

Turkish Public Diplomacy in the Minutes of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (1931-1938) ¹

Murat KÖYLÜ ²

Submitted by: 05.05.2024

Accepted by: 23.09.2024

Article Type: Research Article

Abstract

For the young Republic of Turkey, the 1930s were a test of international public diplomacy. Turkey, which based its domestic and foreign policy on the principle of “Peace at home, peace in the world!”, was also concerned about its own future with the dictatorial regimes of Germany, Russia and Italy, which had distanced themselves from democratic governance and entered into an arms race with a sense of revenge, as well as the public diplomacy it would conduct and the measures it would take with the countries in its region. During the First World War, the country had suffered great devastation. The Turkish nation had spent everything it had in the struggle for liberation and was almost exhausted. However, it had managed to build a democratic state based on “National Sovereignty” despite the great economic depression that engulfed the world. However, the political developments in Europe and the possibility of the Republic of Turkey entering into a new chaos with the approaching World War could have destroyed all the gains and the future of the country. The task of protecting Turkey from this impending danger and keeping it safe could only be possible with the rational policies pursued by President Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the correct decisions taken by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in line with these policies. The aim of this study is to examine the Turkish public diplomacy as reflected in the minutes of the Turkish Grand National Assembly of Turkey between 1932 and 1938 in order to prevent Turkey's involvement in the upcoming great war and to secure its gains with measures to ensure its security in the region.

Keywords: TGNA, Türkiye, Public Diplomacy, Minutes

Citation: Köylü, M. (2024). Turkish public diplomacy in the minutes of the Turkish grand national assembly (1931-1938). *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(3), 1359-1376.

¹ This study does not require ethics committee permission.

² Çağ University, Vocational School, Property Protection and Security Department, murat.koylu86@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7759-7675

Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Tutanaklarında Türk Kamu Diplomasisi (1931-1938)

Murat KÖYLÜ³

Başvuru Tarihi: 05.05.2024

Kabul Tarihi: 23.09.2024

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Öz

Genç Türkiye Cumhuriyeti için 1930'lu yıllar, uluslararası bir kamu diplomasi sınavı niteliğindedir. İç ve dış politikasını "Yurtta sulh, cihanda sulh!" ilkesine dayandıran Türkiye'nin, Avrupa siyasi tarihinde kendini gösteren, demokratik yönetim anlayışından uzaklaşmış ve intikam duygusuyla silahlanma yarışına giren Almanya, Rusya ve İtalya'nın diktatörlük rejimleri ve bölgesinde bulunan ülkelerle ile yürüteceği kamu diplomasisi ve alacağı önlemler kendi geleceği için de önem kazanmıştı. Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda ülke içinde büyük yıkım yaşamıştı. Türk milleti, varını yoğunu kurtuluş mücadelesinde harcamış, neredeyse tükenmişti. Ancak, dünyayı saran büyük ekonomik buhrana rağmen "Milli Egemenliğe" dayalı demokratik bir devlet inşa etmeyi başarmıştı. Ancak Avrupa'da yaşanan siyasi gelişmeler ve yaklaşan Dünya Savaşı ile Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ni yeni bir kaosun içine girme ihtimali, ülkenin tüm kazanımlarını ve geleceğini yok edebilirdi. Türkiye'yi, yaklaşan bu büyük tehlikeden koruma ve güvende tutma görevi ancak başta Cumhurbaşkanı Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün izlediği akılcı politikalar ve TBMM'nin bu politikalar doğrultusunda alacağı doğru kararlarla mümkün olabilirdi. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye'nin yaklaşan büyük savaşa dâhil olmasını engellemek ve bölgedeki güvenliğini sağlayacak tedbirlerle kazanımlarını güvence altına almak için 1932-1938 yılları arasındaki süreci içindeki Türk kamu diplomasisinin TBMM tutanaklarına yansıdığı şekliyle incelemektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: TBMM, Türkiye, Kamu Diplomasisi, Tutanaklar

³ Çağ Üniversitesi, Meslek Yüksekokulu, Mülkiyet Koruma ve Güvenlik Bölümü, murat.koylu86@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7759-7675

Introduction

The process of Turkish public diplomacy has taken different forms in different periods. This diversity has emerged as a result of changes in Turkey's domestic structure on the one hand and changes in the international system on the other. Factors that were particularly influential in the development of this process include leadership, the periodic increase in the weight of bureaucratic institutions, the influence of the press and public opinion, economic and other pressure groups, and the increasing role of the military (Oran, 2009, p. 73).

According to the founding philosophy of the Republic of Turkey, Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the future and independence of the homeland "*will be ensured not only by the removal of the occupations, but also by the establishment of a new, unconditionally, independent Turkish state based on national sovereignty!*" (Atatürk, 2007, p. 33)" The domestic and foreign policy of Turkey was built on two fundamental principles. The basis of the domestic policy was "national sovereignty", while the principle of "full independence" was the condition for reaching the civilization reached by the victors and even beyond with a peaceful policy to be followed in foreign policy and the revolutions to be made.

However, the hegemony of the dictatorial governments established with the change and transformation caused by the disruption of political balances with the "New European Order", which was tried to be established in Europe since 1648⁴ with the First World War, was the biggest threat to the foreign policy of the New Turkish Republic.

The first was Germany, oppressed by the Treaty of Versailles, signed at the end of the war and described by Adolf Hitler as "*an instrument of immeasurable cruelty, oppression and shameful disgrace*" (Hitler, 2017, p. 645). Hitler saw this treaty as a trigger to mobilize the German people and realize the new European order: "*... in the hands of a clever government that wants to make use of it, it can serve as a whip to arouse the reaction of the nation...*" (Hitler, 2017, p. 645)"

In his 1923 book *Mein Kampf*, Hitler outlined three dangers and areas of struggle that threatened the future of the German people. The first of these was the Treaty of Versailles. With the Treaty, the German Army, which was the guarantee of the German people, was destroyed. He states that Germany can regain its former strength only with a strong military presence. The second was the "German Jews", which he characterized as the internal enemy that he thought had destroyed the German economy, and finally the destruction caused by Bolshevism. He expressed his thoughts on this issue as follows:

"At Versailles they first turned the vulgar lust and rage of international thieves against the old German army. Unless the Jewish hordes are purged, no preparatory measures can be taken technically. Unless, by fighting them, the Marxist idea, which is the cause of their enmity, is uprooted from their hearts and minds, millions of people will seem invincible to us (Hitler, 2017, p. 645)."

The second threat was Bolshevism and its leader Stalin, who pursued a policy of Russian expansionism and Slavization. After Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, tensions between Germany and Russia began to arise. Thus, tensions in Europe Russia, led by Stalin, who saw Hitler's Germany as a danger by approaching the Slavic states and mobilizing the policy of Pan Slavism, Germany's eastern had tried to block his way (Görgen, 2021, p. 238-239).

⁴ The Westphalian System of States is essentially a nascent international system that does not establish sovereignty and political authority. The Treaties of Münster and Osnabrück, which constituted the Peace of Germany, mainly dealt with feudal issues such as the special German principalities, the system of election of the Holy Roman Emperor, religious representation and imperial courts. The most important result of the treaties was the loss of the influence of the Holy Roman Empire, one of the two great universal institutions of the medieval world, by giving the German principalities the right to sign treaties. Thus, the Papacy, the universal institution of the Middle Ages, also suffered a blow (Krasner, 1993, p. 236). As a matter of fact, with the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555, the relationship between religion and politics was explicitly recognized as an area of sovereignty and the German principalities were given the opportunity to have a say over religion in their territories (Phillpot, 2013, p. 70-71). However, although this process, which started with religious autonomy, enabled the state to draw the boundaries of its sovereignty, the process was legally completed with Westphalia (Özcan, 2019, p. 54-55).

The third threat was the "Mare Nostrum" dream of Benito Mussolini, the fascist leader of Italy, who wanted to restore the Roman Empire. Benito Mussolini, influenced by Adolf Hitler's idea of lebensraum, implemented his fascist program. Mussolini wanted to revive the powerful Roman Empire by taking over the countries in the Mediterranean. Emphasizing that the 20th century would be their century, Mussolini had created one of the best navies in the world in the Mediterranean (Fleming, 2002, p. 43).

The change in the balance of political power in Europe after the First World War and the harsh treaty conditions imposed on the defeated states led to the proliferation of dictatorial structures that mobilized the people's sense of revenge with the idea that, in Hitler's words, "... in the hands of a clever government that wants to take advantage of it, it can serve as a whip to arouse the reaction of the nation..." (Hitler, 2017, p. 645). Other dictators such as Hitler, who implemented Bismarck's "Iron and Blood" policy, and Mussolini and Stalin rapidly had begun to arm themselves for the so-called defense policy. Thus, the Balkans, the Mediterranean and the Young Turkish Republic had come under great threat from the beginning of the 30s.

Although the Lausanne Peace Treaty was a great victory in registering the existence of the New Turkish State in the international arena, the "Full Independence" and "National Declaration" aims of the National Struggle were not fully realized. According to the Treaty, the demilitarization of the Turkish Straits by leaving the control of the Turkish Straits to an international commission prevented Turkey's full independence and would be threatened international security in the coming chaos. Moreover, leaving Hatay, which was a Turkish homeland, to Syria under the French mandate was unacceptable.

In this study, the decisions taken by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM), which shaped Turkish public diplomacy in response to the political developments in Europe that would lead the world to disaster in the early 30s, and the discussions in the minutes of the Assembly will be analyzed. Thus, it will be seen how important the attitude of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, the most fundamental institution of the concept of "National Sovereignty", towards the public diplomacy decisions taken by the government in the 1930s, when theocratic governments were on the rise, was for the protection of world peace.

As a study method, more than 577 minutes of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey were analyzed through literature and archive searches and the relevant ones were analyzed and applied.

International Political Developments in the First Years of the 1930s and Their Reflection on the Minutes of the Turkish Grand National Assembly

Although the Lausanne Peace Treaty paved the way for the establishment of the Young Turkish Republic and ensured its international acceptance, it also postponed the resolution of some vital problems. The new Turkish Democratic Government believed that these problems could be solved over time through effective diplomacy.

The first of these was the Mosul Question. During the Lausanne negotiations, the problem, which could not be fully agreed between Turkey and Britain, was postponed to be resolved between the two countries. However, for Britain as well as Turkey, Mosul was of vital importance in terms of energy and Far East policies. They never had been wanted to leave Mosul to the Turks. For this reason, a separatist Kurdish tribal uprising to be organized within Turkey (Cibranlı Tribe, Sheikh Sait Uprising), planning, preparation phases, and all kinds of support provided the problem to be solved in its favor.

Finally, the Mosul Question was concluded in favor of Britain with the signing of the "Turkish-Iraqi Border and Good Neighborliness Treaty" between Turkey, Britain and Iraq in Ankara on June 5, 1926 with the mediation of the League of Nations (Oran, 2009, p. 267).

From the 1930s onwards, the balance in both Europe and the Middle East began to shift. In the Middle East, increasing Jewish immigration, especially to Palestine, caused disturbances in this region. and this led to the development of Arab nationalism as a reaction. led to the rise of the Soviet Union. In Europe, when Mussolini

came to power in Italy and Hitler in Germany, these two the country gradually formed a revisionist front. Germany was forced to accept the Versailles limitations one by one, while Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935 and took over the Mediterranean.

It posed a threat to British supremacy. Germany's efforts to get closer to Turkey and Italy's activities in the Mediterranean region before the Second World War. Developments that increased Turkey's importance in the eyes of the UK. As of the early 1930s, the effects of the 1929 economic depression began to fade in the international arena on the one hand, and increased polarization on the other. In this period, the status quo camp led by Britain and France the split and tension between the revisionist camp led by Germany and Italy it was starting to become clear (Oran, 2009, p. 271).

On November 1, 1931, President Gazi Mustafa Kemal (who had not yet taken the surname Atatürk), in his speech opening the 4th term of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, were based Turkey's foreign policy in the region on the principle of creating a secure geography from the Balkan states to Iran within the framework of good relations with neighbors. His speech is as follows:

President Gazi Mustafa Kemal: "Honorable Members of Parliament, p. Over the past year, the conciliatory and consistent character of our foreign policy was once again confirmed. The sincerity of our relations with our immediate neighbors has increased. We have good relations with every state in the international arena and we are achieving positive results. Our motto will always be to follow a path of peace that aims at Turkey's security and is not to the detriment of any nation (Bravo! Applause). We wish the same visits to Hungary. I would like to especially mention your impressions. The manifestations of friendship with the friendly Hungarian nation are worthy of the happy events we always desire and long for (Applause). The visit of His Majesty the King of Iraq and his honorable ministers left very sweet memories in our country. We were pleased to receive in Ankara the Honorable Commissar of Foreign Affairs of our great friend Soviet Russia. On this occasion, it was made clear that it is in the great interest and sincere desire of the two countries to maintain their experienced friendly relations with the same strength and sincerity. Dear Sirs, p. Turkey, due to its geographical position, is particularly interested in the preservation and consolidation of peace in the Balkans. It is natural to attribute a special sincerity to Turkey's satisfaction with the fact that it has almost no disputes and conflicts with its neighbors" (TBMM Z.C., 1931, p. 3-4).

At the beginning of the 1930s, the membership of the Republic of Turkey in the League of Nations was being beginning to discussed. In the Mosul Question between Turkey and Britain, the League of Nations ignored Turkey's just demands and ruled in favor of Britain, which caused Turkey to have a negative attitude towards membership in the League. This negative decision brought Turkey-Soviet Union relations closer to each other. The Soviet Union's belief that the League of Nations was established against it was also effective in its approach to Turkey. Turkey gradually moved closer to the Soviet Union and signed the Treaty of Friendship and Neutrality with Soviet Russia on December 17, 1925 (Başarır, 2019, p. 1420).

One of the problems Turkey had with the League of Nations was the exchange between Turkey and Greece. As the mixed commission established between Turkey and Greece failed to find a solution, the dispute was taken to the Permanent Court of Justice at The Hague on the recommendation of the League of Nations. The Court's interpretation of the term 'settled' on February 21, 1925 failed to resolve the dispute (Doğan, 2015, p. 231).

The event that led to the improvement of relations between Turkey and the League of Nations was the Bozkurt-Lotus case between Turkey and France in 1926. The case was brought by Turkey to the League's Permanent Court of International Justice and the matter was resolved in favor of Turkey by the court in 1927 (Ersaydı, 2010, p. 41). This was the first time Turkey had confidence in the League of Nations. Turkey, which was in favor of peace, later signed the Kellogg Pact and showed that it was open to international cooperation by

participating in the Preparatory Committee of the League of Nations' Disarmament Conference (Bıyıklı, 2016, p. 123-124).

With these developments, the states defeated in the First World War were also admitted to the League. In 1931, Turkey adopted in principle to join the League of Nations and assured the Soviet Union with a note. Turkey decided to join the League at the beginning of 1932. However, Turkey wanted to join the League by invitation, not by application. Spain's representative to the League of Nations, De Madariaga, took the floor at the General Assembly of the League of Nations on July 1, 1932 and presented the draft resolution inviting Turkey for membership on behalf of Germany, Albania, Australia, Austria, the British Empire, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Guatemala, Iran, Iran, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, Japan, Colombia, Cuba, Latvia, Hungary, Panama, Poland, Romania, New Zealand, Yugoslavia and Greece. Sixteen members took the floor one by one and expressed their views on Turkey's participation in the organization (Uluslan, 2008). In conclusion, it was unanimously decided that Turkey would become a member of the League of Nations and be formally invited to make valuable contributions and that the General Secretariat would notify Turkey (Uluslan, 2008).

Upon the notification of the decision to Turkey, the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TBMM) decided to accept the invitation on July 9, 1932. The decision was notified to the General Secretariat of the League. On Monday, July 18, 1932, with the unanimous vote of 43 members of the League of Nations, Turkey became a member of the League. On the same day, it was decided that Turkey's representatives would attend the meetings of the ongoing period (Uluslan, 2008). The decision of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey to become a member of the League of Nations is reflected in the minutes as follows:

Dr. Tevfik Rüştü Bey, Minister of Foreign Affairs (after explaining at length the process of his invitation): “In response to your invitation on behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to inform you that the Republic of Turkey and Turkey is ready to become a member, and that Turkey is ready to conclude treaties with non-member states, including the treaties which Turkey has already concluded and the treaties it has assumed, and that this is in no way incompatible with the duties of a member of the League of Nations. In this respect, in fact, all these treaties, which were signed before the admission of Turkey, were signed by the same majority of the members of the League of Nations. I point out that they were signed in the spirit of the Treaty of Paris. In making this statement, I would like to emphasize that Turkey is in a special situation because of the commitments of a military nature arising from the treaties signed at Lausanne in 1923. I consider it a duty. In these circumstances I should recall the wording of the note dated 1 June 1925, signed by the representatives of Belgium, France, the British Empire, Italy, Poland and Czechoslovakia, which the German Government referred to in its letter of 8 February 1926 to the Secretary-General concerning the admission of Germany to the League of Nations. The last paragraph of that note is expressed as follows, (...The obligations imposed on the members of the League by this Article (Article 16) are to be understood in such a way that each of the member States of the League to ensure adherence to the treaty and to provide a defense against offensive action, in a way that is compatible with the military situation and to work together in an honest and effective manner within a scale that takes into account its geographical position is obliged to do so). I request the acceptance of my high regards Clerk general sir. I ask you to please approve this text that I have read out” (loud applause).

Chief – “Sir, you have listened to the statement of Mr. Acting Foreign Minister. Those who approve the reply to be written in the style he has read, please raise your hands. Those who do not... It is approved” (TBMM Z.C., 1932, p. 543-544).

Turkey's International Policy between 1932-1938 and its Reflection on the Minutes of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey

From the 1930s onwards, the balance in both Europe and the Middle East began to shift. In the Middle East, increasing Jewish immigration, especially to Palestine, caused disturbances in this region. and this led to the development of Arab nationalism as a reaction led to. In Europe, when Mussolini came to power in Italy and Hitler in Germany, these two the country gradually formed a revisionist front. Germany had to violate the Versailles limitations one by one, while Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935 and took over the Mediterranean. It posed a threat to British supremacy. Germany's efforts to get closer to Turkey and Italy's activities in the Mediterranean region before the Second World War Developments that increased Turkey's importance in the eyes of the UK.

From the early 1930s onwards, the international arena was becoming increasingly polarized as the impact of the economic depression of 1929 began to fade. The division and tension between the status quo camp led by Britain and France and the revisionist camp led by Germany and Italy began to crystallize. Against this background and international environment, Turkey began to implement a significant part of its domestic reforms. realized and largely solved the problems left over from Lausanne. Revisionist states gained strength in Europe and began to disrupt the status quo of the United Kingdom and France due to its geographical position in the region. During this period, the UK tried to increase the possibilities of cooperation with Turkey. It was worried that Turkey would join the revisionist countries. Turkey had to fulfill the Misak-ı Milli (National Pledge), and although it thought that it had failed to do so, it did not join the revisionist countries. Even from the beginning of the 1930s, Italy's refusal to join the revisionist countries in the Eastern Mediterranean and its aggressive policy pushed Turkey away from the revisionist camp and closer to the status quo camp (Oran, 2009, p. 271).

Reflection of International Relations Issues on the Minutes of the 4th Period, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th Legislative Years of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (1. 11. 1931 - 23.12.1934)

During this period, Turkey was particularly disturbed by the aggressive policies pursued by Italy, and this led to Turkey's decision to take action against a possible Italian attack. Turkey needed an ally in the Mediterranean. Mussolini's imperialist activities in the Mediterranean and the decision of nearby Turkish Italy to establish military bases in the Dodecanese Islands made Italy a serious threat to Turkey (Barlas & Güvenç, 2009, p. 240). During this period, it became increasingly important for Turkey to maintain peace in its region and ensure its peripheral security against the aggressive policies of the increasingly unstable European and Far Eastern countries.

The first international issues of 1932 reflected in the minutes of the Turkish Grand National Assembly were "Law No. 1/204 on the Approval of the Ratification of the Residence Agreement between the Republic of Turkey and the United States of America and the States of Iraq (TBMM Z.C., 1932, p. 354-359) and the Reports of the Foreign Affairs Committee":

Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Şükrü Kaya B. (Muğla) - Distinguished gentlemen, I would like to inform you that the the document he presented for approval is one of the first and important documents in the recent history of the Orient. is one of them. Until now, the defunct Turkish Empire managed the State's relations with the outside world not through bilateral treaties but through unilateral capitulations. was doing. The Turkish nation is certainly not responsible for the misdeeds of the years leading up to the Republic. But the Empire, because of its ignorance and incapacity, left this country in an inferior position in the eyes of Europeans and Americans. This is a historical fact. It was only the Republic that erased this historical fact from Turkish political administration (Bravo, applause). If it is a great honor for us to see this every day and everywhere, it is a great lesson for future generations. The treaty we have

concluded with the American nation, with the united Governments of the United States of America, is based entirely on the principle of mutual reciprocity and is based on principles derived from the principles of international law. This treaty will be of great help to the development of the good relations which have existed between us and the American nation for a long time. Since the Treaty of Lausanne, the Americans have, as a matter of fact, developed very good feelings in favor of the Turks. It is natural that we should be pleased to see, read and hear them. There is no doubt that the Turkish nation feels the same way towards the Americans. If this feeling is known by official and unofficial Americans, it will undoubtedly arouse the same feeling in them. (Bravo, applause).

Chief - All those in favor of the articles ... Those who do not... It is accepted (TBMM Z.C., 1932, p. 354-355).

In the 2nd Legislative Year of the 4th Term of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, the draft laws (Reports of the Justice and Foreign Affairs Commissions) on the Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of the Republic of Turkey and the Governments of other nations were approved. Bill No. 1/325 on the ratification of the treaty of conciliation, judicial settlement and arbitration between the Republic of Turkey and the Kingdom of Sweden (TBMM Z.C., 1932, p. 126), p. Bill No. 1/323 on the ratification of the treaty between the Republic of Turkey and the Government of Iran on the demarcation of the frontier line and the parliamentary reports of the Committees of Foreign Affairs, National Defense and Internal Affairs (TBMM Z.C., 1932, p. 152), p. The Law No. 1/231 on the ratification of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Republic of Turkey and the Government of the United Kingdom and its ratification by the Committees of Justice and Foreign Affairs, The Draft Law No. 1/232 on the Approval of the Ratification of the Extradition Agreement between the Government of Iraq and the Government of the Republic of Turkey and the reports of the Justice and Foreign Affairs Committees, the Draft Law No. 1/235 on the Approval of the Ratification of the Residence Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Turkey and the Government of Poland and the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Residence, trade and navigation between the Government of Norway Bill No. 1/135 on the ratification of the treaty and reports of the Economic and Foreign Affairs Committees (TBMM Z.C., 1932, p. 380-398), p. Bill No. 1/322 on the ratification of the treaty of conciliation, judicial settlement and arbitration concluded between the Republic of Turkey and the State of Denmark, and the briefs of the Committees of Foreign Affairs and Justice (TBMM, 1932, p. 430-437), p. Republic of Turkey and Czechoslovakia The extradition treaty concluded between the The Bill No. 1/321 on the ratification of the treaty on judicial cooperation in criminal matters and the Mazbats of the Committees of Foreign Affairs and Justice (TBMM, 1932, p. 455).

As is customary, President Gazi Mustafa Kemal, in his opening speech of the 3rd legislative year of the 4th term of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, said that Turkey's international relations are based on "friendship":

"Honorable deputies of the nation! Our nation has shown great vigor in the face of the difficulties that all nations are struggling to overcome, and our Government is extremely sound (Applause). Our relations with our neighbors and with all nations are based on the serious and sincere idea of peace and security (Applause). Maintaining an honest position among friends is a principle to which we always attach great importance (Applause)" (TBMM Z.C., 1932, p. 3).

Turkey's peaceful policy in the Balkans was welcomed by the Balkan countries. Especially the Greek Government and Parliament attach great importance to this approach in the face of the growing danger in Europe. This idea is clearly expressed in the telegram sent by the Presidency of the Greek Parliament to the Turkish Grand National Assembly:

To President of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey

The signing of the new treaty establishing closer relations between Turkey and Greece confirms the firm determination of our nations to live peacefully and to sincerely pursue the goal of realizing their common interests and constitutes a new proof of the peace-loving mentality that has spread among the Balkan nations after the war. The parliament, which is the expression of the feelings of the entire Hellenic Nation, salutes the work done with enthusiasm. I convey to the Grand National Assembly my friendly and heartfelt greetings to Turkey.

President of the Assembly: Haralambos Vosikis (TBMM Z.C., 1933, p. 4).

In his traditional inaugural speech at the 1st session of the 4th legislative year on November 1, 1933, President Gazi Mustafa Kemal summarized the national and international situation of the republic, which celebrated its 10th anniversary. In particular, the President emphasized the importance of friendly relations with the Balkan countries and the possibility of an attack from the Balkans:

Dear Sir, the States in the Balkans and Central Europe The Republic of Turkey maintains a sincere position among them only because of the honest and open nature of its policy (Applause). We carefully consider the requirements of this very delicate policy. The Republic of Turkey's relations with other States I can say that their relations are generally good, in accordance with the provisions of the treaties and the requirements of international friendship (TBMM Z.C., 1933, p. 3).

The threat in the region was behind this speech. It began to deteriorate in the 1930s as Mussolini's expansionist policy began to take hold. Italy's foreign policy found external support with the rise of the Nazis in Germany in January 1933 and the rise of Franco fascism in Spain. more aggressive. The development that caused the greatest concern in Turkey was Mussolini's speech at the 2nd Five-Year Fascist Congress in March 1934. Italy's historical ambitions were in Asia and Africa. Two months later, Mussolini told the Daily Telegraph that Italy was a maritime state and needed 29 million tons of grain to feed its people. and it can only produce 6 million of them, so expanding he said he had to. Already during this period, the Italian leader for Mare Nostrum (Our Sea) (Oran, 2009, p. 295).

Following the opening speech of the legislative year by President Gazi Mustafa Kemal, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs took action and started signing memorandums of understanding on the description of the aggression of any aggressor state in the international arena.

Republic of Turkey and Czechoslovakia, Law No. 1/771 on the ratification of the Convention between the Governments of Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia on the definition of rape Approval of the draft bill and the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee (TBMM Z.C., 1933, p.104-121). The Bill No. 1/770 on the ratification of the Convention between the Republic of Turkey and the Governments of Afghanistan, Estonia, Iran, Latvia, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Council Republics on the definition of rape and the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (TBMM Z.C., 1933, p.104-124). Bill No. 1/806 on the ratification of the treaty of friendship between the Republic of Turkey and the State of Iran and the report of the Council of Foreign Affairs (TBMM Z.C., 1933, p.105).

Finally, the "Balkan Treaty" (Oran, 2009, p. 295) signed on February 9, 1934 between Turkey, Yugoslavia, Greece and Romania in order to put an end to security concerns in the Balkans was ratified by the Turkish Grand National Assembly on March 6, 1934 (TBMM Z.C., 1934, p. 23-26).

Turkey, its accession to the General Convention on Arbitration for the peaceful settlement of disputes between States and Foreign Relations Bill No. 1/805 and Justice Committees were approved (TBMM Z.C., 1934, p. 124-125).

President Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, in his traditional opening speech of the 5th legislative year of the 4th term of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, drew attention to the danger in Europe and drew attention to the friendship alliances established by Turkey.

Friends, In the last year, the international political world has become preoccupied with protection, p. that is why armaments have been accelerated in all countries. The Government of the Republic, on the one hand, has therefore endeavored to strengthen the power of national protection, and on the other hand, in order that peace may not be shaken, it has done its utmost to keep to the path which gives hope to the cooperation of nations (sustained applause). The unbreakable commitment of Republican Turkey to its friendships has been tested in the past years on various occasions (applause). It is a well-known characteristic of our nation to keep its promises to each other (Applause). We have always paid attention to this and will continue to do so in the future will be clear. The Balkan Treaty, (Continuous applause) the Balkan States will be able to recognize each other's a happy one that takes into account the respect (Applause). We believe that this is a real is obviously of some value. The "Balkan Treaty Our nation welcomed the efficient and appropriate work of the "council" with love (Applause) (TBMM Z.C., 1934, p. 3).

Reflection of International Relations Issues on the Minutes of the 5th Period, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th Legislative Years of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (1.03.1935 - 10.11.1938)

On February 8, 1935, following the constitutional amendment on December 5, 1934 that gave women the right to be elected as deputies, 383 male and 18 female deputies were elected as a result of the general elections held to determine the deputies of the 5th term of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM), and the TBMM started its work in the 1st legislative year of the 5th legislative term on March 1, 1935.

In the 1st and 2nd legislative years of the 5th term of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, two issues came to the forefront in international relations. The first one was the signing of commercial agreements with neighboring states (Greece, Syria, Soviet Union, Bulgaria) and other European states (Italy, Norway, Spain, Yugoslavia, etc.). This was stated by President Kemal Atatürk in his opening speech of the 3rd legislative year of the Turkish Grand National Assembly on November 1, 1936:

Our trade relations have expanded this year. Mutual breadth and convenience are the principle we follow. Where our exports are facilitated, we are not afraid of increasing imports. We are trying to increase and facilitate these imports. This honest policy has steadily increased the volume of our trade since the first year (TBMM Z.C., 1936, p. 5).

The other issue was the solution of border problems with neighboring countries (the Soviet Union and the French Mandate Administration of Syria).

One of the issues that could not be fully established by the Lausanne Peace Treaty in accordance with the principle of national sovereignty and full independence for Turkey was the status of the Black Sea Straits. Turkey has a number of restrictions on its sovereignty in the Lausanne Convention on the Straits the reason why he reluctantly agreed to the provisions the League of Nations, as well as the desire for a peaceful outcome that the collective security system created will function and that international disarmament that it was going to happen.

For the first time, at the disarmament conference held in London in 1933, Turkey asked for the abolition of the provisions of the Lausanne Straits Convention, which demilitarized and demilitarized the shores of the Straits and the islands in the Sea of Marmara (except İmralı). But this request was ignored as it was not relevant to the subject matter of the conference (Oran, 2009, p. 370). On April 10, 1936, Turkey sent a note to the state's

parties to the Lausanne Convention on the Straits, requesting the convening of an international conference to determine a new regime. The request in question It was based on the principle of "rebus sic stantibus"⁵ in international law.

All the parties to the Convention (except Italy, which signed it in 1937) responded positively to Turkey's note. The USSR was dissatisfied with the regime introduced by the Lausanne Convention on the Straits, and therefore made changes in the Straits regime in its favor Turkey's proposal, believing that it could do so. Bulgaria, although it did not want Turkey to strictly control the Straits, did not oppose the new regime, hoping that the Turkish initiative would give it the opportunity to change the provisions of the 1919 Neuilly Treaty on demilitarization. Greece, Romania and Yugoslavia supported Turkey on this issue because of the Balkan Pact. France, despite being a status quoist, opposed to the status quo in Europe and the peace treaties, did not want to prevent a change that Moscow welcomed, also due to the influence of the alliance treaty it had signed with the USSR in 1935 in order to gain Soviet friendship against Germany. Britain, the architect of the Lausanne Straits Treaty, on the other hand, welcomed the Turkish proposal as it wanted to draw Turkey to its side against the Italian threat in the Mediterranean.

At the end of the Montreux conference, the Montreux Straits Convention was signed on July 20, 1936. signed. This convention and its annexes were ratified by the Turkish Grand National Assembly on July 31, 1936 (TBMM Z.C., 1936, p. 331-342). It entered into force on November 9, 1936. The Straits area is controlled by the Turkish army militarization began on August 15, 1936, in accordance with the protocol (Oran, 2009, p. 374).

President Kemal Atatürk expressed his satisfaction with the signing and entry into force of the Montreux Straits Convention in the opening speech of the 3rd Legislative Year of the 5th Term of the Turkish Grand National Assembly:

The signatories of the Montreux Treaty, who have shown great friendship and understanding by recognizing Turkey's rights, have also rendered a valuable service to the cause of a general peace, the stability of which everyone must work for in this critical period of the world (Applause). The Straits, which had been a source of dispute and ambition many times in history, are now completely under Turkish sovereignty, and are used only for trade and commerce. It has become an avenue of friendly relations (Applause). Henceforth, the passage of warships of any belligerent State through the Straits is forbidden (Bravo, applause). On this occasion, on land and sea, the Great The friendship between us and our neighbor Soviet Russia, which has passed through all kinds of experiences for fifteen years, has maintained its strength and sincerity of the first day and has continued to develop naturally. I am also pleased to declare that it continues (Sustained applause) (TBMM Z.C., 1936, p. 5).

Another problem that left the integrity of the Turkish homeland incomplete and awaiting a solution was the Hatay problem. Atatürk, taking advantage of the tension created by Hitler in Europe after the 1936 Montreux Straits Convention, believed that it was time to solve the Iskenderun problem.

After the Battle of Sakarya, France realized the power of the National Struggle. On October 20, 1921, between Franklin-Bouillon and Yusuf Kemal, negotiated by Mustafa Kemal himself an agreement was signed. Articles 7, 8 and 10 of the agreement are important in terms of the later Hatay problem. Article 7 states that "A special administrative regime will be used for the Iskenderun region. The people of this region, who are of Turkish ancestry, shall be entitled to enjoy their culture. It shall enjoy every facility for its development. The Turkish language shall have an official character there", while Article 8 determines the Turkey-Syria border line and

⁵ Latin for "circumstances was changed" principle of international law. This principle is called according to the treaty at the time of its conclusion the parties have the right to terminate or suspend the application of this treaty in the event of a change in circumstances affecting the treaty has the right (Pirim, 2022: 50).

the border is drawn in a general way to pass just south of Payas on the Gulf of Iskenderun, that is, to leave the Sanjak of Iskenderun to France (Oran, 2009, p. 149-150).

However, it was unacceptable that Hatay, which was a Turkish homeland, remained outside the borders of Turkey. Atatürk sent a letter to the French Government on behalf of Turkey, proposing that France, in parallel with its decision on Syria and Lebanon, should make a similar decision on the Iskenderun Sanjak, which was predominantly Turkish, but this proposal was rejected (Dayı, 2002, p. 335-336).

While steps were taken in diplomacy between France and Turkey for the solution of the Hatay Issue, the delay and the lack of the desired results from these steps were reflected in Atatürk's opening speech to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on November 1, 1936 and this speech was considered to be a full ultimatum, p." *In the meantime, the main issue that occupies our nation day and night is the fate of Antakya and Iskenderun and their region, whose true owner is a Turk. This is the single greatest issue between us and France. (Continuous standing ovations, hurray, hurray)* (TBMM Z.C., 1936, p. 6-7)."

Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Dr. Tevfik Rüştü Aras his speech about Iskenderun and Antakya in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on November 27, 1936 was summarized as follows:

Do I need to tell you how the Wisdom of the Republic has been engaged in this work with all its heart and soul after hearing the great chief's explicit declaration on this matter? After having settled the thousand and one painful accounts that the general war catastrophe had heaped upon us and the liquidation of which was left to our generation, by negotiations in Moscow, in Ankara, in Lausanne and in the speeches and conferences that followed them, and by replacing old disputes with firm friendships, the fact that the fate of Iskenderun and Antioch has not yet been settled in practice in a fundamental way stands as the only national issue that worries the Turkish nation day and night. The fact that this matter has been left to the last is not in any way due to the fact that in our opinion its importance is different from our other settled affairs (TBMM Z.C., 1936, p. 70-79).

Ataturk was very disturbed by the fact that all attempts did not yield the desired results. He believed that it was time to take action. For this reason, he invited Prime Minister İnönü, Chief of General Staff Fevzi Pasha and Foreign Minister Tevfik Rüştü to a meeting in Eskişehir. After the meeting in Eskişehir, he left for Konya with the participants of the meeting. In his meeting on the train, he said the following: "*I would never drag the country into a war, but the Hatay problem has been my indispensable cause* (Dayı, 2002, p. 336)."

However, as long as the Hatay issue, which he said "*It is my personal matter*", was not resolved, Atatürk's discomfort was increasing. On October 29, 1937, in his speech to the foreign ambassadors attending the Republic Day ceremonies, he said the following to the French Ambassador Ponsa:

"I do not wish to enlarge territory, p. I am not in the habit of disturbing peace. I promised my nation from the rostrum of the Grand Assembly that I will take Hatay! My nation believes in what I say. If I cannot fulfill my promise, I will not appear before him, I cannot stay in my place... (Dayı, 2002, p. 337-338)"

The proposal of Mahmud Esad Bozkurd, Member of Parliament for Izmir, and two of his friends, that the Grand National Assembly of Turkey thank Atatürk and the İsmet İnönü Government for the success achieved in the Hatay issue. Prime Minister İsmet İnönü's thank you speech reflected in the minutes of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, p.

Prime Minister İsmet İnönü (Malatya)-The fact that our friend Mahmud Esad Bozkurd was instrumental in opening such a discussion has invited me to thank him personally. I also thank him very much for his compliment towards us. I owe it to the sensitivity shown by the great Atatürk in this national issue, as in every great issue, to praise his efforts to explain a national cause on the path of peace,

humanity and civilization and to bring it to a positive conclusion (Applause). It is an important development and a valuable stage for humanity when nations can put forward their causes with enthusiasm, discuss them with an open heart, no matter how difficult they may be, and finally feel satisfied with the results achieved (Strong and sustained applause) (TBMM, 1937, p. 160-173).

Conclusion

In the 15 years following the proclamation of the Republic, Turkey experienced the most intense period in the field of public diplomacy between 1931 and 1938. In 1929, the economic depression that started in the United States shook the strong and weak political systems of Europe and disrupted their internal and external political balances. With the rise of nationalist politics, which saw the crisis as an opportunity, it paved the way for totalitarian regimes that used revenge in states that were condemned to poverty after the First World War with agreements containing harsh conditions.

The possibility that the changing political climate in European politics would turn into a threat over time for Turkey, which was in an effort to establish an exemplary democracy based on the principle of “National Sovereignty” with the proclamation of the Republic, increased the importance of public diplomacy to be followed especially after the 1930s. In this direction, first of all, the importance of supporting the steps necessary for international security in public diplomacy by the Turkish Grand National Assembly through the smart diplomacy decisions to be followed by the Republican Government emerged. Turkey's membership in the League of Nations, environmental security agreements, security of the Turkish Straits, mutual trade agreements and judicial agreements all constituted the public diplomacy efforts of the Turkish Grand National Assembly in the 4th and 5th legislative periods together with the domestic public order laws.

Thus, the Republic of Turkey emerged from the First World War defeated, under the leadership of Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, it was the Turkish Nation and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, composed of its representatives, who were behind this success of the Republic of Turkey, which recognized its existence to the whole world with its victory first on the battlefields and then at the diplomatic table.

In the 1930s, the Turkish Grand National Assembly, on the one hand, tried to complete the construction of the young republic by enacting the revolutions made for it, and on the other hand, by taking steps to develop international diplomatic, commercial and friendly relations, it managed to ensure its peripheral security in an increasingly unstable European context. Thus, it prevented Turkey from being dragged into World War II, the greatest catastrophe of the 20th century. He also had secured the integrity of the homeland with his stance on the Montreux Straits Convention and the Hatay issue.

References

- Atatürk, G. M. (2007). *Nutuk*. Ankara: Yakamoz Yayıncılık.
- Barlas, D. and Güvenç, S. (2009). Turkey and the Idea of a European Union during the Inter-war Years, 1923–39. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 45(3), 425-446. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00263200902853421>
- Başarır, M. (2019). Sovyet Rusya'nın 1925 Dostluk ve Tarafsızlık Antlaşması'nın feshine yönelik Türkiye'ye verdiği notaların Türk basınına yansımaları. *Belgi Dergisi*, 2(18), 1417-1448. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/769706>
- Bıyıklı, M. (2016). Türkiye'nin ittifak politikası ve katıldığı uluslararası güvenlik ittifakları (1928-1938). *Yeni Fikir*, 8(17), 121-136. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1721404>
- Dayı, E. (2010). Hatay Devleti ve Hatay'ın Anavatan'a katılması. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(19), 331-340. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/32606>
- Doğan, N. (2015). Uluslararası Sürekli Adalet Divanı'nda Türkiye-Yunanistan mübadele davaları. *TESAM Akademi Dergisi*, 2(2), 221-239. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/138015>
- Ersaydı, A. (2009). Bozkurt-Lotus Davası ve Genç Türkiye'nin hukuksal yetkinliği. *Tarih Okulu Dergisi*, 2010(VI), 33-43. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/144878>
- Fleming, T. (2002). *The New Dealers' War: FDR and the War within World War II*. London: Paperback.
- Görgen, İ. (2021). Rusya'da Stalinizm'in doğuşu. *Avrasya İncelemeler Dergisi*, 10(2), 225-248. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/2009206>
- Hitler, A. (2017). *Mein Kampf*. Ankara: Parga Yayıncılık.
- Oran, B. (2009). *Türk dış politikası (1919-1980)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Özel Özcan, M. S. (2019). Westphalian devletler sistemi ve modernleşmenin geleneksel dünyanın büyük güçleri olan imparatorluklara etkisi. *Ekonomi İşletme Siyaset ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, 5(1), 49-62. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/843945>
- Pirim, C. Z. (2022). Uluslararası andlaşmalar hukukunda değişim, istikrar ve değişim yoluyla istikrar: Rebus Sıc Stantibus. *Türkiye Adalet Akademisi Dergisi* (51), 47-76. <https://doi.org/10.54049/taad.1139345>.
- TBMM. (1931). *Zabıt Ceridesi Cilt 4-2 (1)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.
- TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-2 (54)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.
- TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4 -2(62)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.
- TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-2(64)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-2(72)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-2(75)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-2(76)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-3(1)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1932). *Zabıt Ceridesi Cilt 9 (1)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1933). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-3(71)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1933). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-4(1)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1933). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-4(17)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1934). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-4(24)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1934). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-4(43)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1934). *Zabıt Ceridesi 4-5(1)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1936). *Zabıt Ceridesi 5-2 (81)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1936). *Zabıt Ceridesi 5-3 (1)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1936). *Zabıt Ceridesi 5-3(8)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

TBMM. (1937). *Zabıt Ceridesi 5-3(30)*. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi.

Uluslan, Ş. (2008). Türkiye'nin Milletler Cemiyeti'ne (Cemiyet-i Akvam) Girişi. *Çağdaş Türk Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(16), 237-258. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/233348>

Genişletilmiş Özet

Amaç

Türk kamu diplomasi oluşum süreci farklı dönemlerde farklı biçimler almıştır. Bu çeşitlilik, bir yandan Türkiye'nin iç yapısındaki değişimlerin, diğer yandan da uluslararası sistemdeki değişimlerin bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kurucu felsefesi Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'e göre vatanın geleceği ve bağımsızlığı "yalnız işgallerin kaldırılmasıyla değil, aynı zamanda milli egemenliğe dayanan, kayıtsız şartsız, bağımsız yeni bir Türk devletinin kurulmasıyla sağlanacaktır! Türkiye'nin iç ve dış politikası iki temel ilke üzerine inşa edilmiştir. İç politikanın temeli "milli egemenlik" iken, dış politikada izlenecek barışçıl bir politika ve yapılacak devrimlerle galiplerin ulaştığı medeniyete ve hatta ötesine ulaşmanın koşulu "tam bağımsızlık" ilkesiydi. Bu çalışmada, 30'lu yılların başından itibaren dünyayı felakete sürükleyecek olan Avrupa'daki siyasi gelişmelerin Türk kamu diplomasisine yön veren TBMM'nin aldığı kararlar ve Meclis tutanaklarında yer alan tartışmalar incelenecektir. Böylece teokratik yönetimlerin yükselişe geçtiği 1930'lu yıllarda "Milli Egemenlik" kavramının en temel kurumu olan Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin hükümetin aldığı kamu diplomasi kararları karşısındaki tavrının dünya barışının korunması açısından ne kadar önemli olduğunu göstermek amaçlanmıştır.

Tasarım ve Yöntem

Araştırma kapsamında 1930'lu yılların başlangıcında Avrupa'da yaşanan siyasi gelişmeler incelenmiştir. Özellikle Birinci Dünya Savaşı sonrası Avrupa'ya yerleştirilmeye çalışılan yeni siyasi düzen karşısında, savaşın mağlup devletleri içinde yaşanan siyasi devrimler sonucu, milliyetçilik akınlarının yükselişe geçmesiyle oluşan totaliter düzenlerin, zamanla başta Avrupa olmak üzere dünya barışına yönelik tehdidin varlığı incelenmiştir. Verdiği Ulusal Kurtuluş Savaşı sonucuyla tam bağımsızlığını kazanan ve yürüttüğü etkin kamu diplomasi ile medeni dünyanın onurlu bir üyesi olduğunu tescil ettirdiği Lozan barış Anlaşması'ndan sonra Cumhuriyeti ilan eden Türkiye içi ise medeni dünyanın gereği olan inkılapların inşası için milli iradenin temsilcisi olan Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi tarafından yoğun yasama dönemlerinin çalışma sorumluluğu başlamıştır. Ancak başta Avrupa olmak üzere Dünya'da yaşanan dengesiz siyasi gelişmeler, başta Cumhuriyet Hükümeti ve TBMM tarafından doğru yönetilmediği taktirde Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ni yeni bir kaosun içine girme ihtimali, ülkenin tüm kazanımlarını ve geleceğini yok edebilirdi. Türkiye'yi, yaklaşan bu büyük tehlikeden koruma ve güvende tutma görevi ancak başta Cumhurbaşkanı Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün izlediği akılcı politikalar ve TBMM'nin bu politikalar doğrultusunda alacağı doğru kararlarla mümkün olabilirdi. Bu anlamda öncelikle çalışmanın tasarımı, TBMM, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin inşasını sağlayan inkılap kanunlarının yasallaştırma çalışmalarının yansıması, özellikle 1930'lardan sonra dengesizleşen Avrupa siyasetinde barışçıl bir yol izleyecek kamu diplomasi politikalarını oluşmasında aldığı kararlarla, hükümete olan desteği dönemselsel olarak incelenmiştir. Çalışma yöntemi olarak, 577'den fazla Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi tutanağı literatür ve arşiv taraması yoluyla incelenmiş ve ilgili olanlar analiz edilerek uygulanmıştır.

Bulgular

Türkiye Cumhuriyetin ilanından sonraki 15 yıl içerisinde 1931-1938 arasında kamu diplomasi alanında en yoğun dönem yaşanmıştır. 1929 yılında Amerika'da başlayan ekonomik bunalım, Avrupa'nın güçlü ve zayıf siyasal sistemlerini de sarsmış, iç ve dış siyasi dengelerini bozmuştu. Yaşanan krizi fırsat olarak gören milliyetçi siyasetin yükselişe geçmesiyle Birinci Dünya Savaşı sonrası ağır koşullar içeren anlaşmalarla yokluğa mahkûm edilen devletlerde intikam duygusunu kullanan totaliter rejimlerin önünü açmıştı. Cumhuriyetin ilanı ile "Milli Hakimiyet" ilkesine dayalı örnek bir demokrasi kurma çabası içinde olan Türkiye için Avrupa siyasetinde değişen siyasi iklim zamanla bir tehdit haline dönüşme ihtimali, özellikle 1930'lardan sonra takip

edilecek kamu diplomasisinin önemini artırmıştı. Bu doğrultuda öncelikle kamu diplomasisinde uluslararası güvenlik için gerekli adımların Cumhuriyet Hükümeti'nin izleyeceği akıllı diplomasi kararların TBMM tarafında desteklenmesi önemi ortaya çıkmıştı. Türkiye'nin öncelikle Milletler Cemiyeti üyesi olmak üzere, çevresel güvenlik anlaşmaları, Türk Boğazlarını güvenliği, karşılıklı ticaret anlaşmaları ve adli anlaşmaların tamamı TBMM'nin iç kamusal düzen yasaları ile birlikte 4. Ve 5. yasama dönemlerinde kamu diplomasi çalışmalarını oluşturmuştur. Ayrıca TBMM'nin kamu diplomasisindeki etkin rolü, milli iradenin de tam olarak uluslararası ilişkilere yansıdığını göstermiştir. Böylece Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün önderliğinde Birinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan yenik çıkmasına rağmen, önce savaş meydanlarında sonra da diplomasi masasında kazandığı zaferle varlığını tüm dünyaya kabul ettiren Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin bu başarısının ardında Türk Milleti ve onun temsilcilerinden oluşan Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi vardır. 1930'lu yıllarda TBMM, bir yandan kendisi için yapılan devrimleri yasalaştırarak genç cumhuriyetin inşasını tamamlamaya çalışmış, diğer yandan da uluslararası diplomatik, ticari ve dostluk ilişkilerini geliştirecek adımlar atarak giderek istikrarsızlaşan Avrupa ortamında çevre güvenliğini sağlamayı başarmıştır. Böylece Türkiye'nin 20. yüzyılın en büyük felaketi olan İkinci Dünya Savaşı'na sürüklenmesini engelledi. Montrö Boğazlar Sözleşmesi ve Hatay meselesindeki tutumuyla da vatanın bütünlüğünü güvence altına almıştı.

Sınırlılıklar

Araştırma hazırlanırken, dönemsel olarak TBMM'nin 4. ve 5. yasama dönemlerine ait 577 tutanağa TBMM arşiv kayıtlarına ulaşılmasında herhangi bir sınırlama yoktur. Araştırmacılar, TBMM arşiv belgeleri ve bu belgelerin dijital ortama aktarılmasından dolayı, belgelere kolaylıkla ulaşılma imkânı sağlamıştır. Ancak dönem içinde kamu diplomasi alanında yapılan uluslararası anlaşmaların muhatap devletlerin parlamentolarında yapılan görüşme ve tartışmalar ile ilgili belgelere ulaşılabilmesi bir sınırlılık olarak kabul edilmiştir. Dönemsel olarak alınan parlamento kararlarının muhatap devletler açısından incelenmesi, dönemin siyasi yapısı konusunda alana katkı sağlayacaktır.

Öneriler (Teorik, Uygulama ve Sosyal)

Araştırma sonuçları kendi bağlamında bir örnektir. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti inşa süreci başlangıcından günümüze kadar süregelen kamu diplomasi alanındaki gelişmeler, özellikle bu bağlamda TBMM'nin rolü araştırmacılar tarafından analiz edilmesi yasama organının sadece iç siyasi sistemlerin oluşmasında değil, aynı zamanda kamu diplomasi alanında önemini ortaya konulması bakımından çalışmanın TBMM'nin teorik alt yapısını oluşturacaktı. Dönemsel yaşanan ve aldığı isabetli kararlarla Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kamu diplomasi gelişmesine hizmet eden çalışmalar, gelecekte yasama organının benzer olaylar karşısında alacağı kararlara ve uygulamalarına örnek teşkil etmesi bakımından önemli olacaktır.

Özgün Değer

Çalışmada, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kuruluş döneminde kamu diplomasisi alanında en yoğun ve kritik dönemi (1931-1938) ele almıştır. Bu dönemde, yürütmenin başında bulunan Cumhurbaşkanı Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk yönetiminde cumhuriyet hükümeti, Türk milletinin yaklaşan ve dünya barışını tehdit eden siyasal kaosun etkilerinden korumak için kamu diplomasi alanında alınan kararların TBMM tarafından da desteklenerek, yasalaştırılması, Türk demokrasisinin sağlıklı işleyişinin değerini ortaya koymuştur. Bu bağlamda Avrupa siyasetinde, demokrasinin temel kurumu olan milli meclislerin demokrasiden uzaklaştığı, totaliter rejimlerin yükselişe geçtiği 1930'lu yıllarda TBMM'nin örnek gösterilecek düzeyde aktif olarak çalışmasını incelenmesi bu çalışmanın özgün değerini oluşturmaktadır. TBMM tarafından dünya barışına katkı sağlamak amacıyla uluslararası diplomasi alanına krize dönüştüğü bu dönemde aldığı kararlar, Türk kamu diplomasi alanında geleceğe yönelik çalışmalara örnek olacağı gibi, demokrasiyle yönetilen ülkelerin

parlamentoları tarafından kamu diplomasi adına alınacak kararlara da örnek teşkil edecektir. Ayrıca TBMM`nin kamu diplomasisinde aktif rol alması kuruluşundan itibaren Türk demokrasinin sadece iç siyasette değil, uluslararası siyasette de sağlıklı bir başlangıç ve gelişme göstermesi araştırılması, çalışmanın özgün değerini artırmaktadır. Alanla ilgili benzer çalışmaların artması ve yayınlanması özellikle Türk demokrasinin sağlık işleyişine katkı sağlayacaktır.

Araştırmacı Katkısı: Murat KÖYLÜ (%100).