

A LIBERAL INTELLECTUAL IN THE TRANSITION TO MULTI-PARTY
SYSTEM IN TURKEY:

AHMET EMİN YALMAN



KIRAL ATAÇ

FEBRUARY, 2022

A LIBERAL INTELLECTUAL IN THE TRANSITION TO MULTI-PARTY
SYSTEM IN TURKEY:

AHMET EMİN YALMAN

BY

KIRAL ATAÇ

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

FEBRUARY, 2022

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: 06.01.2022

Name/Surname: Kırıl ATAÇ

ABSTRACT

While liberalism makes individuals experience their renaissance, it can sometimes leave them in a dilemma or even contradiction due to its nature; this ambiguous nature of liberalism has also often left Turkish liberals hesitant. The tragedy of Turkish liberals is that they remain in between state-society relations and take ambivalent positions between the government and the opposition from time to time. The importance of Ahmet Emin Yalman (1888-1972), who constitutes the central axis of this study, is that as a journalist who witnessed the critical watersheds of Turkey from the Second Constitutional Era to the Republican period, he was a figure among Turkish liberals who reveals this fragile structure. Therefore, in the transition to the multi-party system, which is the most fundamental test of democratic consolidation in Turkey, understanding Yalman's thoughts is essential in penetrating liberalism in Turkey and getting an idea about that period. Nevertheless, Yalman's biggest tragedy is foremost his love and hate relationship with the Democrat Party government and Adnan Menderes, and then his being stuck between his passionate journalist identity and his liberal intellectual identity. On the other hand, the fact that he constantly experiences the conflict between the emotional and the intellectual bond with his profession that he had established, and he made concessions from his liberal stance according to time and context, has made him a controversial name. This study will discuss Ahmet Emin Yalman's opinions and intentions in Turkey's transition to democracy while trying to depict a portrait of his renaissance.

Key words: Ahmet Emin Yalman, Liberalism, Democrat Party, Transition to Multi-Party System, Turkish Political Thought

ÖZET

Liberalizm, bireylere kendi rönesanslarını yaşatırken, doğası gereği onları bazen ikilemde, hatta çelişkide dahi bırakabilmektedir; liberalizmin bu müphem doğası, Türk liberallerini de çoğu kez tereddütte bırakmıştır. Türk liberallerinin trajedisi, devlet-toplum ilişkilerinde arada kalmaları ve iktidar ile muhalefet arasındaki pozisyonlarında zaman zaman ikircikli konumlarda yer almalarıdır. Bu çalışmanın ana eksenini oluşturan Ahmet Emin Yalman'ın (1888-1972) önemi, İkinci Meşrutiyet döneminden Cumhuriyet dönemine dek Türkiye'nin en kritik dönüşümlerine tanıklık etmiş bir gazeteci olarak Türk liberalleri içerisinde bu kırılgan yapıyı gözler önüne sermiş bir figür olmasıdır. Bu yüzden, Türkiye'de demokratik konsolidasyonun en temel sınavı olan çok partili sisteme geçişte Yalman'ın fikriyatını anlamak, hem Türkiye'deki liberal düşünceye nüfuz etmek hem de o dönem hakkında fikir edinmek açısından elzemdir. Gel gelelim, Yalman'ın en büyük trajedisi, başta Demokrat Parti Hükümeti ve Adnan Menderes ile yaşadığı sevgi-nefret ilişkisi ve ardından tutkulu gazeteci kimliği ile liberal entelektüel kimliği arasında sıkışıp kalmasıdır. Öte yandan, mesleğiyle kurduğu duygusal bağ ile entelektüel bağ arasındaki çatışmayı da sıklıkla yaşaması; zamana ve bağlama göre liberal duruşundan tavizler vermesi onu tartışmalı bir isim haline getirmiştir. Bu çalışma, Ahmet Emin Yalman'ın rönesansının bir portresini çizmeye çalışırken, Yalman'ın Türkiye'nin demokrasiye geçiş sürecindeki düşüncelerini ve niyetlerini tartışacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Ahmet Emin Yalman, Liberalizm, Demokrat Parti, Çok Partili Sisteme Geçiş, Türk Düşünce Hayatı

Canım babaannem Emine Feriha Ataç'a...



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"Walking is the best medicine."
Hippocrates

First and foremost, I would like to express my biggest thanks for my walks, which helped clear my intensely foggy mind during this process. I was able to write this thesis thanks to my long walks and night walks that made me feel good.

As I have stated in this study, "everyone experiences their own renaissance one day."

I have also experienced my renaissance by starting an academic life. I would like to express my most immense gratitude to Associate Professor M. Selin Türkeş-Kılıç, who made this possible. I have always been proud to work with her and be her assistant. She not only guided me academically but also became a family to me. She has been part of my "renaissance." For this reason, she deserves the most enormous and most sincere thanks.

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Cemil Oktay not only for his supervision and academic guidance but also for his continuous support, encouragement, and understanding throughout this study. There would be no success without his generous help. I owe a debt to thanking Assistant Professor Murat Arslan for his endless patience, valuable comments, and detailed reading to enhance the academic quality of this study. I also would like to thank Assistant Professor Bilgen Sütçüoğlu for her valuable contributions and suggestions, and for devoting her time to reading my work. I am greatly indebted to a very special thank to Assistant Professor Rukiye Ebru İlter Akarçay, who always believed in me. She was always 'there' for me, and I am sure she will always be 'there.' I owe a debt of gratitude to my dear Associate Professor Gizem Alioğlu-Çakmak for her endless support and encouragement.

Further, I would like to express my lovely thanks to my dear friend Dila Seyhan. This thesis would not be over if it were not for the cheerful times with her. I also would like to thank special thanks to my colleagues M. Furkan Durmaz, Emirhan Duran, Volkan İşbaşıran, H. Batuhan Şar for their friendships and supports.

I am an only child, but I have always wanted a sibling. Luckily, I have a person whom I can call my brother, even if it is not biological, who is my dear friend Dr. Dorukhan Akyüz. I probably could not love it more than if I had a brother. He is one of the leading people whose opinions I valued throughout my life. He contributed a lot to me in this process.

And my lovely parents... I would like to express my wholeheartedly thanks to my dear mother Nevcivan Ataç, who did not sleep before me at night when I worked, and to my dear father, S. Turgay Ataç, who always encouraged me. Without them, it was impossible to succeed.

Last but by no means least, I dedicate this work with love to the beloved memory of my late paternal grandmother Emine Feriha Ataç.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ÖZET	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.THE NATURE OF LIBERAL THOUGHT	15
3.FOOTPRINTS OF LIBERAL THOUGHT IN TURKEY	26
4.AHMET EMIN YALMAN: A LIBERAL JOURNALIST IN BETWEEN WITH EMOTIONALISM AND INTELLECTUALISM	32
4.1.Early Years.....	32
4.2.Beginning of His Journalistic Life	42
4.3.The First Contact with Overseas	57
4.4.Return to Homeland	62
4.5.Years of Exile.....	70
4.6.The Remnants of the Exile	72
4.7.The Republican Period	76
4.8.Love and Hate Relationship: The Democrat Party and Ahmet Emin Yalman.....	104
4.9.1946 Elections: A Compatible Togetherness in the Name of Democracy.....	106
4.10.Towards 1950 Elections: A Moderate Liberal	111

4.11.The Democrat Party Government: A Dissident Liberal.....	122
4.12.Malatya Assassination: A Breaking Point.....	136
4.13.1954 Elections: The Tipping Point.....	139
4.14.Fall of the Democrat Party Government: Tragedy of Democrat Party and Yalman	143
4.15.May 27, 1960 Coup: A Contradictory Liberal	149
CONCLUSION	153
BIBLIOGRAPHY	158
Appendix: Abbreviations	167

1. INTRODUCTION

Everyone experiences their own renaissance one day. Genuine maturity is a process that begins with accepting others as they are. The valid breaking point of life, or to put it in other words, is the turning point when the individuals return to themselves are experienced when even the previously denied teachings are tolerated. Free thought principally tries to understand first, makes to pass through the mind's filter, evaluates, analyzes, interprets, and reaches a conclusion in that way; hardly judges without understanding. One and all are left alone with their free mindset one day. The vital thing is to internalize this, to blend it with the harmony in the usual flow of society. If individuals feel detached from this harmony in society, they will desire to renew themselves with their instincts of self-fulfillment. One way or another, with the urge to participate in production, individuals will try to appropriate themselves to society and make an effort to be born again. Each individual is destined to be a part of their renaissance.

While Cemil Oktay determines myths and ideologies, he depicts a scene from his childhood. That childhood memory that still visits Oktay's memory gives us striking and surprising clues to trace ideologies. In the town where Oktay spent his childhood, the peddler came to the marketplace and sold the "panacea medicine." When Oktay grows up, he learns that this medicine is an ordinary mint spirit. He thought this medicine was a miracle in his childhood. As a matter of fact, according to Oktay, the more serious panacea medicine is in the eyes of a chemist, the more serious the claims of myths and ideologies are in the eyes of social scientists. Social scientists are more concerned with how myths and ideologies are told than with the claims that fill their content. The importance of myths and ideologies is not in what they say but in how

they say it. If one compliments Oktay's determination on this issue, it would be helpful to listen to his words: "... If there were diseases, there were medicines, too." (Oktay, 2018)

Everything that cannot be understood and therefore cannot be controlled has been frightening to human beings. People were first afraid of events occurring in nature. The only way to overcome fear is to understand what is feared and to be able to control it, in other words, to change it. The myths that have been reached from prehistoric times to today show us that people tried to understand and explain natural events, thus getting rid of the unknown and fear. Beyond understanding nature, the myths also functioned as a means of keeping and managing the society within the framework of certain rules. The Enlightenment Philosophy, which puts the "individual" above the society and equips this individual with "intelligence" and "natural rights" against political power, is, in this sense, an effort to redefine nature and society. The belief that man can explain everything and create his future through reason has shaken traditional and religious beliefs to the root, and this world has become to be explained by this world, not by the rules of the next world. It has been the triumph of the individual and science. Antoine Destutt de Tracy, one of the rational philosophers of the 18th century Enlightenment period, meant the "science of ideas" by the concept of "ideology." However, the concept of ideology has undergone great changes since then, losing its positive meaning and gaining a "pejorative" meaning. In daily use, ideology often means not being objective, not being scientific, and being biased and dogmatic. Ideology is the thought of different people who do not think like us. No one accepts that their worldview is an ideology, and each ideological group accuses other groups of "being ideological." For example, conservatives,

according to progressives, and progressives also according to conservatives act "ideological."

Ideology is, first and foremost, a worldview. It tries to tell people what kind of world they live in, guides the individual in the face of socio-political options, and makes it easier to choose. In other saying, ideologies are road maps put into the hands of individuals and communities (Hekimoğlu-Örs, 2018, pp. 7-10). Each ideology also has something to say about human nature, historical process, and socio-political structure (Eatwell, 1996, p. 14). Among the ideologies, liberalism is undoubtedly one of the highlighted ideologies that have taken the courage to speak about human nature and the individual as its principle and have demonstrated this stubbornness and insistence throughout history recklessly.

Liberalism leaves individuals to themselves, but it never isolates and alienates them from society. In the liberal order, on the one hand, individuals are aware of their priorities, intellectual preoccupations, and subjective interests. On the other hand, they are aware that they are a part of society and a representative of the whole; besides, they have ideas and awareness about their contribution to the total benefit. Liberal thought is essentially a revolutionary and rebellious movement. It aims to liberate individuals in an enlightened line by designing to break them from the bonds of the old order and traditions. The society model envisaged by liberalism is a society in which individuals freed from all kinds of the state, religion, and peer pressure exist.

Liberal thought sets out to ensure the emancipation of individuals and the basic principles and institutions it deals with in this framework can be listed as follows: individualism, individual freedom, and human rights, constitutionalism, and the rule of law, limited state, neutral state, meritocracy, and free market economy.

Along with all these features of liberalism, its ambiguous position in Turkey should also be mentioned. This hesitant and ambivalent situation of liberalism has spread to Turkish-Ottoman political thought. When movements such as Ottomanism, Turkism, Islamism, and Westernism were introduced, such ideas and ideologies were seen as magic recipes for salvation, while liberalism was approached cautiously. Liberalism has never been viewed as a "homeland rescue project," and liberal intellectuals have also been viewed with suspicion (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 112). In addition, liberalism is perhaps the most harmed ideology from nationalist discourses among the currents of thought in Turkey. Although Islamism, socialism, and conservatism have managed to be articulated with nationalism, it is challenging to say the same for liberalism (Özel & Sarıkaya, 2018, pp. 455-456).

The relationship of liberalism with religion is somewhat complicated. Liberals, by origins, advocate secularization that is, individual freedoms against religious authority. In other words, their purposes are the liberation of the individual from religious domination. Considering that religious beliefs and practices are among the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual, liberals also oppose the restriction of religion by secular government models. Thus, they are subject to criticism and even hostility from fundamentalist sections because of their secular approach. On the other hand, while defending the individual's freedom of religious belief and expression, they find themselves on the same side as fundamentalists against secularists (Karaveli, 2010).

It is possible to observe the complex relationship between liberalism and religion in its relationship with nationalism. Liberalism, in its essence, takes a stance against monarchy and aristocracy. In this respect, liberals also support nationalist movements based on popular representation (Tamir, 1995). It is possible to see liberal intellectuals

in establishing the nation-state model and the conception of the nation as an imaginary community (Lind, 1994).

In addition, there have been times in liberal orders when pluralism was sacrificed for the sake of a free market economy. For the sake of consolidation of the liberal economy, there is the tolerating of politically authoritarian periods and sometimes the suspension of fundamental democratic rights for democratization. In Turkey, some liberals just supported military or civilian authoritarian governments just because they thought they could contribute to establishing the democracy they dreamed of (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 113).

To better understand the importance and purpose of this study, it is first necessary to identify the position of liberal intellectuals and liberal thoughts in the early years of the Republican period. In this context, the positions of liberal ideas in Turkey have shown specific differences between the single-party and the multi-party period.

It can be argued that liberal intellectuals belonging to the single-party period are within certain limitations. In the early Republican period, reasons such as the principle of statist economy and the radical modernization project left a narrow space for intellectual freedoms and civil rights. In this respect, the development of intellectual movements in the Ottoman Empire after the Tanzimat (Reorganization) era, albeit limited, was only possible with the transition to a multi-party system in the Republican period. However, among these intellectual movements, the intellectual movement that received the most blows was the tradition of liberal thought. It has been seen that very different collectivist intellectual movements with socialist or nationalist colors are more successful than liberalism (Kalkan, 2018, pp. 3-4).

It is possible to say that there are three main reasons for the disadvantage of liberalism in the Republican period. The first reason is that the political and economic policy choices took an anti-liberal course in the single-party years. Especially after the establishment of the Republican People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*) (RPP), liberalism seems to have been rejected as a hostile foreign intellectual movement (Yılmaz, 2018). It should be noted that the liberal thought tradition, which developed partially in the Ottoman Empire, was interrupted abruptly with the Republican period.

The second reason is that also, liberalism constantly advises the ruling elite to modernize the state while demanding a system in which the powers of the state are as limited as possible. That is, for liberalism, less government is the best government. The state should trust its individuals, be aware of the potentials of its individuals, expand individual rights and freedoms, and spread social modernization to the base. However, these words are unrequited in traditional societies. In new democracies, where political instability is often seen, the total adoption of liberal understandings ceases to be an actual demand.

The third reason is that although the single-party period did not place freedom of thought, the policies it followed indirectly supported collectivist ideologies and excluded individualist ideas. The media resources that the intellectuals could reach and local ideas have supported the statist economy. This situation has placed liberalism at a significant disadvantage by causing individualist ideas to be automatically excluded from the "public sphere" and "public debate." (Kalkan, 2018, p. 5)

Nevertheless, in the early years of the Republican period, and especially in the single-party period, despite the lack and disadvantaged position of this entire individual

thought environment, some intellectuals position themselves as liberals. Ahmet Emin Yalman is one of them. Apart from Yalman, another example who defined himself as a liberal in this period can be shown as Ahmet Ağaoğlu. However, since Ağaoğlu is not the subject of this study, Ağaoğlu will not be emphasized. Yalman is a writer who describes himself as liberal, anti-communist, and individualist. It is necessary to underline the secular nature of Yalman, which was heavily influenced by the Enlightenment tradition. On the other hand, it can be determined that Yalman sees freedom as a high level of consciousness and places the freedom of individuals above everything else.

Journalist-writer Ahmet Emin Yalman, one of the prominent figures of the Istanbul press, who had lived and wrote during the Second Constitutional Era and the Republican period, is a liberal intellectual who will construct the central axis of this study. Yalman worked as a journalist until the end of the 1960s, witnessed the May 27 coup, and became one of the actors of Turkey's many transformations and turning points. Yalman, due to his education in both traditional and modern educational schools, starts to get to know the East and the West from an early age. Yalman's essential works and contributions to the adoption of modern journalism and the consolidation of liberal thought in Turkey cannot be denied. Therefore, Yalman's place in the history of Turkish political thought and his significance among Turkish intellectuals are notably considerable.

Yalman, who started his career with the *Niyet* newspaper when he was only nine years old, continues his journalism adventure in many different newspapers. Yalman has chosen journalism entirely consciously and willingly. Journalism was not an indispensable or compulsory option that life presented to Yalman. In every period of his life and under all conditions, he tried to show all his efforts to perform this

profession with great passion, devotion, and determination. Life came with attractive opportunities for Yalman to quit journalism from time to time; Yalman also had to leave journalism a few times, even if by force. However, Yalman returned to journalism with the same enthusiasm as on the first day, every time he had the opportunity. As the motto of the *Vatan* newspaper, which he loved very much, he set out with the principle of "call a spade a spade" and tried to practice his profession without compromising this principle as much as possible.

Yalman passed the exam opened by the Ministry of Education and studied Sociology, History, and Journalism at the Faculty of Political Sciences at New York Columbia University with a scholarship. His doctoral thesis is on the press and development in Turkey, and its title is "The Development of Modern Turkey as Measured by Its Press" (Yalman, 1914). Yalman is one of the followers of Prince Sabahaddin, who is considered one of the important liberal figures in the history of Turkish thought. Yalman is aware of the depressive course of the Ottoman Empire in those years; the country was falling apart, but salvation was also possible, and this way of salvation could be rebuilt with the ideas disseminated through the newspapers. Yalman also sees this liberation as possible in a liberal understanding in the line of Prince Sabahaddin (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 113).

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the old established system was shaken off and begun to adjust itself, under various circumstances and auspices, and with varying speed to new conditions. The price paid was disintegration, territorial loss, arbitrary government, and the appearance of non-social types on both extremes, both among the best and the least educated classes. Now, the imperial burden has been so far lightened, and the destruction of the old order so generally accomplished, that a new era can be

ushered in. This will primarily one of capitalistic development, in which surplus will be produced and organized. In the coming era all the disadvantages of an active capitalistic regime will be apparent. The press will have to forfeit some of its idealism, and some of its virtues. The advantage to be achieved in return will be stability. And stability is what Turkey needs for obtaining surplus and prestige (Yalman, 1914, pp. 139-140).

The central axis of Yalman's political thought is the opposition to state centralism and strict bureaucracy. Comparing the solution methods offered by Ahmet Rıza and Prince Sabahaddin about the country's future, which was on the agenda during the Second Constitutional Era, Yalman criticizes Ahmet Rıza's walking through the Auguste Comte's path and his lack of tolerance. In short, Yalman disclaims Ahmet Rıza's Jacobinist tradition. Yalman emphasizes that Prince Sabahaddin sees local administrations as a condition of democracy and points out that Sabahaddin's ideas are not valued because of the fear that it will lead to the empire's disintegration. According to him, if the Ottoman Empire were organized in a federation, the state would be kept alive, and its future would be completely different (Yalman, 1970a, p. 85).

Yalman's decentralized determinations, which are also evident in his mind-map, bear traces of his observations in the United States and his contacts with Prince Sabahaddin. Comparing the Union and Progress Party (*İttihat ve Terakki Fırkası*) government with the principles of the decentralization and local governments practice he witnessed in the United States, where he was a student, Yalman criticizes the Unionists for allegedly establishing a strict centralization (Demirci, 2018, p. 474).

In an article titled "Local Administrations and Centralism (*Mahallî İdareler ve Merkeziyet*)," which he wrote about a year before he was banned from working as a journalist; he heavily criticizes centralism, based on the inadequacy of this method in the face of a flood in Eyüp, Istanbul. Yalman mentions that the provincial administration law should be prepared by abandoning the centralized system.

Ahmet Emin Yalman has remarkable ideas about the new order established after the War of Independence. In a letter addressed to Mustafa Kemal (later Atatürk) in the *Vatan* newspaper on October 5, 1923, he openly expressed his concerns about the course of the new regime. According to Yalman, Mustafa Kemal should not have any organic ties with the newly formed party, namely the RPP. In Yalman's opinion, Mustafa Kemal should become a "national bloc" around which everyone is united. Therefore, Yalman argues that Mustafa Kemal should no longer be affiliated with any political party. Yalman argues that democracy will only be consolidated if Turkey transitions into the multi-party system under these circumstances. On the other hand, Yalman states that none of these ideas he put forward at the end of the day have come true and says that Turkey has lost a lot in the name of democracy (Yalman, 1970b, pp. 956-957).

Yalman was not allowed to profess journalism for a long time. Apart from not supporting the closure of the Progressive Republican Party (*Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*) (PRP), there were other reasons for this. Yalman's warnings and criticisms of the government about the course of the new regime interrupted his journalistic life for a while. During this period, Yalman, who assumed the representation of some foreign companies in Turkey, was engaged in trade. Yalman returned to journalism in 1936 with Atatürk's permission, and this return was one of the breaking points of his life. After that time, Yalman has cared to establish more

moderate and constructive relations with the government. He shed light on the positive aspects of the Kemalist regime at almost every opportunity. For Yalman, the Kemalist regime had become an indispensable part of democracy. Yalman criticized the perception of the multi-party system as the essential element of democracy and defended the single-party system (Yalman, 1938, pp. 110-111). Thus, Yalman contradicted what he wrote between 1922 and 1923. He now idealized the political order he described as wrong fifteen years ago. The prohibition of him from doing journalism for a long time may have caused him to do such a maneuver (Demirci, 2018, p. 476).

Yalman puts his views in 1938 and 1940 in a Kemalist framework. He does not hesitate to describe a single-party regime as a "totalitarian dictatorship" while describing a period when his newspaper was frequently closed in the 1940s after the banned period between 1925 and 1936. Even he also defines the RPP as a totalitarian party. He even draws parallels with the spread of communism in Europe.

Yalman softens his critics in his work titled "Realizing Dream (*Gerçekleşen Rüya*)," which he wrote in 1938. In this work, he praises the new regime on the one hand and criticizes it on the other. On the other hand, in his series of articles titled "Towards Clarity (*Berraklığa Doğru*)," he draws the reaction of the single-party regime with his critical analysis, and his newspaper was shut down. This event is the precursor of closure penalties that almost will never end. On this occasion, Yalman's view of the single-party regime hardens.

Later on, Yalman began to oppose the single-party regime harshly and joined the opposition ranks of the Democrat Party (*Demokrat Parti*) (DP). While Yalman's relations with the DP were positive during the early years of the DP government, their relationship began to deteriorate gradually. Yalman was assassinated in Malatya

during those years. In 1959, the *Vatan* newspaper was closed for a month, and he was sentenced to prison for translating and publishing an article by an American journalist criticizing the DP regime. However, he was released from jail immediately due to his health conditions. He supported the military coup of May 27, 1960. As a liberal intellectual, Yalman, who had been an advocator for individual freedoms and democracy throughout his life, did not care about the interruption of democracy and stood behind the junta regime. This critical turning point naturally put his liberal identity in an ambiguous position. He left the *Vatan* newspaper in January 1961 and published the *Hür Vatan* newspaper between 1961 and 1962. Yalman was awarded the "Golden Pen of Freedom" by the World Association of Newspapers for his services to journalism in 1966. He was a member of the Association for Spreading Free Ideas (*Hür Fikirleri Yayma Cemiyeti*). In addition, he was a member of organizations such as the World Liberals Union and the International Press Institute. He had many copyrighted and translated works.

The main issue discussed in the central axis of this study is to what extent Ahmet Emin Yalman was able to preserve his liberal understanding in the transition to the multi-party system, which is the most basic test of the democratic consolidation in Turkey. Yalman was one of the key figures in the DP, and he also described himself as "the fifth of fours" of the DP; for this reason, Yalman's ideas and intentions during the transition to the multi-party system and afterward in the DP government is essential in terms of shedding light on that period. In addition, this study will discuss whether Yalman's liberal thought is consistent and coherent and how he bent the liberal line, and will also focus on determining which identity of Yalman is predominant at the end of the day. Yalman was stuck between his passionate journalist identity and his liberal intellectual identity throughout his life. On the other

hand, he often experienced the conflict between the emotional bond he established with his profession and the intellectual bond. This study also tries to reveal the extent to which Yalman behaves and writes as a consistent, rational, and scientific ideologue and intellectual. Therefore, the contradictions between Yalman's emotionality and liberal intellectualism in his approach to the journalism profession will also be discussed.

Before opening the door to Ahmet Emin Yalman's liberal mentality, this study will briefly explain how the wheels of the liberal political order turn. For this reason, this thesis will begin with a chapter that gives information about the mentality of liberal political orders after the introduction part. The second chapter carries on with the adventure of liberal thought in Turkey. In the third chapter, Ahmet Emin Yalman's life and struggle will be discussed, and finally, this study will try to decide in the conclusion part.

While describing Yalman's life and struggle, this study will take a journey into his past experiences to understand what kind of tradition he came from and how his mind was shaped. This is essential for understanding how his liberal ideas developed. To better grasp the development of Yalman's individualist ideology, it is necessary to illuminate the layers of his thoughts, penetrate deep into his mentality, and take a photograph of the critical breaking moments of his life. Therefore, this thesis will begin from Ahmet Emin Yalman's early period, continue with the watersheds in his life, and try to penetrate Yalman's mind's privacy. However, this thesis essentially will focus on where the transition to the multi-party system and the DP came to power. In this study, by using primary sources, Yalman's memoirs and articles published in newspapers were used. Only the articles and newspapers related to the subject and scope of the study were scanned, and the articles in the remaining newspapers were

excluded from the study. Therefore, a daily newspaper scan was not conducted.

Finally, although this study aims to portray Yalman's life chronologically rather than thematically, it certainly does not claim to be an intellectual biography.



2. THE NATURE OF LIBERAL THOUGHT

Liberalism is difficult to define; this difficulty arises because it is a multi-layered ideology that cannot be dealt with on a single plane and cannot be thought of in one dimension. Perhaps one of the most dominant factors that make the definition of liberalism difficult is that it has differences within itself. These differences sometimes even lead to contradictions. Liberalism is an ambivalent, hesitant, polyphonic ideology in itself. It is understandable that the doctrine has such a long history and has undergone such cleavages. Liberal thought has started to make a name for itself as a trend challenging state centralism. The main concern of the liberal understanding was to gain civil liberties for individuals against the state's intervention. With the assumption that the individual has a rational mindset, liberalism argued that humanity could also progress systematically. Indeed, 19th-century liberalism was not an ideology that sought remedies and solutions in the past; its direction and compass adopted a forward-looking understanding. In this sense, liberalism assumed the role of being both the heir and the protector of the Enlightenment. The liberal interpretation favored changing the existing order because it advocated progress and was against conservatism, which defended the status quo.

This complicated nature of liberalism makes it difficult to define it. Liberalism as a modern ideology is essentially a political doctrine. Although political philosophies or ideologies do not constitute an overarching philosophical system, they often have epistemological and ethical foundations. It is also true for liberalism. Therefore, it is understandable that liberalism is included in the subject of political philosophy. For that matter, there are even liberals who interpret liberalism as a holistic philosophy or an overarching moral ideal.

What is meant by liberalism as a "modern" doctrine is that it emerged historically in the atmosphere of thought of the New Age and with the emergence of new socio-political formations (Erdoğan, 2018, p. 23). Although liberalism is a product of the "age of reason" at one point, its approach is not an "absolute rational" approach; it is instead "moderate rationality." Two of the leading liberal philosophers of the 20th century, Karl R. Popper and Friedrich A. Hayek, called this approach "critical rationalism."

When it is observed at the intellectual roots and history of liberalism, it is possible to say that it is fed from three primary sources: John Locke, Scottish Enlightenment, and Immanuel Kant. Liberalism is essentially an Anglo-American tradition of thought, and its first prominent thinker is John Locke, who wrote in the late 17th century. According to him, people preserved their natural rights while passing from the state of nature to a "civilized" political society, and they commissioned and authorized the state to protect these rights. Locke summarized these rights in the trilogy of "life, liberty, property." The current of thought known as the Scottish Enlightenment was shaped mainly around David Hume, Adam Smith, and Adam Ferguson in the 18th century. The general acceptance of this tradition finds its counterpart in the concepts of "by itself order" and "natural freedom system." The greatest thinker who made the Scottish Enlightenment tradition the basis of his liberal understanding in the 20th century is Friedrich A. Hayek. Immanuel Kant's ideas have a significant place in forming liberal interpretations. Kant influenced many liberals either this way or that way with his understandings of "personal autonomy," "equality of persons in terms of moral worth," and "universal justice." (Erdoğan, 2018, pp. 24-25)

An important distinction within liberalism is between classical liberals and modern liberals. The main determining factor in this distinction is the extent of the state's authority and its attitudes towards the market. In this framework, the main feature that distinguishes classical liberalism is that while it emphasizes economic freedoms and the market economy, it is against expanding the state's involvement. This distinction is behind interventionists such as John Rawls and J. M. Keynes being referred to as liberals, along with liberals such as Robert Nozick, Frederick A. Hayek, and Michael Friedman, who continue the Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham school (Berkday, 2018).

One of the ongoing debates within the liberal understanding is shaped around John Stuart Mill's ideas of political participation. Mill argues that democracy will lead to broad political participation and enable individuals' intellectual and moral capacities to develop. According to Mill, the criterion of social good is not utility but the full development of human abilities. In a sense, this opposes the market's determination of human worth. With this thesis of Mill, the idea of "participation" and enlargement of participation, which is an essential element of today's democracy debates, enters the liberal understanding.

In contrast, many liberals think it is sufficient for the state to be impartial and enable its citizens to live according to their own choices. If individuals want to participate in political and public life, there is no problem; but it is up to them to choose other activities. This point is one of the differences in the liberal understanding and is still being discussed (Berkday, 2018, p. 71).

From the time it was first expressed, it is seen that liberal understandings are approaches that open the way for new and modern societies by resisting traditions.

Liberal attitudes are ultimately the product of Enlightenment thought (Oktay, 2017, p. 107). An essential feature of the Enlightenment is to notice, see, understand and endure the tradition, but keep the tradition aside and continue on the road without it (Manent, 1986, pp. 11-16; Châtelet, 1986). The tradition was an understanding based on continuity in all issues. Traditional society consisted of a hierarchical structure that traced a religion-based or mythified past at the ideological level. To follow that trail, to stay within these limits, in a way meant to preserve legitimacy. Weber expresses this policy of continuation as follows:

In pure traditional sovereignty [...], when it comes to activating the means of law creation, according to tradition, no source other than ancient documents, judgments, and habits is relied upon (Weber, 1971, p. 233).

As can be understood from these statements of the Prussian sociologist Weber, the traditional society was created, not a formed one, so it was perceived as an order that had to be tolerated (Oktay, 2017, p. 108).

In the 17th century, Charles Loyseau made segmentation of traditional societies with the statement, "The house of God, which looked like a single house, actually consisted of three parts." (Goff, 1982, p. 235; Duby, 1978, s. 11) These three divisions were the *oratores*, *bellatores*, and *laboratores* classes, respectively. In the Ottoman order, their names are *ulama (ulema)*, *lashkar (leşker)*, and *raia (reaya)*. The order in the "house of God," which Loyseau described as "the three-eyed," was a divine order; it was hierarchical. In other words, God had determined everyone's position in society. Especially in feudal periods, the transitions between classes were not considered well. It has meant to go astray in faith (Oktay, 2017, p. 109).

In traditional societies where this sacred, hierarchical, horizontal, and vertical social mobility was slow, "game-changer fourth-class" emerged (Le Goff, 1982, p. 240).

The name of the new class that broke and changed this game was the bourgeoisie, and it would make a name for itself for centuries. They were the ones who "liberated the tone of the cities," as a German folk saying puts it (Oktay, 2017, p. 109). From now on, more flexible, permeable, bendable, and adaptable approaches will gain importance against rigid, strict, challenging structures and understandings. Liberal thoughts are the understanding that created these structures and made the bourgeoisie the most critical player of society over the centuries.

Liberal approaches, based on the individual, embody sophisticated features and aim to limit political power to protect freedoms, developed together with pluralist constitutional democracy. In other words, liberalism formed the basis of pluralist democracies on the level of thought. Liberal thoughts, from the very beginning, have always taken a cautious stance against political powers, with the priority they ascribe to the individual. They never favored absolute power models. They always insisted on the idea that every individual-oriented action would ultimately be in the interest of society. Therefore, no matter what, they did not take kindly to the issue of authorizing political powers for any purpose. In the liberal understanding, a politics that ignores the individual and does not include the individual's free thoughts was unthinkable. Defining a priori goals for society would not pave the way for freedoms; more and especially, they would open the doors of captivity (Hayek, 1945). In the liberal understanding, the individuals could well determine their interests as they already have these puissances.

Montesquieu emphasizes that regimes based on openness will successfully produce inclusive policies. Another situation that Montesquieu wants to underline is that the

best governance is governance that does not make it felt. Another liberal thinker, Tocqueville's approach to the subject is also as follows:

Two social situations can be distinguished. The public is aware of everything and sufficiently enlightened; it can govern itself. In this case, society itself gives shape to the organization. On the other, society is governed by an external power that directs it (Tocqueville, 1964, p. 258).

Liberal thought is a creative approach to modern times; with this feature, it cannot be said that it is very close to the traditions; on the contrary, it is a supporter of the new and change (Oktay, 2017, p. 110).

From the beginning to the present, liberalism has changed within the framework of the conditions of the time. Despite the continuity in some of its basic features, the problems that liberalism insistently cares about show differences according to the periods. Its unchanging, strictest characteristic feature is its suspicious approach to political power. Liberal thought is not at peace with the state institution and its dominance over society and the individual. Liberalism emphasizes that this sovereignty should be as limited power as possible. Powers must be separated and be subject to constant control. In parallel with this understanding, Kant says, "To be in power corrupts the reasoning ability of the mind." (Kant, 1960, p. 37) What Kant wants to emphasize is the fact that governments cannot think freely. Governments have to be in a pluralistic order to think freely. In particular, it is the most indispensable condition for all kinds of thoughts to express themselves without hesitation, for the mind of the society to be cleared in a way. At this point, the emphasis that Locke and Montesquieu attributed to the mechanism of checks and balances can be better understood (Oktay, 2017, p. 111).

In his observations in his book "Democracy in America," Tocqueville tells how the organizational habits at the civil society level and the freedoms on this subject are a determining factor in the functioning of the political order. Each interest or opinion group could come together and create a balance in the ordinary course of life with opposing groups. Moreover, liberal etiquette and customs at the civilian level resulted in the functioning of politics in a liberal tone. On Tocqueville's continent, however, things worked in the opposite direction. In European examples, liberalism at the political level would eventually lead to the formation of liberal customs at the civil level (Tocqueville, 1964, p. 49).

Liberalism avoids characterizing society as inclusive. Liberal understanding does not try to design community in the broadest scope. According to the liberal view, micro-scale designs to be produced at the micro-scale in society will increase the general welfare level of the organization. The expectation of liberalism is the production of limited instrumental values within a specific period. With this feature, liberal thought stands out from all other ideologies as perhaps the worldliest ideology. Since liberalism, by its very nature, expresses a stance, an attitude, and vision based on the individual, it may not be considered the right approach to associate it with the word ideology. Liberal thinking is a cluster of ideas that tend to stay in the gray area. There is neither absolute "good" nor absolute "bad" in liberalism. In societies that do not operate within liberal principles or based on political measures and precautions, the political order should not be expected to be in a liberal environment. In such societies, it is as if there are secret and open corridors between the centers of political power and prisons; exit one and enter the other. The oppressed of yesterday will become oppressors one day. Today's oppressors are the oppressed candidates of tomorrow (Oktay, 2017, p. 113). It is not the main aim of liberalism to produce inclusionary,

embracing, universally accepted absolute truths. Liberalism is concerned with creating different realities.

In liberal thought and order, liberalism is examined under two separate headings, both economic and political. However, these two topics are complementary to each other. It is possible to talk about three basic principles of the economic liberal order. Here again, these principles are mutually complementary. Economic liberalism is defined by a market environment, free competition, and private enterprise opportunity. In other words, people can engage in any business they wish in economic life and determine how they can earn their living with their own free will. The social position, class, and status that the individual is born into are ineffective here, and all these discriminator elements are outside the equation. The primary consideration and focus of liberalism is the merit of the individual. Every individual is expected to be involved in the game, and individuals should compete to maximize their interests. It is one of the aims of liberalism that this game is realized within equal rules for each individual. As can be noticed, while economic liberalism tackles production, consumption, and distribution activities in an autonomous area independent of political authority, political liberalism, on the other hand, tries to ensure the protection and assurance of this autonomous area.

Liberal understanding is an understanding that puts severe responsibilities on the individual's shoulders. Yet, liberalism never defines individualism as selfishness. Classical liberal thinkers defend individualism, individual initiative, individual rights, and freedoms to achieve the common good and benefit (Mill, *L'Utilitarisme*, pp. 56-57). In line with this understanding, the individual should not act selfishly, as the nature of liberalism will perform with an individuality aimed at providing the total benefit of society. That is to say, being liberal means having an idiocratic ethic of

responsibility at some point—liberalism's effort to penetrate the political sphere results from this ethical and moral stance.

Liberalism envisages being "moderate" and "reasonable." The effort to seek balance in political authority stems from this. In a liberal understanding, it is essential to act "temperate," in other words, "to remain mediocre" or "middle-of-the-road." One of the main reasons the quest for balance in politics is emphasized in liberal constitutional texts is this principle of moderation (Oktay, 2017, p. 117). Alexander Hamilton, in "Federalist Papers," emphasizes the importance of avoiding extremism such as despotism (Hamilton, 1986, p. 293). In parallel with this idea, also James Madison, while defending federalism, sees it as a means of "stopping and rasping the violent conflicts of the factions." (Madison, 1986, s. 299)

Liberalism does not see society as a homogeneous structure. The liberal understanding is aware that society is made up of differences, and these differences may be partly in ideas and partly in interests. Likewise, it is this vitality that activates the community and adds dynamism. It is out of the question to prevent this diversity and difference in society. It is where politics comes into play. Perhaps one of the most vital functions of politics is to keep society together within the framework of all these differences. Liberals have something to say about the function of politics on this issue. The issue that the liberal understanding attaches importance to is the rule of law. Laws must not only allow each difference to express itself but must also be designed so that each difference does not exceed the limits of the others. The rule of law can turn politics, which is vulnerable due to the heterogeneous structure of society, into a regular activity up to a point, for these reasons that liberalism is sensitive to the principles of the rule of law. The state of the law is a calculable, foreseeable order; limits the arbitrariness. Therefore, the freedoms and initiatives of

the individual are guaranteed by the rule of law. Liberal economic and political orders are the states of law precisely. These are complementary elements of each other. If there is a malfunction in one of them, the negativity will spread to the other side. They are being liberal in the economic field, and remaining authoritarian in the political area is not a sustainable approach in the long run. Both economic liberalism and political liberalism require a commitment to a severe legal discipline. That is, they can also be considered as preconditions of each other. In geographies where anarchic practices of law are standard, it is impossible to meet the demands of liberal politics or to realize liberal economic practices (Oktay, 2017, pp. 117-118).

Liberals took from Locke the view that the legitimacy of governance is not a hereditary or divine right, but merely the "consent of the ruled," expressed in the social contract; they took the principles of "separation of powers" and "checks and balances" from Montesquieu. The purpose of these principles was to provide security against the autocratic rule because there were some concrete examples in this regard. Liberals in various countries admired the republican constitution of the United States, the bodies of revolutionary France, and the evolving parliamentary system of England. Following these models, they argued that representatives elected by the people periodically should make and implement the laws in a legitimate government. The decent government also had to tolerate a "loyal opposition to the system" that was free to criticize those in power (Berkday, 2018, p. 63).

The chief and foremost concern of liberals has been the incentives of individual freedoms from the very beginning. Every individual should have an "autonomous" understanding that can make his own decisions, measure wrong, and right him. The individual could only be a free being to the extent that he was freed from the oppression of political powers. Therefore, if he was well educated, he could freely

participate in the production. If the individual can self-determine his destiny and freely make his own decisions, he can also respect the decisions of others. Liberals opposed the state and any authority that restricted the individual's right to free choice, interfered with freedom of expression, and did not allow him to realize his renaissance. According to John Stuart Mill, "the individual has sovereignty over his own body and mind," and the only purpose of the legitimate exercise of power over any member of civilized society, against his will, could be to prevent harm to others (Mill, 1956).

Liberalism entered the 21st century in various divisions, just as it did when it entered the 20th century. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that the aspect of liberalism that provides its internal consistency and enables us to define is that it defends the right of freedom for every individual in different historical contexts. Today, it is possible to follow liberal values on issues of great social importance, critical and controversial topics such as the arguments against sexual and racial discrimination, defense of minority rights, and so on (Berkday, 2018, p. 107). Suppose one gives ear to the words of the American philosopher John Dewey. In that case, it is seen that he argued that divisions within liberalism would be overcome and "organized unity in action with consensus in thought" would be achieved (Dewey, 1980, p. 91). On the other hand, some political scientists argue that liberal theory, which contains such inconsistencies and tensions, became the dominant ideology of the 20th century thanks to its ability to combine and change classical liberalism with other approaches (Gaus, 2001, p. 30). Liberalism, with its tensions, contradictions, most probably carries on to preoccupy the minds of many as the heir to ideals of Enlightenment.

3. FOOTPRINTS OF LIBERAL THOUGHT IN TURKEY

Liberal ideas began to be influential in Turkey from the second half of the 19th century. In a very general sense, since the Western political model followed by Ottoman modernization was mainly based on liberal political institutions, some authors argued that the modernization effort of the Ottoman Empire, which became evident from the beginning of the 19th century, also meant liberalization. Although this may be a meaningful thesis for the political modernization movements in the last period of the Ottoman Empire, considering the attempt to pass the "constitutional monarchy," which means an effort to limit the sultan with a written constitution, it would be wrong to equate modernization with liberalization. From an ideological point of view, the intellectual source and support behind the enactment of the first constitution (*Kanuni-i Esasi*) in the history of Turkey in 1876 came from the New Ottomans (*Yeni Osmanlılar*). Their main representatives were Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, and Ali Suavi (Erdoğan, 2018, p. 32).

In Turkish political history, names that have expressed liberal discourses have been seen since the Tanzimat era. İbrahim Şinasi, Sadık Rıfat Pasha and the New Ottomans are among the names that come to mind first. Sadık Rıfat said that the people are not the state's material; it is a name that says that the state should be the servant of the people (Rıfat, 1974). Likewise, Şinasi put forward ideas that can be considered liberal at a very early stage (Köker, 1992, pp. 177-178). The terminology of the New Ottomans in Western societies is Ottoman Liberals, if not exactly a faithful designation. Ziya Pasha's distinction between personal forms of government and forms of government within the scope of the law and his ardent support for the constitutional monarchy is proof that he always had a liberal understanding (Sangu, 1940, p. 856). The distinction at the 1902 Paris Congress of the Young Turks was

mainly shaped around the debates on "decentralization" and "private enterprise."

(Mardin, 2019)

In the following periods, Jacobin (centralist-imposing) tendencies will outweigh, and the Second Constitutional Era will quickly turn into an authoritarian rule. The centrist and statist attitudes formed in that period also guide the Republican period. However, despite everything, it is a well-known fact that sometimes assertive and loud, and sometimes low, liberal voices rise. The claim that political traditions have a serious weight in the prominence of the Jacobin understanding seems to be a fairly common claim. The traditions inherited from the empire did not give many opportunities to liberal approaches in Turkish modernization. It can be understood this development when evaluated with the approach of historical sociology. Developmental policies put freedom-oriented values on hold, starting from the middle of the Tanzimat era (Oktay, 2017, pp. 118-119).

Prince Sabahaddin was another important intellectual who defended liberal theses during the Constitutional Monarchy period. One of Prince Sabahaddin's main ideas was his advocacy of private enterprise; however, the point that distinguishes him from other liberal-leaning writers in this respect is that he tried to base his economic views on an individualist social theory. According to him, individualistic societies are more productive, entrepreneurial, and independent in character than communitarian societies. For this reason, the Ottoman Empire, which, like all other Eastern societies, had a communal social structure, to be able to get out of the crisis it had fallen into depends, to a large extent, on the development of individuality in the social structure. According to Prince Sabahaddin, it is also necessary to abandon the centralism that creates inefficient bureaucratic mechanisms and reorganize the administration in line with the principle of decentralization (Erdoğan, 2018, p. 32).

Although there are some partial exceptions, the period of the Republic of Turkey under the single party rule did not generally provide a suitable ground for liberal ideas and movements. On the contrary, the influential intellectual movement of this period was the Kadro movement, which developed a statist-authoritarian interpretation of Kemalism.

The first political opposition movement of the Republican period that could be described as liberal was The PRP, founded in November 1924 and closed by the government in June 1925. The program of the PRP was a classic expression of political liberalism, which marked the resistance to the radical and authoritarian tendencies of the Kemalist regime (Zürcher, 1995).

Free Republican Party (*Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası*) (FRP), which was founded in 1930, five years after the closure of the PRP, was liberal in its program, but not a true opposition movement. When the party started to become a real opposition party, it had to close itself. FRP was founded by his close friend Fethi (Okyar) Bey at Atatürk's request, and even Atatürk himself decided which deputies would join the party. Among them is Ahmet Ağaoğlu, who is known for his liberal-nationalist ideas and is considered the ideologist of the party. In fact, Ahmet Ağaoğlu is one of the most prominent names that come to mind among thinkers who can be described as "liberal" in the single-party period. Ağaoğlu's thoughts were a mixture of liberalism, nationalism and democracy. The emphasis on individuality and individual freedom is a recurring theme in his works. In Ağaoğlu's polemics with the Kadro members, the emphasis on the individual and individuality is at the forefront. However, Ağaoğlu cannot be said to be a systematic and consistent liberal thinker with his moderate statism and support of "strong government." (Erdoğan, 2018, p. 34)

The transition to a multi-party system has been a turning point in various aspects in the Republic of Turkey. The DP, founded under the leadership of Celal Bayar in January 1946, right after the Second World War, and in which Adnan Menderes took the de facto leadership, came to power in 1950.

The DP was proposing a liberal program in its main lines especially emphasizing the freedom of religion and economic freedom. Although the party made liberal reforms in the first period, it moved away from this liberal attitude over time. It started to establish an oppressive government from the second half of the 1950s. Disturbed by the DP's departure from its initial promise of liberalization, a group member left in 1955 and founded the Liberty Party (*Hürriyet Partisi*) (LP) under the leadership of Fevzi Lütü Karaosmanoğlu. Although the LP seemed to be more committed to the goal of a pluralist-democratic regime, over time, this party also shifted to opportunism and joined the RPP in December 1958.

An essential feature of this party in terms of Turkish intellectual history was its closeness to the *Forum* journal, which a group of liberal intellectuals founded. This journal was founded by academics who moved away from the DP administration, such as Fethi Çelikbaş, Aydın Yalçın, Turan Güneş, Şerif Mardin and represented the liberal intellectuals opposition to the DP.

The Justice Party (*Adalet Partisi*) (JP) assumed the political legacy of the DP after the closure of the DP. The JP was perceived as a liberal party from time to time in terms of its general role within the system due to its representation of peripheral forces against the bureaucratic center. However, like the DP before it, it can be defined as a developmental-populist party.

Like the DP, the JP carried out an anti-pluralist policy with the help of the "national will" blessing, which is assumed to represent it. This ideological definition validates the True Path Party (*Doğru Yol Partisi*), founded in 1980. In particular, the leadership of Süleyman Demirel was perhaps the most fundamental factor that kept these parties away from any doctrinal line because Süleyman Demirel was nationalist, conservative, democrat, liberal, and many more. It is possible to say that Demirel experienced a fluctuation between principled behavior and pragmatism throughout his political life. The dominant side in this scale has undoubtedly been pragmatism (Arslan, 2019). On the other hand, Turgut Özal, who founded the Motherland Party (*Anavatan Partisi*) (MP) in 1983, seems to be more influenced by liberal themes than Demirel, although his main orientation is a pragmatist. As a matter of fact, during his leadership, MP's emphasis on economic liberalism and the "instrumental state" thesis was more evident. However, it is not possible to consider MP as a full liberal party. Because in the first period of MP, the conservative-nationalist influence of its founding cadres and social base, which showed the characteristics of a coalition, had a great impact on the social and cultural policies of the party. The party did not show the same sensitivity towards civil and political freedoms as it showed on economic freedoms and freedom of religion. The first and still the only party to use the term "liberal" in the multi-party period is the Liberal Party (*Liberal Parti*), founded in 1994 by businessperson Besim Tibuk; the party later changed its name to the Liberal Democrat Party (*Liberal Demokrat Parti*) (LDP). Although it makes nationalist-conservative statements from time to time and gives the impression that it only defends liberal theses in the economic field, LDP is the closest party to liberalism from today's Turkey, not only in terms of its name but also in terms of its program and partly its discourse (Erdoğan, 2018, pp. 34-35).

After taking a brief look at the adventure of liberalism and liberal ideas in Turkey, the view is that although there are some favorable conditions for liberalism to flourish in Turkey, this environment is not conducive enough for it to emerge as a deep-rooted tradition of thought and politics. Not only the intellectual environment and mentality of Turkey but also the nature of the traditional state-society relationship and form of economic organization do not constitute a fruitful basis for liberalism. Also, a sincere liberal needs to be open to self-criticism. At this point, it is a strange situation for some liberals in Turkey to express their liberalism in a Jacobin way. Turkish thought is first a Jacobin, then a liberal or statist thought. Therefore, the habit of Turkish politics not to allow different discourses is quite high (Oktay, 2017, pp. 113-119). As a result, liberal ideas seem to maintain their position in Turkey as an ideology that will occupy minds as an intellectual understanding rather than influencing politics in a holistic and systematic way for a while.

4. AHMET EMIN YALMAN: A LIBERAL JOURNALIST IN BETWEEN WITH EMOTIONALISM AND INTELLECTUALISM

4.1. Early Years

Ahmet Emin Yalman had not been a spectator for what was happening in the country and the world in every stage of his journalistic life for more than sixty-odd years. He had made himself responsible for correcting, improving, and even changing the mistakes he saw as a liberal and reformist pen. Although he occasionally deviated from these principles, he was observed to behave contradictory and even sometimes incoherently; nevertheless, he is one of the prominent figures that marked the history of Turkish political thought with his writings and ideas.

"I consider it a good end to my long and hectic journalistic life to be able to describe what I have seen in this way." (Yalman, 1970a, p. 5) Yalman starts telling his memories with these words. From this "good end" he left, to make discoveries of his frame of mind, trace his ideology, and penetrate his mindset will be this chapter's primary purpose and goal.

Ahmet Emin Yalman, born on the night of power, is assumed to be a lucky person from the day he was born (Yalman, 1970a, p. 7). Let alone how lucky Yalman is, Yalman's perspective on his destiny has always been favorable. Because Yalman, even in the most desperate and miserable times, managed to find a way out, (Yalman, 1970a, p. 7) and on the other hand, he did not hesitate to criticize himself ruthlessly. He sees the cause of all kinds of misfortunes that happened to him throughout his life due to repeating the same mistakes. However, he is optimistic even though he has not

learned any lesson from his experiences; after getting rid of all kinds of troubles, the pleasure of reaching salvation and the joy of embarking on adventures connect him to life (Yalman, 1970a, p. 8).

Yalman, who opened his eyes to the world on May 14, 1888, interprets Thessaloniki, where he was born, as the country's leading window to the West (Yalman, 1970a, p. 11). There is no need to go far to discover Yalman's desire to turn to the West and his passion for civilization. The words he chose to describe the city where he was born to reflect this desire, albeit implicitly.

Yalman's fondness for liberty stumbles on the first remnants of a tragicomic childhood memory. One day, the Greek servant named Marika imprisons Yalman in the room; he cannot tolerate this and smashes the window with his "left" hand. As a result of this broken glass, a significant scar remains on his left hand. In his memoirs, he describes this incident as "the first wound he received for the sake of freedom."

(Yalman, 1970a, p. 12) In this way, it becomes easier to distinguish left and right in the future. Yalman, who controls the location of the wound in the moment of hesitation, thus quickly understands where his left side is and protects himself from "slipping to the left" throughout his life (Yalman, 1970a, p. 12). His allegory based on this memory is indeed found later in his life. He always interprets communism as a threat, and as a liberal, he always protects himself from "slipping to the left."

Yalman's fearful dream from his mischievous childhood years was to go to school. A dungeon filled with constant pressure would come to life when school was mentioned in Yalman's mind (Yalman, 1970a, p. 15). Fear of being deprived of his freedom from that age posed a grave danger in his young mind. This fear happened to Yalman in the following years. On the other hand, it will be understood later that Yalman's concerns

about school are unfounded. Having a successful education life, Yalman can be defined with many different words. However, for Yalman, the only word that will undoubtedly meet everyone on a common ground would be "working." Yalman has always been a hard worker, passionate about self-development and giving importance to his education. Yalman, who did not want to go to school and interestingly wanted to be a porter, was trying to show this enthusiasm to the people around him with the burdens he carried (Yalman, 1970a, p. 15). The burdens that he took on his back in his childhood never left his back in the following years. It has been Yalman's primary duty to work for his nation and country and be worthy of all the nation and homeland's opportunities.

Yalman's meeting with many values coincides with his childhood. The secularism and the adoption of the secular education model in schools are one of them, too. Yalman, who is not yet aware of the meaning word secularism, has realized the importance of boys and girls sharing something thanks to the game in primary school. It was the intention of his teacher, as well (Yalman, 1970a, p. 17). This game presented Yalman with the awareness that men and women could live in the same worlds, and the seeds of secular thought were sown in Yalman's mind at that time.

Yalman's first concrete activity in journalism was the *Niyet* newspaper, which he wrote in his handwriting when he was only nine years old. He started such an initiative at that age and continued it patiently for years is proof that Yalman was born as a journalist (Yalman, 1970a, p. 18). Ultimately, he found himself again as a journalist at the end of the day, even though he was involved in other jobs at various times of his life. There were also times when he refused attractive offers not to be separated from journalism. It demonstrates that Yalman is undoubtedly a person who does his profession with passion.

Yalman's father was also keen on journalism. The *Mütalaa* magazine founded by his father is also essential for Yalman. The *Mütalaa* magazine, which lasted for two years, was a special education for Yalman. He spent almost all of his time outside of school in the magazine's administration room. Tevfik Fikret was sending his unpublished articles in Istanbul to *Mütalaa* because of the lighter censorship in Thessaloniki. Thanks to this magazine, Yalman met with important writers such as Tevfik Fikret, Cenap Şahabettin, Recaizade Ekrem, Halit Ziya and Hüseyin Cahit (Yalman, 1970a, p. 18).

The first quarrel Yalman witnessed in the media was between *Servet-i Fünun* and *Malumat*. *Servet-i Fünun*, which he regarded as the representative of the reform and Westernism movement, on the one hand, was frequently come under fire by the *Malumat* magazine, which interpreted this innovation movement as an enemy on the other (Yalman, 1970a, p. 19).

Yalman's liberal ideas began to flourish in the house where he lived. Yalman realized early that the old and the new were silently clashing in their house, even though this house has seemed in complete harmony. His uncle and father were people of two different worlds. His uncle represented conservatism and stagnation, and his father the longing for change and dynamism. However, there has been no conflict or quarrel between these two opposite realms living side by side in the same house (Yalman, 1970a, p. 21). The environment in which Yalman grew up showed him that differences could exist in harmony. Because liberal understanding is an effort to protect the individual from arbitrary external pressures that prevent the individual from realizing his full potential (Berktaş, 2018, p. 55). Here, too, a liberal climate prevailed in Yalmans' home, consciously or unconsciously. The issue of tolerating

these different ideas, which is the basis of liberalism, has visited Yalman from his childhood years.

Yalman loved the Thessaloniki Military High School, which he started when he was nine. Yalman was a child who feared or even hated the school in the early years of his childhood. For him, school means sacrificing freedom. However, despite all military discipline and strict procedures, he liked his new school (Yalman, 1970a, p. 24).

Therefore, it can be said that the military school was the first serious turning point in Yalman's education life. Yalman also acquired the culture of discussion and negotiation in this school. The first traces of Yalman's experiences of Anglo-Saxon culture are found in this school. In this school, where attention is paid to creating a comfortable discussion environment free from pressure, Yalman started to feel the pleasure of openly discussing opinions with other opinions for the first time in these years. Yalman also expresses his gratitude to the enlightened soldier Süleyman Pasha, the founder of the military schools (Yalman, 1970a, p. 25). In this way, his liberal feelings begin to mature, and he learned to express his thoughts freely through this school.

During these years, Yalman faced an injustice that he could not forget. Due to an unfortunate problem with his geography teacher, he took zero even though he gave the correct answers in the geography exam. Yalman describes this event as "a story of injustice." From an early age, he has a deep sensitivity to injustice. This situation left deep traces on him, and he struggled with all his might against injustices throughout his life. These scars penetrated Yalman's heart so deeply that they even caused him to have a nervous disease. Due to this illness, he had to leave school just two months before receiving his diploma. He says that this wound never healed, and he never forgot this injustice throughout his life (Yalman, 1970a, p. 30). Yalman, as mentioned

at the very beginning of this study, has succeeded in taking a lesson from this calamity. This unfortunate incident became a good teacher for him. He experienced severe enlightenment about education. He realized that teachers must be honest, principled, and permanent justice representatives. He saw how injustice could infect a person's heart.

Since his childhood, he wanted to fulfill another dream which is being a traveler.

When asked what Yalman wanted to be when he grew up, he would say he wanted to be a traveler by dreaming of being an aimless dervish. It was among his dreams to see worldwide, go on adventures, and follow Evliya Çelebi's footsteps. Yalman's purpose was more than just traveling the world. While traveling around the world, he was thinking of sharing the troubles of people in distress and giving pleasant surprises to people when they least expected it. As a superior intention, he wanted to be a wanderer in the service of righteousness and goodness. That was precisely the role he was trying to take on (Yalman, 1970a, p. 31). Indeed, this dream has come true in a way. Yalman, thanks to his journalist title, had the opportunity to travel to many different parts of the world. He has written several volumes of travel books. Yalman was also even referred to as "Second Evliya Çelebi." He tried to fulfill this task he had undertaken throughout his life.

It can be said that his first serious contact with the free world took place in the German School. He started to breathe free and comfortable air in this school that he had not been able to feel before. Yalman came from a military school under the control of Abdulhamid's despotism. Until his last year at Yalman Military School, he did not realize a secret struggle against this despotism both in and abroad. He soon realized what it meant to shout as "Long live my sultan!" three times every night at the military school (Yalman, 1970a, p. 33).

One day, a boy next to Yalman said, "Down with that sultan!" and Yalman was horrified. Yalman was not yet aware of this despotic administration of the Ottoman Empire. He did not fully grasp what these slogans meant. He was unaware even of the people exiled by the Sultan. Much later, he began to understand what was going on in the Ottoman Empire in those years. His father told him what the two sides represented in the war, what the Young Turks did when they fought abroad, and how the captives were exiled. Yalman's head was starting to get confused.

Nevertheless, that was a good sign. During a visit to Thessaloniki, Yalman's father reads Tevfik Fikret's poem "What is the Necessity? (*Ne Lüzumu Var?*)" to Yalman. Tevfik Fikret, the Turkish teacher of Robert College, wrote this poem in his handwriting. It is probable that there is no other copy of that poem, perhaps because he gave the draft to Yalman's father. When Tevfik Fikret was called for interrogation, the following question was asked him, referring to modern developments: "What are the necessities for all these modern developments and innovation movements?" In response to these questions, Tevfik Fikret said in his poem: "What are the necessities of your bigoted mind and outdated administration?" (Yalman, 1970a, p. 34)

Yalman took the poem in his hand to read it carefully. When his father forgot to ask for the poem back, he obtained a secret document belonging to the period of Abdülhamid. Yalman, even as with his childish mind at that time, understood that this meant a great responsibility and risk (Yalman, 1970a, p. 34). This pleasant coincidence can be called a twist of fate. The fact that Yalman got rid of his childhood, took responsibility, and started to take life seriously coincided with the period of Abdulhamid. Yalman's attitude was apparent in the face of despotism. From now on, it was necessary not to remain indifferent to the events happening in the

country, approach them seriously, be aware of them, and struggle. Yalman could not remain indifferent to this tyranny in the future.

In the Selanik newspaper, which is the official newspaper of the province, false news appears on the following day of each incident, saying, "Everything is fine thanks to the sultan, everyone is comfortable." (Yalman, 1970a, p. 35) It did not need to have superior intelligence for Yalman to realize that it was living in an environment full of hypocrisies and lies. Undoubtedly, Yalman had begun to notice all these events to a certain extent. However, he did not have the information that would make it possible to understand what the revolutionaries wanted, what threats the country was under, and what kind of disasters the despotism created.

The chest, which was brought to their homes by the relatives of Yalman' at that time, played an essential role in Yalman's struggle for freedom. Thanks to that secret chest, he had the chance to closely penetrate the minds' of the famous names of the period, such as Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, Şemsettin Sami, Ahmed Mithat Efendi. All of the books in that chest were prohibited by the Sultan. If all those books were found in any home in Istanbul, the landlord could have been exiled immediately. Yalman secretly took these books one by one, read them, then put them in place without his father noticing. The ideas of freedom heroes like Namık Kemal started to get inside Yalman's head at that time. Yalman believed that these works nourished his soul (Yalman, 1970a, p. 40). The contribution of Yalman is secretly these readings to the struggle for freedom after becoming a journalist has been undeniably important.

How important two German patriots were for Yalman's life during this period is worth mentioning. The four years Yalman spent at the Beyoğlu German School are full of sweet memories. His teachers were virtuous figures to leave deep impressions on their

students. In particular, the principal Dr. Schwatlo was a unique administrator, according to Yalman. When Dr. Schwatlo, a teacher of German literature, realized that Yalman was interested in writing, he became very interested in Yalman and tried to encourage Yalman to constantly (Yalman, 1970a, p. 42). Yalman was exposed to the mistreatment of his geography teacher in the Military School. However, this mistreatment was neutralized or vanished just because of the excellent treatment Yalman received from Dr. Schwatlo.

Ludwig Szamatolski, a German language professor, is the other German worthy of mentioning. Szamatolski was Jewish in terms of religion but German. He supported a conservative party that favored the emperor as a political ideology. He does his best to make his students love Germanness (Yalman, 1970a, p. 43). Undoubtedly, this teacher contributed significantly to Yalman's familiarity with German culture and, therefore, Western civilization.

After the 1908 revolution, Yalman wrote an article for the *Vossische Zeitung* newspaper published in Berlin. He mentioned that Germans were seen as the support Abdulhamid in the past should be eliminated. Szamatolski replied to Yalman in the newspaper *Tagliche Rundschau*, which represents Germanism, and stated that Germany understood and sincerely supported the Young Turk movement and longed for a new and progressive Turkey (Yalman, 1970a, p. 44).

The treatment of Jews in Germany during the Hitler period made Szamatolski very sad as a German patriot. In his letter with great difficulty to Yalman in 1938, he stated that this was not true Germanism and that Hitler and his supporters never approved of what they were doing. However, Szamatolski died before learning the fate of the Nazis and seeing Germany as a free and democratic country again (Yalman, 1970a, p.

45). What Yalman learned from Szamatolski, an important figure in his life, was invaluable. Although Szamatolski was a solid German nationalist, he opposed the totalitarian regime and fought this fascism. His nationalist feelings have never precluded his objectivity. This attitude is also valid for Yalman. It has always aimed to maintain its neutrality without allowing its national feelings to prevent its opposing and critical stance.

Yalman also criticizes life in the period of Abdülhamit strictly. When he remembers his four years in the German school, he mentions encountering two different worlds. First was the school's straightforward and pleasing neighborhood; the second was a realm full of suffering. Yalman had begun to feel that corruption, looting, and immorality were hidden in this realm. According to Yalman, the Ottoman Empire of the Abdulhamid era was far from being a national entity. He thought that the Sultan treated the country as his farm. Yalman, who expressed his discomfort with the moral breakdowns, also complained about the corruption of the Palace (Yalman, 1970a, p. 46).

Yalman did not hesitate to criticize Abdulhamid's politics in administrative, social, and economic terms. Abdulhamid was pampering the people living in Istanbul as a privileged group so that his security would not be threatened. It was why the people of Istanbul were not taxed and exempted from military service (Yalman, 1970a, p. 50). Yalman was aware of the policies Abdulhamit applied out of fear of losing power. The regime of despotism interrupted liberty and free thought, which are the values Yalman much cared about to that age.

Some relatively minimal changes occurred in Yalman's private life during those years. Yalman, who spent the summer holidays with his uncle, also met liquor in those

years. For this reason, he had a falling out with his uncle, who has conservative thoughts. Yalman describes his acquaintance with alcohol as a weakness due to his friends' influence, making his self-criticism. In addition, while he was in Istanbul, he was careful not to miss the theaters and various shows in the city by giving importance to his intellectual development (Yalman, 1970a, p. 50).

4.2. Beginning of His Journalistic Life

Yalman's journalism story begins with his father writing a letter to Hüseyin Cahit in 1907. After reading Yalman's father's letter, Hüseyin Cahit advises Yalman, does not suggest the journalism profession to Yalman, and urges him to choose another career. However, despite all these recommendations, when Yalman insisted on becoming a journalist, Hüseyin Cahit writes a letter to Abdullah Zühtü to help Yalman. In this letter, Hüseyin Cahit asks Abdullah Zühtü to introduce Yalman to Ahmed Cevdet, the owner of the *İkdam* newspaper. On the other hand, he does not even agree to talk to Yalman, the owner of the *İkdam* newspaper. He gives a definite refusal, saying there was no room for children in his newspaper. Yalman, who visited Mihran Efendi, the owner of the *Sabah* newspaper with Abdullah Zühtü Bey, started his journalism career as an English interpreter at the *Sabah* newspaper, which was his first place of work as a result of this meeting (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 51-52).

Yalman's first notable success in his journalism career came about a month after he started working. The Times newspaper wrote a three-article series about its outstanding success to complete the Hejaz Railway in three years. The *İkdam* newspaper, which was the biggest rival of the *Sabah* newspaper, was not aware of this series because it did not buy Times newspaper. Abdulhamit was very sensitive about the Hejaz Railway (Kanberoğlu, 2018, p. 161). While foreign newspapers were

writing articles against the Ottoman Empire at every opportunity, Abdülhamit was very happy to have three articles written about the Hejaz Railway in a newspaper like the Times. Mihran Efendi is welcomed at Yıldız Palace and accepted into the presence of the Sultan. The Sultan expresses his satisfaction directly to Mihran Efendi. The *İkdam* newspaper is in a difficult situation in the face of this event. Hüseyin Cahit, who did not hire Yalman by stating that he did not want to employ children in his newspaper, regrets rejecting Yalman (Yalman, 1970a, p. 53).

Mahmut Sadık is a crucial turning point in Yalman's journalism life. Yalman refers to Mahmut Sadık as his guide who taught him trustworthy journalism. Mahmut Sadık mentions that even though there was pressure and censorship in the period, Yalman should still reveal his potential in his translations. He tells the reader that it is possible to open new horizons, even between the lines. He expresses that Yalman should show the reader new ways by adding his comments in his translations rather than ordinary translations. In addition, Mahmut Sadık mentions that there are two kinds of journalists. The first type is actual journalists, while the second type is journalists who praise and lackey the sultan. Mahmut Sadık sees himself and Yalman's in the first type of journalists. Therefore, he mentors Yalman on how to do real journalism. Yalman had learned much later that Mahmut Sadık was an attendant of the Committee of Union and Progress (*İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*) (CUP) in Istanbul (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 54-55).

Yalman started to see Yıldız Palace and the life there as a partner in the responsibility of evil. Yalman criticizes the bureaucracy while waiting for Tahsin Pasha at the gate of Yıldız Palace to start working at the Sublime Porte Translation Room¹. For him,

¹ Sublime Porte Translation Room was established to enable Turks and Muslims to learn foreign languages, operate in diplomacy, and ensure the Ottoman Empire's relations with other states through

this wait is an excellent opportunity to reflect the contradictory course of the country. Yalman thought that Abdulhamit would not develop the country with his intelligence mechanism and his informants in Yıldız Palace. Such an Ottoman administrative structure was insufficient in facing problems (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 56-57). In this way, Yalman had the opportunity to see the despotism period's inner face closely. The Sublime Porte also had its own strict rules. Yalman is warned not to make many friends. It was seen as a fault to establish friendship with someone within the Porte. With this warning, Yalman understood even better than everyone was under surveillance. Frequent meeting with someone was an eyesore in the period of autocracy (Yalman, 1970a, p. 59).

Yalman welcomes the end of the era of autocracy due to the re-enactment of the 1876 Constitution. The removal of censorship and freedom of the press is undoubtedly good news for Yalman and his career. Because he interpreted the end of this era as "even a worm will turn." Like many people, he considered the declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy in 1908 as a "unifying movement." (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 61-63)

While the first days of the Constitutional Monarchy were noisy, Hüseyin Cahit founded the *Tanin* newspaper with Tevfik Fikret and Hüseyin Kazım. On the other hand, Abdullah founded *Zühtü* the *Yeni* newspaper and invited Yalman to join him by increasing Yalman's salary from two lira to ten lira. Although Mihran Efendi, owner of the *Sabah* newspaper, offered Yalman more money to stay at the *Sabah* newspaper,

reliable persons. In Sublime Porte Translation Room, it aimed to train reformist bureaucrats who would be effective in domestic and foreign policy quickly. Sublime Porte Translation Room, in its current form, has been a school where bureaucrats who prepared the reform movements after the Tanzimat were trained. Sublime Porte Translation Room, a specialization office of grammar, was seen as the best place to start one's career until the end of the century. Ali, Fuat, Ahmet Vefik, Safvet, Münif, Ahmet Arifi, Ahmet Tevfik, and Sadullah Pashas, and Namık Kemal were brought up here is proof of how effective Sublime Porte Translation Room was (Balci, 2013). Therefore, starting to work here was a severe opportunity for Yalman.

Yalman, without hesitation, started working at the *Yeni* newspaper (Yalman, 1970a, p. 65).

It can also be said that Yalman entered a new lane in his career with his new newspaper adventure. Although he started working as a translator for the newspaper, he began writing editorials every day and articles for the newspaper several times a week, even a year after he started working. At this point, Yalman's humble personality should be underlined. Yalman's name was not written under the writings of that period as a twenty-year-old youth. Although Abdullah Zühtü told Yalman that he could write his name under the editorials, Yalman protected his reputation in the face of this offer and did not want to write his name, keeping the newspaper's reputation before him. Yalman was highly confident that he would make his name known in the following years. Looking both modest and confident, Yalman tried to show his respect for the profession with this move. It was a remarkable attitude for a journalist who was only twenty years old and in the early years of his career (Yalman, 1970a, p. 65). It was a remarkable attitude for a journalist who was only twenty years old and was in the early years of his career.

Yalman later had the chance to work in the Upper House (*Ayan Meclisi*). He had been in different parts of his working life, both as a journalist in the press, lecturer at the university, and civil servant at the Upper House. He was also a member of the CUP in Kadıköy province. As a result of this wide range, he had the opportunity to deliberate in his mind quite different views (Yalman, 1970a, p. 66). This intense pace, different work areas, and the excessive workload never intimidated In this way, Yalman reinforced his tendency to be objective as a journalist and always kept his motivation high thanks to his hard work pace.

Most of the Ottoman liberal-minded intellectuals who lived during the reign of Abdulhamit and witnessed the Second Constitutionalist Period in 1908 agree that the first hopes that he could act effectively against the Abdülhamit regime in Turkey were centered around Murat Bey's personality (Mardin, 2019, p. 81). Yalman was also one of them.

When the historian Murat Bey, owner of the *Mizan* newspaper, informed the Committee that he wanted to join the CUP, the Committee wanted to ask all members about this situation. In a way, the CUP wanted to share this responsibility with all Board members and take this decision by a referendum. Yalman read Murat Bey's book with interest and admired his maturity. He saw Murat Bey as one of the leaders who would lead the country to the right path. Yalman observed Murat Bey's unconditional return from Paris to Istanbul due to the dilemma between the Young Turks as a mistake and interpreted Murat Bey's actions as an event that harmed the national struggle. However, just because Murat Bey had this deficiency, Yalman did not ignore Murat Bey's other virtues. According to Yalman, Murat Bey was an important person, and his ideas should have been followed carefully. However, the CUP held the referendum only as a so-called referendum. As a result of this referendum, they did not accept Murat Bey to the Committee. Yalman states that after seeing this incident in his memoirs, he completely distanced himself from partisanship (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 72-73) However; the DP would change this "tendency to stay away from partisanship."

According to Yalman, the Murat Bey incident revives the idea of despotism in Turkey once again. Yalman criticizes the lack of harmony and co-working environment due to dichotomy. He also criticizes the Young Turk movement for its contradiction.

Within the group traditionally known as Young Turk in Europe, three leaders stood out, who advocated three views, none of which fit the name's meaning. The first is Ahmet Rıza, the second is Mehmet Murat, and the third is Prince Sabahattin. While their opinions are influential, none played a significant role as individuals after 1908. Ahmet Rıza remained an obscure Unionist; Murat stayed with the reactionaries against the revolution; he barely saved his life after the 31 March Incident. Prince Sabahattin, on the other hand, lived in exile until his death after a short time, in a way that he could not play any role, despite his various efforts. Although Ahmet Rıza aimed to establish an honest administration and ensure the development and dissemination of education and positive sciences, Murat aimed to establish a Pan-Islamic state that would apply Islamic Sharia. Throughout the clashes between the groups represented by the two men, the Ahmet Rıza group began to mock Murat's Islamism, while Murat accused them of irreligion. Abdülhamit, who knew very well to take advantage of such differences of opinion and to reconcile by satisfying one side, succeeded in withdrawing Murat through his special representatives. They were skilled in applying this method (Berkes, 2019, pp. 394-396).

The third opinion leader, Prince Sabahattin, the youngest of the leaders, managed to gather the majority against Ahmet Rıza. However, his program did not succeed either before or after 1908. When the political parties were born after the revolution, he barely saved his life from the Unionists, the most potent political party. His fate was similar to Murat in this respect (Ege, 1977; Tütengil, 1954).

Although Ahmet Rıza was a member of positivist communities in France, Prince Sabahattin had established a tie with his rival Le Play School. Both were ideological currents of that time rather than sociological currents in a scientific sense; both were reactive to the ideas of the French Revolution. Edmond Demolins, one of the

supporters of Le Play in Prince Sabahattin's time, brought an opinion adopted by Prince Sabahattin in one of his books (Demolins, 1914). The main point in this view is that it specifies two types of society. These are *communautaire* and *particulariste* types of community. In the first type of society, groups such as family, tribe, clan, or state prevail, not individuals. The best representatives of this type are Eastern societies. In the second type of society, it is the person who matters; social groups gather around the person. The best example of this is Anglo-Saxon society. The only novelty in this view in European thought is that it reserved the second type into Anglo-Saxons; otherwise, many thinkers from Adam Smith to Karl Marx made similar distinctions between Eastern societies and Western society in the capitalist economic period (Berkes, 2019, p. 397).

Prince Sabahattin, who established a personal friendship with Demolins and even supposedly donated money to his work, applied this view to the problem of secularization of Ottoman society. Prince Sabahattin founded a committee called *Ligue de décentralisation administrative et d'initiative privée* in Paris. He published a newspaper called *Terakki* between 1902 and 1906. In 1897, articles were published in the newspaper *Ottoman*, published in Paris and Cairo, applying the views of private enterprise and decentralization to the problem of westernization (Berkes, 2019, p. 426).

The thoughts of the three leaders of these three groups were different from each other. Ahmet Rıza's group admitted from the outset that the public did not have the power to carry out the program they proposed because the ignorant people who were not enlightened did not know what they wanted and were not aware of their political rights. Murat Bey's group, on the other hand, accepted from the outset that the caliph could not be touched without the power of a fatwa according to sharia, and

consequently, sharia. Prince Sabahattin's group was prone to private enterprise (Berkes, 2019, pp. 398-399). It was precisely what Ahmet Rıza complained about among the Young Turks. The emergence of such separations made this movement an unplanned action. Among these three groups mentioned, Yalman's sympathy for Murat Bey was evident due to the events experienced in the so-called referendum. As a liberal and secular intellectual, his sympathy for Sharia supporter Murat Bey was surprising, while his distance from statist and centralist Ahmet Rıza Bey was understandable.

Although Yalman appreciated the courage, confidence, and resolution of Ahmet Rıza towards Abdülhamit, he could not help criticizing some of his faults. For Yalman, Ahmet Rıza's biggest mistake was that he was attached blindly to the positivism established by the French philosopher Auguste Comte. According to Yalman, it was a great mistake for Ahmet Rıza to view everything with the unchanging measures of positivism. Another situation Yalman could not tolerate in Ahmet Rıza was his supporter of centralism. Yalman also frequently criticized Ahmet Rıza's lack of tolerance and understanding of people from other views and his unwillingness to leave the leadership of the Young Turk movement to others (Yalman, 1970a, p. 74).

However, the name Yalman feels closest to among these three leaders is, without a doubt, Prince Sabahattin. Yalman mentions that Prince Sabahattin has a sharp mind and received an eligible education. He supports the ideas of decentralization and private enterprise. Yalman even expresses his admiration for Prince Sabahattin with these words:

If Prince Sabahattin Bey's foresight and understanding system based on scientific mentality had been accepted and a Turkish national front had been

established against foreign initiatives; and on the other hand, the Ottoman Empire would have been a federation like the United States and Federal Germany and could have continued to exist in that way. Therefore, the fate of Turkey and the whole world could have been different (Yalman, 1970a, p. 75).

During his education in the United States, Yalman did not hesitate to express his views on Prince Sabahattin. In Chicago, where there are citizens from Anatolia, he has a heated argument with a Unionist named Hasan Efendi from Sivas. Hasan Efendi disagrees with Yalman's article in the *İkdam* Newspaper and objects to Yalman's defense of Prince Sabahattin's views on decentralization. According to Unionist Hasan Efendi, decentralization is a concept that will collapse the country, and Yalman's defense of this idea is not correct. Yalman's response to this criticism is as follows:

The *İkdam* is our oldest newspaper. What I do is to publicize the innovations I have seen in the developed world of the United States, thereby leaving the dualism in the disaster days and encouraging my readers to cooperate in thinking about the interests of the homeland. However, you have to admit that your views about Prince Sabahattin are not appropriate. You are in the United States; here, you see that every city, even every small town has the opportunity to manage its destiny directly, and that is how America thrives. However, our country is dying under a strict centralization and guardianship system. We should also learn from these examples. Especially, how would a person who sees the United States and be smart like you reject Prince Sabahattin's ideas with so much fanaticism? (Yalman, 1970a, p. 158)

Yalman's commitment to the idea of decentralization is strengthened by a visit to the state of New Hampshire during his education life in the United States. He mentions that after visiting the state of New Hampshire, he enjoyed the independence and comfort of the United States local government (Yalman, 1970a, p. 161). Furthermore, Yalman wrote for half a century after returning from The United States about the benefits of being independent of local governments. Yalman mentioned in these articles that democracy should start with local administrations first. However, as both a lecturer and a journalist, he has been deeply saddened that his efforts were in vain. The underlying reason for this effort is that, according to Yalman, the idea of centralism is deeply embedded in Turkish citizens' souls (Yalman, 1970a, p. 165). Yalman mentions the importance of Prince Sabahattin's ideas and the necessity of decentralization in an article published in the *Vakit*, his newspaper, in the following years:

Sabahaddin Bey was an idealist who fought for the country for 19 years. He did not feel a grudge against the nation for his occasionally received bad treatment; he has deep knowledge, broad vision, and a prominent personality. Such men are grown all over the world. We must appreciate this personality. Our nation is faithful. Unfortunately, most of the citizens still do not know Prince Sabahaddin. The CUP did not distinguish between those who opposed due to ambition and those who opposed due to principle. Also, they treated them the same, tarnishing them all. Sabahaddin Bey did not show enough effort to introduce himself to the nation. He did not introduce himself to the public in a language that the public would understand. The public is always afraid of ideas they don't understand. However, since 1900, Prince Sabahaddin has been justified in many of his ideas. We did not do what he said; we

persisted as centralism and attempted to rule the country by force from a single center. We deprived the country of enterprise power and local developments, and we could not comply with the new conditions of the world. The idea of private enterprise was also left unattended (Yalman, 1970b, p. 52).

Yalman was deeply devoted to both Prince Sabahattin's personality and ideas.

However, as it was seen, he could not hesitate to criticize Prince Sabahattin for not reaching the level of the people. Since Prince Sabahattin could not explain his ideas openly to the public, Yalman took it as a duty to himself. He thinks that if the Turkish people had understood these thoughts, they might have adopted these ideas.

Yalman does not hesitate to criticize the CUP harshly. Immediately after the Declaration of Constitutionalism, he had the opportunity to observe how dangerous political ambition is. Passion for politics is a problematic situation that can lead even the best men to the worst roads because, for Yalman, Prince Sabahattin is among those who have this passion. Despite all his maturity and all his patriotism, Prince Sabahattin could not always have himself in the fields of politics and made unexpected mistakes. However, Yalman still does not see the errors in Prince Sabahattin himself. According to him, what drives Prince Sabahattin to mistakes is the country's state. He criticizes Prince Sabahattin from time to time, but he still prevents himself from putting all the blame on him. He sees the corruption of politics and the lack of information in the country as the cause of Prince Sabahattin's mistakes.

After studying sociology in the United States, Yalman read all works of Prince Sabahattin and was amazed by his views. After returning from Malta during the armistice period, he frequently visited Prince Sabahattin Bey and had the chance to chat with him for hours. Yalman is sure that Prince Sabahattin loves his hometown so

much and thinks that what was done to Prince Sabahattin was unfair. Yalman was one of the last to see Prince Sabahattin before his death, and he always expresses his sadness for his situation. Yalman, who speaks of Prince Sabahattin with words full of praise as a considerable patriot, great Turkish intellectual, self-sacrificing person, does not pass without mentioning the other great opinion leaders who suffered injustice while talking about Prince Sabahattin. According to him, names such as Mithat Pasha, Süleyman Pasha, Namık Kemal, and Ziya Pasha were also great thinkers who did not get the value they deserved in this country (Yalman, 1970a, p. 78).

However, Yalman complains that none of the expectations have come true after the end of the thirty-three years of despotism. He mentions piles of anarchy, unrest, strife, and intrigue. Considering that the government was dragged into unknown darkness after the declaration of liberty, he says that the administration of despotism changed hands. Yalman thought that the Unionists were acting in heedlessness (Yalman, 1970a, p. 80). Yalman's expectation of freedom did not match the release that the CUP brought after the annexation of Abdulhamit. For him, despotism changed hands. The new order that the Unionists were trying to convey was not satisfactory for an intellectual with liberal expectations like Yalman.

Yalman cannot help but criticize the unwise steps taken in the foreign policy of the period. He complains that the Unionists cannot analyze the current conditions of the world well and that they are left helpless against the intrigues of foreign states.

According to Yalman, going too far instead of acting cautiously was one of the main problems of the foreign policy of that period. The policy of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was left to the Austro-Hungarian administration, is one of the policies he criticizes. The failure of the Ottoman Empire to protect its sovereign rights over

Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia is another issue that should be blamed for Yalman. Finally, the Cretan lands that came under Greek rule is another issue Yalman attacks. Yalman mentions that he remembers with horror the steps taken in those years due to the irrational decisions taken by inexperienced politicians. In other words, Yalman, as a young, naive journalist with limited political knowledge, cannot tolerate the government's apathy towards all this while he sees all this (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 83-84).

The *Yeni* newspaper, where Yalman worked at that time, was a newspaper that pursued a peaceful middle ground in domestic politics. In addition, although there were many manipulative journalists in this newspaper with foreigners' money, there were honest journalists such as Mahmut Sadık, Hakkı Behiç, Nazım Poroy, and Acem Hüseyin. Yalman, along with these names, was on the path of ethical journalism. He had nothing to do with articles written with foreigners' money (Yalman, 1970a, p. 87).

Yalman's hunger for democracy was so high at that time that when he heard that the Parliament took over the administration again, he retreated to his small room and received this development as a piece of good news and wrote an enthusiastic editorial (Yalman, 1970a, p. 90).

The 31 March Incident was a pre-organized demonstration against the CUP. It can also be called an uprising, as enlisted men forcibly carried out this demonstration despite the military officers. Many civilians participated in the incident. It was the opposition that prepared the uprising. What was meant by the opposition was notably Prince Sabahattin, Kamil Pasha and his son Sait Pasha, İsmail Kemal Bey and Müfit Bey, those who could not find what they were looking for in the CUP and the Ottoman Liberty Party (*Osmanlı Ahrar Fırkası*) (Akşin, 2015, p. 311).

While all these events were taking place, Yalman's criticism of Prince Sabahattin, whom he respected very much in the 31 March Incident, indicates Yalman's tendency to remain objective in the face of events. Prince Sabahattin took sides with the opponents just because the 31 March Incident was against the CUP. Yalman regarded this situation of Prince Sabahattin's as negligence.

It is a significant event for the Parliament to reactivate efficiently after the 31 March Incident. In addition, it is a good development for the country that the bureaucracy started to function correctly in the hands of Western administrators after this incident. Yalman thinks that the best way to carry out reforms in the Ottoman Empire was to use Western experts, who adopted efficient procedures, in executive positions (Yalman, 1970a, p. 103). It can be understood from Yalman's emphasis on the importance of merit since those years that Yalman always favored the execution of bureaucracy in the country through liberal institutions. Along with this liberal tendency, perhaps the first professional activism on human rights was his editorial written in reaction to the hanging of the Spanish rebel leader. He couldn't remain indifferent to the storm that broke out in the world regarding human rights. He believed that this article and his reaction would create a good impression in the whole country's eyes (Yalman, 1970a, p. 104).

The number of such proactive writings of Yalman increases gradually during these years. The effects of these articles on public opinion and the state could also be observed to a considerable degree. The desire to improve contact with abroad was so strong for Yalman that Yalman wrote an editorial in the *Yeni* newspaper about the abolition of passports one day under the influence of this. In those years, there was an environment that could make all kinds of reforms possible. This proposal was accepted in both Houses. A law was passed that travel without a passport was passed.

This law was in effect for more than a year (Yalman, 1970a, p. 105). Thus, Yalman's influence on politics and public opinion began to be felt more and more.

However, Yalman does not think that the reform movements and the contact with abroad were at a level that would give them confidence in the international world.

This atmosphere of peace is temporary for Yalman. It is because the CUP penetrated politics as a military unit. At this point, Yalman admires Mustafa Kemal's opinions as a dignified nationalist and adopts the correctness of his ideas. The recommendations of Mustafa Kemal at the Congress of the CUP on September 5, 1909, mean a lot to Yalman. At this congress, Mustafa Kemal made clear that the military should withdraw from politics, and Edirne delegate Refet Bey supported these recommendations. However, the fact that no one pays attention to these recommendations causes Yalman to despair. Yalman is highly uncomfortable with the country's current state at that time. He claims that the Unionists, who were supposed to be the guardians of freedom, became feudal lords (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 105-106).

As Yalman desired, an honest civilian government couldn't come to power under the current conditions of the Ottoman Empire in those years. The repressive regime of the CUP did not seem eager to meet Yalman's liberal demands. With the proclamation of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, Yalman expected a democratic Ottoman ideal. Still, in the face of increasing pressure from the Unionists, Yalman again began to assume the role of opposition to the government.

Yalman, after the proclamation of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, was thinking about the country's problems for hours every day, in deep disappointment. Doing translations and writing articles while witnessing the collapse of the Ottoman Empire was not enough to comfort Yalman. At that time, he resigned from his job at the

Sublime Porte Translation Room because of his passion for journalism. Yalman, who cared not to interfere with the entertainment life until 1909, states that he was dragged down the current afterward. More precisely, he was in complete inertia during these years. Yalman's self-fulfillment, in other words, realizing his renaissance, coincides with these years.

4.3. The First Contact with Overseas

In 1910, Italians invited a Turkish group of 120 people to Italy. Yalman was among those who traveled on behalf of the *Yeni* newspaper. This trip was significant due to Yalman's first contact abroad. Thanks to this, Yalman had the opportunity to see new people, new visions, and environments. This trip will have left such deep marks on Yalman that he wrote an article on the importance of friendship with Italians after this trip. However, later it turned out that this trip was collusion. The inner side of the matter was revealed later. It turned out that the Italians organized this trip to carry out the attack they had designed for Trabslusgarb comfortably. However, Yalman had returned to his country as an enlightened journalist with the experiences he gained despite this theater (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 109-110).

Yalman's overseas adventure continues with returning to Turkey from Italy and going to Columbia University in New York. Going to the United States is like a lifesaver for Yalman. Yalman is faced with a brand new opportunity to renew his life and educate himself by leaving the *Yeni* newspaper. Yalman will not remain that old Yalman after completing his education in the United States and returning.

Yalman feels very vividly the joy of reaching a new world full of miracles as soon as he arrived in the United States. This period is quite crucial for Yalman in several aspects. His contact with the outside world is significant to the flourishing of his

liberal ideas. In this way, he had the chance to observe and interpret Western civilization closely. He started to gain the maturity of meeting new ideas and tolerating those ideas in these years. In addition to these, as a group of five friends, they were standing out in a foreign society because of their behavior and actions, were trying to overcome the difficulty of discovering a new culture. On the other hand, as conscious and responsible students, they continued their education successfully and made an effort to represent their country.

Yalman had chosen the sociology department at Columbia University as a major. He chose the history department as the first auxiliary field and economics and finance as the second auxiliary field. On the other hand, he was also enrolled in English lessons to improve his English writing ability. In addition, he enrolled in the "History of the United States Constitution" lecture by Prof. Charles Beard to get to know the United States better (Yalman, 1970a, p. 117). In short, Yalman was doing his best to seize all the opportunities offered to him.

Yalman has used information he obtained from his teacher in a sociology class in his journalism life. The knowledge of the sociology teacher that left its mark on Yalman was as follows: An idea should not be presented quickly to people who were not ready for that idea but should be explained to them gradually. For Yalman, it was better to present a new idea within the framework of the thoughts that the reader has become accustomed to and adopted instead of opening it immediately to readers who are not ready for that idea. He expresses this as gradually preparing the readers for new ideas in "small portions." (Yalman, 1970a, p. 124)

For Yalman, on the one hand, this education was delightful and productive for his life; on the other hand, he was struggling with a dilemma in his inner world. Yalman was

confused in those years. He was in deep thought about what services he could do after returning to his country. He was living in a dilemma between the teaching profession on the one hand and the journalism profession on the other. He wanted to return to journalism and fighting with evil. However, there were two reasons for Yalman's move away from the profession he had dreamed of since his childhood. The first is the moral fatigue and inertia left behind by his irresponsible life in journalism after the proclamation of the Constitutional Monarchy. The other was that thanks to the opportunities of his country, he saw teaching as a moral duty when he returned to his country because he was educated in the United States. He wanted to do this duty, not in Istanbul but the destitute villages of the country (Yalman, 1970a, p. 131). Therefore, while there was the journalism profession that he had dreamed of since childhood, on the one hand, he now had a new mission of his own, and at this point, he was in dilemma and abstention on the other hand.

In addition to this dilemma, Yalman takes it upon himself to present his country accurately during his stay in the United States. Yalman's dissatisfaction with Turkey's foreign policy at that time is apparent. He considers it his duty as a journalist to correct this disrepute. He writes letters to newspapers at every opportunity and responds to erroneous articles about Turkey. As a journalist, he tries his best to serve the interests of his country (Yalman, 1970a, p. 131). Yalman and his friends, as Turkish citizens living in the United States, established the "Columbia Ottoman Society" in order to realize these missions (Yalman, 1970a, p. 132).

In addition to these, he had a productive and thriving student life. On the one hand, he was preparing his Ph. D. thesis on the history, development style, and conditions of the Turkish press; on the other hand, he frequently wrote articles for the newspapers of the United States. He also set aside time to send letters about the United States to

the *İkdam* newspaper once a week (Yalman, 1970a, p. 146). Working patiently and astutely would have been the most accurate words to describe Yalman's those years.

His life in the United States nurtured Yalman's liberal views and deepened his perspective on religion and secularism. In the United States, he had the opportunity to witness firsthand views such as missionary work, religious exploitation, and bigotry that were so damaging to secular life. After a missionary meeting he attended in the United States, he left with deep disappointment and an equally conscious mind.

Yalman was mature enough to tolerate people's desire to impose their religion on others as a civic duty, but he would never accept that cruelly do such a thing.

According to him, the most essential things that religion expressed were feelings of compassion and mercy, and these feelings should not be ignored no matter what (Yalman, 1970a, p. 173).

Another thought on which Yalman pondered secularism was women's rights.

Considering Yalman's contemporary identity, the importance he attaches to women's rights, and his support to reform movements in this direction is not surprising.

According to Yalman, the main goal of bigotry in Turkey was to exclude women from public life and to impose an attitude that deprived women of all human rights opportunities. Among the reform efforts that have been going on for over a century, women's causes have not been adequately emphasized. These lawsuits were based on the interests of the order system established in favor of men, along with deep-rooted customs and beliefs and one-sided feelings of jealousy (Yalman, 1970a, p. 196).

Yalman was also criticizing Turkish modernization at this point. For him, modernization was one-dimensional when considering gender roles. While some advantages were provided in favor of men in the public sphere, women's rights were ignored.

In the years when the Balkan War broke out, some mobilizations were promising for women. During the war years, society considered it normal for women to work in hospitals, establish societies, and participate in demonstrations. Yalman considered these important developments steps in modernization and the spread of liberal ideas to the social ground. Within a few months following the Balkan war, new schools for girls were established; Istanbul University opened some higher courses for girls. The *Kadınlar Âlemi* magazine, whose founders and writers are all women has fiercely struggled about the shortcomings and injustices in Turkish social life. Some did not tolerate this, but in the past, such efforts, which could lead to doomsday, were generally welcomed (Yalman, 1970a, p. 196). A great victory was being won against the bigoted mentality. Now, the woman was also becoming contemporary and gaining identity as an individual.

As Yalman completed his education in the United States and returned to his country, his hesitations slowly cleared. He felt reconnected to the journalism profession and was willing to convey his experiences to his readers in the best possible way after returning to his country. The ideas of Auguste Comte had guided Yalman in getting rid of these contradictions. Although Yalman criticized Ahmet Rıza for his commitment to Comte's positivism, he was also influenced by Comte at some point, and he was even able to set his course thanks to Comte's ideas.

Yalman thought of what he would do when he returned to his country, based on a quote from the famous sociologist Giddings in one of his sociology lectures. The statement that made such an impact on him was the words of Comte, "expect the greatest reforms of the world from Russia and Turkey." Yalman's professor interpreted Comte's this statement as follows: "Russia and Turkey are persistent in running an old system. Since they do not keep up with time, the administration will

collapse in both countries; there will be no old traces, and something new will have to be done." (Yalman, 1970a, p. 202)

Herein, Yalman's goal was to use the knowledge and experience he gained in the United States and work with all his might to be helpful to the country to make the revolution established in Turkey fundamental and permanent.

4.4. Return to Homeland

After completing his education in the United States and returning to his country, Yalman began assisting Ziya Gökalp's sociology lectures and Hasan Bey's statistics lectures. The task given to Yalman in the lectures consisted of sitting next to the dais and listening to the lecture while the professor lectured. However, if the professors could not attend the lectures, Yalman would go to the dais and keep the class busy. Undoubtedly, this was not the service life Yalman dreamed of during his education years. Also, since those years coincided with the First World War, Yalman had a small amount of money due to the famine in the country. It was almost impossible to make a living with the money he received. While Yalman was thinking about what he would do in those years, he received the editor-in-chief of the *Tanin* newspaper. His journalistic vein had swelled again. Suddenly, everything started to improve for Yalman with this news. With this offer, he would get rid of unemployment and increase his monthly income (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 211-212). As mentioned at the beginning of this study, Yalman's fortunate personality began to come to light at this point.

His early experiences in early journalistic life brought substantial gains for his future career. His assignment as a war correspondent during the First World War fueled his enthusiasm in his early years. In addition, Yalman was the only Turkish war

correspondent with the privilege of touring all fronts. In this way, he had the chance to closely examine and analyze all phases of the war by traveling across all fronts. Meanwhile, he faced death many times, but his desire to do his duty was always effusive, and his courage did not detract even once. It is the most unambiguous indication of how far Yalman is committed to the journalism profession, even in the most challenging condition because Yalman was conscious of fulfilling his duty without fear (Yalman, 1970a, p. 222). Therefore, this experience can be an essential breaking point for Yalman. With this experience, Yalman felt the nakedness and brutality of the war to the marrow. His human feelings have become more intense, and the importance he attaches to peace, people, and human rights have deepened and gained a different dimension for Yalman. He began to question the place of hatred and ambition in the world and reached a stalemate in the meaninglessness of the reasons behind the states' engagement with such ambitions. For Yalman, the things that devour human beings always came from a lack of will and unconsciousness. Also, being human and remaining human have should not be so difficult. Yalman continued to share, write and think about this experience with his readers in his article titled "Embedded Journalism among the Clouds (*Bulutlar Arasında Harp Muhabirliği*)."

(Yalman, 1970a, pp. 227-228)

Yalman's adventures in his early journalistic life seemed like they were pre-conceived so that he could make comparisons between his ideas about the world. He was first sent to the West as a war correspondent and thus had the opportunity to analyze the West. Later, he went to the East and had the opportunity to see the difference between the Easts. Yalman expresses his comparison based on this adventure with a metaphor as follows:

I started to understand the difference between serving as a war correspondent on the Western front and serving in the East. In the West, they gave people a guide, a channel, and found it natural to help them reach their destination as soon as possible. I was left here in the East, to my luck (Yalman, 1970a, p. 234).

Although Yalman interprets Turkey as an East or West Country, he does not intend to leave his country to its fate; he never hesitated to guide the people of his country.

Yalman sees journalism as a profession to guide and as a profession with a mission to criticize deteriorated works and try to improve them. This longing for the struggle that swelled in him could only be satisfied when he started working as the editor-in-chief of the *Sabah* newspaper. He believed that he could use what he learned in the United States for the good of the country in this way. Yalman interprets the transition from the *Tanin* newspaper to the *Sabah* newspaper as starting a real journalism life. As a result, Yalman's early journalistic life slowly ends during these years (Yalman, 1970a, p. 260).

As soon as he starts working for the *Sabah* newspaper, he does not compromise his oppositional personality. However, it is not possible to criticize the CUP policies and to follow the opposite path of the government. Being aware that it was challenging to criticize the government, Yalman wrote his articles with great care. He is in constant contact with Ziya Gökalp. His articles, in which he criticizes the government's economic policies, arouse significant repercussions. People are satisfied with these articles. The *Sabah* newspapers sales are also increasing gradually. All these are positive signs for Yalman's journalism career (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 266-267).

However, although Yalman was a staunch opponent, he still takes care not to stray from his impartiality. While criticizing the policies that should be criticized, he does not ignore the difficulties experienced at that time. Yalman is always aware of the difficulties experienced, especially during the war. It acknowledges the achievements achieved through these difficulties. Even in those years, he avoids being a blind competitor (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 275-276). In addition, Yalman's importance to modernization shows itself once again in these years. Yalman greatly appreciated the country's initiation of some reform movements in those years (Yalman, 1970a, p. 276). Among these reform movements, the most important thing is to prepare the ground for the separation of religion and state affairs (Yalman, 1970a, p. 278). Since those years, the importance of placing reform movements on a secular ground has been of great importance for Yalman. Putting the reforms on a liberal and secular line makes that reform meaningful for Yalman. According to Yalman, one of the most significant reforms that started during the war was the reforms made for women. Reforms that modernized this kind of society are essential for Yalman in breaking the chains of fanaticism (Yalman, 1970a, p. 280).

While Yalman appreciated the reform movements during the war years, he also could not ignore the functioning of the institutions in the country. Corruption was abundant during the war years. The government of the time had an inefficient working style, so people had no choice but to fall into despair. However, Yalman saw the Turkish Red Crescent (*Türk Kızılayı*) as an institution that could be considered as an example not only for Turkey but for the whole world. According to Yalman, the Turkish Red Crescent was real hope for Turkey. This success of the institution, he attributed to the well-established meritocracy system in the institution. At that time, a liberalized institution based on meritocracy was a severe source of hope for Yalman. Yalman

shows the Turkish Red Crescent between 1914-1924 as an exemplary institution in terms of Turkish bureaucracy (Yalman, 1970a, p. 282).

Yalman's journalism career reaches a new breaking point at 29. Yalman had now decided to publish his newspaper, which is the *Vakit*. He had more moral capital than the material capital he put into this work. He started journalism during the period of despotism. After the proclamation of the Constitutional Monarchy, he was editor-in-chief in the *Yeni* newspaper. He held a doctorate in sociology and history in the United States and did an internship at the Columbia School of Journalism. He spoke three languages. While working at the *Tanin* newspaper, he had a reputation that he gained as a war correspondent. He brought together fifteen thousand readers on his own as the editor of the *Sabah* newspaper (Yalman, 1970a, pp. 293-294). Yalman had a pretty bright career for a teenager looking at his career. However, Yalman was so far from the entrepreneurial spirit that he could not even think of how he would profit from the newspaper he was going to publish. The only thing he thought was to be his boss, to freely oppose evil and corruption, thanks to the newspaper he was going to publish. The tendency to act individually and liberally started to manifest itself in these years of his professional life.

The expected success came in a short time. Harsher propaganda against corruption was conducted in the *Vakit* newspaper than in the *Sabah* newspaper, and it had its effect in a short time. The *Vakit* newspaper became well-liked and sought after the newspaper of the last years of the war. (Yalman, 1970a, p. 297).

Indeed, he also never refrained from criticizing the government's policies in his newspaper. His pen was again ruthless as always. He did not consider the primary source of danger to the country as external enemies; he held the Sultanate position

responsible for this. In his editorial titled "Inopportune Arson (*Mevsimsiz Kundakçılık*)," he addresses Mehmed VI Vahideddin as follows:

Some forget that we are in the face of national dangers. They do not embrace the country's concern; they run after their passions and class interests; they want to continue the evils of the Union and Progress under other masks. Whoever they are, those who do these are arsonists who oppose the national existence (Yalman, 1970a, p. 315).

As can be seen, Yalman emphasizes that the most critical obstacle for the country's liberation was the sultanate position. He argues that the traces of the oppressive policies of the CUP are still being continued, and he predicts that this continuity would cause significant damage to the country. In his writings, he talks about the need to change the mentality. He mentions that a free welfare environment in the country cannot be possible without changing the mentality rather than the individuals.

While Yalman criticizes the sultan, he criticizes Ahmet Rıza Bey, with whom he has no close ties due to the past, with an article he wrote at that time. In his article titled "Everybody Goes Forward, We Go Back (*Herkes İleri, Biz Geri*)," he criticizes Ahmet Rıza Bey's involvement in the sultan's despotism and says the following:

We cannot waste time trying. We are faced with two possibilities. Either we live by protecting our independence, or we live like slaves in our lands, under the rule of a government with no name, divided into foreign economic spheres of influence. The most upsetting point among the negligence that has taken place recently is the role played by Ahmet Rıza Bey. Ahmet Rıza Bey has made his way to a spiritual silence with his last actions. Tomorrow, Ahmet Rıza Bey's name will be referred to as one of today's responsible. Our only

hope is that Ahmet Rıza Bey understands his mistake and returns from the wrong way (Yalman, 1970a, p. 316).

Although Yalman did not sympathize with Ahmet Rıza, he did not find it suitable for Ahmet Rıza to stand next to the sultan, as he knew his stance against despotism during his reign Abdulhamid. The fact that Ahmet Rıza contradicts his ideas in the Meşveret newspaper has been unacceptable for Yalman. In addition, it is a fundamental issue for Yalman that the country is economically, completely independent, and free from external influences. He emphasizes self-determination as well as the end of despotism. Naturally, Yalman becomes the number one enemy of Mehmed VI Vahideddin due to his harsh writings at that time (Yalman, 1970a, p. 317).

Although Yalman refused to support the mandate in this article, he was later accused of supporting the mandate. He put forward the idea of cooperation with the United States with his article titled "Future Thoughts (*İstikbal Düşünceleri*)," published in the November 30, 1918, and 1 December 1, 1918 issues of the *Vakit* newspaper. During the transition to democracy in 1945, Yalman was criticized from the single-party front for defending the American mandate. However, Yalman claims that he has never favored the mandate. On the contrary, he states that he opposes those who want the American mandate. The ideas he put forward in his writings are as follows:

Without jeopardizing the independence rights of the state and being under the auspices of a foreign state, we should call on foreign experts to cooperate in our reform movements, and we should choose these experts from America, which has never had harmful intentions about us (Yalman, 1970a, p. 323).

As can be seen, what Yalman meant by cooperation with the United States was genuine cooperation; he rejected the idea of mandate and wanted to strengthen reforms. Instead, he predicted that reform movements should be based on a more solid foundation with the support of American experts. This idea put forward by Yalman was later expressed at the Sivas Congress, and it was stated that cooperation with a foreign state should be ensured. Although the word "America" is not used directly in the Sivas Congress, this is what is meant.

During these years, Yalman's harsh opposition was a harbinger of the exile that approached step by step. In those years, the abolition of the parliament was on the agenda. He reacted very harshly to the government's move, fearing that it would endanger democracy. Here are his articles on the dissolution of the parliament and censorship on December, 23:

With the dissolution of the assembly, it can be easily predicted where the road taken will lead. The results are temporary. Even the oppressions of Union and Progress turned against them. Any and every violence necessarily creates counter-violence. Under today's conditions, what we need is the reason, caution, and prudence, not ambition and heedlessness. This incapable government should withdraw, and a government that will consider the national interest and act accordingly should come into its place (Yalman, 1970a, p. 336).

Yalman openly invites the current government to resign in this article. He mentions that the government is in heedlessness, and he states that the competence to govern the country no longer exists.

It is not surprising that Yalman, who made such harsh opposition, was sent into exile. However, even when Yalman learns this unpleasant news, he welcomes it with excitement and interprets this development as an important event for his journalism. Being sent into exile means a new adventure for him. He is excited, even happy, to spend time with other intellectuals in exile. His passion for the journalism profession is so deep that it is difficult to understand and explain. Undoubtedly, the years he will spend in exile will not be lost for Yalman. Indeed, it has not happened.

4.5. Years of Exile

It soon becomes clear that Yalman will be exiled to Kütahya. He has already convinced himself that this exile will be a crucial breaking moment for his journalistic life. Yalman's optimism is strong in this regard, as in many other issues (Yalman, 1970b, p. 9).

He again underlines that he is against the mandate in his article titled "Mandate and Independence (*Manda ve İstiklâl*)," published in the *Vakit* newspaper on June, 7.

Highlights from his article are as follows:

No nation that knows itself will give up independence by its own will. It is suicide to seek protection from another state. We must prevail in our destiny and take measures ourselves to gain access to the spirit of the times. Our goals should be the following. We must establish a stable and efficient state administration. We should not allow foreign intervention. We should facilitate the relations of our citizens with the state. Thus, we make all kinds of private enterprises attractive. We must provide an atmosphere of trust to foreign investors and make significant investments possible. The Turkish Nation can never be subject to the mandate system envisaged by the League of Nations.

We know our shortcomings. We, ourselves, choose guides and experts to show us how to overcome these shortcomings. By choosing these guides from America, which is not demanding in our land, we show our goodwill to the whole world. It is no shame to admit our shortcomings in front of the world. With a reform movement based on America's experienced experts, we can quickly outstrip all our neighbors (Yalman, 1970b, pp. 21-22).

With these statements, Yalman sees the country's liberation in the liberal economy. Creating a far from statism and attractive to foreign investors should have been one of the first steps that should be made a priority for Turkey. As can be seen from this article, he once again stated his insistence on getting support from American experts. Yalman is also aware of the shortage of experts in the country at this point. Underlining the Western and modernizing reform movements at every opportunity, Yalman brings his readers together with the description of a liberal Turkey he dreams of. Also, in an article titled "The Liability of the Future (*İstikbalin Mesuliyeti*)," published in the *Vakit* newspaper, he wrote the following words in parallel with those views:

We need love and help, not punishment. Along with internal difficulties, foreign intrigues have significantly impacted our current situation. We need to be supported by foreign aid to recover ourselves and be an element of peace in the Near East (Yalman, 1970b, p. 50).

Yalman's exile life continues with Malta. During exile in Malta, he had the opportunity to stay together with many important names of the period and had the chance to communicate with many different people from many different professions. Sharing the exile period with the distinguished intellectuals, statesmen, and

professionals from professional life, he took a photograph of the Turkey of those years. He has been in close contact with different portraits. He had the opportunity to mingle with people from many different ideologies and views. By this means, he could penetrate the country's most influential intellectuals' mentality closely. It is an important opportunity for a journalist. Therefore, for Yalman, the years of exile in Malta were not so full of frustration and sorrow. As with every painful breaking point in his life, he managed to get out of this turning point by getting stronger and finding himself. Therefore, it would not be correct to describe Yalman's exile as lost years.

4.6. The Remnants of the Exile

After returning to Turkey after the exile in Malta, Yalman eagerly wants to practice journalism again. He even rejected the "Directorate General of Press and Information" position after he returned to the country. He states that he wants to serve his country as a journalist. As soon as he returns to the country, he stays in Istanbul for only two days and wants to go to Ankara and see the national struggle of those years from the front (Yalman, 1970b, p. 226). On his return from Malta, his closeness to the national struggle continues. He toured Ankara and the cities behind the front lines, did interviews, and supported the national struggle in his writings. Instead of dysfunctional Ottoman institutions, he became aside to the Republican regime, which emphasizes the people's will, the national will. In Yalman's attitude, the hope that the Republic would move along a liberal line based on the individual, fundamental rights, and freedoms may have played a role. It can be said that the establishment of the Republic was followed by a more liberal period compared to the last period of the empire (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 116).

The first article Yalman wrote after returning from Malta appeared on November 4, 1921, with "Return to Homeland (*Vatana Dönüş*).\" After describing his hellish life in the Maltese prison in his article, he continues:

During the endless sleepless nights, we were asking ourselves: Will it be possible for us to say that these torments have passed one day, to treat them as a fearful dream, to regain the homeland? Now, this lovely day has come. Everything was left behind, far away. The lessons we have learned from torture, which has taken nearly two years, are to deeply grasp the terrible meaning of the homeland's deprivation and instill in our minds the need to sacrifice everything for the sake of a national homeland. The gift to us from being exiled to Malta is a stronger homeland devotion (Yalman, 1970b, p. 229).

His thoughts in his article titled "Solid Foundation (*Sağlam Temel*)," on November 5, 1921, are as follows:

This country, whose death was expected by many, has overcome terrible difficulties. From now on, it would not be reasonable to return to the old loose and vicious bureaucratic procedures and a half-measure mentality. Due to our determined and knowledgeable principles, and we have become worthy of it. There is no old misery for us anymore. There is only national unity (Yalman, 1970b, p. 229).

As can be seen from Yalman's writings after his return from Malta, his years in Malta returned to him as a stronger devotion to the homeland. Its emphasis on national consciousness and national unity is also worth seeing. He does not hesitate to highlight his nationalist identity while maintaining his liberal line in his writings. In

addition, one of Yalman's main concerns, the flaws of the Turkish bureaucracy, can be understood from his writings. From the very beginning, it advocates meritocracy and a properly functioning bureaucratic system as one of the principles of a healthy democracy.

Yalman, in an article published in the *Vakit* newspaper dated January 13, 1922, under the heading on "While Leaving Ankara (*Ankara'dan Ayrılırken*)," mentions his impressions about Ankara as follows:

I have completed my schedule for Ankara. I visit the front, the back of the front, the western front, the railway organization in Konya, Adana, and Mersin. I reluctantly leave Ankara, preparing a new fate for the Turkish nation. If my duty allowed me, I would have liked to stay here until the end of the struggle and breathe the good air.

... After I came to Ankara, I saw with my own eyes that there is an environment of freedom of thought to criticize the inadequacies. Few invaded countries have had the opportunity to create such a comfortable discussion environment (Yalman, 1970b, pp. 284-286).

Yalman once again emphasizes the importance of free thought in this article. It is a remarkable awareness for Yalman to show tolerance to different opinions even during the war. Yalman undoubtedly attributes the most critical role in bringing this awareness to the society to Mustafa Kemal. It is a hopeful development for the national struggle that he gladly expressed that such an atmosphere of free thought prevails in Ankara. Yalman constantly segregates Mustafa Kemal from other leaders. He distinguishes Mustafa Kemal from these leaders and praises his political acumen

and political skills, emphasizing how corrupt leaders can bring disasters to their country when they abuse their power (Yalman, 1970b, pp. 303-305).

Yalman also reveals his ideas on making reforms after the national struggle is over. His views on westernization and modernization are pretty straightforward. He thinks that Turks cannot fully understand the West and cannot grasp the meaning of change. He argues that the root of the problem is the Turks' inability to understand themselves fully. According to Yalman, our national characteristics bore us, and we want to get away from ourselves and look like someone else in everything. It does not seem right, according to him. The underlying reason for modernization should not be the desire to be appreciated. He thinks that we consume foreign works for this reason (Yalman, 1970b, p. 312).

Yalman not only stated his intention for reform movements after the end of the national struggle but also talked about the encouragement of foreign capital to come to the country in his article "Cleaning in Economic Affairs (*İktisadi İşlerde Temizlik*)." For Yalman, making the country an attractive place for foreign investors was a point to be emphasized. He believed that this way, the country would achieve economic prosperity (Yalman, 1970b, pp. 318-319). In addition, on September 1, in his article titled "The Second Conquest (*İkinci Fetih*)," he enthusiastically spoke about the victory of the war. In this article, he expressed the joy of this victory against the imperialist powers by mentioning the joy of the whole Turkish and Muslim world with all his national feelings. However, the point he underlines is hidden between the lines: the victories achieved so far must gain meaning with the reforms that will be made next (Yalman, 1970b, pp. 328-329).

4.7. The Republican Period

The chapters of this study so far have been written to give the readers an idea about Ahmet Emin Yalman's early life, the early stages of his journalism career, the formation process of his intellectual identity, his way of perceiving the world, and his interaction with the public sphere. It has been tried to focus on the reasons affecting the development of Yalman's liberal ideas and how his thoughts evolved. It has been tried to underline the reasons underlying Yalman's intellectual thoughts and writings are essential during the transition to multi-party system in Turkish political life.

Before moving on to Yalman's thoughts on the transition to the multi-party system in Turkey, which is the main subject of this study, photographs of the essential breaking points in Yalman's life were tried to be taken. It is the most reasonable way to penetrate Yalman's liberal pen and intellectual structure.

Newspapers dated January 21, 1923, reported that the People's Party² would be established. Yalman greeted the news with concern. Yalman was worried that this news was not the birth of party life in the country. Yalman was aware that this was a natural process for Turkey, which wanted to move forward on the path of democracy, but as the opposition, he was worried about whose side the country's savior would stand on. Therefore, Yalman did not think it would be an actual democratic move if such a party was established. Yalman interpreted this situation as the beginning of a one-party system. Such a breakthrough was not a real breakthrough in the name of democratic life for Yalman. He received information from Ankara to address his concerns, but this was not enough to relieve Yalman's concerns. The fact that the prime minister of the time, Rauf Bey, and many patriotic personalities were among

² The RPP was founded under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk on September 9, 1923, under the "People's Party" name. In 1924 and after 1935, it was renamed as "Republican People's Party" (*Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası* and after "*Partisi*") (chp.org.tr, 2021).

the founders of this party was not something Yalman liked. During his visit to Ankara on January 28, Yalman expressed the following views in his article titled "The Nation Needs a Guide (*Millet Rehberine Muhtaçtır*)," in the *Vakit* newspaper:

Political parties represent opposite ideas and interests. However, we do not need different ideas and interests; there must be a trend regarding the country's shared interests. If the aim is to walk together on this path, a national bloc should be established under the guidance of Atatürk, and being talked of by political parties should never be taken into account. Mustafa Kemal Pasha is not a party leader; he should be ahead of the state to follow in his footsteps. He is the head of a political party may cause us to be disoriented. A political party and the whole nation should rely on him as a savior leader. Mustafa Kemal should remain a guide to all of us, the guardian of the country's interests and the continuity of the newly established political parties, and an arbitrator to be listened to with interest (Yalman, 1970c, pp. 25-26).

In an article published in the *Vakit* newspaper on January 9, Yalman once again strongly opposes Atatürk's taking the title of political party leader.

Those interested in the country's development cannot think of two separate study programs. It is not the time to part our ways, especially for Mustafa Kemal, a national guide, to take sides. There are significant drawbacks that the political party separation has already begun. Only and only under the guidance of Mustafa Kemal, a national work block can provide us with the enlightenment needed for a thorough reform path (Yalman, 1970c, p. 26).

Yalman continues the same issue on January 16, with the following words:

Mustafa Kemal Pasha should turn the title of "savior" into "founder" and establish a national work bloc that includes all patriotists and take the lead as a national guide. Only then will the fate of the country enter into a peaceful and soundness path (Yalman, 1970c, p. 26).

Yalman's main concern at this point was not the transformation of Mustafa Kemal into a dictatorship but the fear of polarization that would occur as a result of the establishment of a political party in a newly established country. There was no personal enmity between Yalman and the founding cadres of the People's Party, especially Mustafa Kemal at that time. He wanted Mustafa Kemal to be a supra-political figure, not the leader of a political party. According to Yalman, Mustafa Kemal should always have the title of conciliatory, unifying, and founding leader. In addition, he did not find the possibility of establishing another political party that could oppose a political party led by Mustafa Kemal realistic. The possibility of harming the transition to democracy in the following years could have been created. According to Yalman, Mustafa Kemal was an influential figure and an effective leader. Therefore, it was complicated to establish another party opposing the political party he led. Therefore, at least for now, the status quo should be preserved; Mustafa Kemal should organize a national bloc, not a political party. Yalman argued that both democracies would be strengthened, and reforms would be implemented faster in this way.

Yalman's thoughts about not deviating from the status quo at specific points can also be understood by looking at the discussions on the abolition of the caliphate. Despite having a secular worldview, Yalman, like many, was among those who were surprised by the proposal for the abolition of the caliphate (Yalman, 1970c, p. 29).

Yalman's main concern here is a mind-based rather than a religion-based one.

Considering the possibility of failure of subsequent revolutions due to public outcry, he worries about such an attempt. It is proof that Yalman acts pragmatically and according to the realities of the day rather than being principled. Yalman expressed this situation with these words: "We could have given the same reaction as a Catholic community to the mention of the abolition of the Papacy. We were surprised."
(Yalman, 1970c, p. 29)

Despite all these reservations and concerns, Yalman did not act negatively against all the events in the first years of the Republic. The People's Party was established, and the party program was drafted. The party aimed to guide the establishment of national sovereignty and raise Turkey into a modern state ultimately. In the meeting held in the Assembly on August 9, 1923, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was appointed as the President of the Assembly, Ali Fuat Cebesoy Pasha was appointed as the Vice President. Yalman had gone to Ankara to attend the opening of the new Parliament. In his article titled "Future Preparations (*İstikbal Hazırlıkları*)," on Fethi Bey's candidacy for the prime minister, there are the following lines:

Fethi Bey takes on an essential responsibility when the foundation of a new future is established. Those who know him well do not hesitate to believe that he is adept in such a responsibility. Fethi Bey has broad views, a determination that needs to be examined before deciding on an issue, and ideas of freedom based on a sincere belief. He has thoroughly grasped the meanings of progress and development... (Yalman, 1970c, p. 71).

Yalman had already started to have sincere feelings about Fethi Bey, who will play a key role in transitioning to multi-party system. These ideas are crucial in this respect.

Yalman, on the other hand, continued to express his discomfort over Mustafa Kemal's leadership of the political party; according to him, Mustafa Kemal should have been a nonpartisan figure. In his article titled "Some Essential Points (*Bazı Esaslı Noktalar*)," on September 27, he says:

The presidency has duties along with its powers. One of them is that the head of state remains outside and above party gossip. During the foundation of the People's Party, we defended this view fervently. We put forward why Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who is the natural President of the state, should not interfere with the party life. When Pasha accepted the journalists in Izmit the other day, he said: 'The aim is not to be a Partisanship. An extensive national development program will be carried out. Party discipline is needed for the implementation of this program.' This promise had good sides. We made a pause our objections and waited for the events to develop. Unfortunately, partisanship has not developed in Izmit, as mentioned (Yalman, 1970c, pp. 77-78).

Yalman did not have much of a concern that Mustafa Kemal would evolve into a dictatorship up to this point. However, it is understood that one of Yalman's central reservations started to be because a political party that Mustafa Kemal will lead will inevitably become a single totalitarian party. Yalman feared that true democracy would be neglected. On the other hand, he believed that Mustafa Kemal could play a role in Turkey as a national guide over parties and lead a multi-party regime. At the same time, Yalman had confidence in Mustafa Kemal that he, who played the role of a national guide, would complete secularism and blend reforms with a proper understanding of religion. Yalman claimed that in the following years, he was

justified. Yalman tried to legitimize his arguments in this matter by saying that he had won the enmity of those around Mustafa Kemal (Yalman, 1970c, p. 78).

Yalman went further in this struggle and wrote a letter to Mustafa Kemal with the title "Request to His Excellency Gazi Pasha (*Gazi Paşa Hazretlerine Maruzat*)," in the *Vatan* newspaper on October 5. In this letter, Yalman writes how harmful it would be to gather the party chairmanship and presidency; on the one hand, the manipulations of the fraudsters around Mustafa Kemal and that Mustafa Kemal should be the guide for reforms (Yalman, 1970c, pp. 81-85).

Mustafa Kemal welcomes Yalman's article with tolerance and pleasure. However, the People's Party was eventually established. Undoubtedly, the establishment of this political party does not please Yalman. The lack of consensus within this political party does not give Yalman confidence, and Yalman's hopes for democracy gradually begin to wane.

Needless to say, this is not the only criticism of Yalman towards Atatürk. On the other hand, he complains that Atatürk, as the national guide, did not cooperate closely with the media in Istanbul. According to Yalman, the ability of the press to fulfill its duties in an environment of freedom of expression is vital for the country's transition to a multi-party system. Yalman states that Atatürk is deficient in providing this environment (Yalman, 1970c, p. 105).

For Yalman, a single-party system is not a party in the true sense of the word, but a road to dictatorship (Yalman, 1970c, p. 132). On the other hand, Mustafa Kemal emphasized that the country is not yet ready for the transition to a multi-party system. Mustafa Kemal thought that the People's Party, as a single party, would carry out the reform program on behalf of the nation and that a new era would begin after the

nation fully adopted these reforms. Yalman interprets these views of Mustafa Kemal as practical and easy to defend but with weak foundations. Yalman has been advocating from the beginning is not the idea of a sudden transition to a multi-party system. Yalman favored establishing a national working bloc for the realization of reforms, and if such a step had been taken, the talk of political parties would not have been talked about. If a political party was to be established, other political parties had to be formed against it. In short, Yalman said all or nothing. He saw this system only as a dysfunctional democracy (Yalman, 1970c, p. 133).

The visit of former Prime Minister Rauf Bey and former Vice President of the Grand National Assembly Dr. Adnan Bey to Ahmet Emin Yalman in mid-October 1924 is an issue that needs to be addressed. This visit was necessary for the following reasons. Rauf Bey and Dr. Adnan Bey were preparing to enter an attempt to establish a new political party. Their purpose in visiting Yalman was to offer Yalman cooperation. They wanted Yalman to join them, and besides that, they hoped that the *Vatan* newspaper would become the press and media organ of the new political party to be established. Yalman refused this offer. In Yalman's understanding, a journalist should have been a person outside of politics; if he became an instrument of politics, his journalism would come to a complete stop. Yalman wants to live and die if and only as a journalist. On the other hand, Yalman, while Mustafa Kemal was still the chairman of a political party, did not consider the existence of a new political party to be established very functional. Therefore, he did not lean towards the idea of a new political party being established (Yalman, 1970c, pp. 139-141). Although Yalman says that a journalist should stay away from politics, he will be a journalist who is at the very center of politics as the fifth name of the DP in the following years. His

principles conflicted with the interests of that day; ultimately he had to decide according to his interests.

Even İsmet İnönü expected Yalman to join the new party to be established and make his newspaper their press organ. However, when Yalman remained objective and impartial, İnönü was quite surprised by this situation. Yalman then assured İnönü that he would remain objective and impartial at all times (Yalman, 1970c, p. 144).

However, to what extent Yalman maintained this permanent neutrality is a matter of debate.

In an article entitled "Mustafa Kemal of Turkey (*Türkiye'nin Mustafa Kemal'i*)," published on November 21, Yalman reiterated that Mustafa Kemal should be a nonpartisan figure. He adds the following in his article dated November 22.

The issue is based on mutual respect in our political life, whether a typical system will be established. Judging by the writings of some individuals belonging to the inner circle of the People's Party, it will be necessary to expect an arbitrary administration to come with all its negative consequences (Yalman, 1970c, pp. 151-152).

In the relatively liberal early periods of the Republic, liberal opponents founded the PRP (Zürcher, 1995, pp. 245-246). This party, which is a progressive, republican, but on the other hand, a more liberal policy in politics and economy, is soon surrounded by conservative anti-regime groups. At this point, the complex relationship of liberals with religion comes to the fore. Although progressives are not fundamentally anti-regime, they become the center of attraction and opposition of anti-regime groups due to the principle that "our party respects religious beliefs." After the 1925 Sheikh Said Rebellion, the PRP was abolished, and a more authoritarian management approach

was adopted with Law for the Maintenance of Public Order (*Takrir-i Sükûn Kanunu*) (Zürcher, 2003). On the other hand, Yalman and his newspaper, the *Vatan*, had a critical attitude towards the authoritarian policy after the Sheikh Said Rebellion. This attitude resulted in the trial of Yalman and his co-partner Ahmet Şükrü Esmer at the Elazığ an Independence Tribunal. Although the court released these two journalists, the *Vatan* newspaper was closed. All in all, the *Vatan* newspaper, which Yalman founded by leaving the *Vakit* newspaper on March 26, 1923, was closed indefinitely six months after the Law for the Maintenance of Public Order. The main reason for the newspaper's closure is that Yalman did not write an article criticizing the PRP administrators (Tezcan, 2007, pp. 175-180). As a result, he was tried and acquitted in the Independence Court. However, after this incident, he had to bid farewell to journalism for ten years.

Thus, a period of silence begins for both liberal thoughts and Yalman. In order to consolidate the revolutions, all kinds of opposition were silenced in this period, and this period lasted until the establishment of a liberal party that would propose liberal economic policies after the 1929 Great Depression. In 1930, the FRP was founded by a group of Kemalist cadres (Yetkin, 1982). Among them, especially Fethi Okyar and Ahmet Ağaoğlu should be mentioned. When Yalman was banned from journalism, Fethi Bey made an offer to Yalman to work with him and even said that he could get permission from Atatürk to return to the profession. However, Yalman rejected this offer without hesitation. Yalman did not like Fethi Bey's attitude. Yalman thought that Fethi Bey should be more patient, measured, and principled. According to Yalman, Fethi Bey should not have fought so quickly to seize power at once. Fethi Bey lost himself in the race for power also harmed democracy (Yalman, 1970c, pp. 212-213).

Founded under the chairmanship of Fethi Okyar, the party aims to strengthen local governments, encourage private enterprise and liberalize foreign trade. They oppose the state's initiation of an economic enterprise if the private sector can do it. The other important name of the party, Ağaoğlu, while a politician who advocated statist policies until that day, adopted liberal politics during the FRP period. It strongly opposes the economic policies followed by the RPP (Coşar, 2004, pp. 74-76). However, the FRP is shut down by its founders as it has become the focus of conservatives or anti-regimes (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 117).

Just as the liberal opening in the Republic's early years ended with the Law for the Maintenance of Public Order in 1925, the FRP initiative created a new authoritarian wave in the opposite direction of what was desired. Because the FRP and the Menemen Incident that took place in the same period caused a depression in the Kemalists (Ahmad, 1993, p. 60). The Kemalist revolutionaries, seeing that the reforms have not yet settled even in the Western provinces, realize that ideological devices (Althusser, 1994, pp. 33-34) must be used alongside the state's means of repression to create legitimacy and a base of social support for the revolution. Thus, the new regime is introduced to the public through tools such as religious affairs, community centers, and printing law. This process requires the establishment of religion, family structure, education model, and media sector compatible with the regime (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 118).

In this oppressive period, where the regime is threatened, Yalman has to continue his mandatory break from the journalism profession. Between 1925 and 1935, he had to do other jobs for ten years. During the years Yalman was unable to work as a journalist, he has provided a substantial commercial success as Goodyear's Turkey distributor (Tezcan, 2007, pp. 185-188). After meeting Atatürk by chance at a dinner

in 1936, he returned to journalism and became a co-partner in the *Tan* newspaper in return for his promise not to write against the regime. After a three-month adventure in the *Tan* newspaper, Yalman returns to his journalism life by founding the *Vatan* newspaper again (Kalkan, 2018, pp. 30-31).

Indeed, it is seen that Yalman was more cautious in his articles about the new regime during this period. His book "Realizing Dream," written on the fifteenth anniversary of the Republic, begins as follows:

... This dream seemed far, far away at that time. Nevertheless, the Turkish nation found a genius guide like Atatürk and realized the distant dream. In this way, our nation not only had the opportunity to dominate its destiny and make it suitable for high standards. As it has opened new paths in every period of history, it has reached a position to open new paths to humanity today. In order to complete this historical role, Atatürk has shown us the highest ideals. It is a natural duty of every Turkish citizen to try to make every stage of our life compatible with these ideals (Yalman, 1938, p. 4).

However, Yalman is not content with writing them. Later in the book, he tries to harmonize Kemalism and liberalism. Before the book was written in 1938, those close to the statist, corporatist ideology of the RPP were removed from the party and the country administration by Atatürk. It is claimed that the Kemalist regime will gain a liberal character after Celal Bayar is appointed prime minister. With this mentality, Yalman claims that opening the way for critical thinking in the political sphere will be in favor of the regime (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 118):

Members of the great Turkish family never lose sight of the point of departure from fifteen years ago. They give full credit to the jobs that cannot be

achieved. However, those who adopt the regime cannot accept their duty as merely praising what has been done and making it shines. They cannot leave the role of criticizing and seeking the better for those who remain outside the regime, as it was in the realm of the old system of civicism and politics. Positive criticism; should be one of the mechanisms operating within the regime (Yalman, 1938, p. 36).

Yalman's effort to give Kemalism liberal content is also seen in his criticism of statism and bureaucracy. While he describes the republic as a dream come true, he also describes the project of the republic that he hopes will come true. In this project, a liberal human resources policy based on meritocracy should be adopted (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 119). In his sentences, on the other hand, he emphasizes the essence of meritocracy:

However, to progress in such a gentle and challenging condition, no sake, heart, personal influence should be involved in any way, and only the measure of the country and meritocracy and service should be taken as a basis. The slightest denial of this essence, the most superficial effort of friendship, and a tendency to patronage can disrupt the equilibrium (Yalman, 1938, p. 94).

Thus, after inculcating a more efficient division of labor in political and economic life, he underlines reduce paperwork, and the state economic enterprises need to operate within a free market logic (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 119):

Suppose the slow movements of stationery and the inefficient centralization system are finally over and a broad spirit of safety, a collected authority, and responsibility is put into the public life. In that case, the tremendous burden on the machine will be lifted. Thanks to the rational technique, it is possible to

work with fewer people and to give everyone a satisfying salary (Yalman, 1938, p. 95).

... As for the enterprises operating with the state capital, their success depends on the fact that they are regarded as a commercial field, not a state office. Only in this way can these institutions work efficiently, reduce the cost, and increase the power of the money received by the salary holders. If we want the success of these on behalf of the country and ourselves, we should aim not to turn them into stationery but to make state mechanisms similar to commercial enterprises (Yalman, 1938, p. 96).

However, the project of the re-liberalization of the Kemalist regime ends with the death of Atatürk. Just one day after the death of Atatürk, on November 11, 1938, İsmet İnönü was unanimously elected as the president by the Grand National Assembly. Immediately after İnönü was elected president, Atatürk was declared the "Founding and Eternal Leader" of the party, and İnönü the "National Chief" at the RPP Extraordinary Meeting held on December 26. Thus, the "National Chief Period," which will continue until 1946, begins. These titles raise the allegations that İnönü is trying to liken the RPP to the Fascist Party in Italy or the Nazi Party in Germany (Ahmad, 2007, pp. 117-118).

Yalman continues to criticize the authoritarian regime in this period. Between December 5, 1941, and January 18, 1942, he published a series of articles entitled "Towards the Clarity." In these articles, which caused the closure of the *Vatan* newspaper for a while, he criticizes the one-party system. He stated that the republican regime could not be a one-party system in his articles. If there were a one-party system, it would turn into a dictatorship; he suggested the term "people's group"

instead of a party. According to him, political parties represent social classes and differences, and it is not correct to use the term party since these classes have not yet been formed in Turkey. Based on these considerations, it can be said that Yalman is actually against political parties (Demirci, 2018, p. 478). However, Yalman brings the following criticisms as he writes them: According to him, the single-party period's of the RPP is far from a political party; the RPP cannot represent social classes and differences as required by the republican regime. In Yalman's own words:

The name of the Republican People's Party is entirely wrong. It is also suitable for evoking harmful ideas. The party is an expression of separation. However, the People's Party is a national organization that unites us around a national program and national ambitions. What does it mean to give a unifying power a distinctive name?

When there is only one political party, it is felt like another party will come from behind. Our state system is wrongly classified as a dictatorship when this party does not come.

If we do not dare to avoid party mistakes in other countries today openly, and if we do not insist on naming the national organization that we have formed out of necessity as a unifying party instead of a separating name as 'National Republican People's Group,' external forces may come to the following judgment: This system is not yet complete. Since there is only one political party in the system, this system will only be completed when one or more parties are established (Yalman, 1957, pp. 22-23).

Yalman's criticisms of the government during the National Chief Period are not limited to this. It again underlines that there is a regression in freedom of expression

and critical thought, yet progress can only be achieved with positive criticism.

According to Yalman, one of the most important mistakes made in good faith but that needed to be corrected is that an appointment and promotion model based on meritocracy and specialization has still not been adopted. Yalman, in his "Towards Clarity" articles, criticizes the strict secularist policies of the National Chief Period and brings up the liberal-Kemalist understanding of "moderate Islam." Although the Kemalist, liberal, and moderate concepts of Islam are known today as contradictory and conflicting concepts or currents, Yalman provides an interpretation of Islam that does not conflict with the Republican regime and a liberal interpretation of Kemalism that does not conflict with religious values. In this interpretation, he does not neglect to criticize both strict secularism and religious conservatism (Dinçşahin, 2012, pp. 120-122).

... Islam is an auxiliary force in my individual and national struggles. I will not consent to this being abused once again in the hands of bigots, stakeholders, and politicians to blind the light of the mind, arouse passion and create incompetence by cutting the trust in the soul. Islam is not a regressive force; it is a force of revolution. I also include it among the healing and enhancing agents of my revolution (Yalman, 1957, p. 62).

At this point, it is clear that Yalman offers a moderate understanding of Islam that does not conflict with the Republic reforms. Another criticism of the National Chief period is related to the foreign policy followed in this period. Looking at the policies followed during the Second World War, it is seen that İnönü followed a policy aimed at keeping Turkey out of the war, at all costs (Deringil, 1994). However, this policy of "non-belligerent" causes Turkey to change sides according to the course of the war. Hoping that the British and French would win in the first period of the war and refrain

from an Italian or German attack, the government signed an alliance agreement with Britain and France on October 19, 1939, in Ankara. However, at the beginning of the war, the ropes fall into the hands of Germany. This time, a non-aggression pact was signed with Germany on June 18, 1941.

Following this agreement, the government pursues pro-Nazi policies both across the country and in diplomacy. For example, Turkey allows German naval ships to pass secretly through the Straits, despite the 1936 Montreux Straits Convention. Turkey also becomes the largest chrome supplier to the German military industry. Racism becomes a natural element in the design and implementation of government policies. This situation becomes precise with the following words of Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu while announcing his cabinet's program in the Parliament on August 5, 1942: "We are Turkish, we are Turkists and we will always remain Turkists. For us, Turkism is a matter of conscience and culture as much as it is a matter of blood." (Saraçoğlu, 1942, pp. 24-25) During this period, the Turkish government, also influenced by the anti-Semitism of the Nazi regime, enacted various laws against minorities, predominantly the Jewish minority. For example, Turkish non-Muslims were forced to pay incredibly high taxes nonproportional to their income with the Wealth Tax (*Varlık Vergisi*). Those who could not pay the determined taxes were sent to the labor camps in Eastern Anatolia (Akar, 2000). The government issues the Wealth Tax to tax those who gain unfair profit in war conditions. However, this tax only targets minority groups in Turkey, predominantly the Jewish minority. Tax commissions, which determine the tax each citizen will pay, define three ethnic categories: Muslims, non-Muslims, and apostasies. Non-Muslims and apostasies are obliged to pay higher taxes than Muslims (Aktar, 1999). They were obliged to work in these camps until 1943 when the Wealth Tax was abolished. The camps were closed

after the Soviets defeated the Nazi army at Stalingrad (Ahmad, 2007, p. 121).

However, minorities that cannot pay the Wealth Tax continued to be "unreliable ethnic elements." Wanting to keep minorities under control, the government passes a law requiring the recruitment of non-Muslim men over the age of eighteen (İlmen, 1998, pp. 11-17). These soldiers were sent to the labor battalions. The government was also careful about Ottoman Jews who lived abroad and wanted to immigrate to Turkey. Recent research in the archives of the Prime Ministry shows that thousands of Ottoman Jews were stripped of Turkish citizenship between 1941 and 1943 (Guttstadt, 2006, pp. 50-56).

In addition, there was an increase in the number of pro-Nazi and racist publications in Turkey during these years. Among these publications are *Orhun*, *Atsız*, *Bozkurt*, *Gökbörü*, *Tanrıdağ*, *Çınaraltı*, *Türk Yurdu*, *Millet*, *Bayrak*, *Kızılelma*, *Serdengeçti*, and *Büyük Doğu* magazines. These journals spread the view that Turkey should cooperate with Nazi Germany in order to unite the Turkish race scattered in the Caucasus and Central Asia (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 124).

In contrast, Yalman adopts an anti-Nazism and anti-racist attitude. He wrote articles criticizing the rise of Nazi influence in Turkey since 1937 in the *Tan* newspaper, of which he is a writer and a co-partner. When he criticizes the pro-Nazi news which published in the *Cumhuriyet* newspaper, the *Cumhuriyet* newspaper editor Yunus Nadi and other the *Cumhuriyet* newspaper writers write articles stating that Yalman is a non-Turkish journalist who converted from Judaism (Köktener, 2005, pp. 56-60). These attitudes evoke the thought that they were indeed under Nazi influence. In the following years, Yalman maintained his anti-Nazi position. After the movie *The Dictator*, which satirizes Hitler, is released, he translates an interview with Charlie Chaplin into Turkish and publishes it in his newspaper. Immediately after the

interview was published in the *Vatan* newspaper on December 7, 1942, the government closed the newspaper for two months. Nazi influence has now spread to a broader environment in Ankara than the Cumhuriyet newspaper. When he criticizes the Wealth Tax, another government action with Nazi influence, he again faces a harsh reaction from the government. After the articles he wrote about the liquidation of the tax, the *Vatan* newspaper was closed indefinitely in 1944 (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 124). Yalman describes that period in his memoirs with the following words:

After an article titled "A Terrible Disturbance (*Berbat Bir Rahatsızlık*)," in the September 25 issue, I wrote two articles titled "How Should the Liquidation Be? (*Tasfiye Nasıl Olmalı?*)," in the issues dated September 26 and 27, 1944... I did not know that touching a delicate subject such as the "Wealth Tax" would mean suicide to the newspaper account. Nevertheless, I took responsibility and wrote without consulting anyone. The government clenched its teeth until the third article was completed. The government waited for the crime to be fully committed and then took action. The newspaper's decision for an indefinite holiday was made on September 30 (Yalman, 1970c, p. 381).

During his time as a journalist, Yalman continued to publish anti-Nazi articles. By publishing the book "The Inner Face of Nazism (*Naziliğin İç Yüzü*)," he announced that everyone should learn about Nazism, which brought such a disaster to the world, and that such movements should be prevented. According to Yalman:

The rise and fall of Nazism are some of the best adventures in history. It is once again proved that a system based on domination, despotism, and hatred cannot survive even under the most favorable conditions, that one day it will collapse, and its tyrants will be overthrown. The German nation paid for its

own Nazi adventure with its existence, unity, and independence. Nations, which tolerated this adventure for years with various narrow calculations, were obliged to pay their negligence by shedding blood with floods, experiencing dangers, depressions, and horrors (Yalman, 1945, p. 112).

Among all these events, perhaps the only development that gives Yalman hope is the opening of the Village Institutes (*Köy Enstitüleri*). In the early years of the Republic, foreign educators are invited to Turkey and present reports on how contemporary educational institutions should be organized as part of the modernization project of the new regime. Among these are the report presented by the famous American educator John Dewey in 1924 (Dewey, 1939) and the report presented in 1933 by his student and one of his intellectual followers, Berly Parker (Parker, 1939). In these reports submitted to the Ministry of Education, American-style liberal education models that show flexibility according to each region's needs and the student's abilities are recommended. The Village Institutes emerge as an institution that considers such local needs and individual differences. Yalman, who visited a village institute named "Çifteler Village Institute" in 1944, published his observations during this visit under the title "Travel to the Turkey of Tomorrow (*Yarının Türkiye'sine Seyahat*).\" Yalman talks about these liberal educational institutions where critical thinking is encouraged, with the following words:

It is the best method to respect the honor and dignity of the people of this country, to leave the responsibility of their actions to themselves, and to be confident that they will choose and do the best action. The old-fashioned blind and harsh discipline paralyzes the pure feelings of the hearts in this country, creates artificial distances between people, leads to injustice and misunderstanding, and awakens resistances and adversities. However, love,

respect for dignity, good treatment, fairness, and equity bind the people of this country, encourage them to do their best, create harmony, unity, and pleasurable cooperation (Yalman, 1944, p. 14).

... "Çifteler Village Institute" has a weekly criticism hour. At this hour, total freedom prevails; there are debate and discussion sessions. Students can freely criticize each other, their teachers, and their principal...

In general, the institute's experience has revealed that the feeling of insecurity, the system of blind obedience, and harsh discipline is an inefficient and unproductive system for the people of this country. Freedom, accessible criticism, equity, mutual respect, act with conviction; they are suitable for the spirit of the Turkish nation and very fruitful assets for this country (Yalman, 1944, p. 17).

For Yalman, education is naturally one of the foremost things. Because, according to him, education was at the beginning of being efficient and conscious in progress.

Therefore, the intellectual war against ignorance started through education has always excited Yalman. Referring to the importance of non-formal and formal education for nations from time to time, Yalman often proved his curiosity to learn new things.

Yalman had the opportunity to study in the best schools of his time and has extensive knowledge and experience about the education system in the West. Yalman closely followed the experience of the Village Institutes, supported this education model, and fully believed that these institutes would represent the future of Turkey. Yalman did not see village institutes as institutions that train only the teachers that Turkey needs. Yalman considered these institutions as an ideal method of raising self-confident

citizens who fulfill the requirements of a democratic state of the law in the conditions of the time (Kalkan, 2018, pp. 73-74).

With the result, it is obvious how he describes the village institutes even based on the words "full freedom, discussion, criticism, equity, mutual respect" that Yalman emphasizes in his writings. Yalman believed that in the village institutes, individuals could ameliorate their ability to express themselves freely and have the opportunity to develop their free thoughts quickly. Seen from this point of view, according to Yalman, village institutes both contributed to the intellectual capital of Turkish society and constituted an origin point for liberal enlightenment.

The beginning of the end of the Village Institutes begins with Turkey's efforts to join the Western bloc. In this process, the Village Institutes enter into a closure process, accused of training left-leaning or even communist students. However, this new process is when new opportunities arise for Yalman. Turkish convergence with the Western bloc began with the Soviets defeating the Germans in Stalingrad on January 31, 1943. The Ankara government turned its face to the Allied Powers again.

Ultimately, Turkey declared war on Japan and Germany on February 23, 1945, while the Red Army approaching 50 km from Berlin and the Allied armies were in Cologne (Ersel, Kuyaş, Oktay, & Tunçay, 2002, p. 68). Thus, İnönü is invited to the United Nations (UN) Conference in San Francisco, Turkey. This development will be a turning point in Yalman's career. As a journalist educated in America and knew this country well, he is requested to be in the Turkish delegation to San Francisco. Thus, the second mandatory break that Yalman gave to journalism comes to an end. On his return from the San Francisco meeting, Yalman writes that he yearned for the newspaper after the mandatory vacation period from September 1944 to March 23, 1945. He shared these impressions in the *Vatan* newspaper and in his book named

"What Did I See in San Francisco? (*San Fransisko'da Neler Gördüm?*)" (Yalman, 1970, p. 5). His impressions of the conference are as follows:

Between April 25 and June 26, I carefully watched the San Francisco Conference, raining news on the newspaper every day. Especially on matters concerning our delegation, I gave great news. However, I never forgot that the world was lost its way, the goals hoped by the Atlantic Pact were lost, and that a system based on the outrageous veto of the great powers, and especially Soviet Russia, would distract attention and provide only limited benefits (Yalman, 1970d, p. 17).

After the San Francisco Conference, it is understood that one of the preconditions for Turkey to join the Western bloc is the transition to a multi-party system. In this respect, the San Francisco Conference is an essential element as an international dynamic in the transition to multi-party system. National Chief İnönü gave the first signals of the transition to multi-party system right after the war on the Western Front officially ended in May 1945. In the celebrations of the Youth and Sports Day on May 19, 1945, he says:

The Turkish nation is entering a new era of work. We are on duty to make continuous moves to complete the material conditions of being an advanced human society, especially its spiritual means, as clearly as possible... As we overcome the shortcomings of war times that require precautionary measures, the principles of democracy will prevail in the political and intellectual life of the country... The Great Assembly will ensure that a country, which has undergone significant reforms in a short time, will not be shaken and that [democracy] will advance further (Cumhuriyet, 20 May 1945).

Yalman, also, was pleased that Turkey had the opportunity to become one of the founding members of the UN. Turkey's signing of the UN constitution as a founder can be interpreted as another international driving force that played a role in transitioning to multi-party system. Yalman often expresses his concern, even his anger, at the totalitarian tendencies of the single-party regime during these years, while also underlining the government's efforts to become democratic, such as becoming one of the founding members of the UN (Yalman, 1970d, p. 7). However, as stated earlier, Yalman had felt rebellious and discontent due to the great powers being given too many concessions, the veto system adopted, and the weight of Russian influence in the organization. Yalman called an international system that included the UN "a world disoriented." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 16)

The intra-regime opposition that gave birth to the DP surfaced in mid-1945, in line with the new democracy movement and İnönü's promise to democratize the political system. The budget negotiations, which began on May 21, demonstrated the presence of fierce opposition in parliament. Names such as Adnan Menderes, Feridun Fikri Düşünsel, Hikmet Bayur, and Emin Sazak strongly opposed the government and criticized the government with harshness that the single-party era was not accustomed to (T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: VII., Toplantı: 2, 1945). First of all, the reactions were concentrated on the following points: increased government debt due to the budget deficit, excessive emissions, the cost of living, the suffering of the poor and especially the civil servants, profiteering, the black market, the inefficiency, and injustice of the tax system. The opponents insistently argued that a new view of life should dominate the administration. Finally, in the budget vote held on May 29, there were three hundred and sixty-eight votes in favor and five votes against. Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes, Refik Koraltan and Fuat Köprülü voted against as the four founders

of the DP. In addition to these four names, there was also Emin Sazak (Eroğul, 1970, p. 9).

Land reform, which had been brought to parliament in January and finally started to be discussed on May 14, led to another opposition demonstration. This time the issue had vital. While recognizing an extensive upper property limit of five thousand acres, the reform draft brought by the government envisaged that up to fifty decares of land could be expropriated to be distributed to landless and less landed people in areas where land is not sufficient. It was article 17 of the bill. There was also article 21, which also stated the following: expropriations would be made in proportion to the value of the tax base, not the actual value. Since it was impossible to oppose the entire bill, the spokespersons of the landowners tried to abolish or at least soften these two articles, which constitute the spirit of the issue. Adnan Menderes was at the head of those who attacked Article 17. Refik Koraltan was conducting the article 21 opposition (Eroğul, 1970, p. 10). They also argued that progress in agriculture would be possible not by making the farmer the landowner but by using modern techniques in agriculture and by adopting mechanization.

In the days when the Law of Providing Land to Farmers (*Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Kanunu*) came out of the National Assembly, four members of the parliament had tabled a motion to the party group. The signatories of this motion, known as the Quartet Motion (*Dörtlü Tahrir*), are İzmir deputy Celal Bayar, Aydın deputy Adnan Menderes, İçel deputy Refik Koraltan and Kars deputy Fuat Köprülü. The first is a banker and economist, the second is a lawyer and a farmer, the third is also a lawyer, and the fourth is a professor (Lewis, 1961, p. 298). The first three, especially Celal Bayar, are prominent figures of Turkish political life. Bayar led the government in 1937-39 and became Atatürk's last prime minister. Fuat Köprülü, on the other hand, is

a famous scientist known for his research in the field of history (Eroğul, 1970, p. 11). These four liberal names within the party express their reactions against the authoritarian nature of the decision-making processes within the party with the motion as mentioned earlier.

The main reason for the rejection of the Quartet Motion is controversial. Two views can be put forward on this issue. According to the first, despite the liberalization directive given by the party chairman in May, the People's Party members had not lost their authoritarian habit of reaction yet. According to the second view, the RPP deliberately acted harshly in order to create an opposition party from within (Karpaz, 1959, p. 146). Both views may have influenced the decision to refuse.

Yalman, with a series of articles titled "An Analysis of Our Political Life (*Siyasi Hayatımızın Bir Tahlili*)," has publicly stated his war on the transition to multi-party system. With this series of 8 articles published in the *Vatan* newspaper, he explained at length why the single-party political system doomed to bankruptcy (Yalman, 1970d, p. 30).

On the other hand, Yalman proudly welcomed the rejection of Russia's demands on Kars, Ardahan, and the Straits by Turkey and mentioned that this was a situation to be proud of in the transition to multi-party system. However, Yalman was criticized by Hüseyin Cahit for these thoughts, on the other hand, the RPP deputy Kılıçoğlu attacked him for his ideas about the transition to multi-party system (Yalman, 1970d, p. 30). During this period, Yalman's struggle continued with journalists on the one hand and politicians on the other hand and in a constantly tense manner.

Yalman interprets Adnan Menderes', and later Fuat Köprülü's speeches criticizing the single-party system in the Parliament on 13 August 1945 as "the first storm of

democracy." (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 31-32) The article titled "Let's Talk Frankly (*Açık Konuşalım*)," by Fuat Köprülü, one of the founders of the DP, which is considered the first open rebellion against a single-party life, was published in the *Vatan* newspaper (Yalman, 1970d, p. 33). It can be considered one of the first severe signs of the rapprochement between Yalman and the DP.

Following the motion, leading figures of the liberal wing, Adnan Menderes, Fuat Köprülü, and Refik Koraltan, are expelled from the party. However, the party administration is hesitant to expel Bayar, one of the most important figures of the national struggle and the Kemalist revolution, from the party. However, the National Chief, who made the opening speech in the Parliament on November 1, 1945, says that the only shortcoming of Turkish democracy is the absence of an opposition party and encourages Bayar to resign from the party and establish an opposition party. Thereupon, Bayar resigned from the party on November 2, 1945, and joined the opposition ranks with the remaining "four" members (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 127).

When Adnan Menderes and Fuat Köprülü were expelled from the RPP for writing an article for the *Vatan* newspaper, Refik Koraltan from the Quadruple Movement joined them with a heated protest in his *Vatan* columns. Celal Bayar resigns from his parliamentary position and prefers to unite with these three friends. Thus, with these four names, the *Vatan* newspaper becomes the front of the opposition's struggle. Yalman focuses on the theme of the renewal of the RPP in this period. Yalman, who has been acting with the opposition within the party for a long time, acts together with Bayar and his friends to establish the new party. Yalman said the following about this unity: "... the *Vatan* newspaper naturally became a single front of struggle. I was fifth out of four and remained that way for years." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 38)

Although Yalman had people he trusted and loved very much on the RPP side, he had long pinned all his hopes on Celal Bayar to establish a check and balance party against the single-party government. There were specific reasons behind these hopes. When Yalman relentlessly struggled against war corruption in the *Vakit* newspaper in 1917, Celal Bey, who was the responsible clerk of the CUP, came to visit Yalman in a three-room administration center in Yerebatan in İzmir. Osmanzade Hamdi Bey was with Bayar. Bayar encouraged Yalman and his friends for their courageous attitude. Yalman maintains his belief and commitment to Bayar with the following words:

Celal Bey assumed dominant roles in economic life by establishing İşbank after the War of Independence. He continued in these roles as an economic assistant. Celal Bey showed an example of systematic and successful work during Atatürk's period, benefited from foreign experts... He was able to evaluate the business and decision-making staff... I applauded his appointment as the Prime Minister in 1937; this kind of hope and reforms will take root in the country (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 38-39).

Yalman's closeness with Celal Bayar and his feelings of trust in him came from here. Yalman was already friends with Fuat Köprülü from the university and the newspaper. He knew Refik Koraltan as the Konya deputy and governor quite well. Nevertheless, he had never met Adnan Menderes. He did not know what role Adnan Menderes played as the Aydın Provincial Chairman of the FRP. He also did not know how Atatürk discovered the value of Menderes. The only thing Yalman heard about Menderes was that he heard from the radio that Menderes was elected as an MP from the RPP after everything was over. However, Adnan Menderes seemed to Yalman a promising passenger of a brand new road. Therefore, he felt the need to meet him closely. They dined and talked for hours in Ankara. Their views were converging on

every issue. Yalman felt in the face of a new, original, energetic force unprecedented in public life. However, despite everything, Yalman was cautious about the possibility of Menderes coming to power. He kept in mind the possibility that power might corrupt him too. He described the power as the pharaoh's chair. Although Yalman was not wholly comfortable, he still wanted to cooperate with Menderes due to his inherent optimism (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 40-41).

Yalman and these four names started working together to prepare the program of this new party to be established. Although Yalman was determined not to accept any political duties, he saw it as a natural duty to serve the development of multi-party system. They were gathering every morning at Adnan Menderes' house in Kavaklıdere; they were working and eating their lunch there (Yalman, 1970d, p. 42).

One day, these four names said to Yalman, "We are the main team close to Atatürk; it is up to us to continue the existence of the People's Party," stating that they want to claim their old party (Yalman, 1970d, p. 42). Yalman opposes this view and offers to find a new name for the party instead of fighting the legacy of the ruling party.

Probably considering the Republican-Democrat distinction in the American political system (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 128), he suggests the establishment of the DP against the RPP (Yalman, 1970d, p. 43). Although there were rumors about the name of the new party, such as the Kemalist Party and the Democrat Farmer's Party, the name the Democrat Party, which was Yalman's proposal, was accepted (Yalman, 1970d, p. 47).

4.8. Love and Hate Relationship: The Democrat Party and Ahmet Emin

Yalman

Having received the approval of the head of state and, therefore, the ruling party, the founders finally formally founded the DP on January 7, 1946. The press gave significant coverage to this political party. The program of the new political party and the statements of its leader were widely broadcast. The DP's program of eighty-five articles was divided into two main sections: general provisions and government affairs. In the first part, the general principles of the party were specified. It was possible to group those under two headings: liberalism and democracy. Liberalism was accepted both in terms of freedoms and as an economic order. In the government affairs section of the program, it was stated that the activity of private enterprise and capital was essential (Eroğul, 1970, pp. 12-14).

On January 7, journalists were called to the headquarters, and they were given the party program and by-law with eighty-five items, and every point has enlightened.

The founders told journalists:

We aim to meet you and give you complete information about our party. There is no point against the constitution in the prepared program and regulation. We know that there is hesitation in minds due to the failure of the FRP trial. For this reason, this time, we dealt with the undertaking thoroughly, and we struggled for the country. We appreciate the magnitude of our responsibility to history. We will try to ensure that the country's national will and national sovereignty are fully implemented. Atatürk fully believed that the country needed a second party, but the revolution was very new. Today's experiences were also absent; today's conditions are entirely different.

The country is at the beginning of a new era; it is necessary to achieve development without disturbing the peace and harmony of the people. We believe that the press will do its part in this great cause. The main activity of the party will start after the twentieth of the month (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 51-52).

After all these speeches, Adnan Menderes answered the questions asked by journalists about whether the new party is on the right or the left: "Perhaps two fingers from the People's Party are on the left." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 52) Yalman considered the DP's entry into the struggle for democracy to such an extent an enthusiastic start. Yalman seemed highly pleased with the courage spirit prevailing in the DP.

During these years, Yalman's newspaper the *Vatan* began to act as the DP's spokesperson publicly. Rumors that the *Vatan* newspaper became the media organ of the DP were among the frequently discussed topics on the agenda. Yalman's impartial stance had changed during these years. Previously, no more neutral journalists stated that they would not participate actively in politics. Instead, a journalist worked day and night to adopt a political party to society.

Still, Yalman responded to criticisms with all his calmness as follows: "I do my job out of concern for the honor and reputation of the country. The *Vatan* will never be an organ of any political party..." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 57)

In his article published in the *Vatan* on April 19, 1946, under the heading "People's Party at the Crossroads (*Halk Partisi Yol Ağzında*)," Yalman mentions the following:

There are two ways for the RPP. One of them is the way of good; the other is the way of evil. Keeping the first way is very simple and easy. In order to do

this, it is necessary to believe in the maturity of the Turkish nation... The People's Party has an honorable past and all kinds of services. Against this, as an inevitable consequence of the single-party system, some arbitrary, unaccounted, lawless, and harmful movements are not missing. The party has to decide sincerely to take the legal path from now on... (Yalman, 1970d, p. 70)

Yalman does not hesitate to criticize the RPP, even if he appreciates it on some points, but sees the RPP's authoritarianism as a natural consequence of the single-party system. It can be regarded as an indication that Yalman criticizes the system, not the individuals.

4.9. 1946 Elections: A Compatible Togetherness in the Name of Democracy

General elections were moved to a year earlier so that the opposition was not given a minimum organizational period. Nevertheless, the opposition had only a six-month past against the twenty-three-year-old ruling party. However, as in every period of social change, these pressures again served the opposition. The organization of the DP spread rapidly during this period. While the Democrats were trying to spread, on the other hand, they were not to care about the pressures. Menderes stated that the primary purpose underlying this rashness is not to leave the opposition time to develop (T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: VII., Toplantı: 3, 1946). Democrats were also blaming the slow liberalization steps of the government (Eroğul, 1970, pp. 16-17).

Despite all the opposition's objections, when the general elections were scheduled for July 21, the DP administrators hesitated to boycott the elections. They decided to consult with the chairmanship. A small congress gathered in Ankara on June 15 to

discuss this issue. As a result of the meeting, it was decided to enter the elections. Thereupon, the election campaign started with all its violence. Democrats paid particular attention to the rallies. These meetings, attended by thousands of people, made the RPP members panic. As a result, they increased the pressure. Power and its spokespersons could hardly distinguish such a style of struggle from anarchy (Eroğul, 1970, p. 17). For example, Falih Rıfkı Atay, in the *Ulus* newspaper, known for its affinity with the RPP, felt the need to write: "The DP has ceased to be a political party: it is a movement of destructors and avengers." (*Ulus*, 4 July 1946) However, the Democrats were cautious not to deviate from the law. They held big meetings, but they also made great efforts to keep their quiescence. When administrators put pressure on them, they were content with taking them to court. However, some incidents were not possible to prevent. They injured the DP board member in a village in Izmir (*Vatan*, 8 July 1946). Worse than that, the DP organization chief, a teacher, and Adnan Menderes' butler were killed 48 hours before the election in Aydın (*Vatan*, 20 July 1946).

Meanwhile, the DP had also provided the support of Fevzi Çakmak. Having decided to join the political struggle at the end of June, Çakmak had been accepted to be an independent candidate on the DP list. Since Çakmak had extraordinary prestige in the country for reasons such as being a close friend of Atatürk, his role in the War of Independence, and his piety, this involvement frightened the RPP. Taking Çakmak with the party, the DP hardened its struggle by feeling the support of the people behind it and by not abandoning the legal ways. Thus, the election campaign of the DP turned into a democracy storm that Turkish political life was never used to (Eroğul, 1970, p. 18).

On July 21, the storm, which suddenly calmed down, intensified after the elections. The reason was that the election was a massive disappointment to the opposition. The DP nominated 273 candidates for 465 seats. Only 62 of them could be selected. However, it was evident that the Democrats had much more excellent support than that. After the elections, reports began to be written about the irregularities and pressures. The DP asked İnönü to intervene to correct the injustice by sending a telegram to İnönü before the results became clear (Cumhuriyet, 23 July 1946). These objections did not help, and the election results were announced. Democrats then held a series of election protest rallies. The first one was held in Izmir with the participation of forty thousand people (Vatan, 26 July 1946). Ten thousand people gathered in Bursa two days later (Vatan, 28 July 1946). Extensive meetings were held one after the other in Konya, Adana, and Ankara. The RPP watched them in nervous silence. However, he used the means that martial law gave him in Istanbul. The *Yeni Sabah* and the *Gerçek* newspapers, which published a blistering protest by Celal Bayar, were closed by martial law order (Karpas, 1959, pp. 164-165).

As the post-election turmoil continued, the Assembly convened on August 5. The RPP members nominated İnönü for president and Kazım Karabekir as president of the parliament. It was apparent that Karabekir was taken to the stage to balance Çakmak. Democrats' candidates were Fevzi Çakmak for the presidency and Yusuf Kemal Tengirşenk as the chairperson of the parliament. Both parties voted for their candidates. İnönü, re-elected president, appointed Recep Peker to establish the new cabinet. The election of Peker, who was inclined to authoritarian power, was alarming about the intentions of the RPP (Eroğul, 1970, p. 19).

As soon as the Assembly started working on August 12, it faced numerous election objections. The elections of 36 provinces were objected to altogether. In addition,

objections were raised against 27 parliamentarians personally (Cumhuriyet, 13 August 1946). A thirty-person commission was set up to examine them. However, this commission, which completed its work within twelve days, did not see any objection as valid (Cumhuriyet, 25 August 1946).

Yalman was also one of the opposition figures who harshly criticized this election struggle. He was not afraid to call the 1946 elections "fraudulent" elections and called the People's Party's secular program "the so-called secular program." (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 75-77) At that time, the *Vatan* newspaper sent observers to almost every part of the country to keep the pulse. Yalman rushed all over the country to follow the course of the election days. In his memoirs, Yalman stated that he listened to stories of oppression and cheating wherever he went and stated that the DP members were threatened, expelled from polling stations, and even beaten on election day. Therefore, it is not surprising that he interpreted the 1946 elections as "terrible heedlessness." (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 78-79)

It could be understood from the fact that Yalman was also invited to an international meeting in Cleveland on January 9 and 12, 1947, that the Yalman - the DP rapprochement did not create a negative impression on the world public opinion in this period. It can be said that Yalman's international reputation continued in those years. At this meeting, views were to be put forward on what the free world expects from the United States. This news was a source of pride for Yalman's prestige, as representatives from very few countries were invited (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 91-92).

Yalman stated the following in an article titled "Bitter Medicine (*Acı İlaç*)," before going to the United States:

The free world values criticism, knowing that it is bitter medicine. Americans cannot get enough of their criticism among themselves; they invite thirteen people, whom they accept as having experience in the outside world, to their countries by saying, "Come, criticize us, show us the way we need to go." I am very sorry that Prime Minister Recep Peker could not control his feelings and insulted a valuable patriot like Adnan Menderes as a psychopath while setting out as one of these guests. What did Menderes do? Using his hard work and experience, he prepared a thorough and valuable budget criticism. If the Prime Minister found this unfair, instead of swearing, he could respond by showing Menderes his mistakes... Unfortunately, the rulers of our country repeat that they love criticism very much, but they want it to remain on the shelf as an ornament. If anyone uses it, they cannot tolerate their words; they get furious (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 93-94).

On this occasion, Yalman once again expresses his admiration for America's culture of tolerance and freedoms, with the influence of his long years in the United States. In addition, Yalman's belief that Adnan Menderes would bring a culture of criticism to the country began in those years. Furthermore, Yalman hoped that Menderes would bring a new culture to politics and a new dimension to freedoms. At the meeting in Cleveland, Yalman also gained a lot of admiration and appreciation in the international environment for his anti-communist rhetoric, his advocacy of firm American cooperation, and his emphasis on democracy (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 99-102).

The DP was completing the first year of its political life in such a tense atmosphere. Nevertheless, in retrospect, it could not be said that its struggle was fruitless. On the contrary, the way it traveled towards its goals was a real success. First of all, a multi-party regime now in Turkey, albeit in difficult circumstances, had proved its viability.

After some hesitation, the people embraced the opposition opportunity, which was extended to them. Despite all its anger, the government has shown that it will not eradicate the opposition (Eroğul, 1970, p. 23).

4.10. Towards 1950 Elections: A Moderate Liberal

The first significant congress of the Democrats in Ankara on January 7, 1947, the first anniversary of the founding of the party, occupies an exceptional place in Turkish political history. Indeed, for the first time in Turkey since the republic was founded, a successful opposition party was convening a libertarian congress from beginning to end. Democrats openly challenged the government and announced with a loud voice that if their decisions were not implemented, they would leave the ruling party to the nation's jurisdiction. These were so new that the audience and the heroes of the event truly felt themselves at a historic turning point. Mümtaz Faik Fenik, who likened this meeting to Erzurum and Sivas Congresses in an article in the *Vatan* newspaper (Mete, 1947, p. 78) in those days, probably was articulating people's passionate feelings (Eroğul, 1970, p. 24).

While the DP's struggle for democracy continued, Yalman returned from the United States on February 16, 1947. Since this war for democracy began, Yalman had been declared the number one enemy by the RPP. However, this time, right after Yalman returned to the country, İsmet İnönü summoned him to Çankaya with Hüseyin Cahit. İnönü's expectations from Yalman were clear. İnönü's priority was in favor of providing inner peace in the country. As İnönü knew Yalman's role among the Democrats, he wanted Yalman to play a conciliatory and mediator role. İnönü expected Yalman to stop the Democrats from being offended and not boycott the next midterm elections. Yalman accepted these demands with pleasure, as he found them

beneficial in the country's interests. However, on the other hand, Celal Bayar was severely in favor of the boycott. This convergence of İnönü and Yalman undoubtedly disturbed Bayar. The relationship between Yalman and Bayar was slowly beginning to deteriorate (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 105-106).

While all these developments were taking place inside the country, Yalman again received an invitation from an international meeting. Yalman's integration with the world was carried out rapidly in these years. He was invited to the extraordinary meeting of the world liberals at Oxford University from April 9 to April 14. The idea of a new international organization was on the agenda. A liberal manifesto was to be prepared for this organization, just like the communist manifesto. Afterward, such a comprehensive liberal manifesto was prepared that even one manifesto letter did not need to be changed over the years. Yalman was elected to the board of directors of this organization, established and named the Liberal International. As soon as he returned to the country, he founded the Association for Spreading Free Ideas and Ali Fuat Başgil was appointed as the head of this institution (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 109-112).

Yalman seemed very enthusiastic and hopeful about this new organization. In his interview with the BBC, he talked about:

Liberalism, which aims to defend the rights and freedom of the individual against totalitarian regimes that regard the state as a basis and regard citizens as slaves, established a new organization at the Oxford Congress and started an attack against backwardness. Liberalism is preparing to break through the darkness and radiate light again. It has been a great pleasure to witness the

regeneration of free ideas closely. The Oxford Congress gave me the effect of a beautiful dream come true (Yalman, 1970d, p. 113).

When Yalman returned to the country, he found the DP leaders in dynamism. He also complained that the RPP organization resorted to various tricks in order to prevent the activities of democrats. At that time, the Governor of İzmir filed a lawsuit against the *Vatan* newspaper, which resulted in Yalman being sentenced to five months' imprisonment. The RPP's newspapers did not hide their joy from this situation, either (Yalman, 1970d, p. 113). During these years, while the tension between the DP and the RPP was increasing, the tension between Yalman and the RPP press was also increasing. Addedly, although Yalman insisted that he was neutral, his position on the Democrats' side was becoming clearer day by day.

As a result of this increasing tension, a presidential declaration called the 12 July Declaration (*12 Temmuz Beyannamesi*) was published in Turkish political history. İnönü described the contacts he organized between the government and the opposition in this declaration and stated that he aimed to create a sense of trust between the two political parties. This development especially pleased the DP executives. Yalman also welcomed this declaration as to the beginning of a period of tolerance, equality, and peace in the country (Yalman, 1970d, p. 115). If İnönü had been on Recep Peker, the opposition would have no alternative but to withdraw from the parliament.

Ultimately, all these developments resulted in Peker's resignation. After this resignation, the opposition and all supporters of democracy took a deep breath. Hasan Saka was assigned to form the new government. Hasan Saka and his cabinet, which is known that they were far from the single-party mentality, came to power was another event that pleased Yalman (Yalman, 1970d, p. 119). This process brought with it the fragmentation of the DP itself. The events started to develop rapidly after İnönü's east

trip. According to the allegations of the opponents who were later expelled from the DP, İnönü made Nuri Özsan, who accompanied him during this journey, feel that some names from the opposition party had to be expelled to soften the relations (Müstakil Demokratlar Grubu, 1949, pp. 23-24). Sadık Aldoğan, Kenan Öner, Ahmet Tahtakılıç, and Yusuf Kemal Tengirşenk were at the top of these names. Although the accuracy of the claim is not sure, it has been observed that, shortly after the end of the journey, Aldoğan had a falling out with the founders (Cumhuriyet, 30 September 1947). After the RPP Congress, the opposition to the DP's executives grew even more. The reason was that they could not get İnönü to leave the chairmanship of the party, although they hoped for help from the 12 July Declaration.

While the DP was experiencing all these divisions within itself, Yalman received an invitation as one of the representatives of the World Liberal Union to the European Union Congress, which was decided to be held in The Hague with the encouragement of Churchill. Although Yalman was not an official representative of Turkey in this congress, he was Turkey's voice and supported such an integration. The summary of Yalman's long article about congress is as follows:

I am here as a representative of the World Liberals, but I want to make our voice heard as the only Turk present at the congress. In his opening remarks, Mr. Churchill spoke of the European Union initiative undertaken between 1600 and 1607 by the French King Henry and his visionary minister, Sully, and said by the way: "The aim of the enterprise was danger from the East, and the source of this danger was the Turks at that time."

We all know that a great revolution has developed in history since then. Far from threatening the security of Europe, the Turks today are showing a solid and advanced castle landscape that Western security has in the East. Today

there is a danger from the East as well, but the source of this is the regime of Soviet Russia (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 140-142).

Yalman underlines the Soviet threat whenever he sees the opportunity to integrate with the world in an international environment, clearly revealing his closeness to the Western world and his anti-communist tendencies.

Yalman, while constantly emphasizing anti-communism, on the other hand, in the thesis he put forward in his series of articles titled "From Congress to Congress (*Kongreden Kongreye*)," he mentioned the following: "The main cause is not between the right and the left, but choosing between totalitarianism and liberalism." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 143)

A reorganization effort emerged in the opposition from May 1948. Some of the DP leavers have formed an Independent Democrats Group (*Müstakil Demokratlar Grubu*) to await the decision of the great congress (Cumhuriyet, 11 May 1948). On the other hand, some other personalities attempted to establish a new party. Fevzi Çakmak was accepted to chair the NP, established in July 1948.

After its establishment, the NP vehemently opposed the government and the DP.

Extremism and combativeness became the primary propaganda tools. They accused the Democrats of following a policy of collusion with the RPP. They said about the DP, "They betrayed the nation and sold the opposition, which is the property of the nation, to the government." the DP reacted harshly to this situation (Eroğul, 1970, p. 41). Openly against Fevzi Çakmak, Menderes said the following words: "Dresses and ranks have never been the infallible measure of courage, sense of honor, moderation, wisdom, and intelligence." (Esirci, 1957, p. 164)

On October 18, 1948, by-elections were held in thirteen country districts. Opposition parties did not join them. Yalman, who participated in the big rally organized by the DP in Aydın, had the opportunity to see the country's current situation almost everywhere in Aydın. His view was: "The people of Aydın openly vote of no confidence in the current administrative system in Turkey." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 152)

Regarding electoral understanding, the RPP made it clear that it had not learned anything after the July 21, 1946 experience and persisted in deceiving itself. Yalman, who went to İzmir at that time, put forward the following views in a telegram he sent from İzmir to the newspaper: "If the RPP goes like this, we will soon see that he will close its eyes with a natural death." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 152)

Yalman criticized İnönü for reverting to a single-party mentality and accused him of not fulfilling his promises in the 12 July Declaration. In an article he wrote on October 22, 1948, he says:

The 12 July Declaration gave us great hopes for a while. Unfortunately, from time to time, former National Chief İnönü forgot that he was the President from time to time, and we always saw him in partisan roles in the political scene. The spectacular sight on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Republic is: We are faced with not a President who tries to create love, harmony, and trust in the country, but a party president who trusts force and takes only one side (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 152-153).

Hasan Saka's government was so worn out that he lost the opportunity to survive even by faltering. In December, in a speech he gave in Edirne, Bayar declared that "the government has lost its ability to take measures and act." (Vatan, 6 December 1948)

These words were expressions of the truth. The government lasted only one more

month and resigned on January 14, 1949. Power was now a challenging burden for the RPP to carry. Hilmi Uran, Necmettin Sadak, Fuat Sirmen, and Nurullah Sümer, who was offered to form a new government, refused this offer (Cumhuriyet, 16 January 1949). As it turned out, no one was keen to come to the responsibility of forming the new government. Finally, Şemsettin Günaltay became the person who accepted this heavy-duty that could be called a burden.

In his speech on the day he received the vote of confidence from the parliament, Günaltay expressed his liberal stance by saying: "... I assure you as a historian, the only remedy for the future of this nation is the establishment and functioning of a democracy based on solid principles." (Ulus, 25 January 1949) A few days later, he visited the DP Headquarters. Thus, he made it clear from the very beginning that he intended to get along with the opposition (Eroğul, 1970, p. 45). Yalman was among those in a position to be satisfied with the Günaltay cabinet. Yalman interpreted this cabinet, despite its minor faults, as fully representing the youth, embracing liberty, and the adopting spirit of cooperation of the 12 July Declaration. This government ensured that the principle of judicial control, which was insisted on but rejected by the DP, is fully included in the Election Law (*Seçim Kanunu*), the votes are counted publicly. The Supreme Election Council examines the election records. Yalman even considered the Günaltay cabinet the most successful cabinet the country has seen in recent history, including some of the DP cabinets that came to power in the following years (Yalman, 1970d, p. 161).

Yalman mentioned the following in his article titled "The Caravan Is Walking (*Kervan Yürüyor*)," on February 12:

Fortunately, a new atmosphere has begun to blow in the country for a while. Especially during this visit to Ankara, you witnessed outstanding developments closely. For the first time in a long time, we see a government in Turkey that has understood the meaning of liability, knows what it wants, determined.

... The Prime Minister plays a perfect role with his courage and love for the country. Some members of the People's Party are allowing the government to work well (Yalman, 1970d, p. 167).

However, in the following years, the atmosphere of the country deteriorated, and the tension between the government and the opposition increased again. Yalman was deeply concerned about this situation and underlined that what matters is not who is right or wrong but how to achieve good (Yalman, 1970d, p. 176). Yalman, who claims to be genuinely devoted to democracy, participated wholeheartedly in the DP's struggle for years. However, after the objectives achieved in 1949 and the understanding of the Günaltay cabinet, Yalman found it harmful and dangerous to continue the struggle for a political party blindly. Therefore, Yalman, leaving the primary purpose aside, considered it more appropriate for the country's interests to continue his role as a mediator. Yalman touched upon these points in his articles "Inner Side of the Matter (*İşin İç Yüzü*)," published on July 21 and August 1, and "We spoke heart-to-heart with a citizen (*Bir Vatandaşla Dertleştik*)," published on August 3. He stated that the DP and the RPP should not fight and that if it continues like this, it will endanger the functioning of democracy. He also insisted that the NP's provocations should not be allowed. In his third article, he says:

Various kinds of works in the country need improvement, but if the primary rotten and origin point is wrong, it will not be possible to put them on track.

... The first goal we have to reach for this purpose is to establish mutual trust and peace in public life. However, according to departure direction, we do not go there; we go away.

The latest picture of our political life on the eve of the 1950 elections is nothing more than an unfaithful and ruthless power struggle. Both major parties find themselves right and see the opposing parties as detrimental to the country. The grudge front that watches this tense situation from afar, that is the NP, continues its provocative role in the joy of seeing how the seeds it sowed produce crops (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 179-180).

However, although Yalman tried to mediate between the two political parties, the conflict continued. Realizing that this tension will continue between the government and the opposition in the country for a while, Yalman requested Rauf Orbay to be an independent candidate in the midterm elections. Yalman started publishing an article series in the *Vatan* newspaper with "The Brake of Independents - The Role Expected from Rauf Orbay (*Müstakillerin Freni – Rauf Orbay'dan Beklenen Rol*)," on August 17. He aimed to bring someone who could act as a mediator between the parties, thanks to Rauf Orbay in the Parliament. Rauf Orbay did not say no to these offers and pressures and accepted (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 181-184). Yalman's efforts were to create solutions to reduce the tension in politics and soften the harsh relationship between the government and the opposition.

On the eve of the 1950 elections, it is necessary to open a separate parenthesis to Ahmet Emin Yalman's adventure with Nazım Hikmet. This relationship is vital in

seeing Yalman's impartial, respectful and liberal side. Yalman, who regards Nazım Hikmet's imprisonment as one of the irregularities of the single-party system, wants to lend a helping hand to Nazım Hikmet. Accordingly, he participates in a petition campaign for the release of Nazım Hikmet. In the Nazım Hikmet case, Yalman takes a liberal stance that emphasizes individual differences and freedom of expression and shows no closeness to Nazım Hikmet's ideas. In his article published in the *Vatan* newspaper on September 19, 1949, he underlines that Nazım Hikmet's being a communist should not be understood as treason:

If Nazım Hikmet has thoughts parallel to communist theories, it is not a sign of being attached to solidarity other than Turkish homeland love. The Turkish poet Nazım Hikmet has not been and cannot be a Muscovite agent. His feelings appearing in the style of communism are only a product of his concern and sensitivity towards those who suffer misery and injustice. We have to find a solution to these miseries and correct these injustices to keep our society alive. Those who hear these pains and remind us are not the nation's enemy; on the contrary, they are their most prudent friends (*Vatan*, 19 September 1949).

However, Yalman could not maintain this attitude for a long time in the cold war environment. After a while, the news which linked together Nazım Hikmet and Moscow started to appear in the *Vatan* newspaper. Perhaps due to this change of attitude, Nazım Hikmet later wrote the following lines for Yalman (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 129).

First pro-German then pro-American. / "Fatherland" was for him in every era, at any time / a newspaper to be sold / and he did indeed sell the Fatherland (Göksu & Timms, 1999, p. 254).³

The DP voters also criticize Yalman in Kayseri on the eve of the election. The DP voters, who believe that Yalman writes articles against the DP, take a stand against Yalman during this time. On the other hand, Bayar defends Yalman, stating that Yalman always stands by the DP and emphasizes that his opinions should be respected. Afterward, Yalman goes to Kayseri, explains himself to the voters there, and resolves their hostility. On this occasion, Yalman has the opportunity to travel all over Kayseri once again and writes an interview series titled "The Story of a Dispute (*Bir Anlaşmazlığın Hikâyesi*)."

(Yalman, 1970d, pp. 197-199)

Yalman goes to England, feeling the need to watch the elections to be held in the United Kingdom in these years, which is a short time before the elections in Turkey, and to announce them to the readers as an example (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 204-205). Due to his excitement that the elections will be held in Turkey after a short time, Yalman seeks the opportunity to witness the different election atmospheres in the world closely.

Election wars begin in 1950. Yalman already predicts that the DP will win before the elections are held and does not even hesitate to say that the RPP is in the realm of dreams (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 206-208).

³ In native language (Turkish): "...ve Ahmet Emin Yalman / önce Alaman oldu sonra Amerikan. / ona göre her devirde, her zaman / satılacak bir gazetydi "Vatan" / ve hazret sattı Vatanı. / Hapse atacaklarmış Ahmet Emin Yalman'ı / Amerikana yaranmaktaki rekabeti yüzünden. / Hapisteki hırsızlara acıyorum ben, / ahlâkları bozulacak / Emin Beyle aynı damda yaşayarak..."

4.11. The Democrat Party Government: A Dissident Liberal

All eyes were now on election day. Interest in political issues has reached extraordinary proportions. For example, in Elazığ alone, more than 600 people applied for candidacy for parliament (Cumhuriyet, 6 March 1950). The parties were in feverish activity. The Democrats announced their candidate lists in April. They had utterly strengthened their position with two crucial attendances. The first of those who joined them was Halil Özyörük, the President of the Supreme Court, and the second was Atatürk's old friend Ali Fuat Cebesoy. RPP members were also doing their best. İnönü actively entered the election struggle at the end of March. In the speech he gave in Malatya in the last days of the month, he openly clashed with the opposition (Ulus, 31 March 1950). Thus, he abandoned his role as the neutral head of state and appeared on the stage as the chief warrior of his party (Eroğul, 1970, p. 53).

Meanwhile, a sudden event made the election struggle even more nervous. Marshall Fevzi Çakmak passed away on April 10, 1950. An enormous crowd attended the funeral ceremony, and the ceremony was instrumental in several sharia demonstrations. Circles loyal to the revolution were disturbed by this. In a statement he made a few days later, Bayar stated that attempts to disrupt the national unity would be opposed and asked everyone to help the government in this matter so that the elections could take place within the framework of the law (Cumhuriyet, 20 April 1950). At the beginning of May, the parties started their propaganda speeches on the radio. The election struggle had reached its peak. The parties worked with all their might to get high marks from the voters on the big test day. With the end of the propaganda on the evening of May 10, all eyes were turned to the ballot box. As the Democrats said, "word now belongs to the nation." (Eroğul, 1970, p. 53)

The May 14 elections passed in great silence. The participation rate exceeded 80 percent. Nothing important happened. As the results were revealed, the next day, it was understood that the DP had won a victory that exceeded all hopes. According to the results announced a few days later, the DP won 53.35% of the votes and 408 of the 487 seats in the parliament. The RPP was only able to get 69 deputies. The Nation Party (*Millet Partisi*) (NP), on the other hand, could not have a significant presence, and only one deputy could enter the parliament from the NP (Eroğul, 1970, p. 53). This vast difference in the parliament was the result of the majoritarian system. The DP won 83% of the seats versus 53% of the vote, while the RPP won only 14% of the seats versus 39% of the votes (Abadan, 1966).

The new assembly convened on May 22. Refik Koraltan was elected President of the Assembly, and Celal Bayar was elected President of the Republic. Adnan Menderes was tasked with establishing the first DP government. Thus, quietly, a revolution was achieved in the area of the political regime. A twenty-seven-year single-party rule allowed an opposing party to emerge and flourish and finally submit to the nation's rule, leaving power to this opposition. It was a genuinely bloodless revolution.

As much as the DP's takeover of power, its opposition had a significant meaning. The most important reason for the birth of the DP was that the opposition to the RPP had become very widespread and deep-rooted. This place was fed from two primary sources. The first of these was the growing desire for power of the ruling classes. The second was the widespread weariness of the people. As a result of the reduction of imports and the spread of the black market in the war, a group of the commercial bourgeoisie and landlords suffered enormous profits (Lewis, 1961, p. 291). They had a growing desire for power. They were also uneasy and insecure about the RPP's interventionist economic policy. On the other hand, the majority of the people were in

misery. The war years were a period of great famine. Villagers complained about the pressure from the gendarmerie. Civil servants, a group of fixed income, fell into a deplorable economic situation due to the four-fold increase in prices during the war (Eroğul, 1970, p. 55).

Apart from these, some small groups were also opposed to the power. For example, the adherents of religious administration were ready to overthrow the "godless party" at the earliest opportunity. Non-Muslim minorities, on the other hand, could not easily forget the Wealth Tax disaster they suffered in 1942. Added to all this usual wearing out of power over twenty years, the intensity of opposition to the RPP can be easily predicted.

However, to explain the rise of the DP, it is necessary to consider other factors besides this intense pressure from society. In Turkey, the ruling staff considered imitating European political and cultural institutions as the prerequisite of progressivism, following the tradition of Mustafa Kemal. The political regime introduced by the Republic has managed to resemble the European Parliamentary system, except for one major shortcoming. This primary deficiency, as is known, was a multi-party system. Atatürk himself tried to overcome this deficiency twice during his rule, but he had to regress in the face of the reactions that arose. In the favorable environment created by the post-war, his successors should be considered normal to attempt this trail again. It is necessary to add İnönü's situation to this reason.

Ataturk's desire to achieve reform that he could not succeed and the pride to be felt from it probably influenced the decision of this statesman who could only occupy the second rank. In addition to these internal causes, there are also external influences. The extent to which they play a role is uncertain, but the West is known to encourage liberalization in Turkey. It is unthinkable that these influences, which intensified

during the San Francisco Conference, do not play a role in the entry of the Turkish political regime in a new direction. The DP is a movement born from the combination of this wide variety of internal and external influences.

There were two excellent conditions for the opposition born and developed in Turkey in 1945. The first was that the opposition did not touch the significant prohibitions of the Republic, and the second was that it did not appear to the public as a government game. The administration of the Republic, after twenty years of practice, attached vital importance to keeping Turkish political life between two thick walls. These walls, which were required for the regime's security, were secularism and anti-communism. On the other hand, public opinion learned to shy away from artificial opposition movements after the FRP try. The public had to be convinced that there would be a genuine opposition to support a new movement. The DP correctly evaluated these elements. Since its establishment, it has paid great attention to keeping the opposition in line with the regime. The founders of the DP were devoted entirely to the central philosophy that Turkish political life had developed until then. None of them could be accused of wanting a religious state of communism. The second, the DP has always supported the government in its anti-left initiatives. The DP shared the same idea with the government in the view that the liberalization of the regime was conditional on the oppression of the left. The DP was careful not to approach the Shari'a movement. For example, he did not welcome the religious demonstrations caused by the death of Fevzi Çakmak. The third, the DP leaders have always been careful not to deviate from the laws, no matter how harsh opposition they exercise. In the face of the tremendous pressures of the government, they always resisted the illegal demands for resistance from the lower level. Thus, unlike the PRP, they managed to avoid being tricked, which was very similar to them.

On the other hand, they also managed not to be like the FRP during the opposition period; one of the most issues they focused on was that their parties were not an act of collusion. It was a fact that they entered the opposition with permission and even the government's encouragement. However, they never wanted to be a docile instrument of power like Fethi Okyar. They waged the most severe opposition possible, provided they did not fall outside the regime. Thus, they both forced the hand of power and gained the people's trust (Eroğul, 1970, pp. 55-57).

The DP officially took over power on May 22, 1950. Yalman mentions the post-election period in his memoirs with the following words:

The Turkish people used their will effectively. By punishing the People's Party, which he saw as sinful in the 1946 elections, he opened a new page in Turkey and the history of humanity. It was the first time in history that a totalitarian party lost power without a revolution, only through by-elections, and handed over power to the opposition by accepting it. The whole world was surprised by this, and the Turkish nation passed a unique maturity test (Yalman, 1970d, p. 216).

Yalman also describes the following in an editorial titled "A Birthday Gift (*Bir Doğum Günü Hediyesi*)," on May 8:

I was born on May 14. I am delighted that the elections coincided with today. Suppose these elections are allowed to express the will of the Turkish nation with complete honesty and thus lay the foundations for a stable government. In that case, I will have received an invaluable birthday present. As a result of a whole struggle of life, I will have received the grand prize that I have been waiting for (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 216-217).

Yalman evaluated the DP's coming to power as their belief in democracy and determination. As soon as it became clear that the DP won the election, Canadian Ambassador to Turkey General Odium Adnan Menderes invited Fuat Köprülü and Yalman to the Canadian Embassy and congratulated them (Yalman, 1970d, p. 218).

When the DP was in opposition, Yalman sometimes acted as a mediator and sometimes as a harmonizer. However, he always sided with the DP, kept his liberal line, and favored democracy. Despite his frequent criticism of the RPP, he always respected İnönü and the founding staff of the Republic. Yalman's mediation role continued after the DP came to power. Celal Bayar became President, and Adnan Menderes became Prime Minister. However, when Ali Fuat Cebesoy was promised to be the President first, and then this decision was abandoned, Cebesoy was offended by this situation. At this point, it was Yalman who softened Cebesoy. However, while Fuat Köprülü was waiting to become Prime Minister, he resented being made Minister of Foreign Affairs. Again, Yalman was assigned to soften Köprülü. In short, Ahmet Emin Yalman was the person who kept the peace in the DP in the first days of the DP rule. Also, Samet Ağaoğlu was appointed as Deputy Prime Minister upon Yalman's reminder and suggestion. Yalman had very close relations with the DP during these years and contributed to this newly established power consolidation.

Yalman did not doubt that a modern state administration had been reached during these years. However, on the other hand, Yalman was uncomfortable with the debate between political parties. Yalman found the solution by writing a letter to Adnan Menderes about this complaint.

Honorable Adnan Bey,

You represent the only hope for rational management and working period in Turkey. If you do not hold on to this cause, the forces that have been hostile to every new order for a century and a half will destroy the head of this initiative.

...

You have come up with a good program. You have formed a government that will work as a team. You are compiling people with reasonable measures.

However, by not finding a way to transfer and entrust your numerous deeds to safe hands, you have put so much burden on your own that it is impossible not to get angry, to work efficiently, and to rest. Moreover, as a result, it is difficult to maintain your tolerance and calmness towards the opposition.

I am despondent about this situation because I fear it will create a movement back to the one-party spirit after so many struggles and such a brilliant victory.

...

The May victory profoundly affected the outside world and earned us an excellent reputation. The world of democracy will rely on the tolerance of the opposition party to maintain and expand this credit. If this tolerance is not achieved and political consensus is not achieved, there is no doubt that we will lose the prestige gained very quickly.

...

(Yalman, 1970d, p. 225).

With this letter Yalman, he was warning Menderes in a veiled language. Yalman was worried that Menderes would be corrupted with power after he came to power. He

was worried that he would suspend the opposition and, therefore, democracy. This situation was the first harbinger of the tension between Yalman and the DP in the coming years.

The DP voters criticized Yalman for his criticism of Menderes. However, afterward, Menderes stated that he expected support from Yalman to send troops to Korea. Menderes wanted Yalman to create public support in the press in favor of Menderes. Yalman, on the other hand, evaluated this decision as a bold decision and supported Menderes's move, showing the public that he was in the ranks of the DP again. The point that needs to be emphasized here is that Yalman was so fanatical about North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) membership that while being sent troops to the Korean War, Yalman did not object to the Parliament being bypassed. It is opposite to Yalman's democratic and liberal attitude. This attitude is a manifestation of Yalman's American advocacy.

Yalman's warnings to Menderes are not limited to these in this period. Yalman criticized Menderes for being unnecessarily self-confident in economic and financial matters during this period. Yalman interprets Menderes' dismissal of two economists, Barker and Lifting, as one of Menderes' biggest mistakes. Yalman sees Menderes's statement, "I have the power to think and decide better than any expert in every case," as Menderes' heedlessness (Yalman, 1970d, p. 229).

Yalman's disagreement with the ruling wing at that time was not only limited to Menderes but also occasionally entered into heated debates with the deputy Prime Minister, Samet Ağaoğlu. After Samet Ağaoğlu implicitly told Yalman that the transformation of democracy into the tyranny of the majority was reasonable, Yalman gave the following answer to Ağaoğlu:

The way you are talking about it is not democracy but demagoguery and an implicit dictatorship. True democracy is based on a patriotic faith and the principles of freedom and virtue and values free debate.

... If it is at a low level, it does not descend to its level but tries to raise the people to a higher level and to lead them in good ways (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 238-239).

During this period, Yalman started to feel the anxiety that his hopes would be in vain, together with the disappointment he experienced resulting from the reforms that were not made. Beginning to be sure that the personal and arbitrary administration would reign again, Yalman began to criticize the Menderes government for not keeping its promises.

In addition, the following determination made by Yalman in those years can be considered a good summary of Turkish political life. According to Yalman, when the opposition party comes to power, it loses all its sincere spirits, puts aside its enthusiasm for freedom, democracy, and reform and becomes stagnant, does not risk any effort, and does not embrace dynamic roles like Atatürk (Yalman, 1970d, p. 239).

When hopes that the DP government, for which he had worked for five years and for which he had endured the heavy attacks of the former one-party, would have a patriotic spirit and would make significant reforms, were dashed, Yalman began to think that now, it was time to start doing his best. He rolled up his sleeves to warn the DP administration, his friends, especially Adnan Menderes. Yalman saw this effort not as enmity towards them but as a duty of friendship.

Yalman made his first warning against Menderes with his article titled "Where Does Menderes want to go? (*Menderes Nereye Gitmek İstiyor?*)," on June 22. In his editorial on February 11, he talked about the new cabinet with the following words:

Nothing has changed. Prime Minister Adnan Menderes took the path of monopolizing power by relying on his deep intelligence, intuition, good orator, and other virtues. However, thousands of examples in history show that it is impossible to carry and carryout today's heavy administrative burden in this way (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 240-242).

As can be seen, Yalman clearly states that this new cabinet, which has been formed, cannot be a solution to anything. Upon Yalman's criticism, Menderes tells the famous phrase that best describes Yalman's sharp tongue: "May God protect people from friends like Ahmed Emin Yalman." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 242)

In those years, one of the DP Konya delegates made a proposal that opposed all of Atatürk's revolutions. Yalman severely criticized this proposal. Thereupon, the people in Konya got angry against Yalman and the *Vatan* newspaper and burned many copies of the *Vatan* newspaper in the squares. Deeply depressed by this reactionary trend in the country, Yalman went beyond all kinds of journalism in those years and wrote an editorial on March 26, 1951, with the title of "Invocation from God (*Allah'dan Niyaz*)," in the *Vatan* newspaper. In this article, Yalman briefly talked about the atmosphere of the first year of the DP rule and his deep disappointments.

Yalman accused Menderes of ignoring the warnings he constantly made during these periods. With the increase in opposition within the DP, Deputy Prime Minister Samet Ağaoğlu, Minister of Justice, Minister of Home Affairs, and Minister of Education were not wanted within the party created great tension. The resignation of the

Minister of National Defence Refik Şevket İnce on March 29, 1951, was the last straw for Menderes. In his speech at the group meeting on March 31, Menderes pointed directly to the *Vatan* newspaper and accused Ahmet Emin Yalman. He tried to create a perception against Yalman in public by saying that Yalman's only aim was to bring him down (Yalman, 1970d, p. 246).

At the DP Congress held in Ankara on June 4, 1951, "Enough is enough! (*Artık Yeter!*)," their cries rose. There were requests for Adnan Menderes to leave the party's presidency and deal with the affairs of the country. In an article published on June 8, Yalman advised Menderes to be protected from being dragged towards personal power (Yalman, 1970d, p. 248).

Fuat Köprülü also joined the critics of Yalman from among the DP members and accused Yalman of deliberately and exclusively making his criticisms and warnings. Part of Yalman's reply to Köprülü is as follows: "... It pains me to see a scientist like Fuat Köprülü shrink so much because of politics. May God grant me the opportunity to see Fuat Köprülü rediscover that the level of knowledge is the highest." (Yalman, 1970d, p. 249)

On the other hand, the ice between Ahmet Emin Yalman and Adnan Menderes, who came together at the official opening ceremony of the new Air Force Academy in Eskişehir on October 1, 1951, melted. Under the influence of this encounter, Yalman wrote an article titled "Letter to Menderes (*Menderes'e Mektup*)," on October 4, 1951.

... The other day, after a ten-month hiatus, I came across you in Eskişehir. In front of me, I saw the smiling, kind, sensitive person I used to know. Even though we only greetings each other, I felt that the ice in my soul was thawed, and a belief that had become solid was loosened. I put my negative views into

account of a temporary period in your power, and my hopes that we will see Adnan Menderes, whom we know old, on duty again, were renewed (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 249-250).

Yalman, who has been criticizing Menderes until this date, states that he started to hope for Menderes again by having only one meeting with Menderes at that time. From this point of view, it can be easily said that Yalman's attitude is far from a determined stance. Since then, while there was no concrete development realized by Menderes in Turkish politics, Yalman, who acted emotionally by only seeing Menderes, forgets his rational and objective journalist identity and starts to hope for Menderes again for no reason.

The DP held its third congress in Ankara on October 16, 1951. While the meeting was boisterous, on the other hand, naturally, much criticism was put forward. Adnan Menderes was re-elected as the DP President. With the effect of the lovely atmosphere prevailing after the congress, the resentment between Yalman and Menderes, which lasted for about ten months, ended. They went to dinner at Çiftlik Restaurant together and had the opportunity to chat for a long time. During that conversation, Yalman preferred not to take notes to capture the spirit of the words. However, Yalman listened to Menderes' words so carefully that he published them in the newspaper on November 5, 1951, with the headline "It Is Not Acceptable for Us to Be Deviated by the Paths of Freedom and Progress (*Hürriyet ve Terakki Yollarından Şaşmamız Tasavvur Kabul Etmez*)."

(Yalman, 1970d, pp. 250-251)

Decisions about Turkey's accession to NATO were about to end at that time. On February 17, 1952, the Assembly discussed this critical issue. Turkey finally officially became a member of NATO. On April 26, 1952, Menderes made a trip to Athens,

taking Yalman and other journalists with him (Yalman, 1970d, p. 266). Yalman's identity as an international journalist gained importance again, and his old ties with Menderes were re-established. This trip was a manifestation of Menderes's trust in Yalman.

However, this lovely togetherness would not last long. Yalman was glad that he and Menderes reconciled in October 1951, and that they talked for hours in November, and that they once again loved and trusted each other. Yalman thought that Menderes was also satisfied with this situation, but Yalman was horrified by sight he saw after he returned to Turkey after serving in France and Germany for three months in May 1952. He could not tolerate the confiscation of the RPP's properties. He severely criticized Menderes in his article titled "We Are Cutting Own Throat (*Bindiğimiz Dalı Kesiyoruz*)," in the *Vatan* newspaper on June 5, 1952.

Suppose those responsible for our national destiny do not step on the brake of foresight at the last minute. In that case, the victims of the action they will attempt are not the Republican People's Party, the *Ulus*, and the *Dünya* newspapers, but directly the Turkish nation. The result of this will be to fall into the position of cutting the throat we are on, to become a totalitarian country like Spain and Argentina in the eyes of the world, and to be erased from the list of democratic countries. (Yalman, 1970d, p. 268)

On the other hand, the determinations Yalman made about İnönü when he was at odds with Menderes those days are also noteworthy. He did not hesitate to carefully analyze both fronts. He argues that the reason why İnönü was greeted enthusiastically by the people like a savior at that time was not due to İnönü himself. He attributes the main reason why he found such a response by the public to the DP's deviations from

the road in those years. In other words, his emotional attachment to the DP and therefore to Menderes did not end in those years. Even when trying to criticize the opposition rationally, he does so again through power, revealing his loyalty to the DP at every opportunity. Although Yalman emphasized a "New İnönü" at that time, he did not see this as a natural success of İnönü in the opposition but interpreted it as the people's indispensable reliance on İnönü as a result of the successive mistakes of the DP in power.

Based on the enthusiastic welcome of İnönü in Samsun, almost like a savior, Yalman put forward the following thoughts in the editorial he wrote on July 16, 1952:

Not long ago, most independent citizens could not bear even to hear İnönü's name; they held the former National Chief responsible for every evil. What happened during this time in between? What kind of new and brilliant services did İnönü provide to the country that he received such love and closeness in a vigilant city like Samsun? No, the matter is that the heads of the DP leaders turned more and more in power. They repeatedly repeated the mistakes peculiar to this office, forgot their principles, offended the citizens, and caused the love barometer to reverse. İnönü, who was held responsible for the mistakes of the 1946 elections, became the beloved man of the day (Yalman, 1970d, p. 270).

4.12. Malatya Assassination: A Breaking Point

Perhaps one of the most important breaking moments in Yalman's life is the assassination he suffered. Yalman is exposed to an assassination attempt in Malatya in November 1952. Yalman stays in Malatya Palas Hotel in Malatya during his country tours with the DP. On his way to the hotel in the evening, he is shot by bullets through the darkness, which he could not understand where those bullets came from. Yalman, who just slumped there, thinks of the following in those moments.

... The on-call doctor of the hospital arrived. He took my pulse and said to the people next to him, "he is in a coma; his pulse is not taking."

I listened to these words, which declared that my life had come to an end, with complete resignation, and completely abandoned myself to the flow of luck. I was leaving this world, which I always welcomed as a place of work and a battleground for charity, with a clear conscience. The pleasure of dying at the beginning of duty also engulfed my soul and gave me peace and tranquility (Yalman, 1970d, p. 281).

It is when Yalman was perhaps the closest to death until that time of his life. The first thing that comes to mind of Yalman at that moment is his love for his job, and the first thing he mentions is the thinking of fulfilling responsibilities, which are reflections of his passion for journalism.

The person named Hüseyin Üzmez, who fired seven bullets on Yalman, is an 18-year-old high school student (Yalman, 1970d, p. 285). It seems that the religious sections, contrary to expectations, suffer from the uncompromising attitude of the DP government towards radical Islamist movements and perhaps were blaming Yalman for this. Üzmez and fifteen collaborators explained in their statements that they did

this as a result of the provocations of the *Büyük Doğu* magazine (Ersel, Kuyaş, Oktay, & Tunçay, 2002, p. 207). For example, on June 20, 1952, in an article signed by Abdurrahman Şeref Laç, Yalman was threatened as follows:

Ahmet Emin Yalman, you are still talking through the back of your head without thinking about your position in this country, but are you aware of how you express your identity for the Turkish nation with this state of yours? Let's say that if you have the slightest doubt, you can clear it: The hypocrite whose voice should be drowned out from being the spiritual murderer of Islam and the Turk: It's you. Fear us and die of fear. Yes, with your words and confession, we will be the executioner who puts a lasso around your neck (Büyük Doğu, 20 June 1945).

After his treatment is over, Yalman confronts his assassin, Hüseyin Üzmez. This face-off is somewhat meaningful. Yalman is aware that Üzmez is being used and manipulated. Üzmez says that he harbors hostility towards Yalman for writing articles that harm religious creeds, for being an American mandate, for his efforts to save Nazım Hikmet, and for organizing a beauty contest (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 290-297).

The confrontation between Yalman and Üzmez takes place as follows:

- Hüseyin, you believe that I am an evil man, you tried to sentence me to death by yourself, but the judges give their verdict after hearing both sides. Why did you not come and listen to me before you fire those bullets? Why did you not find out if the ideas given to you about me were actually?
- They would not let me near you...

- Why would not they let you get closer? I have been traveling freely around the country for months. I am preparing dormitory supplements for my newspaper. I am happy to talk to anyone who wants to.
- The obstacle was not on your side. Our folks would not be willing to let me talk to you. They would kill me if I tried to do that (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 290-291).

The trial ended on July 17, 1954, and nine of the reactionaries, especially Hüseyin Üzmez, were given death sentences for their role in the assassination. However, they were commuted to prison sentences due to extenuating circumstances. Hüseyin Üzmez, who fired the bullets, was sentenced to 20 years in prison. After Üzmez was imprisoned, letters began to come from Üzmez to Yalman, and Yalman replied to these letters. In addition, Yalman sent Üzmez his book titled "Towards Clarity," He wrote about real democracy, the correct meaning of secularism, and an honest understanding of religion. Yalman, who later met with Üzmez in prison, wrote editorials in the newspaper for Üzmez's pardon. This story exemplifies Yalman's mercy, forgiveness, and conscience.

Yalman thinks that the Malatya assassination had a very beneficial outcome. As a result of the Malatya assassination, close cooperation began to form between the press and the government. Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, who was very closely confronted with the coordinated terrorist attack of the reactionism front in Malatya, held a press conference in Ankara on December 20, 1952. Many journalists from many newspapers such as the *Vatan*, *Hürriyet*, *Cumhuriyet*, *Yeni Sabah*, *Yeni İstanbul*, *Akşam*, *Son Posta*, *Milliyet*, *Son Saat*, *Dünya*, *Ulus*, *Her Gün*, *İstanbul Ekspres*, *Vakit*, *Zafer*, *Hür Ses*, *Demokrat*, *Yeni Asır* were called. Unusually, this sign of national unity created an air of relief and hope. Yalman also points out this

effective government-press relationship as one of the essential factors in the DP's coming to power in the 1954 elections. According to Yalman, this relationship is also such that the real world democracy should focus on this example (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 298-301).

This state of affairs pleased Yalman so much that he even cried while reading Menderes' speech at the congress from the newspaper. According to Yalman, the DP was on a good track for now. On the other hand, Menderes was now able to fulfill his duty as a virtuous leader who was free from all his faults and freed from all his ambitions in power. The relationship between Yalman and Menderes was intricate, complex, sometimes considerable, and sometimes severe, in short, love and hate relationship. They had a complicated relationship to connect and evaluate intellectually and analytically. They had a relationship that could only be understood if analyzed through emotional bonds. Maybe this was the case from Yalman's window. While Menderes had not yet enough reason to trust his political maturity again, Yalman's heart had already been conquered with just a move through the press. Freedom of the press could have been one of the most critical areas for a liberal pen, but Yalman could not act rationally in his relations with the government. His excellent or lousy relationship with Menderes was constantly getting in the way of his liberal identity. He had to make his criticisms of the opposition through the government constantly.

4.13. 1954 Elections: The Tipping Point

The foundation of Samsun Port was laid on April 4, 1954; on April 22, Celal Bayar opened his third paper mill in Izmit; on April 26, the construction of Mersin port started. In the speeches made on the occasion of these ceremonies, the development

movements were praised and the current in favor of the DP was tried to be strengthened in the minds of the citizens.

Finally, on May 2, 1954, general elections were held. People showed great interest in the elections. The participation rate was 88.63%. As a result of the census, it became clear that the DP had gained an overwhelming majority and even surpassed the great victory of 1950 with an advance of 3%. Democrats received 56.61% of all votes. The RPP, on the other hand, lost 5% of the vote, falling to 34.78%.

Since the majoritarian system reflected this difference with much higher representation rates, the Turkish Grand National Assembly almost consisted of the DP Group. Democrats, who received 92.98% of the seats in the parliament, occupied 503 out of 541 seats. The RPP, which exceeded approximately 35% of the votes, had to be content with 5.52% seats. The RPP had 31 deputies left to have. The DP was opening its second term with an unprecedented victory (Eroğul, 1970, p. 96).

After the 1954 elections, some of the electoral districts that supported the opposition were divided into two, like Malatya, while others were reduced to district status, as in the Kırşehir example (Eroğul, 1987, p. 112). Yalman also reacted to this policy of the DP. He pointed out that the DP was not on a good path after these elections.

According to him, the DP was not worthy of so many votes, love, and attention (Yalman, 1970d, p. 316).

In fact, according to Yalman, Menderes' victory in 1954 had already turned his head. Menderes openly admitted that he would take his following decisions without consulting the press (Yalman, 1970d, p. 317). These words were an indication that the close cooperation between the press and the government had come to an end.

Thereby, the love and hate relationship between Yalman and Menderes could have resumed, and Yalman could have resent Menderes again.

Menderes' words were the last straw. Menderes had caused the link between him and the journalists to break with these words.

Which newspaper are you talking about, the "*Vatan*"? If I had dinner with Safa, the owner of the *Yeni Sabah*, at Ankara Palas tomorrow, Ahmed Emin would immediately give up his articles. Nadir Nadi? Let me tell him about a small embassy like Chile, especially Vienna; the next day, Nadir writes as I want. Is it Burhan Felek? A few sports federation travel opportunities steal his heart. Some among them sell their pen for even 20-30 thousand liras (Yalman, 1970d, p. 322).

Menderes so openly stated that he could buy any journalist by various methods had overstepped the limit entirely. It was precisely at this time that Yalman's emotional ties with Menderes reached the breaking point.

The demonstrations organized to support the Turkish Cypriots on September 6-7, 1955 and turned into acts of violence against the Greeks in Istanbul and Izmir also became one of the reasons for the degeneration of the political life in Turkey (Güven, 2005).

On July 7, 1955, another law restricting freedom of expression was passed. With the enactment of this law, various journalists either have to pay compensation or are imprisoned. This law also gave rise to a faction within the party that advocated giving journalists the right to defend themselves in court (Ersel, Kuyaş, Oktay, & Tunçay,

2002, p. 273). Nineteen deputies, whose demands were ignored by the party rule, left the DP and founded the LP, which had a more liberal view (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 130).

Enver Adakan, who left the DP after fierce debates about the assets of the RPP, had a desire to founding a new party with new members and principles. He aimed to free partisanship from being a means of livelihood and passion and to open up new ideal roads. Names such as former Prime Minister Şemsettin Günaltay, Avni Doğan, and Alaeddin Tiritoğlu, who did not like the current two parties, came together. However, they dispersed upon the formation of the LP. Yalman believed that the LP promised a creditable future. Considering that the DP had recruited its best members, Yalman thought that it was a promising party with the support it received from the newspapers. However, İnönü rejected the offer to join forces with the RPP against the DP. In the October 12, 1957 elections, the LP was wholly defeated. It was able to get only one Member of Parliament. After these elections, the LP almost vanished on its own. While some party members transitioned to the RPP, some members said farewell to the political scene. However, the vacuum opened in the DP because the LP was a pretty chilling and frightening experience for the history of the DP. It was a harrowing trauma for the DP to overcome (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 328-329).

As a matter of fact, on the eve of the 1957 elections, Menderes first showed an affinity with the RPP to break up the opposition and not let the LP breathe. In line with this purpose, Menderes made the following statement in the Parliament:

The country has two great and venerable pashas. One of them is Atatürk, and the other is İsmet Pasha... There is no difficulty that these two cannot handle with the inspirations coming from the depth of history. Thanks to his

cooperation, the country takes on a daily sunny landscape (Yalman, 1970d, p. 336).

However, İnönü did not soften in the face of these words and gave a clear answer by displaying a practical stance.

While the country's suffering continues, a forced spring atmosphere cannot be created. Making Kırşehir a province and respecting me as "Venerable İnönü" does not change the situation. What about our other behests and rights? (Yalman, 1970d, p. 336)

4.14. Fall of the Democrat Party Government: Tragedy of Democrat Party and Yalman

Yalman says that the 1957 election was conducted to overshadow the oppression of the vote robbery in the 1946 election. According to him, from these years onwards, the DP completely turned its back on the freedom, democracy, and reform issues that it had dealt with in June 1945 and started to be driven to suicide (Yalman, 1970d, p. 336).

The early 1950s were the golden years of the Menderes period. Thanks to the demand for food in post-war Europe and the economic "boom" accelerated by the Korean War, Turkey experienced an economic miracle based on exports of foodstuffs and raw materials. There was a surge in demand for consumer goods inside and outside the country as money flowed into the countryside. The merchants, who could import goods sold at high prices, somehow enabled the development of the small industries. Between 1950 and 1953, Turkey experienced an unprecedented 13 percent annual economic growth in four years.

Unfortunately, the foundations of this miracle were fragile and therefore doomed to collapse. For example, the production of foodstuffs and cotton was based only on the increase in cultivation areas, not on advanced techniques. In 1954, the economy stagnated as the growth rate dropped to 9.5 percent. The good years were followed by bad years, and 1956-1959 was marked by soaring inflation with an 18 percent annual price increase. Meanwhile, the economy's growth rate had fallen to a mediocre level of 4 percent, which did not quite match the population growth rate.

The value of the Turkish lira at 2.8, although its value against the dollar was between 10 and 12 liras, benefited the commercial and industrial classes. Import was a profitable business as long as the government provided foreign exchange at low rates and issued import certificates to its parties. However, the government had to implement incentives to export agricultural products. Otherwise, such products would not have a chance to compete in the world market. During the war, the foreign exchange accumulation that had turned the trade balance in favor of Turkey was exhausted. By the mid-1950s, Turkey could not buy capital goods and spare parts. As a result, agricultural machinery failed to serve as it should, and many remained idle. Meanwhile, the slowing factories were operating at half capacity.

Under these circumstances, the government abandoned liberal policies, and on May 18, 1956, the National Security Law (*Ulusal Korunma Kanunu*) was enacted. This law, similar to the precaution taken during the war in 1940, allowed the government to regulate the economy, including the distribution of goods and services and the setting of prices. Despite the new law, the Democrats could not maintain stability and confidence in the economy. They were victims of their pure economics and philosophies. By the end of the 1950s, Menderes could no longer control the economy (Ahmad, 2020, pp. 141-142).

According to the results of the general election of October 27, 1957, the number of deputies issued by the DP is 324. When this number is compared with the 1954 elections, it is seen that the DP had 504 deputies in that election. In other words, the interpretation that the beginning of the decline for the DP is close can be said from this date. Of course, Ahmet Emin Yalman was among those who made this comment.

Ahmet Emin Yalman's son Tunç Yalman was also writing in the *Vatan* newspaper in those years. Lawsuits were brought against Tunç Yalman by the DP government for the articles he wrote about Muhsin Ertuğrul. Since Ahmet Emin Yalman was also the newspaper owner, they included him in this case. The DP government tried to attempt to wear down both father and son. Despite all the reactions from the national and international public, Celal Bayar did not take a step back. Ultimately, Tunç Yalman wrote a soothing article in the *Vatan* newspaper, causing the government to withdraw from the case (Yalman, 1970d, p. 340).

Yalman expressed regretfully at every opportunity in those years that after the 1957 elections, the atmosphere of hatred and resentment began to prevail in the country, and the severe pressures on the press gradually increased. American journalists who came to Turkey received their share from these ill-treatments, and Yalman was later severely punished by the DP government for defending those journalists. All these events have shaken the reputation of the DP government in the world public opinion (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 341-342). The despotic attitude of the DP towards the press resulted in even Yalman being imprisoned. The publication of an article written by the American journalist Eugene C. Pulliam after his visit to Turkey in the *Vatan* newspaper resulted in Yalman being imprisoned. The following statements are

included in the news of the *Vatan* newspaper dated October 17, 1957 (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 130).

Eugene C. Pulliam, owner and editor-in-chief of the Indianapolis Star, New and Arizona Republic newspapers, and his wife, Ms. Nina Pulliam, who came to Turkey just to meet with Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, left our country after being kept waiting for four days and not being able to achieve their purpose, seeing the insult they had never seen before in their lives.

They published the following article in their newspaper's 1st and 2nd October issues. However, we give a mitigated excerpt of it, omitting the parts that are likely to be criminalized in Turkey:

'For the first time since the Second World War, an unfriendly atmosphere towards us started to blow all over Turkey. The Turks hold us accountable for any mishaps that happen to them. The responsibilities for all these situations are concentrated on a single person, the Prime Minister of Turkey, Adnan Menderes, who has put himself in the position of dictator. His power and the breadth of his authority hit him on the head...

In 1950, Menderes promised the Turkish nation greater freedoms and more remarkable economic development. Two years later, he abandoned his commitments and took the position of an absolute dictator of Turkey with various maneuvers.' (Vatan, 17 October 1958).

As can be understood from these articles, Menderes's transformation and his move away from liberal policies started to have vast repercussions in the national press and the international press. Ahmet Emin Yalman's harsh criticism towards Menderes and

the DP government, as well as, there is also harsh criticism from the international press.

In the following years, Yalman will go to prison on March 7, 1960, to serve a sentence of 1 year and three months due to this news. Yalman, who fell ill and was taken to the hospital four days later, will be released for six months on April 15, 1960 (Dinçşahin, 2012, p. 131).

At that time, the President of Pakistan organized a trip by special train and invited press representatives from every country to participate in it. The DP government reacted that they called only Ahmet Emin Yalman from Turkey, and they insisted on getting called another journalist. Although the President of Pakistan was insistent on Yalman, Mümtaz Faik Fenik eventually joined this trip together with Yalman as the journalist of the government. Yalman's prison sentence was finalized during his trip to Pakistan, and his newspaper was closed for a month. Now the ropes between Yalman and the DP government were starting to come to a breaking point (Yalman, 1970d, p. 342).

After the plane crash of Menderes, Yalman is hopeful that national unity will be formed. Yalman is still hopeful about the future no matter what. He still holds hope about the country's course and underlines that this should not be spoiled. He ends his article titled "The Last National Disaster (*Son Milli Felaket*)," dated February 19 with these words:

Before the influence of today's common national feelings dissipates, our politicians should come face to face, repent of their grudges, start to open a great national success in the fields of peace, order and reform together, and the

opportunity created by today's clean togetherness should not be missed
(Yalman, 1970d, p. 349).

The DP Parliamentary Group held an extraordinary meeting that lasted for five and a half hours on April 12, 1960, and decided to open a parliamentary investigation against the People's Party. Taking such a decision in that environment showed that the way of liquidation of the opposition was started. On April 18, 1960, the parliament accepted the DP's motion. A fifteen-person investigation commission, which was formed right after, immediately issued three ban decisions that revealed their true nature (Eroğul, 1970, p. 174). The bans were: congresses, meetings, all political activities of parties, the establishment of new organizations; all publications relating to the commission's activity; publication of the deliberations of the Grand National Assembly on the decision of the investigation (Cumhuriyet, 19 April 1960).

Yalman was among the opponents who harshly criticized this investigation commission established. For him, this commission meant the blatant destruction of the constitution and the establishment of an arbitrary party dictatorship. There were severe reactions from the newspapers and student societies against the investigation commission, which had the arbitrary effect of shutting down newspapers and pouring fines on those they wanted. İsmet İnönü's famous statement, which is "Even I cannot save you anymore," was uttered in those years of Turkish political life (Yalman, 1970d, p. 351).

4.15. May 27, 1960 Coup: A Contradictory Liberal

The Turkish people learned that there was a military coup on May 27, 1960, at three o'clock, with a statement read from the radio by Colonel Alparslan Türkeş. The declaration announced that the Turkish Armed Forces had seized the government of the country in order to "prevent sibling fight" and "save democracy from the crisis it fell into." The declaration emphasized the impartiality of the coup. The seizure of power by the soldiers was met with great joy among the people in Ankara and Istanbul, especially the large student body in both cities and the intellectuals in general. The rest of the country did not show such a reaction. The countryside remained quiet. The turmoil in previous months was almost exclusively limited to Ankara and Istanbul. Elsewhere, there were no indications to confirm a sudden drop in public love for Menderes (Zürcher, 2020, pp. 279-280).

Menderes could not listen to the news of the May 27 coup on the radio; he learned from those who called from Ankara the following day, he wanted to establish contacts with Ankara, but he could not achieve this, too. He decided to go to Kütahya, taking Minister of Finance Hasan Polatkan and a few more deputies. That place was his old constituency; he thought that the people of Kütahya had been loved him, and he hoped that he would find a more accessible and encouraging environment in Kütahya. However, when an officer said that he had received orders to take him to Eskişehir, Menderes began to grasp what the situation was (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 352-353).

Yalman describes the part he mentioned in his memoirs about the May 27, 1960 coup under the title "The Army in the Service of the Homeland (*Ordu Vatan Hizmetinde*)."

In this part, he clearly states that he supports the coup by buttering up to the military and says that after 1955, the DP's government turned into a single-party government

(Yalman, 1970d, pp. 354-355). Yalman, in his writings, praises the coup plotters and describes the day of the coup: "Today is a new day. It is like I was born again." uses expressions (Vatan, 27 May 1960).

Yalman, in his memoirs, describes the announcement of the coup d'etat as "the beautiful sound coming from the radio." After midnight on May 26, they call Yalman from the printing house and wake him up. Yalman immediately listens to the radio and learns that there was a coup. This news is literally a gospel for Yalman (Yalman, 1970d, p. 361). Just after the coup, Yalman writes an editorial entitled "God Has This Day, Too (*Allah'ın Bu Günü de Varmış*)", expressing his support for the coup (Yalman, 1970d, p. 362).

According to Yalman, the DP government did not keep its promises in the face of unconditional trust from the people. It established a single-party era in the country worse than the old one-party era. Menderes ruled the country like an enemy and destroyed the democracy he established with his own hands. Yalman thought that Menderes was a well-intentioned person and did not hesitate to say that he had many good deeds for the country. However, according to Yalman, Menderes could not distinguish between friend and foe and left the right path. Yalman, again making a generous and perhaps very well-intentioned analysis, commented that if Menderes had not done so, he would have been among those who served the history of Turkey the most (Yalman, 1970d, p. 363).

After the coup, Yalman often speaks of Cemal Gürsel with words of praise. He mentions that he did not doubt Gürsel's patriotism and enlightened personality in his memoirs. Yalman frequently meets with Cemal Gürsel at every opportunity and does not leave his side. As a result of his protracted negotiations, Yalman's conclusion

about Cemal Gürsel is that Turkish democracy is now in safe hands (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 367-368).

Ahmet Emin Yalman left the *Vatan* newspaper in January 1961 and started to publish a new newspaper called the *Hür Vatan*. İsmet İnönü once again shows his closeness to Yalman by saying, "In governing the country, I benefit a lot from this objective role of this newspaper." As he slowly enters the last years of his career, Yalman carries on receiving award after award. Yalman was first awarded the "Golden Pen" award. After receiving the Gold Medal from the British Institute of Journalists, he became an honorary member of the International Press Institute. The Journalists' Association gave Yalman the title of the sage of journalists in 1968. Yalman, who spent the last years of his life and career in this way, was deemed worthy of many awards (Yalman, 1970d, pp. 399-406).

Final words are essential. Yalman also seemed to have learned a lot from his memories about his past as he finished his memoirs. Undoubtedly, his greatest aim was to convey what he saw and impartially experienced as a journalist to the next generations in the best possible way. How well he did this is debatable, but it is evident that he worked hard all his life to look his best. While Yalman witnessed many transformations and important breaking points in Turkey, he experienced his own renaissance. Yalman, who has always been eager to learn, curious, and indulgent, has experienced different scenarios in different geographies of the country. His contradictory rhetorics, sometimes inconsistent behaviors, and writings, which were not fed from a theoretical framework, separated him from a real intellectual. In his last words, the types he described as enemies looked like extremely caricatured types: imperialism, communism, bigotry, racism. He lined them up, one after the other as if shouting slogans. Still, the advice he gave in concluding his memories was

noteworthy. He recommended that all political leaders learn from Menderes' example. In addition, the issues of education and village institutes were one of Yalman's most extensive and most profound unfulfilled desires. Indeed, this was why he put an end to his memoirs with the issue of village institutes.



CONCLUSION

Ahmet Emin Yalman was in his early twenties when he started his professional journalism career. Considering the responsibilities that fell on his shoulders in those years, he was pretty modest and mature for his age. While he achieved an unexpected success from a young journalist at that age, his passion, sincerity, and dedication to his job have never diminished over the years. He begins to write editorials for the newspaper at a young age. However, he does not write his name under his writings because he does not want his name to come to the fore. He signals that he will approach journalism passionately since those years with this attitude.

The "bureaucracy" criticism, which Ahmet Emin Yalman always focused on in his long and adventurous professional life, was perhaps one of the most important themes of his writings. While Yalman constantly supports the revolutions of the Republican era, he also complains about the corrupted bureaucracy. Yalman frequently criticizes the slow functioning bureaucracy and the attitudes of the civil servants that harm the state's efficiency. In addition, he argues that the old-fashioned bureaucratic processes should be avoided while making new laws.

Yalman, who Prince Sabahattin greatly influenced, thinks within the framework of the influence of Prince Sabahaddin while analyzing the bureaucratic structure in the country. To this end, he uses two ideal types: Latins and Anglo-Saxons. According to this view, Latins are narrow-minded, and Anglo-Saxons are broad-minded. Latins do not trust people; they doubt (Yalman, 1938, p. 65). The secret of the success of the Anglo-Saxons is to be far from formalism, evaluate first-class minds as soon as they appear, and give them vast, limitless opportunities (Yalman, 1938, p. 80).

According to Yalman, Anglo-Saxons start to work by trusting people. Individuals are at the forefront. It is not possible for Yalman, who comes from an Anglo-Saxon tradition, not to be affected by this mentality and heritage. Insecurity causes disruptions in the bureaucratic system that Yalman criticizes. Therefore, Yalman emphasizes relationships based on trust in human relations and state bureaucracy.

However, according to Yalman, no system can prevent corruption. However,

"corrupted bureaucracies" deceive themselves by saying that they are "overcome."

Yalman does not think that the centralized structure of the sultanate inherited from the Ottoman Empire is compatible with the Anglo-Saxon understanding. The republican reforms changed this bureaucratic system at specific points, but it is impossible to say this for the whole administrative mechanism throughout the country (Yalman, 1938, pp. 67-69).

Yalman distinguishes Kemalism from authoritarian ideologies (Yalman, 1938, p. 127). Yalman's problem with the Kemalist regime stems from its bureaucratic issues. He demands that the new government encourage private enterprise and the regime that trusts individuals and economic statism. Even in 1938, he continued to repeat his pre-republic criticisms.

One of the manifestations of Yalman's liberal and decentralized understanding of society is the Village Institutes Projects. Yalman visited the Village Institutes as a journalist and published his observations in his newspaper. His writings include praise and an optimistic view of both the organizational and educational models of the institutes. According to Yalman, institutes are based on individuals who take the initiative beyond written and formal rules, which fully coincide with liberal understanding. They are more flexible structures than the standard operating rules of the state. The director of each institute has maneuverability and freedom of

movement. Such features are positive steps for Yalman. According to Yalman, the Village Institutes Project is a decentralized model application in the strict sense of the word.

Ahmet Emin Yalman was stuck between two identities almost all his life. There is a liberal intellectual on the one hand and a passionate journalist. Although Yalman has a doctorate in social sciences, it is impossible to find traces of this intellectual accumulation in his journalism. Moreover, although Yalman has taken courses in sociology, history, and statistics at the doctoral level, he seldom refers to specific philosophical thoughts when expressing his ideas. It would not be a correct determination at this point to say that he is an effective opinion leader or a strong ideologue. Instead of deep analysis, he makes simple, short, practical, and day-saving analyzes. It is challenging to say that he handled the events holistically. He often makes his criticisms superficially, not interested in the "how" of things. Therefore, he cannot present in his writings as theoretical background to his readers. Articles in which he refers to liberalism and liberal thinkers are infrequent. He is a man of action, does not establish causality between events, does not think analytically, does not act with the logic of an academician, wants to act pragmatically, and is result-oriented; generally, the solutions he offers are often unscientific.

Establishing an emotional bond with a job is as important as establishing an intellectual bond. However, if this job is a professional occupation, the extent of the emotional bond should be determined well. Ahmet Emin Yalman, from time to time, missed the extent of this emotional bond he established with the journalism profession, crossed the borders, and acted emotionally by ignoring the education he received in his writings.

Ahmet Emin Yalman avoided interpreting liberal thought in a broad sense. Yalman's understanding of liberalism was limited in the triangle of his admiration for Prince Sabahattin's school, anti-communism, and bureaucracy criticism and could not go any further. He also has a mindset full of contradictions and inconsistencies. It is precisely these contradictions of Yalman that constitute the focal point of this study. The change in Yalman's standpoint as a liberal intellectual during and after the transition to a multi-party system in Turkey, particularly examined in this study, is quite surprising. While Yalman was referred to as the "the fifth of fours" working day and night for the DP, even when his newspaper, the *Vatan*, was almost the DP's media organ, afterward they parted ways with all the DP, especially Adnan Menderes.

This animosity between Yalman and the DP may be his biggest contradiction, inconsistency, and perhaps even the most severe concession he made from his liberal and democrat stance. As an emotional liberal intellectual, Yalman did not even speak out against authoritarian military regimes. Moreover, he openly supported these regimes, hoping that Turkey would become liberal in the long run. Yalman's support of the DP government first and then the May 27 coup proves this claim. On the other hand, Yalman's inability to balance his friendship with Menderes is also a point to be criticized. The fact that he sometimes charges Menderes unduly sometimes praises Menderes to the skies and that his relations with Menderes, so to speak, have reached the level of love and hate relations, has taken Yalman one step back from the liberal intellectual line.

The Turkish liberals are confused, contradictory, and ambivalent. They had been either democrats or conservatives; they also used religion, they remained secular, as well; they even supported the junta, as in Yalman's example. Most of all, they had been declared as the bad guy. They had always been treated with suspicion. They took

different positions according to time and context and even contradicted themselves.

Liberal intellectuals in Turkey tried almost every way, but they could not become fully-fledged liberals.

Ahmet Emin Yalman tried to illuminate the path of Turkey and his readers. While Turkey was passing through the dark passages of democracy, she trusted in his sincerity, his whistles, and the sparks he attempted to ignite. At times he was out of breath, unable to whistle vigorously and sometimes there were moments when the flame did not burn; it was becoming a tiny ember.

Nevertheless, he did not cease to be conscientious and hardworking no matter what.

As a journalist, Ahmet Emin Yalman is a significant figure. Being so passionately and emotionally attached to one's profession, sacrificing many things, and even paying many prices for it deserves praise, appreciation, and respect. When Yalman passed away on December 19, 1972, in Istanbul, he was at peace because he had experienced his own renaissance. Yalman, who left deep traces in the history of Turkish thought and Turkish journalism, became a well-known intellectual in the country and abroad.

In that case, it would be more accurate to limit the scope of this study by determining it with a literary expression from the French poet and philosopher Paul Valéry and put and end it that way. Valéry says, "A poem is never finished; it is only abandoned." It was not already possible to fit Ahmet Emin Yalman's entire life into a master's thesis.

In turn, "I abandon, do not finish," this thesis by saying that there is a lot more to be told about Yalman.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: VII., Toplantı: 2. (1945, May 25). 17, 196-233.

T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: VII., Toplantı: 3. (1946, April 29). 22, 217.

chp.org.tr. (2021, October 18). Retrieved December 4, 2021, from *chp.org.tr*:

<https://www.chp.org.tr/haberler/chp-tarihi>

Abadan, N. (1966). *1965 Seçimlerinin Tahlili*. Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.

Ahmad, F. (1993). *The Making of Modern Turkey*. Londra: Routledge.

Ahmad, F. (2007). *Bir Kimlik Peşinde Türkiye*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Ahmad, F. (2020). *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.

Akar, R. (2000). *Aşkale Yolcuları Varlık Vergisi ve Çalışma Kampları*. İstanbul: Belge.

Akşin, S. (2015). *31 Mart Olayı*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Aktar, A. (1999). *Varlık Vergisi ve Türkleştirme Politikaları*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Althusser, L. (1994). *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Arslan, M. (2019). *Süleyman Demirel*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Balcı, S. (2013). *Babîâli Tercüme Odası*. İstanbul: Libra Kitapçılık ve Yayıncılık.

Berkes, N. (2019). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Berktaş, F. (2018). Liberalizm: Tek Bir Pozisyona İndirgenmesi Olanaksız Bir İdeoloji. In H. B. (Örs) (Ed.), *19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler* (pp. 47-114). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Büyük Doğu. (20 June 1945).

Châtelet, F. (1986). *Encyclopedia Universalis*.

Coşar, S. (2004). Liberal Thought and Democracy in Turkey. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 9 (1), 71-98.

Cumhuriyet. (11 May 1948).

Cumhuriyet. (13 August 1946).

Cumhuriyet. (16 January 1949).

Cumhuriyet. (19 April 1960).

Cumhuriyet. (20 April 1950).

Cumhuriyet. (20 May 1945).

Cumhuriyet. (23 July 1946).

Cumhuriyet. (25 August 1946).

Cumhuriyet. (30 September 1947).

Cumhuriyet. (6 March 1950).

Demirci, A. (2018). Ahmet Emin Yalman. In T. Bora, & M. Gültekingil, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce: Liberalizm* (Vol. 7, pp. 473-479). İstanbul: İletişim.

- Demolins, E. (1914). *Anglosaksonların Esbâb-ı faikiyeti nedir?* (A. Fraud, & A. Naci, Trans.) İstanbul: Araks Matbaası.
- Deringil, S. (1994). *Denge Oyunu: İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Dewey, J. (1939). *Türkiye Maarifi Hakkında Rapor*. Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.
- Dewey, J. (1980). *Liberalism and Social Action*. G.P. Putnam & Sons.
- Dinçşahin, Ş. (2012). Ahmet Emin Yalman ve Türkiye'de Liberal Düşünce. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(20. Yıl Özel Sayı), 111-135.
- Duby, G. (1978). *Les trois ordres ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Eatwell, R. (1996). Introduction: What are Political Ideologies. In R. Eatwell, & A. Wright (Eds.), *Contemporary Political Ideologies* (p. 14). New York: Printer.
- Ege, N. N. (1977). *Prens Sabahaddin: Hayatı ve İlmi Müdafaaları*. İstanbul: Güneş Neşriyatı.
- Erdoğan, M. (2018). Liberalizm ve Türkiye'deki Serüveni. In T. Bora, & M. Gültekingil, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce: Liberalizm* (Vol. 7, pp. 23-41). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Eroğul, C. (1970). *Demokrat Parti: Tarihi ve İdeolojisi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Eroğul, C. (1987). The Establishment of Multiparty Rule: 1945-71. In Schick, & Tonak, *Turkey in Transition: New Perspective* (pp. 101-143). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Ersel, H., Kuyaş, A., Oktay, A., & Tunçay, M. (2002). *Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi 1941 - 1960*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Esirci, Ş. (1957). *Menderes Diyor ki: Birinci Kitap 7 Ocak 1947-14 Mayıs 1950*. İstanbul: Demokrasi Yayınları.
- Gaus, G. F. (2001). Ideological Dominance of Liberalism. In M. Freeden, *Reassessing Political Ideologies*. Routledge.
- Göksu, S., & Timms, E. (1999). *Romantic Communist: The Life and Work of Nazım Hikmet*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Guttstadt, C. G. (2006). Depriving Non-Muslims of Citizenship as Part of The Turkification Policy in The Early Years of The Turkish Republic: The Case of Turkish Jews and its Consequences During The Holocaust. In H.-L. Kieser, *Turkey Beyond Nationalism: Towards Postnationalist Identities* (pp. 50-56). Londra: I.B. Tauris.
- Güven, D. (2005). *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Azınlık Politikaları Bağlamında: 6-7 Eylül Olayları*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Hamilton, A. (1986). Au Peuple de l'Etat de New York. In P. Manent, *Les Libéraux* (Vol. IX, p. 293). Paris: Hachette.
- Hayek, F. A. (1945). *La Route de la servitude*. Paris: Médicis.
- Hekimoğlu-Örs, H. B. (2018). İdeoloji: Karmaşık Dünyayı Anlaşılır Kılmak. In H. B. (Örs) (Ed.), *19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler* (pp. 3-38). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- İlmen, V. (1998). 20 Kur'a Askerler. *Tarih ve Toplum*, 3(180).

Kalkan, B. (2018). *Ahmet Emin Yalman Entelektüel Bir Biyografi*. Ankara: Liberte Yayınları.

Kanberoğlu, N. (2018). Osmanlı Devleti'nin II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi Demiryolu Politikaları 1908-1914. *Vakanüvis - Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3, 158 - 187.

Kant, I. (1960). *Ebedî Barış Üzerine Felsefî Deneme*. (Y. Abadan, & S. L. Meray, Trans.) Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.

Karaveli, H. M. (2010). An Unfulfilled Promise of Enlightenment: Kemalism and its Liberal Critics. *Turkish Studies*, 85-102.

Karpat, K. H. (1959). *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System*. Princeton: New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Köker, L. (1992). *Demokrasi Üzerine Yazılar*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Köktener, A. (2005). *Bir Gazetenin Tarihi: Cumhuriyet*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Le Goff, J. (1982). *La Civilisation de L'Occident Médiéval*. Paris: Flammarion.

Lewis, B. (1961). *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. London: Oxford University Press.

Lind, M. (1994). In Defense of Liberal Nationalism. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(3), 87-99.

Madison, J. (1986). Federalist Yazılar. P. Manent içinde, *Les Libéraux* (Cilt X, s. 299). Paris: Hachette.

Manent, P. (1986). *Les Libéraux I*. Hachette.

- Mardin, Ş. (2019). *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1985-1908*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mete, O. (1947). *Bütün Tâfsilâtıyla ve Akisleriyle Demokrat Partinin 1'inci Büyük Kongresi*. İstanbul: Ticaret Dünyası Matbaası.
- Mill, J. S. (1956). *On Liberty*. Bobbs-Merrill.
- Mill, J. S. (n.d.). *L'Utilitarisme*. 1986: Gallimard.
- Montesquieu, S. d. (1876). *Considération sur les Causes de La Grandeur des Romains et de Leur Décadence*. Paris: Librairie des Bibliophiles.
- Müstakil Demokratlar Grubu. (1949). *Demokrat Parti Kurucuları Bu Davanın Adamı Değildirler*. Ankara: Yeni Matbaa.
- Oktay, C. (1998). Hum Zamirinin Serencamı. In C. Oktay, *Siyaset Yazıları*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Oktay, C. (2017). *Siyasi Kültür Okumaları*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Oktay, C. (2018). Önsöz. In H. B. (Örs) (Ed.), *19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler* (pp. XIII-XIV). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Özel, S., & Sarıkaya, A. (2018). Türkiye'de Liberalizmin Prangaları. In T. Bora, & M. Gültekingil, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce: Liberalizm* (Vol. 7, pp. 455-473). İstanbul: İstanbul.
- Parker, B. (1939). *Türkiye'de İlk Tahsil Hakkında Rapor*. İstanbul: Maarif Vekâleti.

Rıfat, S. (1974). İdâre-i Hükûmetin Bazı Kavâid-i Esasiyesini Mutazammın Risale. In

Yeni Türk Edebiyatı Antolojisi 1, 1839-1965. İstanbul: İ.Ü. Yayınları.

Sangu, İ. (1940). Tanzimatta Yeni Osmanlılar. In *Tanzimat 1* (p. 856). İstanbul:

Maarif Matbaası.

Saraçoğlu, Ş. (1942). Kabine Programı. *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Tutanak*

Dergisi, 6 (27), 24-25.

Tamir, Y. (1995). *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tezcan, A. (2007). Ahmet Emin Yalman Dönemi ve Gazeteciliği 1918-1938.

Basılmamış Doktora Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Tocqueville, A. d. (1964). *Voyage en Amérique*. Gallimard.

Tütengil, C. O. (1954). *Prens Sabahaddin*. İstanbul: Geçit Yayınları.

Ulus. (25 January 1949).

Ulus. (31 March 1950).

Ulus. (4 July 1946).

Vatan. (17 October 1958).

Vatan. (19 September 1949).

Vatan. (20 July 1946).

Vatan. (26 July 1946).

Vatan. (27 May 1960).

Vatan. (28 July 1946).

Vatan. (6 December 1948).

Vatan. (8 July 1946).

Weber, M. (1971). *Economie et Société, Volume 1*. Plon.

Yalman, A. E. (1914). *The Development of Modern Turkey as Measured by Its Press*.
New York: Columbia University Press.

Yalman, A. E. (1938). *Gerçekleşen Rüya*. İstanbul: Tan Matbaası.

Yalman, A. E. (1944). *Yarının Türkiyesine Seyahat*. İstanbul: Vatan Matbaası.

Yalman, A. E. (1945). *Naziliğin İç Yüzü*. İstanbul: Vatan Matbaası.

Yalman, A. E. (1957). *Berraklığa Doğru*. İstanbul: Hür Fikirleri Yayma Cemiyeti.

Yalman, A. E. (1970). *San Fransisko'da Neler Gördüm?* İstanbul: Vatan Matbaası.

Yalman, A. E. (1970a). *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim Cilt: 1 (1888-1918)*. İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi.

Yalman, A. E. (1970b). *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim Cilt: 2 (1918-1922)*. İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi.

Yalman, A. E. (1970c). *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim Cilt: 3 (1922-1944)*. İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi.

Yalman, A. E. (1970d). *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim Cilt: 4 (1945-1970)*. İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi.

Yetkin, Ç. (1982). *Serbest Fırka Olayı*. İstanbul: Karacan Yayınları.

Yılmaz, M. (2018). CHP İlkelerinin 1937'de Anayasaya Giriş ve Liberalizmin Yasaklanması. In T. Bora, & M. Gültekingil, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce: Liberalizm* (Vol. 7, pp. 197-295). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Zürcher, E. J. (1995). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Zürcher, E. J. (2003). *Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Siyasal Muhalefet Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası, 1924-1925*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Zürcher, E. J. (2020). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.



Appendix: Abbreviations

- CUP: Committee of Union and Progress
- DP: Democrat Party
- FRP: Free Republican Party
- JP: Justice Party
- LDP: Liberal Democrat Party
- LP: Liberty Party
- MP: Motherland Party
- NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization
- NP: Nation Party
- PRP: Progressive Republican Party
- RPP: Republican People's Party
- UN: United Nations