



ISSN
2547-989X

Sinop Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi

Araştırma Makalesi

Sinop Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8 (1), 229-255

Geliş Tarihi:21.03.2024 Kabul Tarihi:29.03.2024

Yayın: 2024 Yayın Tarihi:31.05.2024

<https://doi.org/10.30561/sinopUSD.1455441>

<https://dergipark.org.tr/sinopUSD>

THE AMERICAN BOARD MISSIONARIES AND THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE PROCESSES

Gülbadi ALAN*

Ayşegül KUŞ*

Abstract

This study aims to deal with and analyse how the American Board missionaries viewed both the process leading to the Lausanne Conference and the Treaty of Lausanne through the Missionary Herald, the journal of the American Board and to shed light on America's views and the missionaries towards the new Ankara government within the framework of the Treaty of Lausanne. Thus, it is intended to show on which basis America built its relations with the newly established Turkish state after the collapse of the Ottoman State, and on which principles of this relationship are founded. In line with this purpose, the process leading to the Treaty of Lausanne and the Lausanne Treaty has been chosen as an example. In other words, case study analysis, one of the qualitative research patterns, was used to understand and evaluate the relations between the United States and the newly established Turkish state, and the study was mainly based on the information given by the American Board missionaries regarding the Lausanne Treaty. The data obtained were analysed through the descriptive analysis method, which allows the data to be summarised and interpreted within the framework of predetermined themes and to examine the cause-effect relationship in the quotations. As a result of the Treaty of Lausanne, missionary organisations were now completely subjected to Turkish law and lost their foreignness and privileges. For the American Board missionaries in Turkey, the behaviour of the American government officials that led to all these developments were considered "tragic mistakes that could not be corrected". Despite this view, the treaty made it possible to make more precise plans for the continuation of missionary initiatives in Turkey. The rights and privileges expected in the work to be carried out were finalised with this treaty.

Keywords: The Lausanne Conference, The Lausanne Treaty, The United States of America, American Board Missionaries, James L. Barton, Ismet Pasha

* Prof. Dr., Erciyes Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, gulbadi@erciyes.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9238-4942>

* Doç. Dr., Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, aysegulkus@hotmail.com <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8051-6001>

Amerikan Board Misyonerleri ve Lozan Konferansı Süreci

Öz

Bu çalışma, Amerikan Board'un yayın organı Missionary Herald aracılığıyla Amerikan Board misyonerlerinin Lozan Konferansı sürecine ve Lozan Antlaşması'na nasıl baktıklarını ele almayı ve analiz etmeyi, ayrıca Lozan Antlaşması çerçevesinde Amerika'nın ve misyonerlerin yeni Ankara hükümetine bakışına ışık tutmayı amaçlamaktadır. Böylece Amerika'nın yeni kurulan Türk devletiyle ilişkilerini hangi temeller üzerine inşa ettiği ve bu ilişkinin hangi ilkelere dayandığı tespit edilmeye çalışılacaktır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda bir yargıya varabilmek için Lozan Antlaşması ve antlaşmaya giden süreç örnek olarak seçilmiştir. Yani ABD ile yeni kurulan Türk devleti arasındaki ilişkileri anlayabilmek ve değerlendirebilmek için nitel araştırma desenlerinden biri olan örnek olay analizi kullanılmış ve çalışma ağırlıklı olarak Amerikan Board misyonerlerinin Lozan Antlaşması sürecine ilişkin verdikleri bilgilere dayandırılmıştır. Elde edilen veriler, verilerin önceden belirlenmiş temalar çerçevesinde özetlenip yorumlanmasına ve alıntılardaki neden-sonuç ilişkisinin incelenmesine olanak sağlayan betimsel analiz yöntemi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Elde edilen veriler doğrultusunda Lozan Antlaşması neticesinde, misyoner örgütleri tamamen Türk yasalarına tabi olmuş, yabancılıklarını ve ayrıcalıklarını kaybetmişlerdir. Türkiye'de görev yapan Amerikan Board misyonerleri, tüm bu gelişmelere yol açan ABD hükümet yetkililerinin davranışları "düzeltilemeyecek trajik hatalar" olarak değerlendirmişlerdir. Bu görüşe rağmen antlaşma, Türkiye'deki misyonerlik girişimlerinin devamı için daha kesin planlar yapılmasını mümkün kılmıştır. Yürütülecek çalışmalarda beklenen hak ve ayrıcalıklar bu antlaşma ile kesinleşmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Lozan Konferansı, Lozan Antlaşması, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, Amerikan Board Misyonerleri, James L. Barton, İsmet Paşa

Introduction

As is known, the first diplomatic relations between the Ottoman State and America started with the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce signed on May 10, 1830. With this treaty, the Ottoman State granted America the status of “most favoured state” under the terms of the capitulations like other European states. The treaty also allowed American Board missionaries to establish more institutions such schools, hospitals, and so on in the Ottoman State. This treaty also formed the basis of Ottoman-American relations leading up to the First World War. After this agreement, another one, which was a turning point in Turkish-American relations, was signed in Lausanne. On August 6, 1923, Joseph Grewⁱ and Ismet Pashaⁱⁱ signed a Treaty of Amity and Commerce in Lausanne. It was meant to establish some diplomatic and commercial relations between the new Turkey and America. This

treaty also indicated the recognition of the independence and sovereignty of Turkey by America. However, in 1927 the American Senate did not approve of the treaty. Taking into account the treaty in 1923, seven years later the Senate finally ratified another treaty with the Turkish Republic. (The Annual Report, 1924, p.66; Lippe, 1993, p.31).

This paper aims to deal with and analyze two issues through the *Missionary Herald*, the journal of the American Board of the Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM-American Board) founded in Boston in 1810. Firstly, how the American Board missionaries handled the process leading to the Lausanne Conference, secondly, how they viewed and the Treaty of Lausanne,ⁱⁱⁱ which was approved by the American parliament in 1930. In addition, it is aimed to cast a light upon the views of America and the missionaries towards the new Ankara government within the framework of the Treaty of Lausanne. Thus, it is intended to show on which basis America built its relations with the newly established Turkish state after the collapse of the Ottoman State, and on which principles of this relationship are founded.

In line with this purpose, the process leading to the Treaty of Lausanne and the Lausanne Treaty has been chosen as an example. In other words, in order to understand and evaluate the relations between America and the newly established Turkish state, the case study analysis, has been used and the study is mainly based on the information provided by the American Board missionaries regarding the Lausanne Treaty. Related to the subject the 1922 and 1923 issues of the *Missionary Herald* about the Treaty of Lausanne were scanned and the data obtained were analysed through the descriptive analysis method.

The Journal of *the Missionary Herald* is older than the American Board. In May 1803, it was published under the name *The Massachusetts Missionary Magazine* by the Massachusetts Missionary Society. In its first edition, only one missionary statement was published, followed by subsequent editions containing one to three pages of mission-related intelligence from both domestic and international

sources. In 1808 it was merged with the monthly theological journal *the Panoplist*, established in 1805. After that date, the magazine was published under both names until 1818 when it was renamed *the Panoplist and Missionary Herald*, which was used until 1820. In the same year, the American Board made the Missionary Herald its official publication, taking it over from the private control and devoting it entirely to the promotion of the foreign missionary enterprise.^{iv}

While discussing the process leading up to the Treaty of Lausanne, the American Board missionaries discussed Turkish-American relations, the view of the Ankara government towards the missionaries, some of the concerns of America about the new Turkish government, the reasons why James L. Barton^v, the secretary general of the American Board, was sent to Lausanne as a delegate, Lausanne negotiations, the policy followed by the Turkish delegation in Lausanne, the restrictions imposed by Lausanne, the American missionary institutions, and some of the expectations of American missionaries from Turkey after Lausanne and so on.

The reason why all these issues are discussed in the context of the Lausanne Conference is to protect the American Board institutions operating in Turkey with appropriate guarantees and to prevent them from being harmed as a result of arbitrary and illegal practice. The most important development that caused the American Board missionaries to be concerned about this issue took place in Izmir. After the liberation of Izmir from the Greek occupation and the Turkish authorities had come to power, Cass Arthur Reed (for detailed information about his life story, see. www.dlir.org), the director of the International College, asked the permission to reopen the college, but the new director of education refused on the grounds that this was contrary to the new law.^{vi} They are concerned that the application of this law to the schools of the American Board missionaries operating in Anatolia will seriously impede their work. In fact, they were sure that this was the intention of the Turkish authorities in framing the law.

When the European states invited America to join the negotiations, the Americans responded that they were neither at war with Turkey nor a party to the 1918 Armistice Agreement, and they did not desire to participate in final peace negotiations or to assume responsibility for the political and territorial arrangements that may be carried out. From this point of view. The missionaries believe that the Department of State was unaware of these dangers that threaten their institutions.

In fact, America intended to limit its intervention, but contrary to the missionaries' view, it was concerned about the impact of the negotiations in Lausanne on American interests in the Middle East.^{vii}

1.The Lausanne Conference and the American Board Missionaries

As a result of these concerns, the State Department has taken three important steps to ensure that the American interests were protected. First, America sent observers to the conference to ensure that some American interests were not adversely affected by the negotiations. Second, it presented a list of American interests to the European Allies and also expressed their concerns in the negotiations.^{viii} Third, America announced that it wanted to make a separate agreement with the new Turkish government at an appropriate time. (Lippe, 1993, p.45).

In accordance with these, the first step taken by the American government was to send the American Board missionaries James L. Barton and William W. Peet^{ix} to Lausanne to support the American delegates through some facts and figures on the history and progress of American religious, educational and philanthropic work in Turkey and the impact of political events and changes on this work. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.477). Therefore, the information about the attitude and opinion of the American Board missionaries regarding the developments before, during and after the Lausanne Conference was shaped through the letters and reports written by James L. Barton, sent by the Board, the Near East Relief, and the group of independent Near East colleges that have their headquarters in America.

His trip to Lausanne has been approved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and although he is expected to attend conference sessions, he is in no way an official representative of the United States Government; rather, he is a recognized American expert in humanitarian aid and education in Turkey, the Balkans, and Greece. Therefore, it is certain that his advice will be sought by American delegates, and references from Washington will not prevent him from assisting wherever and whenever his help is requested. However, his mission is missionary work, and emphasis should be placed on this during his visit. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, s.479-480).

Barton also has some insights about the policies of the Ankara government under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal, who freed Anatolia from foreign control and displayed an assertive attitude against all foreign interventions, and how these policies would direct Turkish-American relations. It is possible to understand these through his answers to the questions asked in an interview with him at a time when the American Board missionaries discussed and evaluated the policies of the new Turkish government towards America within the framework of missionary institutions. These answers are also a clear indication of why he was sent to the Lausanne Conference. In this interview, he tried to reveal the view of the American Board missionaries on Turkish-American relations with his answers to the following six questions: (The Missionary Herald, 1922, pp.379-381).

■ Are our missionaries safe in Turkey? ■ Are conditions in Turkey as serious as present reports would indicate? ■ Will the American Board be forced to retire from Turkey? ■ What about treaty rights and are the capitulations and concessions in Turkey still operative? ■ How far will there be freedom of worship and teaching in the new Turkey? ■ What will be the best method of missionary approach to Turks?

In his answers to these questions, Barton emphasizes that he does not believe that the American Board missionaries have any reason to fear for their personal safety in Turkey. He also thinks that they may be sent out of the country by

the Turks, but that the Turks would not risk being an enemy with America deliberately harming the relations. He even emphasized that if it was necessary to put pressure on the Turkish authorities to protect Americans, they could rely on Admiral Bristol, the American Higher Commissioner.

In his answer to the second question, Barton said that no one would question that conditions in Turkey were serious, but he did not believe that they were alarming. According to him, Turks did not want to be enemies with America because they hoped for American capital to come and develop Turkey's resources, thereby facilitating some degree of prosperity. Furthermore, Barton believes that thanks to the long lasting efforts of American missionaries in the Ottoman country, and their relief work with other American aid workers at different times, especially during and after the First World War, hundreds of thousands of people of all races were familiar with the name of America through the acts of kindness and compassion, and these people would not change their positive attitude or lose their trust under the orders of any Turkish official, no matter how high his rank was.

Although not mentioned in the reports, American missionaries in Turkey had many loyal friends. In fact, these conditions were not changed by the Ankara government. Barton believes that even if Mustafa Kemal, in the initial stage of his victory, were to issue decrees that would harm missionary activities, he would face a strong opposition. In other words, Barton thinks that there was a powerful influence that prevented the Kemalists from taking overt actions against the Americans and their interests in Turkey.

The question of *whether the American Board will be forced to withdraw from Turkey* was posed to Barton to which he replied, "I do not think so". Yet Barton emphasized that they would have to make changes in their working methods and be ready to adapt themselves to the new circumstances. He specifically mentioned that if Istanbul, with a population of 1,200,000^x, remained an international city, it would provide them with a large population to work with. Barton believes that the borders of the nationalist regions might at best be much smaller than they

were at the beginning of the First World War. This would give them greater access to the people of Transcaucasia and Kurdistan. To him, even if the Kemalists return to Istanbul with full authority, there will remain a large and effective space for Christian work in the Near East. Barton is of the opinion that Turkey is a large and highly important country, inhabited by ancient races of great historical importance. Therefore, the territory surrounded by Arabs and Syrians in the south, Armenians, Georgians, Tatars, Kurds, and Russians in the northeast, Greeks, Albanians, Serbs and Bulgarians in the northwest, is strategic and the need for a united special effort is highly essential.

Barton also discussed America's treaty rights, capitulation and privileges in Turkey and questioned whether these rights were still in force. He made the following statement on the subject: (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.380).

“The Capitulations and Concessions were the laws promulgated by the Sultans of Turkey defining the rights and privileges under which foreign interest might enter the country and operate. These took the place of treaties with Christian nations. All missionary work there was begun and continued under the Capitulations.”

In his response, Barton stated that with the outbreak of the First World War, the party in power in the Ottoman State abolished the capitulations and concessions with a declaration. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.380). With this decree dated September 8, 1914, Sultan Mehmed Reshad declared that all financial, economic, judicial and administrative privileges granted to foreign citizens under the name of *capitulation* and all related permits and laws were abrogated and that they would no longer be valid as of October 1, 1914.^{xi}

Related to the question about to which extent the freedom of worship and education would be in the new Turkey, Barton states that they expected a new and unusual wave of Muslim fanaticism, which could be embodied in laws prohibiting the teaching of Christianity to Turks in American schools and colleges and else-

where. He underlines the fact they must be prepared to face such a problem. On the other hand, he expressed the opinion that there would be allowed to carry out their activities with Armenians, Greeks and Syrians and they would be able to worship freely in their own buildings. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.381).

Finally, concerning the question what the best way of missionaries' approach towards Turks would be, Barton suggested four ways that could be used to approach Muslims in Turkey such as medical work, the press, social work and education. However, Barton placed a greater emphasis on the need for medical work to continue across the country with greater vigour than before. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.381).

2. Board Missionaries' Views on the Treaty of Lausanne

James L. Barton, who made accurate assessments about the future of Turkish-American relations and missionary work, took part in the Lausanne Conference on the Near Eastern affairs in Switzerland. As expected, he became a frequent source of reference for the American delegation throughout the conference. Therefore, the American delegation were informed when he had to leave Lausanne in any way. For example, Barton who had to go to Geneva to meet some people from the League of Nations and have lunch, discussed this situation with Child, who told him that he would not need him during the day. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.50).

Barton arrived in Lausanne on November 17th and from that day on, he provided information through his letters. Although these letters are too personal for public use, they contain information to have an idea of the developments that took place in Lausanne. During his stay in Lausanne, Barton passed on information day by day on the progress of the conference as follows: (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.4, 43).

On the 18th he wrote that he feared the conference would be a long one, and that it was quite impossible to prophesy his own length of stay. On

the 19th they were having a “fine day for the opening of the battle of nations for peace or war in the Near East,” and the atmosphere seemed tense with expectancy.” On the 20th the great conference was “launched”—with the Doctor “sitting at number 273, half-way down the right of the center aisle.” The atmosphere was “subdued with a spirit of intensity not experienced at missionary meetings.”

By the 22d, the meetings of the different commissions for sections were “going on full blast” in an upper room in the Chateau shown above^{xii}. The 23d found Dr. Barton busy beyond report with his business—the “strictly humanitarian phases of the situation” in Turkey. Then it was that it became clear that it would probably be months before they could adjourn. On the 24th our Senior Secretary wrote that he was “beginning to appreciate the vast importance of a conference like this, quite apart from the specific questions for which it was convened.” The Turks, for instance, who seemed “well set up and eager to meet people from outside,” were mingling quite freely and were learning a lot about religious liberty and the Western viewpoint. By the 26th, Dr. Barton was having his room invaded by visitors even before he was dressed, and he anticipated even more strenuous times ahead.

On November 28 life at Lausanne was “rather hectic and irregular, with conferences the chief occupation.”

In Lausanne, Barton had repeated meetings with the Turks, during which he explained the fact that the civilized World condemned *Wholesale deportation of all Christians from Turkey at the beginning of winter*. According to Barton, the Turks did not seem impressed by this statement. Still, it was hoped that Ismet Pa-sha and his team would be convinced that behind the American missionary enterprise in Turkey is a large and influential body of American citizens whose confi-

dence in Turkey will increase or diminish according to how Turkey treats American religious, educational and philanthropic interest in Turkey.

Barton also recounted a conversation he had in Lausanne with a highly educated Turk^{xiii} with a Ph.D. from Columbia University. He declared that the Turk, whose speeches he found very fair, recognized that private schools should be relied upon to help improve Turkish education and that there should be greater religious freedom, but he insisted that all Armenians leave Turkey. At this point, Barton was able to say that if the Turks would ‘*grant to Christian missionaries, teachers, and Christian workers of all kinds the same privileges and freedom of action in Turkey that we of the USA grant to Turkey missionaries, teachers, and Muslim workers, it would be all we ask for.*’ Barton reported that the idea of reciprocity was appreciated by the Turks to whom he spoke, but they were hesitant to grant this right to Christian missionaries.

Barton quotes a reporter saying that America could have taken a glorious lead in condemning Turkey’s policy of expelling all Christians from the country, but it would not have done so, and makes comments on the course of the conference saying that *the conference lacked moral leadership and each last country desired to get something for itself and nobody dared ask anything ‘because it is just and right.’* (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.49). Barton also writes that despite this negativity, everyone there still wants peace, and notes that; (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.49).

“There has been no threat, and they tell me that war will be started again or even may be. There is no knowing what any one may do away off there alone; but the men here are peaceful, and look as tame as ribbon clerks on dress parade.”

On 7 December, Barton, together with W. W. Peet, was *summoned* to the presence of Ismet Pasha^{xiv} for a conference on American missionary, educational and charitable institutions in Turkey. Ismet Pasha expressed the hope that the

Americans would not be concerned about the future of these institutions, for Turkey desired for the continuation of these institutions and had no intention of enacting any law which would embarrass the admirable American altruistic work. In the meeting, Ismet Pasha said that his Government had instructed him to assure that American institutions would neither be closed nor hindered because they were asked to continue. They enjoyed the conversation in which they introduced themselves as representatives of the American Board. Barton later learnt that they really had a sincere conversation, and it was reported that the Pasha was deeply influenced by the frank purpose of the American representatives to be of great aid to Turkey. In addition, Ismet Pasha seemed to be very willing to be freely quoted in America.

Indeed, similar assurances have been repeatedly given to Ambassador Child, who, at the Lausanne Conference, displayed an admirable attitude of tireless attention to humanitarian questions and the unharmed maintenance of American interests in Turkey. Barton emphasises that these developments should not be interpreted as a binding agreement with the Turks as to the future of the Board's work in Turkey. Moreover, Barton expresses no such hope in his letters from Lausanne. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.49-50).

In Lausanne, Barton also met with Ambassador Child,^{xv} whose work he admired. Child was trying very hard to get information about the recent developments, even he tried using Barton for it. In fact, Barton remarks that he and his colleagues are there to help their own government to get information. He also mentions that there was already a great movement in Lausanne during this period, because people were holding serious talks, coming together in groups, and some important negotiations were taking place behind the closed doors. Barton and his colleague W. Peet duly fulfilled their duty of conveying information and making recommendations to the American delegation. The best indication of this is the statement they wrote to the head of the American delegation dated December 14, 1922, on minorities:

“Dr. James L. Barton and Dr. W. W. Peet to the Chief of the Special Mission at Lausanne (Child)

Lausanne, December 14, 1922

Dear Sir: After many conferences with the Turks and others, and after deliberate consideration, we are convinced that the best solution of the Armenian minority question would be the designation of a specific territory into which refugee populations, including orphans, could be conducted.

It seems to us that:

(1) The relief question would in this way be most quickly and economically solved, a point which is of prime importance to the American Relief Organizations.

(2) The Armenians would be more effectively protected than if scattered throughout the country amidst Turkish populations.

(3) The Turks in the end would be better satisfied.

(4) This would be most acceptable to the Armenians and they would be willing to settle in such a locality while they fear to return to their former homes among the Turks.

(5) We are confident that such a solution would meet practically the unanimous approval of the people of the United States when the suggested plan of a return to their former homes would be looked upon there with great suspicion and doubt.

You would be the best judge as to the time to bring this matter forward for consideration. We remain [etc.]

James L. Barton

W.W.Peet

Representing the Federal Council of the Protestant Churches of America ^{xvi}

Barton also expressed his views about the representatives of the Ankara government at Lausanne. He describes them as a handful of men who seemed to be a pretty good group so far away from Ankara, but not only a handful compared to the number needed to govern the whole country. After stating that if they actually took action they would have to deal with the entire White-turbaned crowd of the Angora Assembly, he foresaw further difficulties too. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.50). In fact, Barton's statements show that he wondered about the soundness and stability of the Ankara government.

In this atmosphere, on the other hand, Barton was doing his best to reach an agreement with the Ankara delegate and to find a basis for cooperation in the fields of labour. Barton diligently worked to reach an agreement with the Ankara government and to establish a basis for cooperation in their working domains. Additionally, except for his personal discussions at Lausanne, he also provided some information for the agenda discussing matters relevant to them. He writes the following about the session in which the issue of minorities was raised and about the attitude of the Turkish delegation: (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.50).

“...The Turks being 'bound to force all Christians under Moslem laws.' Now and then some new men would drop in from Angora, when the whole bunch would stiffen up in their demands. One of the delegation said to me yesterday, when I was urging the Turks to come forward of their own free will, forestall the conference and offer a territory, large enough and viable, which can be erected into an Armenian National Home, and when I told him it would be the most popular thing the Turks could do and would command the applause of the world and tend to restore confidence in them and their government, that 'if this delegation

should make such a proposition to the conference every last man would be dismissed by the Angora Assembly.' Whether this is true or not, it shows that the Government at Angora holds a pretty firm hand on its representatives here. As I have said, Mr. Child is still hopeful he will be able to get them to take some such step."

From these statements of Barton, it is understood that they wanted to achieve the result they wanted by sowing the seeds of discord in the relationship between the Turkish delegation in Lausanne and the Ankara government. However, in the end, they were not successful in this endeavour.

Barton followed the conference sessions, especially the meetings where activities of the missionaries and the minority issue was on the agenda. During the meetings held in November, December and January, opinions were expressed and they called for missionaries and their institutions to remain active as much as possible. Ismet Pasha declared to the American Ambassador Child, as well as representatives of the American Board, that they desired American missionaries to remain in Turkey and carry on their work as before.

The same statement was also expressed by Fuad Bey,^{xvii} a Turkish unofficial representative in America. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.249, 390). The silence or rejection of requests for permission to return to the stations by the missionaries expelled by the Ottoman government after the outbreak of World War I was interpreted by American Board officials as a sign that the Kemalist government was not friendly towards missionaries. It was even stated that Mustafa Kemal's policy was anti-missionary and that he was suspicious of the presence of missionaries in the country. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.210-211). Barton declared that capitulations could only be justifiably abrogated only by consent of the foreign states concerned.

In Turkey, however much they may be afraid of the Christianity promulgated by the missionaries of the American Board, the representative of the Nation-

alist Government repeatedly urged upon the representatives of the American Board at Lausanne the importance of the continuation in Turkey of the mission schools, hospitals, and institutions of all kinds. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.530).

However, the attitude of some officials in Ankara has not been very friendly. One of them was Dr. Adnan Bey^{xviii}, the governor of Constantinople and the former Minister of the Interior at Ankara. He strongly opposed the continuation of American Missionary medical work in the country on the ground that they now had more doctors than could be employed. However, missionaries were not sure about whether this is also Ankara government's view. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.390).

In his letters, Barton also touches on the atmosphere of the Lausanne Conference. He describes the atmosphere as calming, yet extremely solemn, a place where laughter was rarely heard or seen. He writes that since his arrival he has neither heard a story nor wanted to tell one. He thinks that everyone has something or several things on his mind that demands serious attention and which he cannot lay aside. Conversations in public are in low tones, but for the most part men walk in silence on the streets, even groups of men of a single delegation. Delegations do not mix in public. In a word, this conference is regarded as a serious thing by those who participated. The newspaper men are silent in public. When Barton get them alone, they tell him all they know and then try to get pointers for more knowledge. They are all mature and experienced men of the best type. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.50). Upon these developments in Lausanne, on December 27, 1922, Barton left Lausanne temporarily to visit Athens, Smyrna, Constantinople and other centres in the interest of relief work, and to understand the situation the American Board face in the Near East. However, he returned to Lausanne again and then went to Boston in March. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.51, 332).

3. The Effects of the Lausanne Treaty in terms of Missionaries

The Lausanne Conference, is a conference convened to solve the problems related to the Near East, with Turkey at its centre. The American Board missionar-

ies regarded the Near East as a region which is full of fundamental problems and that they thought that the Lausanne Conference cannot offer a permanent solution to them. They note that no agreement can completely solve these long-standing problems, but only some of them can be arranged. The Lausanne Conference is considered to be a simple conference of people representing the political ambitions, jealousies and prejudices of the participating states.

American Board missionaries also regarded the Lausanne Conference as the highest tribunal for the trial of a nation. They are of the opinion that in this court, after nearly three months of discussion and consideration, no condemnatory statements were made against Turkey regarding the minorities (especially Armenians); on the contrary, Turkey was given a clean bill of health. According to them, they listed the facts that happened during the conference and afterwards with the following items: (The Missionary Herald, 1923, pp.96-97).

“1. Turkey did not wish a conference at all and prefers not to be bound by a treaty.

2. She has proven that she has nothing to fear from any joint allied physical action or from the United States.

3. Without an allied treaty she will find little difficulty in coming to an understanding with Greece, after which she will deal with the nationals of all other countries as she pleases or as she may make separate agreements.

4. She has no "most favored nation" clause to embarrass her, or treaties, capitulations, concessions, permits, or contracts from the former Government to hamper her freedom of action.

5. This leaves America free to come to an understanding with her regarding American interests and institutions in the country, their status and operations.

6. It is clear that Turkey and her people cannot be coerced into a line of action against her will, but that the forces to be brought to bear up-

on her must be moral. The Turks at Lausanne repeatedly expressed their consciousness of the need of moral assistance.

7. Our plan of action must be, not by way of condemnation, but through the moral and religious approach, until the Turks recognize the unselfish character of our endeavours and come themselves to acknowledge the fact that righteousness become a nation. There is little doubt that the Turks will be more approachable through moral rather than coercive agencies. We can do no less than to accept the findings of the Lausanne Conference and offer to Turkey the constructive service of our Christian institutions, keenly desired by many, sorely needed by all. Turkey has faced years of ruthless and deserved condemnation; nothing now remains but to bend our efforts that the past return not. The Conference has cleared the way for beginning a new era of work for Turkey and the Turks.”

America had not been involved in the wartime treaties and was not bound by them and its insistence on self-determination contradicted with these agreements. Therefore, Wilson suggested that the peace settlement should be made under the protection of the League of Nations. However, on August 6, 1923 İsmet Pasha and Joseph Grew signed the Treaty of Amity and Commerce in Lausanne. The treaty was sent to the Senate of America only after a short time before it adjourned. However, the Americans in Turkey, especially the American Board missionaries, wanted the American government to ratify it. Yet the Senate was not able to take up the treaty before adjournment. This process lasted until 1927. In fact, the treaty meant that America recognized the independence and sovereignty of the new Turkish state.^{xix}

On the other hand, the treaty, which was strongly opposed in some quarters because it was thought that it did not meet all desired and it paved the way for other treaties. It opened the door to continuous and renewed negotiations and new understanding, not only in commercial matters, but also on American religious,

educational, and philanthropic institutions within Turkey, now a sovereign state, recognized by European nations. A note, not part of the agreement but accepted as if it were, was given to the US Ambassador Child by General Ismet Pasha, who was Turkey's spokesman in the negotiations. The note is as follows: (The Annual Report, Boston 1924, p.66).

"I have the honour to declare in the name of my government that the latter will recognize the existence of American religious, scholastic and medical establishments as well as of charitable institutions recognized as existing in Turkey prior to the 30th of October, 1914, and that it will favourably examine the case of other similar American institutions actually existing in Turkey at the date of the treaty signed today, with a view to regularize their position."

During the Lausanne Conference, Ismet Pasha repeatedly and openly declared that Turkey wanted and needed the continuation of American religious, educational and charitable institutions. The American Board missionaries, however, were always sceptical. While on the other hand, there was reason to believe that this statement represents the view of Turkey's leading official, the missionaries were troubled by the fact that there were also some opposing views, motivated by intense and almost radical nationalism, which wanted to get rid of all kinds of foreign influence. Moreover, in order to keep the country as a Turkish Republic entirely controlled and governed by Turks, some newspapers in Istanbul wrote that the government's aim was to establish and maintain its own educational institutions and ultimately to free the government from all foreign influence and control.

The Treaty, signed between the American and Turkish delegations at Lausanne and normalized relations between the new Turkish government and the European states, was seen as an extension of the Lausanne Treaty by the Turkish statesmen. However, it was rejected by the American Senate in 1927.^{xx}

This treaty signed by America with Turkey, is intended to cover this medical and missionary work in terms as follows:

“Nationals of either party are to be free to enter, travel and reside in the territories of the other; to exercise liberty of conscience and freedom of worship; to engage in professional, scientific, religious, philanthropic, manufacturing and commercial work of every kind without interference. . . . To employ agents of their own choice, and generally to do anything incidental to or necessary for the enjoyment of any of the foregoing privileges upon the same terms as Nationals.”

The treaty which has been signed also requires that these institutions and Nationals must submit themselves to all local laws and regulations duly established.

Regarding the minority issue, the Board missionaries stated that the majority of the people living in the country outside Constantinople were Turks, Kurds and Jews. According to them, around 60.000 Greeks and 22.000 Armenians would gradually return to their former homes. To them, the new Turkish government needs them because there seems to be no one to replace them in the industrial and commercial enterprises that need to be developed in order for Turkey to become a sovereign state. Therefore, no one believes that Armenians will leave Turkey forever.

The Board missionaries, stating that the following statements in the official note prepared by the Turkish delegation at Lausanne were accepted by both the Turks and the Americans, acknowledged that property rights and war damages were recognised and that the representatives of the two governments discussed ways in which these damages could be assessed: *American religious institutions, schools, and hospitals, as well as relief organizations recognized as existing; in Turkey before the war, are fiscally to be treated upon a footing of equality with similar Turkish institutions and organizations.* (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.390). According to the missionaries, no one would dare to foresee the extent and form of the work that the American Board could carry out in Turkey under this new treaty. This is because the old capitulations were abolished and there was not

much left to replace them. Under the new order envisaged by the treaty, American relations with the new Turkish government would be different from those of the pre-war period. Since the capitulations were abolished, the status of Americans in Turkey will be largely that of Turkish subjects and subject to the laws of the country, which would make it difficult for them to make the necessary arrangements for the conduct of missionary, educational and philanthropic work.

The missionaries emphasise that there are some who believe that once the Turks have been recognised as sovereign people and admitted into brotherhood of nations on an equal footing with other nations, their attitudes will change for the better, so that it will be much easier to work among them, and that the Turks have repeatedly stated at Lausanne that Church and State are now separate and that there is absolute freedom of religion in Turkey. Although the missionaries point out that it is impossible to believe that such a radical and even revolutionary change could be practically perfected without a long period of experimentation, they nonetheless consider the initiative to be of astonishing significance in itself. (The Annual Report, 1923, pp.51-52; The Missionary Herald, 1923, pp.390-391).

While such were the views of the American Board missionaries after the Lausanne Conference, the American Secretary of State, C. Evans Hughes, insisted, as did the American delegation at the first Conference at Lausanne, that the missionaries continue their work until the treaties were ratified and the work organized under the new conditions which the treaty would require. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.392). In line with these, at a meeting of the Western Turkey Mission, the American Board missionaries decided to occupy other locations and open up additional fields of endeavour as soon as possible.

The political agreements that took shape as a result of the negotiations at Lausanne made it more possible to clearly define the policy of the American Board missionaries in Turkey. As a result of these developments, and after lengthy correspondence and negotiations, the Prudential Committee submitted the following resolutions to the American Board meeting in Springfield, which were accepted by

the Board to determine its basic policies in the Near East: (The Annual Report, 1923, p.52; The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.474).

“1. The American Board recognizes and accepts its unique responsibility for missionary work in Turkey and proposes to carry it forward as rapidly as circumstances permit.

2. The American Board recognizes and accepts its responsibility towards the refugees from Turkey now in Greece, Syria, and the Caucasus. It proposes to continue its aid in maintaining the moral and spiritual ideals of these stricken peoples in their exile.

3. The American Board commends the earnest faith and courage of its missionaries in the Near East which prompts them to plan for a large advance both among the peoples of Turkey and the exiles. While it is not practical to fully carry out these plans at present, the Board recognizes the work as established and important and equally worthy of consideration as that in any of its mission fields.”

As can be understood, it is evident that the American Board was hopeful about their future under the administration of the new Turkish government and plans to continue its work with great enthusiasm. In short, Turkish territories still held a promising future for the American Board missionaries.

Conclusion

When looked at the Treaty of Lausanne from the missionaries' point of view, the abolition of capitulations by the Treaty of Lausanne, which was signed as a result of the Lausanne Conference, was the most influential development in terms of the missionary work carried out by missionaries in Turkey. This issue is very important for missionaries in that missionary activities and work had been protected and supported for a hundred years through the capitulations. With this development, it became necessary for missionaries to completely reorganise their views, because with the foundation of the new government in Ankara missionary organi-

sations were now completely subject to Turkish law and lost their foreignness and privileges. These institutions will now be harmonised with the laws of the country and will have to be protected by the forces of justice acting on behalf of the people. Likewise, their property, possessions and lives would be equal to those of the local population. As a result of the agreements signed, the missionaries could no longer see themselves as privileged defenders of justice guaranteed from outside. For the missionaries, there was no other way but to be supporters of justice that had to be constructed in Turkey. For the American Board missionaries serving in Turkey, the behaviour of the American government officials that led to all these developments were considered as “tragic mistakes that could not be corrected”.

The treaties signed at Lausanne made it possible to make more precise plans for the continuation of missionary work in Turkey. The rights and privileges expected in the work to be carried out were finalised with this treaty. Before the Lausanne Conference, the question of whether American missionaries in Turkey would be able to continue their work or not was a main question to be answered, but after the treaty it was resolved positively in favour of the missionaries. However, the occupation of new missionary work centres remained ambiguous for the missionaries.

The American Board missionaries were also closely involved in the minority question, which was of utmost importance at the Lausanne Conference. The conference is extremely important in terms of the protection of the rights of minorities in Turkey. The decisions to be taken at the conference are as important for the protection of the rights of minorities in Turkey as the protection of the existence of minorities for the continuation of the work of the American Board. Because up to that point missionary work had achieved its greatest success among Christians. However, what is certain for the missionaries was that whatever the outcome of the conference is, it has been decided that the missionary effort of the American Board in Turkey would never be decreased. The missionaries believed that the Near East problem could not be permanently solved through armies or treaties; on the contra-

ry, they think that the final solution lies only in the evangelisation of the Turkish people.

According to American Board missionaries, despite a friendship and trade treaty being signed between the two states in August 1923, the U.S. Senate postponed the approval of the treaty thus leaving diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Turkey without a foundation. Nevertheless, following the Treaty of Lausanne, the work of American Board missionaries continued in Turkey without hindrance, and considerable progress was even made in some centers.

Endnotes

- ⁱ He was the US representative at the Lausanne Conference, and the first United States ambassador to Turkey between 1927 and 1932.
- ⁱⁱ The Foreign Minister of the nationalist government of Ankara. For detailed information about his life story, (see. Turan, 2003).
- ⁱⁱⁱ Started on 20 November 1922, the Lausanne Conference was interrupted from time to time, but ended after eight months with the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne on 24 July 1923.
- ^{iv} For more information, see. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, pp.485-486).
- ^v He was born into a Quaker family in Charlotte, Vermont. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1881 and entered Hartford Theological Seminary. After his graduation he applied for overseas service, married Flora Holmes and sailed for Turkey in 1885. For more information, (see. www.dlir.org).
- ^{vi} This law, enacted on July 30th by the Turkish Grand National Assembly at Ankara, is as follows: The provision of the law regarding foreign schools are hereby confirmed, and if any permission has been granted to foreign charitable organizations to have orphan schools, they will be conducted according to the prescribed course of study and shall be under the direction of a Turkish subject, but no permits shall be issued for any new schools. (The Missionary Herald, 1922, p.477).
- ^{vii} This concern can be seen from Bristol's statement to Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes in early October 1922: As the United States is one of the capitulatory Powers with extensive vested interests in Turkey, we cannot afford to remain inactive while the Allies give their consent to important changes in the capitulatory regime. (Lippe, 1993, pp.44-45).
- ^{viii} Upon being invited to the Conference by the Allies, the USA explained its general policies in the memorandum, the first of the three documents it submitted to Britain, France and Italy on 30 October 1922. Here, he stated/announced that he would attend the conference as an *observer* and clarified the term *observer*. In addition to participating in the talks as observers, he also stated that they would take the floor to defend American interests when necessary. The memorandum also listed one by one the issues in which the US was interested. For the other two of the three documents and details of the subject, see. (Armaoğlu, 1991, pp.484-487).
- ^{ix} William Wheelock Peet. At the Lausanne Conference he took a helpful part in securing the recognition of the rights of American missionaries in Turkey. For detailed information about his life story, see. (www.dlir.org).
- ^x The State Institute of Statistics determined the city's population in 1922 as 1.129.655 and in 1925 as 1.011.165. (Bayraktar, 2003, p.11).
- ^{xi} For detailed information on the subject, see. (Erol, 1976, s.51; Gül, 2021, p.739)
- ^{xii} For a Picture Chateau/Shatanon see. (The Missionary Herald, 1923, p.4).
- ^{xiii} There is no information about who this person was.
- ^{xiv} Ismet Pasha was the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the head of the Turkish delegation of the Ankara government at the Lausanne Conference. The Turkish delegation consists of Ismet Pasha (Inönü, Minister of Foreign Affairs), Dr. Rıza Nur Bey (Minister of Health) and Hasan Bey (Saka, former Minister of Finance). The delegation also included counselors, interpreter, clerks, secretaries and Ismen Pasha's aides. Lippe, "The 'Other' Treaty of Lausanne: The American Public and Official Debate on Turkish-American Relations", p.44.

^{xv} Since the US was not at war with the Ottoman State and the Lausanne Conference was intended to end the state of war between the allies, Turkey and Greece, it participated in the conference as an observer because the US had many interests in the East. On November 14, the US government appointed Ambassador to Rome Richard Washburn Child and Ambassador to Bern Joseph C. Grew as observers at the Lausanne Conference. The delegation also includes assistants and a secretariat. For more information, see. (Armaoğlu, 1991, pp.483-527).

^{xvi} Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1923, Volume II - Office of the Historian. (<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1923v02/d799>).

^{xvii} Although there is no definite information about who he was, it is estimated that he was Dr. Fuad Umay, who was in the USA between 7 April and 11 July 1923 upon the invitation of the Turkish Welfare Association with the consent of the Turkish Grand National Assembly. For detailed information, see. (Deniz-Öztaş, 2020, p.566). He even informed the government during his return journey to Turkey on a French steamer, a Turk named Mehmed Pehlivan, who had fought with a Greek, had been handed over the Greeks in Piraeus harbour and that his life was in danger. Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye, Directorate of State Archives, BOA, HR.İM., No:79-69.

^{xviii} For detailed information about the life of Abdülhak Adnan Adıvar, who lived between 1882-1955 see. (Günergun, 2006, pp.13-54; Yıldırım, 2006, pp.55-86).

^{xix} An article titled *Americans in Turkey Want Treaty of Lausanne Ratified, Says Lawyer* published in the New York Herald on 4 January 1926. For detailed information on the subject, see. Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye, Directorate of State Archives, BCA, Muamelat Genel Müdürlüğü, No:267-801-3.

^{xx} (Lippe, 1993, pp.31-63). The reason for the rejection of this treaty by the US Senate in February 1927, the signing of another treaty between Turkey and the United States in 1930, and differences between the two treaties are not mentioned here, as they are the subject of a separate study. However, Joseph C. Grew was criticised the most for the signing of this treaty and he was even accused of *selling the birthright of his nation to a vegetable soup* and failing to provide a homeland for the Armenians. (Armaoğlu, 1991, p.522). Already in 1923, a propaganda campaign was started in the USA under the leadership of Morgenthau, the former US Ambassador to Istanbul, and the Berlin Ambassador in order to prevent the ratification of this treaty by the US Congress. For detailed information on the subject, see. Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Turkish Diplomatic Archives, No:502/100166-1, 2, 3. For the full Turkish text of this treaty, which was not ratified by the US Senate, see. (Açıkses, 1998, pp.8-31).

References

- Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye, Directorate of State Archives, BOA, HR.İM., No:79-69
- Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye, Directorate of State Archives, BCA, Muamelat Genel Müdürlüğü, No:267-801-3.
- Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Turkish Diplomatic Archives, No:502/100166-1, 2, 3.
- Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1923, Volume II - Office of the Historian. (<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1923v02/d799> - 01.02.2024)
- The One Hundred and Thirteenth Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Published by the Board Congregational House, Boston 1923.
- The One Hundred and Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Published by the Board Congregational House, Boston 1924.
- The Missionary Herald, Vol. CXVIII, Thomas Todd Company Printers, Boston 1922.
- The Missionary Herald, Vol. CXIX, Thomas Todd Company Printers, Boston 1923.
- Açıkses, E., “Lozan’da Türkiye ile Amerika Birleşik Devletleri Arasında İmzalanan 6 Ağustos 1923 Tarihli Anlaşma”, Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi, 6/21 (1998), pp.8-31.
- Armaoğlu, F., “Amerikan Belgelerinde Lozan Konferansı ve Amerika”, Belleten, Vol.L, No.32 (1991), pp.483-527.
- Bayraktar, H., “Geçmişten Günümüze İstanbul’da Nüfus”, Coğrafya Dergisi, No:11, İstanbul 2003, pp.5-20.
- Deniz, B. ve Öztaş, S., “Dr. Fuad Umay ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu Faaliyetleri”, RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 19 (Haziran-2020) pp.558-580.
- Erol, M., Birinci Dünya Savaşı Arefesinde Amerika’nın Türkiye’ye Karşı Tutumu, Ankara 1976.
- Gül, M. F., “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Kapitülasyonların Kaldırılması Sonrasında Halkın Tepkilerine Dair Bazı Tespitler”, İnternatiolan Journal of Social Sciences Academy, Year 3, Issue 5, April 2021, p.732-754.
- Günergun, F., “Adnan Adıvar’ın Bilim Tarihi Çalışmaları: Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim’den Önce ve Sonra”, Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları, VII/1 (2006), pp.13-54.
- Lippe, J. M. V. D., “The ‘Other’ Treaty of Lausanne: The American Public and Official Debate on Turkish-American Relations”, The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations, Year 1993, Issue 23, Vol XXIII, 1993, pp.31-63.
- Turan, Ş., İsmet İnönü – Yaşamı, Dönemi ve Kişiliği, Bilgi Yayınevi, İstanbul 2003.
- Yıldırım, N., “Hekim Kimliği ile Abdülhak Adnan Adıvar ve Tıp Tarihi ve Deontoloji Müderrisliği”, Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları, Vol. VII, No:2 (2006), pp.55-86.
- www.dlir.org. (01.02.2024)