, which is equipped with extraordinary powers with the participation of delegates from the Assembly of Istanbul was collected in Ankara. In the first session, Sinop deputy Şerif Bey was elected as temporary president because he was the oldest member. (Kılıç, 1955, p. 32) Later, in the session on 24 April 1920, Mustafa Kemal Pasha gave a broad information about the period from the signature of the Armistice until the opening of the Assembly. In the same session, 120 deputies participated in the voting, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected to the Parliamentary Chair with 110 votes, Celalettin Arif Bey with 109 votes to the Second President, Konya MP Çelebi Abdülhalim Efendi and Kırşehir MP Çelebi Cemalettin Efendi to the Vice Presidents. (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 1, 1959, p. 38).

A declaration was prepared and announced to the nation on 25 April 1920. This declaration stated that the aim of the Grand National Assembly was to save the Caliph-sultan from enemy pressure and his hometown from enemy occupation and not to let the nation be provoked by provocations of enemies. (TGNA Zabıt Ceridesi, 1, 1959, p. 60). Then, at the meeting on 28 April 1920, it was reported that the Sultanate and the Caliphate would be saved.

As can be seen, when the Turkish Grand National Assembly was opened, the image of the Sultan and his circle was still accepted. In such a tactic, first of all, it was expected that the cooperation between the palace and its environments with the occupying forces and the military resistance against occupation were expected to be clear. Thus, a step-by-step policy was followed by a single-party Republic.

General Features of Turkish Grand National Assembly

Social Structure of the Assembly

The session of the TGNA on 23 April 1923 was held with the participation of 120 people. The reason for this is that the elections are delayed and most of the deputies have not yet reached Ankara.

Elections were difficult in some places. Elections in Maraş, Urfa, Elazığ, Diyarbakır, and Trabzon were very difficult, and some of the elected deputies resigned immediately or were considered to have resigned because they did not attend the Assembly. The first few months of the Assembly due to delays have been passed by the examination of the presentation of the Parliament to the Assembly and the review of the certification of elections. (Selçuk, 1987, p. 340-341).

Some of the deputies have resigned while some of the deputies have served, some of them have been dismissed and some have passed away. For example, at the 29th meeting of the Assembly on July 6, 1920, nine MPs were reported to have resigned and three others died. (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 2, 1981, p. 185).

It is difficult to conclude a definite judgment on the number of MPs for the reasons mentioned above. In fact, the number of deputies of the period is inconsistent within each other. The Album of the 50th Anniversary of the TGNA includes the names of 378 members, election areas, ages and professions. However, the age of some deputies and some professions could not be determined by this classification. (Gülekli/Onaran, 1973, pp. 30-38). If the MPS are subjected to an evaluation in terms of occupational groups, the results of the examination of 361 MPS are divided into ten groups; there are 69 Ilmiye class members, 58 soldiers, 29 educators, 27 economists, 37 diplomats, 50 lawyers, 62 civil servants, 39 agriculturalists, 18 medical workers and 2 technical workers. (Irmak, 1987, pp. 265-270). If these occupational groups are examined in more detail, we see various professions such as farmers, journalists, lawyers, engineers, educators, prison directors, muftis, sheikhs (Mevlevi, Bektashi, Nakshibendi) and preachers. (Tunaya, 1958, p. 231).

In the first article of the Nisab-Negotiation Law, adopted on 5 September 1920, it was reported that the Parliament will continue its mandate until it fulfills its purpose, which consists of saving the Caliphate and the Sultanate and the liberation of the nation. (Düstur, 1929, p. 57) Apart from this common goal, the MPs from different circles and professions have also been defenders of their views and principles. These MPs were members of different organizations and societies. These are: the Committee of Union and Progress Party, Freedom and Accord Party, Farmers' Association, the Turkish National Party, Turkey-hours Party, National Ahrar- Population Economics Party and various Defense of Rights and was Reddi Annexation Societies (Tunaya, 1958, p. 232) (Berkes, 1998, p. 491).

However, this did not constitute an obstacle to their working together. But they have to look at the basis of national sovereignty according to different thoughts, that is, some of the MPs perceived this as the Republic, some Bolshevism and some of them as a constitutional order. This is naturally reflected in the work within the Assembly.

Trabzon MP Ali Şükrü Bey, proposed, with the Men-i Müskirat law, the production and sale of alcohol, which is an important source of income to be banned and this was approved by the Assembly. (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 4, p. 130-138)

Due to the cost of the fez, it was proposed to wear a kalpak and they had a very tough discussion on this issue. (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 1, 1959, pp. 149-150) When Tunalı Hilmi Bey raises the right of women to be elected and elect, he saw great reaction, even his speech was prevented.

On the other hand, the Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law was accepted by the Assembly. However, these differences of opinion have not overshadowed the personality of the Assembly, the sanctity and the good will of the MPs. It is a reflection of the ideas settled in the members of the Turkish Nation that has a great history (Irmak, 1974, p. 272). The differences in understanding and purpose did not adversely affect the work of the Assembly, and created a balance and made it work healthier. The Assembly, with a party discipline and by not preventing the representation of free representatives of the nation's representatives, has worked in a more democratic way. In this respect is an assembly to be taken as an example.

It is a fact that the society is so dynamic that there are very different movements of thought in a society. The societies where the thought movements are in struggle with each other have always pioneered the developments. One of the factors that lead the Turkish National Struggle to success is the multiplicity of thought movements in the Grand National Assembly and its balanced struggle.

The Legal Structure of the Assembly

After the negotiations between 25-29 April 1920, the Grand National Assembly of Turkey adopted the Law No. 2 Hiyamet-i Vataniye and emphasized that it was the legitimate organ authorized to achieve this objective.

The Law on Hiyamet-i Vataniye is important in terms of giving the Assembly its authority after the legislative and executive judiciary, in addition to Article 8 of the Assembly. In the eighth article, the verdicts that were passed by the courts and which were not approved by the Assembly were called the Assembly's decision, clearly showing that the first TGNA had the jurisdiction. (Velidedeoğlu, 1974, p. 132-133).

The biggest step to finalize the state structure and establish the legal framework of the assembly government system was taken as a result of the constitution accepted as Article 85 on January 20, 1921. Solely, a constitutional framework for the assembly government (union of forces) was adopted from the onset of the establishment of the assembly. With its accepted final form "the fundamental framework of 1921 constitution can be summarized as National Sovereignty-Legislative (relation of identity); Legislative-Executive (procuratorship); Executive-Administration (relation of supervenience). In short, Community-Parliament-Government-Bureaucracy" (Parla, 1986, p. 25). The principal of liberal parliamentary democracy has been stated in such a clear term in the final constitutional text.

Prepared on September 13 and presented to the assembly on September 18 after negotiations, the program so called as "Populism Program" is the source of "the Constitutional Law". In this law, the sultanate and the caliphate were not mentioned, only in the section of "Madde-i Münferide", the first article in the Nisab-ı Müzakere Law (Majority of Negotiations) was addressed. The Article 1 of the mentioned law is as follows:

"The Turkish Grand National Assembly" (TGNA) gathers until it abolishes the Caliphate and the Sultanate for the Independence of the Country and the Community, which is its aim" Mumcu, 1988, p. 58).

Within this context, it can be implied that the ultimate responsibility of The Turkish Grand National Assembly will be over after it abolishes the Caliphate and the Sultanate. Moreover, that this statement is in the constitution reinforces this impression. However, the principle that the independence belongs to the nation stated in Article 1 of the Constitution is so clear and precise that the contrary cannot be alleged. The course of events have always happened in that way.

One of the most important features of the First Turkish Grand National Assembly is that it has the power to change the regime when needed. This power gives the assembly the Qualification of the Establishing Assembly (Özbudun, 1985, p. 483).

The First Grouping in the TGNA

The difference of understandings and the aims among the representatives will cause the ones with the same opinions to gather and act together and this will cause some groups to flourish in the assembly.

By time, upon the differing opinions in the assembly and the delays in the assembly functioning, towards the mid of 1920, groupings started to act together in order to secure uniformity (Nutuk, 1989, p. 792). Nonetheless, these groups, which were established in order to help and ease the assembly works, would make the assembly functioning harder and cause clashes of ideas due to the conflicts among them (Arar, 1969, p. 20).

In the article "The Groups in the Assembly" published in the New Day (Yeni Gün) by

the Blacksea (Lazistan) Representative Osman Bey he reports that none of these groups have a program, among the representatives of the same groups even there are some with totally different opinions, and they only imitate the central right and the central left in the counties governed by constitutional monarchy (Yeni Gün, April 11, 1921).

Especially during the negotiations of the constitution, these emerging groups, many in numbers but with a few members, are named as the Group of Solidarism, the Group of Liberty, the Group of Countrywide Resistance (Müdafaa-i Hukuk Grubu), the Community Group, and the Reform Group (Nutuk, 1989, p. 794; Güneş, 1985, p. 107-135; Tunaya, 1986, pp. 529-533). There is not much information about the members of these groups, except for the Group of Solidarism and the Community Group.

The Group of Solidarism

This is a group established mostly by unionists. By converting a market into a cafe house and naming it “Solidarism”, the group was mentioned with that name. Besides, they had a dormitory so called “Beylic Barn”.

The members of the Group of Solidarism, the chairperson of which was Yusuf İzzet Pasha, are Çorum representative Ferit, Antalya representative İsmail Suphi Soysallı, Sivas representative Rasim, Kastamonu representatives Dr. Suat and Abdülkadir, Maraş representative Tahsin, Sinop representative Şevket, and Bitlis representative Yusuf Ziya Bey (Kılıç, 1955, p. 81).

They attempted to convince the assembly to accept the principal of Professional representation and for this reason they were accused of causing race conflicts. This is the only act they are known for.

The Group of Liberty

This was an unofficial group of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. It consists of youngs, new ideas and revolutionists (Arikoğlu, 1961, p. 232). There was a wide variety of ideas from liberals to those for the state socialism (Ağaoğlu, 1987, p. 59). Most probably they entered this group during the establishment of the Group of Countrywide Resistance (Müdafaa-i Hukuk Grubu).

The Group of Countrywide Resistance

This group with the ideas of the Anatolian and Rumelian Countrywide Resistance Group consisted of many different ideas (Ağaoğlu, 1987, p. 59). Upon the 1st and 2nd Groups in the assembly they were separated in these mention two groups.

The Community Group

This is a left-oriented group for which most of the unionists are members. Upon the impact of Enver Pasha in Russia, they had relations with the “Communist Party”, the “Community Party”, and the “Green Army Society” (Arar, 1969, p. 38). The group gained an integrity upon the abolishment of the Green Army Society (Selek, 1987, p. 607).

Among its members are Eyüp Sabri Bey, Adnan Adıvar, Şeyh Servet Efendi, Hakkı Behiç Bey and Yunus Nadi (Şener, 1990, p. 86). The most important act of this group is the “Program of Populism” prepared as a government program which was presented to the assembly. Upon long lasting negotiations and some changes, this program was accepted as the constitution on January 20, 1921.

The Reform Group

This is a conservative group established by the Ottoman reformists and some unionists

(Zürcher, 1987, p. 244). This group defended the opinion to make some new needed changes in the organizations and the institutions of the Ottoman Empire (Selek, 1987, p. 620). Later, a great number of members of this group entered the 2nd group of Countrywide Resistance.

The Establishment of the 1st Group of the Countrywide Resistance

Due to the fact that the independent groups mentioned above could not be formed in the assembly and the Group of Liberty could act as is desired, Mustafa Kemal Pasha took actions. He had first one-to-one negotiations with the representatives who are close to his opinions and then in groups (Ağaoğlu, 1987, p. 59). In these negotiations the representatives were asked to join the group to be formed. Those who were unwilling to join were informed that they were free in their opinions.

The group had its first meeting on May 10, 1921. At this meeting, Madde-i Esasiye and Nizamname-i Dâhili were accepted (Hâkimiyeti Milliye, 11 Mayıs 1921.) In the second meeting on May 11, 1921 an administrative board, the chair of which was Mustafa Kemal Pasha, was formed. At the outset, the group was consisted of 113 members (Selek, 1987, pp. 623-624).

The group as is stated in Madde-i Esasiye was mainly formed with these two purposes:

- (1) In order to win a victory in line with National Pact and establish peace, material and moral powers should be directed towards the needed targets,
- (2) The necessary attempts should be made to form State and Public Organizations within the framework of constitution.

The first group of the Anatolian and Rumelian Countrywide Resistance is not a political party in all senses. It is a group gathered around the aim to act together for some basic issues in the assembly. Nevertheless, those who were not accepted as members in the establishment of this group and the conservatives were in opposition. The basic issue that they were against was to form the new organization within the framework of the constitutional rules stated in the second section of Madde-i Esasiye (Tunaya, 1952, p. 538).

Neither the Group Nizamname-i Dahiliye nor the Act of Teşkilat-ı Esasiye did mention Sultanate or Caliphate in any way. Consequently, some were concerned that the Sultanate and the Caliphate would not be protected, and the Republican reign was to be established. These concerns would cause the opponents to organize a struggle with the Defense Legal Group and to form a political group.

Formation of the Second Group in Turkish Grand National Assembly and its General Characteristics

After the establishment of the Association of Defence of National Rights, the initial major reaction was from Erzurum. Hoca Raif Efendi and his colleagues renamed the Anatolian and Rumelian Association of Defence of National Rights, the Erzurum Delegation of Judiciary as the Association for the Preservation of the Sacred Institutions. The main aim of these associations was to ensure the independence of the Sultanate and the Caliphate and to prevent the change of the reign (Nutuk, 1989, pp. 796-798).

Some deputies in the parliament were worried about the same matter. These MPs would see it necessary to come and act together. Consequently, after the return of the Turkish prisoners from Malta, a new group was formed in the Parliament in the late November and mid-December in 1921 (Arıkoğlu, 1961, p. 272). The MPs of the new group were also elected by the Association of Defence of National Rights, and therefore they called themselves the Second Association of Defence of National Rights. 125 people belonging to the second group are listed. Among these deputies, there were those who resigned or were assumed to have

resigned from the First Group (Tunaya, 1952, pp. 538-539).

When the Parliamentary Committee Ceremonies and Secret Sessions are examined, it is noticed that the most effective and leading members of the second group are Erzurum Deputy Hüseyin Avni Bey, Mersin Deputy Salahattin Bey, Lazistan Deputy Ziya Hurşit, Trabzon Deputy Ali Şükrü Bey and Canik Deputy Emin Bey.

On July 16, 1922, the group identified a short three-item statement. The principles in this statement are:

- (1) Ensuring the national unity within the borders of Istanbul with the National Pact
- (2) Reformation of the existing laws based on the principle of national sovereignty
- (3) Protection and implementation of public rights (Tuncay, 1989, p. 46)

In addition to this short statement, there is also an internal charter with the name of Nizamname-i Dâhili, which consists of 16 items. The main reasons of this statement are given as:

- (1) To ensure consensus among the deputies who share the same opinion in the assembly in order to prevent loss of time,
- (2) To moderate and control the process in order to ensure independence within the borders of the National Pact,
- (3) To work as a sincere advocate of the National Sovereignty in order to ensure improvement and innovation for the economic status of the country,
- (4) To fight against any form of excessive conservatism, to fight against the views and deeds that go against the national morality, but which are promoted as innovation, and to ensure and introduce innovations in accordance with the religious and national needs of the people (Tunçay, 1989, p. 551).

According to the Bylaws, there is a 7-person executive committee elected for the period of three months through the secret ballot. The members of the group convene twice a week and the decision is taken with the absolute majority of the members attending the meeting. The issues to be discussed in the Assembly and the decisions to be made are discussed in the Group first and therefore, a common attitude and mutual decision is adopted by the group members. The group does not have a chairman (Tunçay, 1989, p. 352).

With the establishment of the second group in the parliament, two opposing groups emerged. The origin of both of them was the Anatolian Association of Defence of National Rights. Against the First Group representing the Power and government, the Second Group was in the opposing side. The second group only opposed to the issues that they cared about, and were often led by the debates in the parliament. They never intended to rule the government and obtain the power.

On the other hand, the Second Group paid attention to the presence and protection of the unification in the assembly until the National Struggle was over. That was why the group called itself as the Second Association of Defence of National Rights rather than adopting another name. When the articles that were published in the newspaper Tan, which first began to come to out on January 19, 1923 in order to disseminate the views and the parliamentary speeches of the group, it is seen that this unification is constantly emphasized (Demirel, 1995, p. 392). In the meantime, the release date of the Tan is given as 20 January 1923 in some sources, but it is wrong. Ali İhsan Sabis Pasha wrote in his personal memoirs that “the Second Group began to publish the newspaper first in January 1923 to disseminate their ideas,” (Sabis, ty, 357) which caused this misunderstanding. The first issue of the newspaper is absent in the collections at National Library in Ankara; the newspaper collection dates back to the second issue, which came out in January 1923. That is why the first issue of the newspaper is

never referred or used in any studies so far and the misunderstanding about the release date of the newspaper still exists. The second group's main concern was the common attitude against the individual reign. This struggle was not aimed at Mustafa Kemal Pasha's himself. The problems that were faced with due to the individual reign in the previous periods, especially during the Ittihat Terakki period, created the need for the dissidents to act responsibly. Supporting the concept of parliamentary sovereignty, the second group fought against any form of individual reign that might actually occur and acted extraordinarily sensitively about not recognizing anything superior to the assembly and the complete authority and supremacy of the national assembly. The transfer of some of the powers and authority of the Assembly to the Commander-in-Chief and the fact that the President of the Assembly is the natural chairman of the Heyet-i Vekile and that he has the right to nominate the deputies in the elections led Mustafa Kemal Pasha to claim the full authority and this should also be evaluated within this context (Köseoğlu, 1946, p. 10). The principle of establishing a law-based governance in the country is one of the basic principles the Second Group adheres to. As a result of this, the Second Group was sensitive about fundamental rights and freedoms. Opposing against the Independence Tribunal should be considered within this framework as well (Demirel, 1995, p. 394).

The Second Group is a group which mostly consists of conservative members. Although they adopted the concept of national sovereignty, they perceived and regarded it as a form of constitutional monarchy. They advocated the Sultanate and the Caliphate. In doing so, the group advocated not the Caliph - Sultan Vahdettin but the reign of Sultanate and Caliphate as a form of government.

We have mentioned that there are 125 members of the second group. In general, the median age of the Second Group is younger than that of the First Group and they are representatives of regions that are not occupied. 37% of the group members were military and civilian bureaucracy, 27% were self-employed, 24% were lawyers and 2% were farmers. The number of the persons who are members of the clergy in the second group is slightly higher than the First Group (Tunçay, 1989, p. 46).

It is possible to categorize and classify the members of the second group into three groups. These are conservatives, unionists and those who are not rejected by the First Group or have left the first group.

The majority of the members of the second group are conservative deputies. The leading representatives are Ali Şükrü Bey, Vehbi Bey, Hüseyin Hüsnü Efendi, Vehbi Hoca and Miralay Selahattin Bey (Ağaoğlu, 1987, pp. 267-286).

The leader of the group was Trabzon Deputy Ali Şükrü Bey. He was one of the most influential people in the Second Group, a person who resigned from his naval position and could speak English fluently. He might also be described as an extremely conservative person. Moreover, he suggested the alcohol prohibition and, after a great strife, the law was passed (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 4, 1981, p. 137).

Although a majority of the Unionists were in the First Group, some of them joined the second group. Hafız Mehmet Bey, Hilmi Bey and Şükrü Bey are among the leading members of the Unionist group (Zürcher, 1987, p. 230). Returning from Malta after a while, Kara Vasıf Bey became a member of the second group and fought, with the other Unionists, to bring Enver Pasha to Anatolia. (Avcioglu, 1978, p. 545) (Karaosmanoglu, 1983, p. 142) During the formation of the Defence of Law, those who were not welcome in the First Group joined the second group.

There were some deputies who initially joined the first group and then resigned to become a member of the second group. These are Operator Emin Bey, Mustafa Durak Bey, Nusret Efendi, Suleyman Necati Bey, Haydar Lutfi Bey, Abdulgafur Efendi, Cemil Bey and Mehmet Sirri Bey. In addition, some of the deputies who acted in accordance with the second group were considered to have resigned. These are Mehmet Akif Bey, Ramiz Bey, Hacı Ali Sabri Efendi, Sami Bey, Mehmet Vehbi Efendi, Haydar Bey, Yasin Bey and Hafız Mehmet Bey. (Tunaya, 1958, p. 338)

The Efficiency of the Second Group in the Parliament

The second group offered a very effective opposition in spite of being relatively smaller in number than the other groups in the parliament and was able to impose their demands on the assembly. They became able to get the support of the neutral members in the parliament and even some of the First Group.

As Mustafa Kemal Pasha stated in the Izmit Press Conference, the second group tried to recruit members for the government and, particularly with the aim of taking the full control of the administration, they forced the Ministry of Internal Affairs to elect their own members (Arar, 1969, p. 46).

As an outcome of these pressures, one of the First Group members, Nazım Bey, was elected to the Ministry of Internal Affairs on September 4, 1920, but Mustafa Kemal Pasha did not recognize his deputy due to his communist tendencies and eventually forced him to resign (Arıkoğlu, 1961, p. 180). Apart from this, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was disturbed by the fact that the Second Group recruited members for the Cabinet at times and, as a result, the Chairman of the Assembly was granted the authority to nominate the members of the parliament with “the equivalent law to the second article of the Law on the Executive Acts’ that was issued on November 4, 1920 (Düstur, 1929, p. 123). However, the Second Group opposed to the election of the members of parliament through this method and, as a result of these intense efforts, on July 8, 1922, the Parliament adopted the “Law on the Execution of Surrogates” (Düstur, 1929, p. 99) and the right of nomination for the chairman of the Assembly was abolished. In the elections held right after this, Celalettin Arif Bey, one of the leading figures of the second group, was appointed as Deputy Attorney to the cabinet (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 21, 1959, p. 358) despite the unwillingness and disapproval of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Similarly, in spite of the opposition of the First Group, the second group candidate Hüseyin Avni Bey was appointed as the First Deputy Chairman of the Parliament on December 9, 1922 (Arıkoğlu, 1961, p. 301). Kazım Özalp, who served as the National Struggle Representative, tells in his personal memoirs how, after the Battle of Sakarya, the second Group was overwhelmed by his criticisms about the situation of the army and remained unable to respond (Özalp, 1971, p. 225).

Indeed, the speeches delivered by the second group's powerful orators, such as Hüseyin Avni Bey, Ali Şükrü Bey, Selahattin Bey, and Basri Bey, in the Assembly at times left the First Group members and the Government speechless. In particular, the discussion of the issue of Lausanne in the Assembly might be given as a perfect example.

According to a study conducted with the systematic sampling, the deputies of the second group delivered longer speeches than the members of the first group in terms of the number of the lines within the text. This rate increases in favor of the Second Group on the most important issues (Frey, 1965, p. 315).

This harsh and effective opposition of the Second Group discouraged the deputies of the First Group. Therefore, some deputies suggested Mustafa Kemal Pasha to use the numeri-

cal superiority of the First Group in the Parliament in order to dismiss the notable figures of the second group and were immediately rejected (Selek, 1987, p. 629).

All these indicate that even though the second group was in the minority in the parliament, the members displayed a very successful opposition and ensured that the parliamentary negotiations would take place. It should be noted that these debates between the second Group, which is in opposition with the Parliament, and the First Group, which represents the power, did not transcend the limits of courtesy and kindness.

Discharge of the Second Group and Elections

By the beginning of 1923, there was a complete uncertainty in the Turkish Grand National Assembly. A great victory had been won for the National Struggle. This victory strengthened the First Group; yet, the Second Group was aggravated by it. The conflict that had been going on in the Assembly for the last three years reached fever pitch so that even the slightest debate was growing to a discord and, as a result, the assembly could not work.

The heated debates in Parliament due to the Lausanne Conference turned the conflict between the two groups into a kind of feud and the homicide of Ali Şükrü Bey caused the things to reach a point of breaking. (One of the distinguished figures of the second group, the owner of the Tan Newspaper and the deputy of Trabzon, Ali Şükrü Bey suddenly disappeared on March 27, 1923 and his corpse was later found on April 2, 1923. Once Ali Şükrü Bey was found to be assassinated by Topal Osman Agha, Mustafa Kemal Pasha's military officer, he was executed by a shot (Demirel, 1995, p. 507). The negotiations about the Treaty of Lausanne entailed the risk that the pact that was to be signed between the two parties would be officially approved by the Assembly unless the provisions of the Second Group were considered and applied. According to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the only solution was to renew the elections and to discharge the Second Group.

In fact, Mustafa Kemal Pasha had been thinking of discharging the Second Group ever since. In a conversation following the victory of the great Taaruz, once Halide Edip asked Mustafa Kemal Pasha to take a rest, he, referring to those who opposed him, said that "It seems that after the Greeks, we will fight each other; we will destroy each other." He indeed implied that the notable figures of the second group deserved to be lynched (Adivar, 1987, p. 227).

During the abolition of the Sultanate, in a private meeting with Mustafa Kemal Pasha in his house, Rafet complained about the Second Group and said that "I very well know how to fight against those, but neither the timing nor the setting is convenient," which revealed his response. During this period, the Second Group was worried that they would be discharged and so were extremely frustrated. In Yunus Nadi's article entitled "A New Cidal Era" that was published in Yeni Gün newspaper on November 25, 1922, it was written that a new era was to begin in the country. (New Day, November 25, 1926) In the article, Yunus Nadi clearly stated that there appeared a new era for Turkey, none of the members of the second group would oppose this, yet those who wished to prevent any of the innovations would be immediately discharged (Aralof, 1967, p. 222). However, the Second Group was sure that the author absolutely referred to them in the article and displayed their response with a statement made to the President of the Assembly in the following day (Grand National Assembly, 25, 1960, p. 95-97). In a meeting held on January 29, 1923, the Assembly decided not to take any action on the issue.

What Yunus Nadi wrote in his article was in fact the personal views of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. The country indeed entered a new era. The second group mostly consisted of conserva-

tive members. A new form of regime occupied Mustafa Kemal Pasha's mind. This type of government would be a threat for the existence of the second group. He would not perform what he planned in the first place. The first Assembly only served as a Revolutionary Assembly and it already accomplished its mission. The Assembly, which would be formed by the elections, would be the Founding Assembly, which was to develop the innovations the new regime demanded for. In the late March in 1923, Mustafa Kemal Pasha decided that "the timing and setting were perfect and it was time for the elections to be renewed."

Mustafa Kemal Pasha collected the Committee of Deputies to put the idea of renewal of the elections into practice on March 31, 1923, and the renewal of the elections was determined in the negotiations. After that, the same decision was also taken by the Board of Directors and General Assembly of the First Group (Cebesoy, 1957, p. 301). On 1 April 1923, with 120 signatures collected for the Assembly Presidency, it was requested to renew the elections (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 28, 1961, p. 283). In the meetings held afterwards, the Second Group did not oppose to the idea; instead, they openly supported it. Yet, the negative attitude of the Second Group, who always claimed to be an advocate of the idea of the National Sovereignty, would naturally mean to deny this. Erzurum deputy Hüseyin Avni Bey's words "If one wants to be led by his blind obstinacy, this is the real trouble and he is the actual problem. I assure that no one in this country will be deprived of the right to express his own thoughts" aimed to reveal and affirm their devotion to the National Sovereignty. By a majority vote, it was decided to renew the elections (TBMM, Zabıt Ceridesi, 28, 1961, p. 240). When the decision to renew the elections was made, most of the deputies left Ankara and moved to the electoral districts. The last meeting of the Assembly was held on April 16; at the first session, the unanimous conclusion was reached yet, at the second session, the majority of the members failed to be reached so the meetings were delayed on May 21. However, when the majority failed to be reached again, the First Assembly did not meet again (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 29, 1959, p. 240).

Elections and the New Grand National Assembly

Electoral campaigns of the second group

After the decision to renew the elections was made, the Second Group initiated the electoral campaigns, yet they did not possess the organizations or societies that would engage in these activities. The provincial-level delegates of the Anatolian and Rumeli Defense of Rights Society simply worked for the First Group. The second group was believed to be effective only in İstanbul and Trabzon. Some of the former Unionists in Istanbul were working for the second Group (Ertürk, 1957, p. 240). Selahattin and Kara Vasıf Beys were in collaboration with Kara Kemal and his friends who could be powerful in Istanbul (Kılıç, 1955, p. 122).

After the killing of Ali Sukru Bey, Trabzon Assembly for the Defense of Law started to work for the second group. The Second Group member, Lazistan deputy Abidin Bey was putting blame on Mustafa Kemal Pasha for the murder of Ali Sukru Bey and trying to pull votes in favour of the second group in the speeches he gave around Trabzon (Cebesoy, 1957, p. 317). Lazistan deputy Ziya Hursit Bey was propagating in the same way Abidin Bey did. The Independence newspaper published in Trabzon was using the case of Ali Sukru as an instrument of propaganda to support the Second Group. As a consequence of all these efforts, it was believed that the people living Trabzon would vote for the Second Group (Arıkoğlu, 1961, p. 323).

The Second Group also carried out certain work on Alewi and Bektashi people. The group tried to collect votes by means of Bektashi Sheikh Celebi Cemalettin Effendi settling in Hacibektash of Kırşehir (Ertürk, 1957, p. 323). Besides, each deputy of the Second Group was

propagating in his own polling district in order to be elected. However, despite all these efforts, the Second Group was inefficient since it did not become organized in a sufficient way to maintain the campaign swing. In opposition to the Second Group, there was influential Anatolia and Defense of Law Society.

The Campaign of the First Group

Mustafa Kemal Pasha gave great weight to organization because he aimed to form a new regime. On December 6, 1922, he announced that he had formed a party with the name of "People's Party" based on the principle of Populism in order to transform the First Group into a political party with a definite program. He also started certain studies to prepare a party program. After all these studies, he published a declaration including nine principles as the principle of People's Party. In the declaration, it was announced that The First Group of Anatolia and Rumelia Defense of Law Society was going to transform into People's Party and participate in the elections with the nine principles. In the principles, after it was emphasized that the sovereignty unconditionally belonged to people and the main initiative in the acts of government was the national sovereignty, the projects planned in the political, social, legal and economic areas were explained (Oration, 1989, pp. 956-958)

Despite the completed formation of People's Party, it was planned to participate in the elections on behalf of the Defense of Law Society instead of People's Party since that name was both known and loved widely by the people (Aydemir, 1988, p. 86). Moreover, because there is a common reaction against the partisanship among the people, using the name of People's Party was deliberately avoided.

Immediately after the decision of election in the assembly, the First Group organized a meeting in order to clarify their road map (Kılıç, 1955, p. 119). Mustafa Kemal Pasha and some deputies carried a study on preparing an election bureau including Defense of Law Society and the members of the Assembly for deciding on the nominees and investigating them (Aydemir, 1988, p. 86). Furthermore, most of the deputies were sent to their poll districts to propagate and some of them were sent to observe and control the election campaign (Arikoğlu, 1961, p. 337).

Defense of Law Communities functioned as campaign offices in favor of the First Group. The city communities were deciding on the nominees and sending their names to the centre. After certain inquiries were realized, the nominees were accepted or rejected. For instance, Hilmi Uran tells resentfully in his memoirs that although he was accepted as a nominee, his nomination was cancelled after a while (Uran, ty, p. 160).

While this campaign was being maintained, some precautions were taken against the Second Group. Some former unionists were assigned to hinder the propaganda campaign of the Second Group (Ertürk, 1957, pp. 524-525). Mustafa Kemal Pasha announced a declaration on April 11, 1923 in order to guarantee the very significant Istanbul elections by implicating that the people should not vote for the Second Group.

In Trabzon, Zamir bey and Refik Sevkett Bey were sent to persuade the central members of The Defense of Law pursuing a campaign against the First Group. When all these efforts turned out to be in vain, Defense of Law Central Assembly was discharged and a new assembly working for the First Group was taken into service (Cebesoy, 1957, p. 317). By doing so, opposite actions were tried to be eliminated in the Black sea region.

Furthermore, a former unionist attendant in the secret service, Husamettin bey was sent to Kırsehir in order to avoid The Second Group's propaganda on Alewis and Bektashis and on condition that forty Bektashi fathers coming from Albania were brought to Kırsehir

from Istanbul, the support of Bektashis was gained (Ertürk, 1957, pp. 524-525).

In its campaign, the First Group was also supported by Istanbul and Anatolian press. While the newspapers mentioned the poll campaign of the First Group every day, they never mentioned the efforts of the Second Group. The newspapers maintained their release influencing the elections although the voting started towards the end of June. *Vakit* newspaper released the photos of the First Group's 51 nominees and the biography of Mustafa Kemal Pasha about the elections on June 28 in Istanbul (*Vakit*, June 28, 1923).

Namely, Mustafa Kemal Pasha took the advantage of all propaganda elements during his campaign. All the efforts of the Second Group fell short with its limited means when compared to the actions of the First Group.

Elections

As a result of the elections starting towards the end of June and ending on July 24, 1923, all members of Anatolia and Rumelia Defense of Law Association won the elections (Kılıç Ali, 1955, p. 124). 270 deputies were elected from 73 polling districts for the Second Grand National Assembly and Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected from both Ankara and Izmir and later on he preferred Ankara deputyship (Aydemir, 1988, p. 89). None of the Second Group nominees was elected and paid the price for a three year opposition by staying out of the assembly.

The Second Grand National Assembly gathered under the chairmanship of the eldest member Abdurrahman Seref bey on August 11, 1923 (GNAT Minute Book, 1, 1959, p. 2). Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected as the president of the assembly on August 13, 1923 (GNAT Minute Book, 1, 1959, p. 36).

Conclusion

In the first Grand National Assembly of Turkey, The Second Group was advocate of conservative ideas. In this regard, their struggle is a fight against all reforms embodied in the personality of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. The Second Group aimed not radical but partial structural changes. Mustafa Kemal Pasha's attempts to change the regime were always met with resistance. A constitutional regime in which caliphate and sultanate were maintained based on national independence was aimed.

Although Mustafa Kemal Pasha was the leader of the First Group, he did not interfere in the struggle between the two groups or the government and the Second Group. The Second Group's harsh opposition always led the members of the government to do their best. In a word, Mustafa Kemal Pasha regarded the Second Group as equilibrant for the maintenance of executive acts in best way.

The Second Group's opposition style is generally quite balanced. They used the advantage of being the one criticizing rather than the one executing. Their effective speeches with heavy criticism caused hesitance and faction in the First Group from time to time and in that way they gained support for their ideas.

Especially from the beginning of 1923 they maintained their opposition out of the Assembly through *Tan* newspaper. With that newspaper, they tried to propagate their notions with the review essays written by the deputies on various topics but especially on the political ones.

Early 1923 is the turning point from the respect of victory. However, the Second Group prepared their own end by coming out against the agreement that would be signed according to the conditions offered by the government for the consolidation of victory diplomat-

ically. In fact, the agreement needed to be signed without any trouble. Otherwise, this situation damages the efforts to change the regime. For that reason, liquidation of the Second Group was brought to agenda through an election. When such a solution was offered at the Assembly, the Second Group always mentioning the national sovereignty did not reject the offer or had to accept such an offer.

The election campaign was directed by Mustafa Kemal Pasha in the name of the First Group. The activities of the Second Group were insufficient when compared to the organized campaign of the First Group. As a consequence of the elections, the Second Group could not make its presence felt and stayed out of the Assembly.

In conclusion, the Second Group in the First Grand National Assembly of Turkey becomes successful in the duty of opposition with its efforts originating from its conservatist notions. This balanced controversy between the First and the Second Groups is one of the major reasons taking the national resistance to success. Moreover, the struggle of the Second Group makes the First Assembly become one of the most democratic assemblies in Turkey even today.

References

- Adivar, H. E. (1987). *Türk'ün Ateşle İmtihanı*, 9. Baskı, İstanbul:Atlas Kitabevi.
- Ağaoğlu, S. (1987). *Kuvayi Milliye Ruhü*, İstanbul: Baha Matbaası.
- Akçura. Y. (1991). *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*, 3. Baskı. Ankara: T.T.K. Basımevi.
- Aralof, S.İ. (1967). *Bir sovyet diplomatın Türkiye hatıraları*. (A. Ediz Çev.) İstanbul: Burçak Yayınevi.
- Arar, İ. (1969). *Atatürk'ün İzmir basın toplantısı*. İstanbul: Burçak Yayınevi.
- Arıkoğlu, D. (1961). *Hatıralarım*. İstanbul: Tan Matbaası.
- Arslantürk, N. (1962). *Yakın Tarihimiz* (3.Cilt). İstanbul: Vatan Gazetecilik.
- Atatürk, M. K. (1989). *Nutuk-Söylev* (2-3. Cilt). Ankara:T.T.K. Yayınları.
- Avcıoğlu, D. (1978). *Milli kurtuluş tarihi*. 3. Baskı, İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.
- Aydemir, Ş.S. (1988). *Tek adam* (3. Cilt). 10. Basım, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Berkes, N. (1998). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, İstanbul: Doğu-Batı Yayınları.
- Cebesoy, A. F. (1957). *General Ali Fuat Cebesoy'un Siyasi Hatıraları*, İstanbul: Vatan Yayınları.
- Demirel, A. (1995). *Birinci Mecliste muhalefet ikinci grup*, 2. Baskı. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Ertürk, H. (1957). *İki devrin perde arkası*, İstanbul:Hilmi Kitabevi.
- Frey, F. W. (1965). *The Turkish political elite*. Massahusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- Güleklı, N. C. (1973). *TBMM'nin 50. Yıldönümü (1920-1970)*, İstanbul: M.E.B. Yayınları.
- Güneş, İ. (1985). *Birinci TBMM'nin Düşünsel Yapısı (1920-1923)*, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniv. Yayınları.
- İrmak, S. (1987). *Atatürk ve meclis, A.A.M.D.*, Sayı 8, Ankara.
- İrmak, S. (1974). *Atatürk ve çevresi*. İstanbul: İ.Ü. Atatürk Devrimleri Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.

- Karabekir, K. (1990). *İstiklal Harbimiz*, İstanbul: Yüce Yayınları.
- Karaosmanoğlu, Y. K. (1983). *Vatan Yolunda*. 4. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kılıç, A. (1955). *Kılıç Ali Hatıralarını Anlatıyor*. İstanbul: Sel Yayınları.
- Köseoğlu, S. (1946). "Birinci büyük millet meclisinde ikinci grup." *Mesuliyet Dergisi*, 1.
- Köseoğlu, S. (1946). "Birinci büyük millet meclisinde ikinci grup." *Mesuliyet Dergisi*, 2.
- Mumcu, A. (1988). *Türk devriminin temelleri ve gelişimi*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Onaran, R. (1973). *TBMM'nin 50. Yıldönümü (1920-1970)*. İstanbul: MEB Yayınları.
- Özalp, K. (1971). *Milli mücadele (1919-1922)*. Cilt 1, Ankara: T.T.K. Yayınları.
- Özbudun, E. (1985). "TBMM hükümetinin hukuki niteliği." *A.A.M.D.*, 2, Ankara.
- Parla, T. (1986). *Demokrasi, anayasalar, partiler ve Türkiye'nin siyasal rejimi*. İstanbul: Onur Yayınları.
- Sabis, A. İ., *Harp hatıralarım* (5. Cilt). İstiklal Harbi ve Gizli Cihetleri, t.y.
- Selek, S. (1987). *Anadolu İhtilali* (1-2. Cilt). 8. Baskı, İstanbul: Kastaş Yayınevi.
- Şener, C. (1990). *Çerkes Ethem olayı*. 4. Baskı, İstanbul: Ant Yayınları.
- Tunaya, T. Z. (1952). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler (1859-1952)*. İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş Yayınları
- Tunaya, T. Z. (1958). "TBMM Hükümetinin Kuruluş ve Siyasal Karakteri." *İ.Ü. Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 23(3-4), İstanbul.
- Tunaya, T. Z. (1986). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler* (2. Cilt). İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları.
- Tuncay, M. (1989). *T.C.'de Tek Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması (1923-1931)*. 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Cem Yayınları.
- Uran, H. (1959). *Hatıralarım*. İstanbul: Ayyıldız Matbaası.
- Velidedeoğlu, H. V. (1974). *Devirden devire* (1. Cilt). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınları.
- Zürcher, E. J. (1987). *Milli Mücadelede İttihatçılık*, (N.Salihoğlu, Çev.) İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.

Periodicals

- Düstur* (1929), Üçüncü Tertip, Cilt 1, İstanbul: Milliyet Matbaası.
- Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, 11 Mayıs 1921.
- Harp Tarihi Vesikaları Dergisi* (1955). Sayı 13, Ankara: E.U. Basımevi.
- Harp Tarihi Vesikaları Dergisi* (1955). Sayı 22, Ankara: E.U. Basımevi.
- Harp Tarihi Vesikaları Dergisi* (1955). Sayı 23, Ankara: E.U. Basımevi.
- Vakit*, 28 Haziran 1928.
- Tan*, 19 Ocak 1923.
- Yeni Gün*, 25 Kasım 1922.

TGNA Official Reports

-
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 1, Vol. 1, 3rd Edt. TGNA Publishing, Ankara, 1959.
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 1, Vol. 2, 3rd Edt, TGNA Publishing, Ankara, 1981.
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 1, Vol. 4, 3rd Edt, TGNA Publishing, Ankara, 1981.
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 1, Vol. 21, 2nd Edt, TGNA Publishing, Ankara, 1959.
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 1, Vol. 25, 2nd Edt, TGNA Publishing, Ankara 1960.
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 1, Vol. 28, 3rd Edt, TGNA Publishing, Ankara, 1961.
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 1, Vol. 29, 3rd Edt, TGNA Publishing, Ankara, 1959.
- TGNA Official Report**, Term 2, Vol.1, 2nd Edt, TGNA Publishing, Ankara, 1961.
-