

THE NATION PARTY:
FORMATION, DEVELOPMENT AND CLOSING PERIODS WITH
RELIGION, LAICISM, DEMOCRACY AND POLITICS DEBATES

HASAN BASRİ GÜNER

BOGAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY
2010

THE NATION PARTY:
FORMATION, DEVELOPMENT AND CLOSING PERIODS WITH
RELIGION, LAICISM, DEMOCRACY AND POLITICS DEBATES

Thesis submitted to the
Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by
Hasan Basri Güner

Boğaziçi University
2010

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Process Leading to 12 July.....	1
Towards Disintegration.....	2
Trust in Turkish Judges.....	3
The DP is a Toddler With Smell of Milk in his Mouth.....	4
CHAPTER 2: FORMATION OF THE NATION PARTY.....	7
Marshal Fevzi Çakmak and His Role in the Nation Party.....	7
The Ideas and the Personality of Marshal.....	8
DP's Decomposition Process, Reasons and Results.....	9
The Beginning of the Story.....	16
The NP Formation Application.....	18
The Main Principles of the Nation Party's Program.....	20
CHAPTER 3: THE DEVELOPMENT DURING THE STRUGGLE PERIOD OF THE NATION PARTY.....	24
The 22 July Declaration of Marshal and the Struggle Getting Stronger.....	24
The Additions to the NP.....	25
The Political Reaction Accusations of the NP.....	26
The Arrest of Bölükbaşı for Founding an Organization to Assassinate İnönü and Celal Bayar.....	28
Marshal's Death and the Events at his Funeral.....	35
The NP Deputy Osman Bölükbaşı in the GNAT Alone.....	39
The General Amnesty Law.....	40
The First Grand Congress of the Nation Party.....	42
The Korean War and the Parliament Permission Discussion.....	43
The Second Menderes Government.....	44
The Second Grand Congress of the Nation Party.....	45
The Parliament President Elections.....	46
The Domination and Violence Policies of the DP Government in its First Year.....	46
The Third Grand Congress of the Nation Party.....	47

CHAPTER 4: THE CLOSURE OF THE NATION PARTY.....	50
The Hikmet Bayur Problem and the Kemalism Discussions.....	50
The Offer from Osman Bölükbaşı.....	52
The DP's and the RPP's Exploitation of the Hikmet Bayur Incident.....	53
The Malatya Assassination.....	54
The Recorded Democracy.....	54
The Letter to Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın.....	55
The NP's Fourth Grand Congress: Hikmet Bayur's Resignation.....	57
The Final Scene of the Assassination against the NP.....	59
The NP Inquiry in the DP Parliament Group.....	61
The Nation Party Case and the Permanent Abolition.....	62
Menderes Leaves the Parliament Bench.....	66
 CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	 69
The Political Conditions.....	69
The Role of the Religion.....	70
The Extremists and the Moderates.....	71
The İnönü Opposition.....	72
The Supporters and the Effect of the Press: <i>Millet</i> versus <i>Büyük Doğu</i>	72
The End of the Nation Party Movement.....	73
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 75
 APPENDICES	 77
A. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REPUBLICAN NATION PARTY (RNP) AND THE 1954 ELECTIONS.....	78
B. THE HISTORY OF THE NATION PARTY'S FOUNDERS IN THE DEMOCRAT PARTY.....	82
C. THE TELEGRAPH OF BÖLÜKBAŞI TO MENDERES.....	94
D. THE FOURTH LOWER CRIMINAL COURT DECISION.....	96
E. THE REACTION OF ALİ FUAT BAŞGİL.....	97
F. THE NATION PARTY PROGRAM: ORIGINAL TEXT.....	98

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The Process Leading to 12 July

By the spring of 1947, there was no sign that the Republican People Party (RPP) would carry out the terms in the Charter of Freedom. On the contrary, their expansion of their offensive campaign caused trouble in the Democrat Party (DP). The RPP continued their attacks targeting idealist members of the DP. These members demanded a return to the public in the case of not-applied Charter of Freedom terms. They were accused of being “greedy” and “rabid” and the provocations in the DP increased. Following the DP’s First Grand Congress, the RPP’s offensive campaign intensified relationships. This situation forced the DP administrators to search for contacts within the RPP.

Pre-contacts were conducted by Recep Peker, Nihat Erim and Fuat Köprülü. Well-known business man Vehbi Koç also served as negotiator. The first contact between Nihat Erim and Fuat Köprülü, took place during a visit of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT) group to England in May 1947. In this meeting, it was decided to have a mild mediation between the parties, so the process of İnönü-Bayar contacts began. Meanwhile, those around the RPP accelerated their propaganda, saying that these contacts were to take radical precautions against the extremist members in the DP. The idea of the “domestication” and “taming” of the DP was put into the press directly from the Prime Minister’s mouth. In his declaration in Ulus, on 2 July 1947, Prime Minister Recep Peker said: “Bayar promised to rearrange the DP’s organization and warn the extremist members about their propaganda extremism in these meetings. All of this gives the impression of a stable party.”¹

The text of the declaration read by İnönü on the radio on the night of 11 July, known as the Declaration of 12 July in Turkish political history, there are sections that would prove these evaluations right. The declaration implied that the DP used abnormal propaganda methods such as the display of power and provocative speeches. The founder and the administrators of the DP in accepting the Declaration of 12 July indirectly admitted they had approved the use of the extremist and unacceptable propaganda by their party. The preparation of the Declaration, İnönü had judged the content of the declaration, worried the

¹ *Ulus*, 2 July 1947.

DP. Opposition against the Declaration among the DP members included General Administration Board members Y. K. Tengirşenk, Sadık Aldoğan, Ahmet Tahtakılıç and Ahmet Oğuz and Party Inspector Osman Bölükbaşı.

The DP assembled a Small Congress on 22 July 1947 to review the Declaration of 12 July, and released a notice after the congress. The hesitations caused by the Declaration were explained: “Under today’s political and administrative circumstances, it’s hard for the opposition to become a true inspector, even impossible; that is a well known fact to all attendants as well as the public. So it has been decided that a symbolic opposition is harmful to the country, and will not help improvement. On the contrary, this could help to continue today’s conditions.”² After these events, Osman Bölükbaşı resigned from party inspection on 23 July 1947. In his resignation letter, he said: “Against the government party’s request for the elimination of extremists, maybe I can serve your mild policy with this resignation that can be considered as a compromise by the General Board.”³

Towards Disintegration

The Declaration of 12 July sharpened the disagreements in the DP, activating the disintegration and elimination process in the party irrevocably. The challenge arose between the groups of this negotiation, considering it noncompliant with the Charter of Freedom. An administration group led by Fuat Köprülü, with the silent support of Celal Bayar and Adnan Menderes, made the final encounter inevitable. Hopes and expectations for a mild political environment with the Declaration of 12 July appeared empty and the RPP’s attacks on the opposition increased just after the declaration. The RPP front continued to carry out provocations inside the DP for disintegration between “extremist” and “mild” while accusing the DP of “being destructive and provoking public for convulsion but unsuccessfully” to silence the opposition. “The ‘extreme and soft’ differentiation came out not because of the events, totally became from the personalities and the characters of the party members.”⁴

² The DP Congress on 22 July 1947.

³ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 68.

⁴ Metin Toker, *Tek Partiden Çok Partiye* (Ankara: Milliyet Yayınları, 1970), Tarih Serisi, Vol. 2, p.302.

Three weeks after the Declaration of 12 July, he said: “Acting with determination and decision to tear apart the single-party cancer that has been eating the national body, the DP fights against a conservative and dictatorial coterie which wants to maintain illegal domination by principles of denial and persistence. Osman Bölükbaşı, saying relieving hopes and expectations from the Declaration of 12 July should be evaluated in the light of the experiences, in an article in *Kuvvet* newspaper on 1 August 1947, stated that there should not be any pessimism until the active results were received and told the RPP administrators of the hopes for the discussions in the DP after the declaration: “Democrats who consider discussion ‘tradition’ and cooperation ‘obligation’ should unite in the ‘Charter of Freedom’. Member whose creeds are the ‘Charter of Freedom’ and are determined to quit old traditions in the new house cannot be classified as ‘mild’ or ‘extremist’. Our friends are people who carry the Kuvayı Milliye soul and seek the real warrant of freedom and the democracy in their own determination and fortitude, who know that the cruelty is no crueler than the fear of cruelty.” Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, in an article in *Tanin* newspaper on 31 July 1947, compared the DP members who asked for the resignation of Prime Minister Peker to rebels who wanted the head of the Grand Vizier at the doors of the palace and lost their own heads instead.⁵

Trust in Turkish Judges

The violent policy of the Recep Peker government targeted the press as well as the DP administrators. After Adnan Menderes’s speech in Izmir, on 24 April 1947, *Kuvvet*, *Tasvir*, *Demokrasi*, *Yeni Asır* and *Demokrat Izmir* newspapers published this speech, and prosecutors decided that the text was felonious. The responsible manager of that issue of *Kuvvet* newspaper; Samet Ağaoğlu, Mithat Perin, Fuat Arna and five other journalists were subject to the judicial inquiry and their arrest warrants in absentia were decided for the crime of insulting the parliament. They were accused of publishing Menderes’s speech, which was insulting to the moral identity and legality of Parliament. Fuat Arna, submitting himself to the prosecution, was arrested and taken to prison. Arna was in handcuffs even while he was in the Justice Hall and being taken to court for trial. Minister of Internal Affairs Sökmensüer tried to explain this as a precaution to prevent any “bailout.” These persons accused with the 159th

⁵ Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın’s article, *Tanin* newspaper, 31 July 1947.

article of Turkish Penalty Law, stayed in the prison for three days, then were freed with the decision of the Izmir High Criminal Court.⁶

The DP is a Toddler with the Smell of Milk in his Mouth

While the DP was waiting for İnönü's promises of the Declaration of 12 July to come into effect, the pessimism in the party increased. The political rights and freedoms of the Turkish people, to be returned in the future, were not conveyed to the RPP. In his Erzurum speech, Minister of Public Works Cevdet Kerim from the RPP said that the DP was not working sincerely; they were ambitious for their power and trying to separate the country. He ended with the following threats: "We can not leave the competence to this 'one-year-old toddler with the smell of milk in his mouth' acting with the principle of motive validates instruments. The government has the power to stop them and crush them if necessary."

Hilmi Uran, General Secretary of the RPP sent a circular to the party organization in late August 1947 on the Declaration of 12 July. The circular had accusations against the DP. The editor-in-chief of *Ulus* newspaper, the press representative of the RPP, Nihat Erim wrote an article on 24 August 1947 supporting this circular. The circular of the RPP's General Secretary, included the following allegations: "The DP tried every possible provocative way throughout the country for the last time, when they realized they weren't getting results they went to İnönü, and the Declaration of 12 July was issued after this."

Nihat Erim, defending the RPP circular, wrote: "The DP couldn't get any results despite all the provocations, then turned to President İnönü's mercy." Hilmi Uran's circular included this statement: The process of preparation of Declaration of 12 July. "President İnönü heard our complaints about the DP walking in illegal paths. We have been complaining about the DP administrators seducing and provoking citizens with false hopes." He wrote: "There are people who seek and find their political foulante from the disagreement of two parties, also who seek and maybe find an advantage –yes, a personal advantage- from this situation" in his article implying "extremists" among the DP members.

The DP boycotted the municipal election of 26 May 1946 because of the still-valid antidemocratic laws. The low participation in elections (49% in İstanbul, 22% in Izmir) made

⁶ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 72.

the RPP angry, and these results were considered an outcome of the DP's provocations. The Declaration of 12 July caused a disturbance in the RPP. On 26 August 1947, the RPP parliament group gathered and considered the events after 12 July and criticized Recep Peker's government. Following this, Recep Peker requested a vote of confidence. After voting, he received 35 negative, 303 positive votes of confidence. After this event, Recep Peker made changes to the government on 4 September 1947. Şükrü Sökmensüer, Minister of Internal Affairs was left out and a new cabinet was created with five changes.

Following the events of the Declaration of 12 July, it was shown that the RPP did not fully intend to take steps towards democracy. Recep Peker received the majority of votes against 35, from the RPP parliament group. Thus his "democratic pressure" of which the DP had complained was approved and maybe legalized. "The RPP is not friendly and using the DP for their secret agenda" was declared one day before 30 August 1947, the day it was going to be published in *Kudret* newspaper. However, the DP's General Center requested that the article in *Kudret* paper be examined by the General Administration Board. The examinations concluded that the article did not comply with the party advantages and *Kudret* newspaper was exposed to the pressure because of this situation. As a result, article was not published the next day.⁷

The last article of Osman Bölükbaşı as a DP member was published on 23rd September 1947 in *Kudret*, before he cut his all connections with the DP on 3 October 1947. An article entitled "Deadlocks and Sword of National Sovereignty" examines the events during the three months after the Declaration of 12 July and includes some observations about the Turkish nation's expectations. In the RPP's official newspaper, *Ulus*, it was said of the resignation: "Osman Bölükbaşı, who writes and gives speeches in measured and non-measured terms and has made new organizations with travelling villages since the day DP was formed, also his leaving the party has aroused contradictory comments."

This speculation was written about the resignation, which was said to have happened in Yozgat,

"Osman Bölükbaşı who came to Yozgat to attend a session dated 30 September 1947 for insulting the Board of Election of Sorgun, said hard words about Celal Bayar at a dinner at the DP's provincial chairman's house. Because of this, there was a discussion between him and his lawyer, Osman Şevki Çiçekdağ. It is guessed that there is a connection between this incident and Bölükbaşı's resignation from DP. It is

⁷ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 74.

assumed that Bölükbaşı left DP of his own will after saying such hard words about Celal Bayar”.⁸

Osman Bölükbaşı disclaimed this news with an explanation in *Ulus* newspaper dated 6 October 1947, saying “these are unrealistic, he felt amazement and sorrow and he applied the DP to determine true nature of this scam. He continued: “In view of your news trying to elicit some comments against the DP by evaluating my resignation as a mystery, I am content with declaring that Bölükbaşı will be in democracy suit till death even outside the DP and as a citizen he will continue to do his part in this holy struggle with his old passion and determination, and he will always be respectful of the memory of his companions.”⁹

⁸ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 84.

⁹ *Ulus*, 6 October 1947.

CHAPTER 2 FORMATION OF THE NATION PARTY

Marshal Fevzi Çakmak and His Role in the Nation Party

Before continuing our story about the Nation Party it is very important to describe the role and effect of Marshal in the formation of the party. Marshal Fevzi Çakmak was a great commander for the great majority of the public. He proved his military genius in the Turkish Independence War. He was one of the founders of the Nation Party and he was very different than the other founders. He was born on 12th January 1876, in Istanbul. After a successful military school career and as a result of his successful achievements in the Balkan Wars, he was ascended to Colonel rank. He was appointed to be the Governor of Taslica and he commanded 35th army, there. After the declaration of *Constitution II*, Fevzi Pasha remained in Taslica, until he was appointed to be the commander of the Army Corps organised against Russia, in 1910. Then he was designated to Western Army Corps organised against the Italian attacks in Trablus.

In the following years, he worked in the Ministry of War, as the chairman of the department of action. After the Balkan wars, he was designated as Ankara Division Commander, and then to fifth Army corps. In March 1914, he was ascended to be a Brigadier General. In the First World War, he fought in Gallipoli. In 1915, he commanded the Anafartalar Group. In 1916, he was appointed to be the Commander of the Second Army Corps of Caucasia. In 1917, he designated to be the Commander of 2nd Army Corps. In 1918, because of his successes in Syria, he was promoted by the Divisional General rank. After the Peace Treaty of Mondros; he was designated to be Minister of War, but he resigned from his duty with the occupation of Izmir by the allies. On 3rd February 1920, he supported the organisations of the War of independence in Anatolia. On 8th April 1920, after the occupation of Istanbul, he left Istanbul and went to Anatolia. He joined the Army of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and he worked him, until he died.

In Ankara, Turkish National Assembly was designated him as the director of the cabinet as an appreciation of his joining. After the Inönü Triumph, in 3rd April 1921, he was designated to be General. In 1921. After the Sakarya War; in 29th September 1921, he was given the rank of Marshal. In 1946, he was elected as the Istanbul deputy and in 1948, he

established the Nation Party. He died, in 10th April, 1950. It can be seen that Marshal had had very important missions and had known as a very serious personality.

Beside these military career, Marshal was a conservative and religious person. And he was more like one of the public than the other elite people on the administration. Therefore he had had a great influence over the public. Therefore, if there would be a real opposition, Marshal was the most convenient leader for this task. And we may say that Marshal had never been an active executive of the Nation Party, however, the Nation Party had been formed under the effect of his soul.

All the life span of the Nation Party, Marshal had been known as the founder and the leader of the party even though he had not been in the party along its existence. We may say that public had always thought that Marshal had been the only leader of the party.

The Ideas and the Personality of Marshal

In the history of Turkish Republic, being religious have never become a problem, however, the role of the religion in the government have been always the most important problem. Kemal H. Karpat is giving notes from *American Scholar* magazine that was issued in 1936 and he is explaining the personality of Marshal. Karpat says that Marshal was very religious person. But he was always at the very top administration of the government. Atatürk had always deep respect to him and it has been said that he had not drink any alcohol at the same table with Marshal.¹⁰

To make a very characteristic analysis about Marshal, we may give the following words of Karpat's same book which had been taken from : "Since Marshal entered into politics with a very strong and angry defense of himself, he explained that he had many different nicknames: Just because he visited the grave of his daughter, he had been called as 'reactionary', just because he spoke to public as "my children", he had been called as 'conservative', finally, just because he defended his rights and freedom, he had been called as 'communist'."¹¹ We may find the same explanations about Marshal in the book "Hür Ufuklara Doğru –Toward Free Horizons" written by Fevzi Boztepe, İstanbul, 1952.

¹⁰ Kemal H. Karpat, *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1967), p. 56.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 157.

However, the very well known organ of the NP, *Millet* newspaper, made very clear anti-communist publication in all its life span. It is a very important evidence to understand how easy to make a bad nickname to a very valuable person in the politics understanding of this period.¹²

DP's Decomposition Process, Reasons and Results

The Democratic Party faced a decomposition process at the very beginning of its political life. After a short period of two years after its formation the DP was partitioned when it was in opposition. The underlying reason for its decomposition was the member did not have a common ideology except for being dissenters. The DP had no clear program to provide to its electors except for an opposition role. Discussions in the party after the 1946 elections about "going to the country" and different point of view about opposition strategies lasted in the first Grand Congress. These discussions, which were renewed after the 12 July Statement period, caused the "moderate-extreme" partition to be more sharpened. As a result of the DP's decomposition process reached a point from which there was no return. Timur writes that "The DP founders had targetted to criticize the policies of İnönü rather than his personality. The others called as extremists in the DP."¹³

In this difficult period, the majority of 1946 staff resigned, were forced to leave or were sent down. Osman Bölükbaşı was first to leave the DP. In 1948 two-thirds of the staff present at the DP's formation process was out of the party. The DP's president candidate Marshal Fevzi Çakmak, Istanbul provincial chairman Kenan Öner, General Sadık Aldoğan, Fuat Arna, Hikmet Bayur, Mustafa Kentli, Osman Nuri Koni, Suphi Batur, Enver Kök, Emin Sazak, Ahmet Tahtakılıç, Ahmet Oğuz, Hasan Dinçer, Yusuf Kemal Tengirşenk, Enis Akaygen and Osman Bölükbaşı were out of the party. After these discharging processes, two formations came into existence: one in the parliament forming a new group, and the other forming a new opposition party. A group of members of parliament discharged from the DP formed the Separate Democrats Group, and the other discharged staff formed the Nation Party on 6 July 1948. These staff who stuck to 1946 ideals and formed a new political party

¹² *Millet*, Haziran-Aralık 1947.

¹³ Taner Timur, *Türkiye'de Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, no. 3, 2003), p. 47.

continued the struggle with the RPP and the DP. On the other hand, later, some DP managers who had been effective in facilitating the “moderate-extreme” dialogue that caused the decomposition of the DP left the DP and moved to the RPP. The DP, which got rid of these “extreme and strong opposition supporter” staff, started a voyage which ended up with the overthrow of the party with “revolution” in 1960.

Much has said and written about the reason for internal upheaval and its results in the DP in the period 1947-1960. Those who lived through the events made evaluations that reflect their points of view on this subject. To better understand the real reasons for the events in this period, which became an important milestone in Osman Bölükbaşı’s political life, it is appropriate to consider the political backgrounds and views of the parties to this internal fight.

To be able to make a healthier evaluation about this process which resulted in DP’s decomposition, these questions must be answered:

Was it a difference in ideals and beliefs or a character conflict that was the basic reason for DP staff departures?

What was the effect of the confidence crisis in this period revealed by doubts about DP founders’ sincerity and commitment to democracy? What ideas mainly affected the “moderate-extreme” polarization in the DP?

Was the struggle about discharging idealist staff that learnt politics in the DP by the DP founders who came from the one-party tradition? Did the idea of authoritarian discipline in the party of the the DP founders who grew up in the RPP and their will and search to establish domination over the DP have any effects on this discharge process?

What was the effect of the disturbance felt by the DP founders for questioning their responsibilities while they were criticizing the totalitarians of the RPP about the one-party regime?

Objective answers to these questions will help us to understand the real dynamics of the past events. Four founders of the DP in 1946 who had been members of the parliament at the RPP until 1945 were important members of the DP. Celal Bayar was vice chairman at RPP in 1938 and was the prime minister of İsmet İnönü. Adnan Menderes also began his involvement in politics in the RPP with National Chief İnönü. He became a RPP member of parliament in Aydın in 1931, and an inspector of the RPP sport organization. Adnan Menderes’ interview with İnönü, when he wanted to become agriculture minister in RPP’s one-party government, did not show results. Fuad Köprülü and Refik Koraltan also took some responsibilities at RPP’s various degrees. Samet Ağaoğlu, who participated with these four

founders in the struggle within the DP and who were ministers in the DP governments continuously until the 1960 revolution, also wanted to be candidates for member of the parliament in 1943-1944, but this demand was not accepted.

It is seen that nearly all the people in “traditional – moderate “ group in the DP were past generation members and they were representatives of the RPP’s one-party tradition’s political view. They were professional politicians who had grown from the RPP School. They had shared the responsibility of the RPP management during 23 years before 1946. On the other hand, those who were discharged with the claim of being “extreme“ had had no political adventures in their past. They had adopted the 1946 suit just like the *Kuvayı Milliye (National Forces)* spirit and they were staff who considered it an Anatolian movement. These staff lived through the 1946 struggle with missionary spirit and enthusiasm like militants. It is true that except for differences in idealism and concept between these two groups, there is a character difference in this sense.

The DP founders that grew up in the RPP and come from the one-party tradition, did not have the idea to form an opposing party at the beginning. On 7 June 1945, they demanded by making a motion known as the ‘Quad Declaration’ to the RPP Parliament Group, that the RPP party program and policy guidelines should be modified to effectuate the present Fundamental Law. Assistant Professor Esat Öz makes these identifications in his research, “Transition Process to Democracy in Turkey” published in ‘*Özgür Düşünce*’ in 1966 : You can examine the DP for its founders and mass support’s composition or its program (its ideology) and its organizing structure; it is seen that it represents change and continuity.

It represents continuity because they grew up in the RPP school. Consequently, in view of party management and organization, since they had similar comprehension and values, they did not have a structure much different that of the RPP. Accordingly, they defended a “change”, which meant returning to origin, not a break-away. Political opposition coming from the same tradition did not have the purpose of destroying the one-party ideology and its institutions or even to question it seriously. The DP’s basic attitude was to oppose the republic’s authoritarian and state partisan interpretation, which was assumed to be represented by the RPP, and to protest the exercises of the National Chief period.¹⁴ Examining by comparing the DP’s democracy and independence perceptions and exercises in the DP’s

¹⁴ Transition Process to Democracy in Turkey” published in ‘*Özgür Düşünce*’ magazine number 3 in 1966.

government and opposition periods will explain an objective judgment about the DP's managers' belief in democracy. It seen, from the formation of the DP there were two groups with different structures and ideas. With incidents over time, the borders of this grouping became sharper and after the departure of the staff seen or exposed as "extreme," discharge process completes.

Metin Toker says this about the subject in his book '*From Single Party to Multi Party*':

The separation of extremist and moderate in the DP did not start with the incidents, it started with people's nature and character. If Bayar was so patient and rational, Kenan Öner was as impulsive and irrational. Marshal did not have a tiny bit of Menderes' calmness. The founders were from the RPP school. The others had refused to obey authority all their lives. Character conflicts appeared at the beginning. Öner and Köprülü, Köprülü and Tengirşek, Bayar and Bölükbaşı, Menderes and Aldoğan did not ever like each other, they did not agree. They did not even believe in each other.¹⁵

These evaluations in Samet Ağaoğlu's memoirs, '*Political Diary*', are very important on the subject: "Adnan Menderes started the struggle to become the DP's second man after Bayar. He thought Fuad Köprülü was his closest helper in this until the DP rose into government. For this, Adnan Menderes' self-sacrifice was to take no notice of Köprülü's being too free and easy, his conceit and rudeness. He would take no notice of these, but he would hit those who would and could oppose him in his way to become first in the second stage, second in the first stage, with Köprülü's hand until this hand got tired or retreated from this idea or feeling. The most important of effects that caused the DP's internal struggle was the contradiction and conflict between the states of minds of the politicians that had grown under one-party management and their sincere belief in democratic regime with idea and reason. The source of delusion that bothered the DP arose from politicians who had grown up with the one-party state of mind and the mentality, the conflict between this state of mind and mentality and sincere democracy ideal. The totalitarian system gets its power from the individual's egocentric tendency. The democratic system does not get along with this tendency. I can say that the real reason of internal conflicts that started from the day the DP had been formed appeared from this contradiction.

As Samet Ağaoğlu confessed years later in this discharge process, "the Democratic Party Discipline Board acted like the Independence Court." Expressions in Samet Ağaoğlu's

¹⁵ Metin Toker, *Tek Partiden Çok Partiye* (Ankara: Milliyet Yayınları, 1970), Tarih Serisi, Vol. 2, p. 308.

notes that he kept about conversations at party headquarters display the DP managers' states of mind: Fuad Köprülü said the following at a meeting of the DP General Management Board on 18 December 1947: "We had this gangrene because of moving with friendship feelings until now. We have to get rid of it. "At the same meeting Refik İnce said "We are in a party matter, we are facing a state of mind that is opposing us. Whom do we have to get rid of for this main case? We have to talk about these," to advocate the discharge of his close friends who had started in the party together in 1946, by using party discipline mechanisms such as a revolution court. As a natural result of this mindset, in an announcement made by DP Headquarters on 13 March 1948, people discharged from DP by these methods were characterized as "buyer ups, in pursuit of hatred and revenge and the people who don't want the country to have a stable and harmonious political and social structure."

Şevket Süreyya Aydemir's findings and evaluations on this subject were expressed as follows in his book, *Logic of the Revolution*: "About the New Party Chiefs! It seemed that they would be absorbed sometimes into courage, sometimes confusion, sometimes leadership and pride in being chief, but generally, into drift that comes from the feeling that old system has expired its lifetime. Hesitation would be over fast and easy, because time was on their side. They will have the power. Their power was not just ones that had their names written in new party books. Their conscious and subconscious waves wrapped the country like winds, as we tried to explain above, that don't support each other, but all of them opposing the present government, that rioted to fret and destroy it, or else new booming winds, were blowing for them. At the same time, spirit and nature disagreements that showed up not very late even if it was not revealed during the first days, was getting stronger between the new chiefs revealed in Ankara and intellectuals that joined the movement in centers like Istanbul and Izmir. Because, in the past, from the beginning of Independence War, the leaders of new attempts, the new formations, the formation of the Republic and the new regime were all in Ankara. Democrats in Istanbul and in many provincial centers felt they were unknown, but always present foreignness in heads towards monopoly of this Ankara group, whereas the new party was organized to spread politics to the whole country and create new leaders throughout the whole country by destroying this monopoly tradition. Then, it was time for these centers. In this new movement, Istanbul and other centers reveal their own leaders without taking cover of this or that leader of Ankara. Then, intellectuals of the country should now take their place in this party and at the front. For example, famous lawyer Kenan Öner in Istanbul and similar figures seemed to be leaders of this new development at the time, but these expectations and

hopes showed a deficit and were put aside. Because Ankara was Ankara. Leaders of the new formation were also people representing Ankara who had grown up with the Ankara professional politics tradition. It was possible to make politics with them, but it was not possible to talk equally with them. This was not a law. It was a matter of tradition, nature. As a matter of fact, national celebrities who came out of this tradition of Ankara, but not the regular people of the new party, and who deluded themselves with the dream of becoming important people in the new party and masters of tomorrow, put their feet on the ground of reality. In a short time, they disappeared.“

Politicians who refused to become regular people along with the new chiefs and mass public speakers like Osman Bölükbaşı were sent away from the new party in a short time. In the new party, the Ankara hegemony and leadership tradition settled in the first election (1946). It lasted until the end. In other words the one-party regime and discipline were conducted in the Democrat Party as a continuity of the tradition lasting from 1923. Therefore, it can be said there was no difference between the old RPP government and the new Democrat Party. Şevket Süreyya Aydemir makes this striking evaluation, in his same work, about the results of this fragmentation in the the DP: “Especially after this decomposition, there started to be an authoritarian air at the DP. Habits of being the only voice in management of leader staff that moved from the RPP to the the the DP and that had grown up with the RPP’s one-party tradition, were increasingly settling at party’s high levels and especially in Bayar’s attitude and comportment. What would have happened if these staffs weren’t discharged in the decomposition before the DP government? I assume that if it were like this, the (one-man) spirit at the DP and one-party state of mind coming from the RPP that could not be renounced, could be prevented.”¹⁶

Osman Bölükbaşı’s explained his opinions about sources of conflict at the Democrat Party and reasons for its having spread so widely response to the question, “What are the reasons for the conflict in the Democrat Party and its spreading so widely? In your opinion, how could this conflict have been overcome?” in an interview titled “We Faced the Government That Belongs to the People That Transformed Their Suspicion into Witness and Their Ambition into Judgement.” Published in Tasvir newspaper, dated 2 April 1948.

“In my opinion, the conflict at Democratic Party appeared in time because people of different habits and states of mind gathered together and as a result old traditions came

¹⁶ Şevket Süreyya Afdemir, *İhtilalin Mantığı*.

up in the new home. You can add any kind of personal weaknesses. A one-party system that continued for a long time, tried to transform people according to one pattern and into chickens that wait for their feed, and it brought up a group of people of a weak character to support every process and case. The Democratic Party, which was formed fast, more or less settled this kind of people at every level. The differences, which did not appear at first, arose with the development of the case. The 12 July Announcement especially dragged some people to the intoxication and they made a mistake inadvertently by thinking that this announcement and its promises were a solid step that could take them to success.¹⁷

One-party supporters that knew very well that domination would go on as long as fear went on, characterized people that had states of mind and characters to play a role to destroy the domination in order to enlighten and encourage public, as “extreme”.

To the question; “Your name is also said to be among the founders of a third party. What do you say about this?” he said: Appearing of a lot of things coming from the DP’s own weaknesses is possible if the DP cannot get rid of the chaos, for which in my opinion a handful of people are responsible who refuse the concept that is based on 100 percent morality. I am sure that even the people said to be forming a party will serve the DP even if they are not included, when the DP proves that it represents a real opposition by getting rid of the current situation which makes all of us sad.¹⁸

Osman Bölükbaşı believed that the main source of the DP’s internal decomposition was Celal Bayar’s insincerity, that it was executed by Prof. Fuad Köprülü, who was in control of him, that Menderes was used by them in this game. In the same way, Bölükbaşı who thought that İnönü and Bayar did not believe in real democracy during the passage to multi-party political life, that they wanted to play a democracy game, and believed that this lack of faith was the underlying reason for distress during the 1946-1950 period.

It can be concluded that in the place of İnönü and Bayar’s formerly executed artificial opposition trials, they conducted a strategy to clamp down on the public by just putting the opposition in order. Mehmet Altay Köymen, a professor at Ankara University in the Language-History-Geography Faculty, said in his research “Prof. M. Fuad Köprülü’s political life,” published by *Yeni Forum* dated 11th August 1981:

“Democracy is a regime of morality. This simple reality is forgotten in Turkey in the implementation of democracy that we took from the West. In place of that, insincerity and lack of good have appeared. In that way, democracy degenerates in the hands of civil politicians. We try to learn tricks of democracy before learning it. Therefore, on

¹⁷ *Tasvir*, 2 April 1948.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

the basis of the attempted democracy movement in Turkey, even from the beginning there was insincerity and lack of good will and it could not be corrected anyhow. It is possible to observe the same insincerity and lack of good will also during the DP's time. Köprülü, with his writings and his scientific popularity, and Osman Bölükbaşı with his political speeches that dragged public and his organizational skills, played the leading roles in DP's development and being government. Osman Bölükbaşı who made these services before being government, and many democracy apostles were discharged or forced to resign in one way or another. Fuad Köprülü should not have allowed this kind of conduct without thinking that one day it would be his turn. ¹⁹

Osman Bölükbaşı expressed his unchangeable opinions about this subject, about pardoning Celal Bayar and the old DP politicians, in the interviews made in Turkish Grand National Assembly on 14 May 1969:

“Things wouldn't have ended with revolution if İnönü had not followed small estimations while entering in democratic life, if he had not appointed Celal Bayar, as we all know very well that he does not believe or like him, with the opposition duty in an artificial way, if while he had had the chance he could have prepared social, economic, cultural and legal grounds to make it possible to have a democratic life and if he could have brought up a secured constitutional charter, today there wouldn't be the memory of hung up unfortunate prime minister and friends in this unfortunate country which faithless politicians are preparing to embrace. Our opinion is that the Turkish public will have the opportunity for peace and our political life will be able to settle into its regular order without embracing these two former presidents on the political scene who the ones most responsible as in Turkey's past crises and distress, but allowing them to withdraw into a corner. It is not impossible to think with mercy and grace of those hundreds of Harbiye students and young officers who became the victims of incidents created by others and to remember with a much bigger feeling of compassion for the unfortunate Menders and his friends, Talat Aydemir and Fethi Gürcan, who were hung as a result of the last scene created by these two presidents who tried to seem like apostles of forgiveness and tolerance.”²⁰

The Beginning of the Story

Important names of the 1946 movement that separated from the DP started to work to form a new party at the beginning of 1948. This work accelerated after Istanbul Province President Kenan Özer's resignation from the DP on 16 January 1948. This incident caused great disturbance and unrest among the DP managers. As a result, a widespread smear

¹⁹ *Yeni Forum*, 11 August 1981.

²⁰ Interviews made at the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on 14 May 1969.

campaign was organized to destroy the new party before its formation. Irrelevant of the NP's and its managers' ideology and opinions, in this campaign, publications saying that "those who separated from the DP were being used by Communists to divide the DP into two" were made. These expressions, published in the *Vatan* newspaper dated 12 January 1948, reveal the dimensions of psychological operations: "One must be very careful and prudent. We are facing a Communist trap. The remiss who are trying to divide DP into two are victims of red intrigues."²¹

Ahmet Emin Yalman, the editorial writer of *Vatan* who made these ugly accusations, had made speeches which complimented the DP managers. On 20 March 1948, he wrote that: "the destructive and defeatist movements made by a handful of men who follow their personal hatred and ambition threaten the country's existence, independence and citizens' rights and freedom."²² It should be noted that a very interesting similarity in the "used by Communist desires" accusation made formerly by the RPP of the DP, was being used by the DP managers to discredit their former friends with whom they were accused by the RPP.

At the same time, the DP managers tried to denounce the discharged people's efforts to share their ideas with the DP organization and to influence them in a planned assassination attempt. In reality, the decomposition was unavoidable. After a victory obtained just by disturbing the RPP, at this second stage, the opposing idea that had won would want to distinguish itself. The other accusation made by the DP managers of their discharged colleagues was that they intended to form a new party to become ministers and members of parliament to satisfy their own ambitions. These developments were greeted with pleasure by the RPP. The RPP managers who were pleased by this decomposition in the DP said that it revealed a fight between "extremist and moderate" and one of the opinions would discharge the other at the end of this fight for power.

The DP managers who were uncomfortable with the decomposition and grouping in the party and started a struggle against them made a huge effort to defend themselves against the trumped-up claims to prove that the DP voters were not affected by it. Celal Bayar gave a speech at the Istanbul Congress on 17 January 1948: "The 12 July Announcement is a bill of a promise. When its time comes it will be demanded that it be paid, but the aim has not been

²¹ *Vatan*, 12 January 1948.

²² Ahmet Yalman's editorial column, *Vatan*, 20 March 1948.

achieved yet.” Bayar was talking about the opponents of the 22 July Announcement on 22 January 1948 in Balıkesir: “I don’t appreciate this. A party appreciates aims, not tactics. Aims are achieving the purpose without giving importance to this or that way. We want this.” He ended his speech with this threat after his speech reflecting a point of view that every illegal way was possible to achieve the purpose: “Democrats are connected to regulations. The ones that get out of line will be pulled by their ears and sent to the discipline committee. If that’s not enough, they will be discharged from the party and they will be gone.”²³

DP Headquarters, at the same time, gave information to the press saying that Kenan Öner had met Osman Bölükbaşı in Ankara and that he had sent Osman Bölükbaşı to Hatay and Maraş to organize conferences to spread the propaganda that the DP was a party in a trumped-up fight. Kenan Öner made this explanation on 10 February 1948 in view of this claim: “I saw Osman Bölükbaşı because he did me a favor by visiting me. He told me that he thought my resignation reasons were right and that his experiences also proved his opinion. As Osman Bölükbaşı, who proved by his every movement that he did not have a slave spirit until now, isn’t so helpless to take orders from me I don’t have the capability to teach this kind of man.”

One of DP founders, Refik Koraltan, compared those who left the party with Çerkez Ethem’s betrayal in his speech at the DP Ankara Center on 20 March 1948. Osman Bölükbaşı gave this answer to this accusation in a speech published in *Yeni Sabah* on 27 March 1948. Like other accusations, the old DP politicians who would become NP founders, answered that they did not accept these accusations, either.

The NP Formation Application

The Public Party was formed by eight people on 19 July 1948 with this application to the Ankara Governorship.

To the Ankara Governorship:

We, the founders whose names, surnames, professions, addresses and signatures are written at the bottom, have formed a new party with the name “Public Party.”

Founders appointed Marshal Fevzi Çakmak as the honorary president of the party.

Two copies of the party’s program and policy guidelines are attached. We respectfully

²³ The NP Istanbul Congress on 17 January 1948.

request that certification be provided and this application sent to the Internal Affairs Ministry in accordance with Associations Law article 4.

19 July 1948

Party Center: Adakale st. Nr: 4, Yenişehir-Ankara

1. Mareşal Fevzi Çakmak. Istanbul member of the parliament.
Çankaya St. Nr: 8
2. Enis Akaygen, Istanbul member of parliament. Sanatoryum St. Nr: 4, Yakacık
3. Hikmet Bayur. Selanik St. Nr.72, Yenişehir-Ankara
4. Prof. Dr. Kenan Öner, Lawyer. Vali Konağı St. Yüce Apt. Nr: 9.
5. Dr. Mustafa Kentli. Atatürk St. No: 334, Izmir
6. Osman Bölükbaşı, Farmer. Kuşdili Quarter Nr: 20, Kırşehir
7. Osman Nuri Koni, Istanbul Member of Parliament. Karanfil St. Nr: 32, Ankara
8. General Sadık Aldoğan, Afyonkarahisar Member of Parliament. Serçe St. Nr: 28, Yenişehir-Ankara

Marshal Fevzi Çakmak was appointed honorary president of the NP, Hikmet Bayur was elected president, Osman Nuri Koni was elected vice president and Doctor Mustafa Kentli was elected General Secretary.

After NP's formation, these members of parliament also participated in the party along with four founding members of parliament: Bahattin Öğütmen (Edirne), Mehmet Öktem (Muğla), Asım Gürsu (Muğla) and Denizli Member of Parliament Reşat Aydın, who later would be famous as messenger of the "assassination" claim. During the formation process of the NP, retired Admiral Rauf Orbay, "Hamidiye" hero, was also wanted among the founders.

Osman Bölükbaşı visited Orbay, Atatürk's brother-in-arms, at his home and gave him Marshal's greetings and this wish. Rauf Orbay's answer was: "It is an honor for me to work for the Marshal. But, I entered politics once, and I saved my honor and my life with great difficulty. Thank you very much for your attention, but I will never enter politics again." The incident that Rauf Orbay said he had saved his honor and his life with difficulty was his forming Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası in 1925, and being sentenced to 10 years for suspicion of participation in the Izmir assassination attempt on Atatürk, and then being forgiven.²⁴

²⁴ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 102-103.

The Main Principles of the Nation Party's Program

The basics of the party's political philosophy in the NP program, which consists of 11 chapters and 135 articles, are grouped 34 main principles. Bringing people and their natural rights to the foreground, based on morality and excellent justice concept, defending economic liberalism and employees' right to strike were in the NP program along with topics about relations between state-individual and religion-state, which became the subject of intense discussions starting in the 1990s.²⁵ It is the third political party in the real sense after the RPP and the DP after the beginning of multiparty life. The basic principles that the NP defended can be grouped as expressions such as: "Independence is the cornerstone of all our political program," that were being made. The individual's natural rights and freedom were listed like this in the NP program: "Living, person and habitation immunity, conscience, idea, publishing, travel, communication, compact, work, acquiring a property, heredity, liberty for forming an association."

In the NP program: Rights "legal resistance to every kind of injustice and criticizing government" were especially added to inviolable natural rights and freedom. In fact, what seemed like very unnecessary details when evaluated from today's point of view were the reason for that time's specific crisis. In the program which accepts that every individual's right and freedom are bordered with others' equal rights and freedoms, harming somebody else is specified as evil and since goodness and evil are matters of morality, individual independence is specified with a moral basis and sense of mission. One of the most interesting and important points of the NP program is bringing extensive preservation to individuals against the state's pressure and any kind of coercion. In the program where it is specified "The individual's personal and political freedoms are in danger because of the extensive authorization given to states." It is emphasized, for that reason, that "Authorization given to government should be fully limited."

In the NP program, the former illegal limitation of these natural rights is considered a social and political crime as a result of a totalitarian state concept and sorrow and pain caused by state coercion. Therefore, it was argued that the violation of these rights by anyone, including the state, should be judged in the justice courts regarding the system's general regulations. The state concept was attached to law: The NP program evaluates right and

²⁵ Millet Partisi, *Program ve Tüzük* (İstanbul: Teknik Basımevi, 1948), see Appendix-F.

justice as an excellent behest which is above the state and guiding state, limiting state's authorization. This justice and right concept is accepted as not only a principle of execution and appreciation, but at the same time as a matter of a moral aim and faith.

The NP program, which also takes the principles of Western democracy, accepts that it is illegal when the majority overrides the minority and demands that provisions of the 1924 Constitution which do not fit into real democracy, especially the second article which uses the political principles of the RPP as the government's main qualifications, be abolished. In the program by which the law-dependent government principles are put forward, constitutional guarantees that will protect the individual against the government are demanded. It is claimed that in order to be able to inspect legislative power, it is necessary to establish a Constitution Court. The MP, which accepts equality before the law, also adopted the principle that the obligatory equality for everyone in law is valid for relations between individuals, individual and government institutions, social classes, political parties, religions and sects as well.

In the program which emphasizes the fact that public power which takes its source from national willpower cannot be used against an individual or group and as a result of this, it is said that the NP's "wisdom of the government" mentality, which makes the laws dependent on whim, and the mentality of "use of the treasure," which continuously causes unfair losses the society, are seen as the basis of enforcement and will be fought against the NP's understanding of liberalism: it is emphasized in the program that the NP supports "moderate liberalism" in the economic field, but it is not the classical, the cruel liberalism based on the principle of "let them do it, let them pass (birakınız yapsınlar, bırakınız geçsinler)."

The party's economic ideology was based on the principles of "individual ownership, individual entrepreneurship and free trade," but the government's regulatory role and interference in social policies were accepted. In the program it is stated that the government cannot be ignorant of the following fields and will interfere: Establishing monopolies, unfairness in capital, extreme profit desire, tricky trade, unfair misuse, the sorrow and poverty of big masses caused by the crisis. In the program, the following interference by the government is protested: breach of individual ownership rights on the work and production vehicles for the government's benefit and etatism with the tendency to limit individual entrepreneurship and government capitalism. The government's role in the economic field is stated as follows in the program: "as the principle, the government cannot deal with industry, trade and agriculture. However, the war industry and ports which are not in demand by

individual and domestic capital, dam and energy facilities, railways and installation of the PTT (post, telephone, telegraph) can be established and operated by the government. The MP recognized the workers' right to strike, which was an important innovation, and supported the idea of establishing worker insurance institutions to include all workers with agricultural insurance.

The NP's understanding of nationalism and conservation was as follows : The political ideology of NP, which adopted a kind of conservative Turkish nationalism close to traditional moderate Turkism ideology, represented a distant stand to nationalism. In the program of the NP, which was a nationalist-conservative right party with the importance it gave to institutions such as the family, national customs and religion, the principle of nationalism is explained as follows:

“Nationalism, one of the main qualifications of the Republic of Turkey, is also one of the main principles of our party. According to us, the most important element of the idea of being a nation is a kind of unity of thought and feeling that comprises a national conscience and is composed of a common life and belief in the future. We accept the great role and share of the language in composing the national awareness. The party accepts everyone who says ‘I am a Turk’ and regards himself as a Turk and believes the long and honourable civilized history and the hopeful future of the Turks. It regards following a suitable curriculum and program which would strengthen the national awareness at educational institutions as a national duty and thinks it is necessary to try to raise the youth with this belief even outside the schools.”²⁶

Relations between religion and government: The MP adopted the principle of secularism, which supports that religion and traditions are out of the influence field of the government. However, those principles on some issues subject to discussions in this field today in Turkey appeared in the party program:

“The party accepts the great importance of beliefs, morality, traditions, customs and manners in the composition of social order. The party is respectful of the institution of religion and national customs. The party accepts the idea of separating religious facts from governmental works. They regard it as sacred for everyone to have the right to worship God in any language and in any form they wish and respects everyone's conscience and freedom of belief. The party approves people from various religions and sects to form organizations with religious purposes and transferring religious associations to these organizations in Turkey. This organization must be authorized to order and manage its own members' religious actions. The party regards it appropriate to add religious instruction in the primary and secondary school curricula and divinity

²⁶ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 106.

faculties at universities. However, children's attendance of religion lessons depends on the parents' wishes and is voluntary until the student of full age."²⁷

The other important ideas that the NP supported: One of the properties of the NP program were the concepts of moralism and superior justice on which the program was based. The party carried the following suggestions to the political agenda, which represents an important renovation of that period: These are establishing a Second Parliament (senate), choosing the President for one period; reducing the number of deputies; not counting the time spent as a deputy and the allowances of deputies while calculating retirement; running the justice works based on the unity-of-justice principle; not establishing private courts except for the cases for crimes related to the army's exclusively military works; keeping the appointment, promotion, transfer and assignation of judges separate from political effects and performing those operations in their own institutions, establishing a second stage between country courts and Supreme Court; forming a separate law with the name of "Air Law" depending on the conditions of the day; adopting jury form for media crimes; connecting judicial police independently to the attorney; establishing private courts for juvenile crime and preferably assigning female judges for such courts.

²⁷ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 107.

CHAPTER 3

THE DEVELOPMENT DURING THE STRUGGLE PERIOD OF THE NATION PARTY

The 22 July Declaration of Marshal and the Struggle Getting Stronger

As is known, although Marshal Fevzi Çakmak was elected Istanbul deputy from the DP list in the 1949 elections, he preserved his independence and his identity beyond the parties, and did not join the DP. Upon the NP's establishment, Marshal published a declaration on 21 July 1948 and explained the reasons why he had abandoned independence and entered into active politics, as well as the aims of the NP.

Marshal emphasized that the NP was a sincere opposition party and invited the people who accepted the party program and believed in the characters of the founders to get together under the roof of the party. After the NP was founded and its members went to Anatolia to get organized, a struggle between the DP and the NP started. Celal Bayar, who provoked this strong struggle with a speech in Çeşme on 22 August 1948, attacked the NP with harsh words, saying: "Some persons who were once with us now have revealed their true identities and moved onto the political stage. These persons should deal with their parties' work instead of damaging the people's, the DP's honour. They mustn't think of spending their time performing artificial, negative, galling actions."²⁸ The writers who were supporters of the DP also attended this campaign. In this campaign, where *Vatan* newspaper's head writer Ahmet Emin Yalman took place in the first row, Marshal Fevzi Çakmak was accused of wanting to become the new chief and he was targeted. The NP was accused of being "a merciless excess party" and "a revolutionary party." The RPP spokesmen and press organs also followed a campaign targeting Marshal and the NP.

Against these attacks the NP directors who reacted in the same harsh manner started to struggle with both the RPP and the DP. *Kudret* newspaper was the only media organ of the NP and the General Directorate of the DP sent a confidential circular letter to the organization with the signature of Fuad Köprülü on 30 October 1948 telling them not to read *Kudret* newspaper. Osman Bölükbaşı went to Yozgat as a guest of the independent young people of Yozgat at the beginning of November 1948. When he returned from Yozgat, he gave an

²⁸ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 109.

interview to *Kudret* and said the following about his trip: "I told of the conditions when I resigned from the Democrat Party and the embarrassing games and conspiracies of the Democrat Party leaders by revealing the events and stating the names of the witnesses during the biggest meeting that has ever been held in Yozgat. I said that I had not left the democratic idea by resigning from the DP and that I would struggle for democracy until I died, and added that my attitude was not to change religion, but only to leave the mosque where there is no imam to stand behind and perform salat and go to another mosque. By being able to account before the public very easily about my brief political past, I can pay my debt to citizens who once voted for me. I am committed before the public that our opponents who are trying to tarnish our good reputation with cafe gossip should clearly express their opinions and that I am giving the right to the newspapers which will write about them to prove."²⁹

The Additions to the NP

After the NP was established on 20 July 1948, there were important people joined the party: Fuat Arna, who resigned when he was DP Inspector; and DP Sinop deputy Yusuf Kemal Tengirşek, Suphi Batur and Enver K k joined the NP. The General Administration Commission membership which had consisted of eight people was increased up to ten people and Fuat Arna and General Şefik  akmak were also taken onto the Executive Board. Within the frame of the party's organizational works Osman B l kbaşı and Fuat Arna were sent to Anatolia. By the end of 1948, the NP was organized in Ankara, İstanbul, İzmir, Aydın, Sinop, Edirne, Burdur, Kayseri, Denizli, Kastamonu, Amasya and Kırşehir. Meanwhile, in 1949, when Prime Minister Hasan Saka resigned on 14 January 1949, Şemsettin G naltay was assigned to form the government. On the NP side, 1949 started with the news of a death which which had happened during the first quarter of the year. Kenan  ner who had played the leading role in forming the NP, passed away on 9 March 1949. The NP was deeply affected by the death of this man who had played the leading role.

Meanwhile, the deputies who had left the DP before and formed the *M stakil Demokratlar Grubu (Independent Democrats' Group)* in the Parliament published a declaration with the name "DP Founders Are Not the People of this Case" (DP Kurucuları Bu Dvanın Adamı Değildirler) and joined the NP. The * z Demokratlar (Pure Democrats) Party* also joined with the NP. After these additions, Ahmet Oğuz, Ahmet Tahtakılıç, Hasan Dinçer,

²⁹ *Kudret*, November 1948.

Ali Rıza Kırsever and the General President of the Öz Demokratlar Party Hasan Tiryakioğlu, were taken to NP Executive Council and Ahmet Tahtakılıç became the General Secretary.

The Political Reaction Accusations of the NP

After the foundation of the NP, the RPP supporter not only aimed at Marshal Fevzi Çakmak's prestige and honour, but also started a campaign against the NP based on the accusation of political religious reaction. In the media tool of the RPP, *Ulus* newspaper, an NP spokesman talking about Allah in his speeches was accused of being a religious political reactionary. A new side was opened against the NP with expressions such as "swearing dervishes party." This accusation is very important in order to reveal how the opposition was conducted in this period, because the same people had been accused of being Communists a very short time earlier. There was no connection between these two accusations. In an article published on 5 January 1949 in *Ulus*, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın likened the NP members to "Dervish Vahdeti caliphs" and wrote the following accusations: "The NP chiefs who appear as if they want to bring followers of sharia of the 31 March Event back to life, these ominous provocateurs who want to play a role by hiding behind the religion curtain on the political stage, want to place the fear of Allah in the hearts of the Turkish nation instead of the fear of law. I take it as a responsibility to inform people when I see the followers of sharia of the 31 March event and the ghosts of Vahdettin before us."³⁰

The Democrat Party also used accusations of political reaction in order to weaken the NP in its early days and carried out this campaign although not as apparent as the RPP. Celal Bayar accused the NP at the Bursa DP congress and said, "We will not let sharia live." When he was asked what he had meant by that, he changed his attitude and tried to disclaim it with unclear and unreasonable words. Similarly, in a meeting that Celal Bayar had with the prime minister in mid-1949, it was reflected in the media that Bayar tried to accuse the Turkish nation of non-existent political reactions. Prime Minister Saraçoğlu described this meeting in the parliament at a time of anger. In the negotiations held in GNAT in June 1948 regarding the amendment to be made to penal law, he said the following to the DP deputies who cheered against the prime minister for the reason that this also addressed extreme right trends: "I talked to DP president Bayar a few times about this issue. Bayar always stated his worries

³⁰ *Ulus*, 5 January 1949.

about political religious reaction. I told him I would prepare a law draft to prevent political reaction. Should I believe you or your president? Please be sincere gentlemen!”

In June 1949, the RPP Government brought The Law to Struggling with Extreme Trends into the GNAT. The amendment to be made in the law draft which aggravated the articles 141, 142 and 163. of the Turkish Penal Code proposed, “No matter what the condition is, abusing religion or religious emotions to ruin the principle of secularity, regardless of the reason, making propaganda or inculcating requires penal servitude up to five years.” During the GNAT debates, the NP spokesmen stated that the NP was the enemy of Communism and in the same way they also showed the same sensibility towards political reaction movements and reactionaries. They added that the draft was aimed at the extreme right and left trends and also with the amendment to be made in article 163, it seemed that the article was to be exaggerated as if secularism was about to be lost and this attitude was at a level that would hurt Muslims’ conscience freedom and that it forced the limits of secularity.

Those ideas that the NP supported in the parliament sped up the political reaction accusation campaign started against the party. Faced with those accusations, the NP published a declaration on 15 June 1949. In this declaration, it stated that the Turkish nation and NP were faced with a common character assassination from the RPP and the DP together and with this aim they were trying to mark NP unfairly and speculatively as “reactionist-puritanical.” In the declaration, the following ideas were given:

"Appropriate to the clear provisions of the Constitution and the mentality in civilized countries, the NP which demands the application of religion and freedom of conscience with all its requirements in a country and by detecting the idea of separating religion and governmental issues in its program and carrying the honour of answering a great need of the nation with its activities loyal to this principle, the NP rejects those kinds of evaluations seriously and with hatred."³¹

In the NP declaration that reminded that during negotiations held in parliament about article 163, the NP deputies declared from the desks, “there is no reactionary tendency in this country, the ones who say there is are slandering the nation.” The following statements were made about the aim of the RPP: "Since there isn't a real need for this law, making a law including fluid elements with the aim of supressing the opponents by using possibility and worry as an excuse is an expression of searching for a gun against a fictitious danger. The

³¹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 112.

purpose of this is to keep the present group in power and political reaction alive by making fictitious religion as the reactionist mask.”

In the NP declaration, the NP supported the ideas regarding the latest amendments in the Penal Law that focused on fighting Communism and reaction. The mentality that directed the Marshal Plan, from which Turkey also benefited, showed that in all countries ruled by a national sovereign, the best way to fight Communism was to prevent poverty, profiteering, and a high cost of living and secure financial development. Trying to suppress the Communist wave in the country which was fed by unhappiness, poverty and profiteering with legal violence, clearly indicates incompetence and insincerity. While claiming that they enacted laws to protect laicism, the RPP and the government only interfered with Muslims’ religion; thus they were the ones violating laicism, and freedom of conscience and religion. Therefore, this freedom must be protected from them. The NP’s opinions about this situation are clear in the program. The party declared to the Turkish nation that the slanders were products of dark political motives.

The RPP and their helpers trying to keep their coterie rule and political reaction under the mask of democracy, and they created a religious reaction cloak to obtain legal weapons and shoot brave, serious, sincere opposition the NP, this is clear from the written reasons above. They are trying to keep from the public by altering ideas of our parliament members. The NP will continue its legal fight against this cooperated assassination and secure the victory of legal rights and freedom. It appears that the war between laicism and religious reaction, which still goes on today, was in fact a concept created in a period when the RPP had the majority in the parliament, the bureaucracy and the judgment.

The Arrest of Bölükbaşı for Founding an Organization to Assassinate İnönü and Celal Bayar

Osman Bölükbaşı’s home in Ankara İtfaiye Meydanı, Kurtuluş Apartmanı, №5, was surrounded by police. Armed police officers were placed even on the roof of neighboring apartment buildings roofs on 16 November 1949 when he was with Fuat Arna and Nurettin Ardıçoğlu. Ankara prosecutor on duty Lütfü Musluoğlu and the police notified Osman Bölükbaşı at one o’clock about the decision of the Ankara Criminal Court of the First Instance taken the same day for his search and arrest. He was wearing his pajamas and chatting with his friends when the police started to search his house, and after four hours of searching, they

confiscated his papers and books.³² The decision of Third Criminal Court of First Instance of Ankara, taken under the supervision of Judge Emin Gebizoğlu and announced to Bölükbaşı by a prosecutor, was as follows:

“Note of Ankara Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions dated 16 November 1949 and № 949/1107 has been read and reviewed. Event: Destroying President İnönü and Leader of DP Celal Bayar by killing them, with a declaration signed by Marshal Fevzi Çakmak for propoganda to cacel the Board of Minister with the NP members; Osman Bölükbaşı, Fuat Arna and Afyon representative in the parliament retired General Sadık Aldoğan, and denounced by Aydın representative in parliament Reşat Aydınlı. Held: Considering the high criminal quality of action attributed to the defendants and considering the possibility of destroying evidence which has become a reality: The Arrest of Osman Bölükbaşı and Fuat Arna in absentia and taking precaution, to prevent decimation of evidence, a search of the houses, and offices and upon Osman Bölükbaşı, Fuat Arna, Sadık Aldoğan and Nuri Leflef in question have been decided.”³³

It is important to see that the crime Osman Bölükbaşı and his colleagues were accused with the death penalty, to understand the influence of the RPP and the DP on the judgment. Even though Sadık Aldoğan, Istanbul representative in parliament, had immunity from prosecution, he was searched too. When Aldoğan said that it was against The Fundamental Law to search the house of a parliament member, the prosecutor replied, “The Fundamental Law says that a parliament member can’t be arrested; it does not say he is immune from a search of his house.”

This dubious answer to a parliament member from a judicial member raises the question of how he could be that confident. It has simply because the prosecutor felt superior to the parliament member. Arrested Bölükbaşı and Fuat Arna were brought to the court of justice, then to The Central Prison of Ankara with a police chamber. While Bölükbaşı and Arna were brought to court, the denouncer Reşat Aydınlı was leaving. When he famously said, “I didn’t denounce,” Bölükbaşı and Arna motioned to the room of Rüştü Kayıkçioğlu Ankara prosecutor, without giving any answer.³⁴ Bölükbaşı and Arna stayed for four hours in the room which includes Deputy Prosecutor Zeki Kumrulu and Police Chief Ekrem Anıt. At 21:30 they were taken to the Second Magistrate Criminal Court, where the continuation of

³² Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 113.

³³ Ibid., p. 113.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 114.

their arrest was decided and they were sent to Ankara Prison at night. In the same hours, the Ministerial Council reviewed the subject and the Prime Ministry gave the following explanation: “Parliament member from Denizli, Reşat Aydınli announced the Parliament member from Afyon, Sadık Aldoğan, Osman Bölükbaşı and Fuat Arna, and all members of the NP were planning to kill İnönü and they asked Reşat Denizli to join them. The subject is now under the control of the Ankara Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The investigation continues.”

Celal Bayar, answering the question of journalists on the day of Bölükbaşı’s arrest, laughed and said,

“I have a bulletproof amulet; no one can kill me.” The same day, so-called denouncer Reşat Aydınli gave the following declaration to the press: “According to the Criminal Court of First Instance, Sadık Aldoğan’s house was searched after my denunciation. Fuat Arna and Osman Bölükbaşı were arrested. They say my denunciation explains their plot against both İnönü and Bayar. I didn’t do such a thing. Sadık Aldoğan made these accusations. I ran to the Ankara prosecutoer after that. Asked when I denounced such a thing. The prosecution was waiting for my testimony. The prosecutor of Ankara confirmed that I had just given any testimony, neither in person nor written. But he told me ‘you said this to a high position officer. You have denounced. There was an official notice on 12 November 1949 to our office from Ministry of Justice, and to them from the Prime Ministry. Considering the importance of subject, we obtained a decision from the court’”³⁵

The next day, the prosecution turned to Celal Bayar and General Kazım Özalp, parliament member of Balıksesir, for information. While leaving a one hour-long interview, Celal Bayar said that he had nothing to say about this. On the same day, the NP leaders gave a press statement about denouncer Reşat Aydınli being sent to the Discipline Board for discharge based on his provocative acts in the NP. Meanwhile, the government applied to the GNAT for the cancellation of the immunity of Sadık Aldoğan, parliament member of Afyon. The Commission decided to cancel Aldoğan’s immunity on 17 November 1949. The reason of commission was as follows: "Despite Reşat Aydınli’s denial in testimony at the prosecutor, a report of the MİT, the testimonies of Celal Bayar and Kazım Özalp prove existence of this denouncement.” Reşat Aydınli resigned from the NP on the same day.

During negotiations in the GNAT Commission, it was declared that the police reports stated that Reşat Aydınli went to one of his acquaintances in the National Security Organization at first to convey information about the plot, then repeated the same subjects

³⁵ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 115.

before the Prime Minister. Three days after event, it was understood that Celal Bayar was the person who had reported these allegations of Reşat Aydınli to the government. General Leader of the DP, Celal Bayar, in his statement to the prosecution on 18 November 1949, said:

“I was returning from an Aegean trip. Reşad Aydınli was on the train too. Some friends told me of his desire to greet me. I told them that he could visit me when I was alone. He came to my compartment. We talked. We went to the dining hall together. We ate. Aydınli told me that he had a personal matter to discuss with me. I said ‘we can talk here.’ He expressed the importance and secrecy of the subject. We went to the compartment. He narrated the plot of three persons mentioned. I told this incident to General Özalp when I returned to Ankara. And I told him to tell this İnönü, if he wants to take precautions.”³⁶

When the allegations of Reşat Aydınli proved incorrect, Osman Bölükbaşı and Fuat Arna were released on 21 November 1949. Bölükbaşı and Arna left prison by car. When they saw Celal Bayar at the Sıhhiye bus stop, Fuat Arna stopped the car and got out to face him. He answered Celal Bayar’s accusations about using money from an unknown source, implying that he had been receiving money from the Russians: “I have heard you dishonored me with the allegations about that I received money from the Russians. I have already declared that you are a fraud, a fake freedom hero!”

Bölükbaşı said these following words to Bayar:

“You have hid a letter from Erzurum in the past that says İnönü should be killed. Now you are being an actor in this plot against us, telling Kazım Özalp, maybe it’s necessary to take precautions. Inform İnönü, you are flirting with İnönü and trying to shoot us, uncovered opposition. Also you have the opportunity to show yourself like an important statesman who suffers from assassinations. I will expose all of the facts. Why didn’t you tell İnönü about the letter from Erzurum? If we have to kill, we would kill people, not the dogs! Celal Bayar left without answering.”³⁷

As it would be understood from these relations, essentially the law system, the ruling party and the main opposition are fully united against the idea of the NP.

The new developments about the assassination clearly revealed that this was a conspiracy. President İnönü distributed the following note on this issue to the press on 25 November 1949 and sent it to the Speaker’s Office. The complete text of the note with the heading;

³⁶ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 116.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 116-117.

"Minutes of the Meeting Held in the Presidential Palace in Çankaya on 9 November, 1949" are given below: "We were having dinner with Hilmi Uran, Tevfik Fikret Sılay, Faik Ahmet Barutçu and Nihat Erim. We were informed that Kazım Özalp demanded an urgent interview. He arrived at the end of the dinner. Celal Bayar had demanded an urgent interview with him in the evening and said some unimportant things regarding some actual events. After he had said these, he dropped a hint that there were things to talk about when the servants had left at the end of the dinner and he told us these after a while: On his last journey by train, a deputy, who is now with the NP, came up to Celal Bayar and, after telling him that he wanted to talk to him alone in private and asking him not to tell his name to another person, he informed Celal Bayar of the following:

During the discussion where Osman Bölükbaşı, Fuat Arna, İzzet Mühürdaroğlu and Sadık Aldoğan, who were among the notables of the NP, were also present, they discussed the question of assassinating Celal Bayar and İsmet İnönü. They had planned to eliminate Celal Bayar and attain their goal in the country by making the Marshal announce with a declaration that this assassination was committed by the RPP. However, they preferred to assassinate İnönü considering that since İsmet İnönü and the government would have command of this case, they might suppress the possible chaos and response. They evaluated the fact as in this case, the ruling party would lose power as a result of İnönü being lost and also the event would be attributed to the Demokrat Party, so that a disastrous end for this party would be prepared when the declaration is again given by the Marshal. Celal Bayar added that those men were capable of doing this, and that if Fuat Arna was not taking his expenditures from national security, he made expenditures whose source was not apparent. He said the Communists might play an active role in this event and that they could prepare the opportunity for the politicians' visions to become real by providing the man and the media. Bayar requested that Özalp give this information to me. He said that the man who informed him had also talked to Mr. Naci, Chief of Police, about the issue. During the talk, Özalp attempted twice to learn the name of the deputy who had informed Celal Bayar and Celal Bayar did not utter the name after either attempt. It is the President's note. It has been seen. Kazım Özalp the Presidency Secretariat."³⁸

Bayar denied the allegations about himself in this note of Presidency and, with an explanation he made on 29 November, he stated: "The note sent from Çankaya also included the expressions that he had not said to Özalp and his words that he denied in the eye of Attorney Generalship."

Celal Bayar, who panicked in his attempt to defend himself, said: "If I had not informed those concerned about the possibility of the assassination that I had learned about, I could have made such an assassination become easier by keeping quiet." The exemption of Reşad Aydınlı, who had made the denunciation, was cancelled by the Parliament on 31 October 1949 and he was taken to court. Throughout his judgement in Ankara Criminal Court

³⁸ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 117.

of First Instance, Reşad Aydınlı kept on claiming that he had not denounced anyone. I would like to finish this slander event which was recorded in the Turkish Political History with the observations and determinations of one of the leading names of the DP, Samet Ağaoğlu, which appear in his memoirs, called *Political Diary (Politik Gündem)*. Ağaoğlu wrote the following:

"Does İnönü have anything to do with Reşat Aydınlı's slander? In addition, did Celal Bayar think of benefiting from this plan against NP? I must admit that the answers to these questions, either positive or negative, cannot be given easily. This assassination denunciation event reveals clearly how immoral and ill-bred the democracy struggle between 1945 and 1950 could become. A mentality which does not abstain from hitting its rival with the most horrible slanders shows itself in every age and all the time in the country's political life."³⁹

Osman Bölükbaşı published a brochure with the heading "The Lowdown on the Assassination Slander and Celal Bayar" after the articles published in the DP's spokesman *Zafer* newspaper and aimed at Bölükbaşı and his friends in order to clear Celal Bayar's name. The main outline of the brochure is as follows:

"By using the insult of Celal Bayar who planned the assassination slander which is known by the citizens, the people have been encouraged to be against us for days. Therefore it is time to help the public to make a correct judgement by answering these attempts and the circular letter that Celal Bayar had sent to the party organization." We are certain that the citizens who would consider our following explanations by reason and fairness will understand the aims of the people who are trying to hide Celal Bayar's terrible attitude and the realities behind the event of insult and they will see that Celal Bayar, who evoked the government by informing İnönü of the personal comments and some additional information which was not considered to be worthy by the government in the court, is much more sinful in this event compared to Reşat Aydınlı, who is actually an instrument in this event. Celal Bayar, who cannot deny our honourable services to the Democrat Party, knew me and my friends very well. In this respect, despite all the events that have happened between us, it was a virtue of humanity and loyalty that it should first have been him who stated that we could not be the heroes of such a bloody attempt that would lead the country to a catastrophe and said 'they are not people to do such a thing' even if someone who is more reliable than Reşat Aydınlı claimed so, because a proverb makes the suggestion as 'Kill the brave man but don't be unfair to him.' When I resigned from the inspectorship of Demokrat Parti on 23 July 1947, as was long ago explained in *Kudret* newspaper, it was today's Celal Bayar who said to me, "We are like a father and son. We cannot be separated. We will continue with that case together. I do not accept your resignation" and informed me with a letter dated 6 September 1947, saying that he had that he accept my resignation with grief after I had insisted for one and a half months to accept my

³⁹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 118.

resignation in which I accused the democrats seriously by expressing that a bargain had been made with the 12 July agreement on the heads of the so-called brave and extremist democrats. This time the same man, Celal Bayar, talks privately with Reşat Aydınli on the Soma train and then as soon as he comes to Ankara, he makes an appointment and runs to Kazım Özalp's house and sends him to inform İnönü. According to what Özalp published in newspapers and said in Çankaya and based on his statements in the office of the attorney general, Celal Bayar said the following about us: They are capable of doing such a thing. They are not very reliable. In fact, Fuat Arna, if he doesn't have a confidential role in these actions as the man of national security, and if he isn't receiving his expenditure from them, that means he is making expenses whose source is not known. He spends more than what he earns. I don't know how they live. Communists may play an active role in this event.

By this means, upon Bayar's attempt to introduce us as people who are capable of cooperate with Communists and even as people who would play bloody assassination games, the government took action and decided to arrest us. This shows that Bayar's responsibility in this game is much heavier than Reşat Aydınli's whom he had found and used as an instrument.

It must be considered that Celal Bayar is a man who claims to be seen as the hero of the democracy, which is impossible to be established as long as morality and virtue are not taken as the basis. When we were arrested, he should have said to the journalists, "I cannot say anything on a subject which has been passed to court," but instead, with an attitude as a man who is satisfied with his action and is relieved and in a manner which is not suitable for a leader of the party which seems to be the opponent, he said: "I have a bullet-proof amulet. Nobody can kill me." And by saying so, he both adopted the event and also demonstrated a ridiculous bravery show in karpıç restaurant as he did not take the confidentiality precautions that he himself advised for the President.

This former Galip Hoca who writes his amulet himself shows with his words that he is in control of a sadistic feeling and with his laughter which is published in *Vatan* newspaper and thus reveals his role and share in this assassination game. It is so sad that Celal Bayar who sent a telegraph numbered 4196 on 26 July 1946 to Bölükbaşı who was in Sorgun Prison saying that, 'We are following your fight for democracy with appreciation. We are also suffering due to the problems you are suffering. We expect that justice will become effective soon.' This time shows the loyalty of not being able to prevent himself from insulting Bölükbaşı and his friends' arrest with his bullet-proof amulet and laughter. The people of this nation easily recognize the ones who move away after causing chaos. With coincidence, I met Celal Bayar, our old faithful case friend, who played with our honour and independence, while I was coming home from prison. As a man whose honour and independence were damaged and who had come out of prison ten minutes earlier, I apparently returned the attribution and insult he had made behind the curtains. The citizens who learned about the real facts about Bayar's terrible actions will certainly appreciate how they want to make our reaction bigger and add to the legend that we make a fist.

The fact that Celal Bayar, who brought a libel suit against several innocent citizens who repeated these words believing the 'Plane Sale' attribution which was once done by the RPP members, did not sue against us for the insult we had made is clear evidence that shows he is in a situation of not being able to sue, because Celal Bayar is worried about his actions being detected with a court order. This is why he uses the words saying that his friends in the party did not regard it necessary to sue

due to the insult made to him as an excuse. If Celal Bayar, who attempted to prove his behaviour honesty with the telegraphs sent to him, had addressed the nation with a court order by suing against us instead of these telegraphs, he possibly would have gained more trust. We, who struggle believing that as long as the RPP government is not closed, the country's future is in danger, are not such people who could be provoked by any source other than our conscience. Despite the evil game he played, Celal Bayar behaved so bravely that in the circular letter he sent to the party organization, he could claim that he was faced with a moral assassination plan and he wanted to pretend he was innocent. With this behaviour, he seems to be 'the cruel thief who fools the landlord.'

This attitude of Celal Bayar, who experienced in politics and wanted to deceive people by putting on wool like an innocent lamb, reminds one of the following lines of the late poet Mehmet Akif:

The cruel wanders around, lively, and the innocent is dying,
The guilty one is the other, then why is another convicted?
Thousands of questions can be asked to the free man,
But man is terribly guiding against these questions!

Bölükbaşı and Arna, whose lives and honour were damaged and who were put into the comfortable alcoves of prison, were sinners, while the intriguer and informer Celal Bayar was innocent! We will be contented only by saying this for now: "God makes everyone fall into the trap they prepared for others."⁴⁰

Marshal's Death and the Events at his Funeral

Marshal Fevzi Çakmak was put into hospital in September 1949 when his disease got worse, and he passed away on 10 April 1950, one month before the election. The death of this important man, who was regarded as the only soldier to deserve the title "Marshal" after Atatürk, the founder of the Republic, caused great sorrow country-wide. When it was expected that a national day of mourning for the death of the Chief of Defence of the Independence War would be announced, the RPP government was ignorant and radios continued to broadcast music on the day of his death and the day after and flags were not lowered. The State Radio only gave a short announcement of this great soldier's death, and they did not commemorate his memory with even a few words. Due to the time of the entertainment programs on the radio, a group of Istanbul University students gathered at night in Taksim Square and went to the radio station building to protest.

As a result of this attitude, which naturally got a reaction from the public, especially young people at universities, the environment in Istanbul became very tense on the day of the

⁴⁰ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 118-121.

funeral. The university students who came to Marshal's house in Nişantaşı at a very early hour in the morning, and his politician friends, including Osman Bölükbaşı, escorted the funeral procession to Beyazıt Square. When the funeral cortege came to the old Harbiye building, the young people saw that there was no flag on the pillar and they wanted the flag to be pulled on the pillar. The young people gave more reaction when the military authorities said that they had not received a command on this issue.

More than 300,000 people attended the funeral. Among the public some people said "Allahu Ekber" in Arabic and knelt in prayer. After the funeral salaah, when they were about to continue with the military ceremony, the coffin of Marshal could not be put on the gun carriage due to the fact that discipline could not be provided. As a result, the coffin was taken to the grave in Eyüp Sultan by the hands of a very big crowd.

Because of the events during the funeral, 72 people were placed under arrest and the Nationalists Association (Milliyetçiler Derneği) and Turkish Culture Association (Türk Kültür Ocağı) in Istanbul were searched. The young people put under arrest were accused of "acting as protagonists for political reaction using the death of the Marshal as an opportunity."⁴¹ The RPP government considered this event an activity to provoke political reaction and regarded saying "allahu ekber" as taking a position against the reforms. Ahmet Emin Yalman, the head writer of *Vatan* newspaper, wrote in an article dated 18 April 1950 that those events were "the rebellion attempts of those representing fanaticism and political reaction after finding courage to do so," and showed the NP as responsible for those. The reaction the agitated university students showed because of the disrespect shown to Marshal's memory was regarded as an attempt at rebellion. Therefore, the Ministry of Transport made a surprising decision on 20 April 1950. With the aim of preventing students from travelling from one place to another in groups, they cancelled the discount for students travelling in groups by bus. These advancements hastened the reaction claims started against the NP, the personal troubles that had arisen at the funeral were exploited and used as material for the slander campaigns. The NP headmen answered the "reaction faction" accusations as follows: There is not religious reaction, but political reaction in the country. Saying "Allahu Ekber" is not a crime; conducting mawlid for their deceased relatives is the natural right of every Muslim.

⁴¹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 122.

The DP leaders also supported this smear campaign which the RPP had started, and in this way, they expected political benefit from the attenuation of the NP. Yet, they took the tactic of continuing the incitements from backstage without coming to the forefront. One year after Marshal's funeral, in March 1951, the funeral became the object of a disagreement between Osman Bölükbaşı and Adnan Menderes during the meetings held in the GNAT beyond the 2nd Menderes Government's agenda. Bölükbaşı, also mentioning the statements about religion and conscience which took place in the government's agenda, stated as follows in his speech in the GNAT:

“If it is the desire to lay solid foundations for the future of this country, the freedom of religion issue must be fully solved and this issue must be removed from the speeches of the factions from now on. Dear people, it is not possible to handle the issues discretely. There are such events this country witnessed in the past and they should be remembered. As you know, citizens said ‘Allahu ekber’ during a funeral. This event, which is not prohibited by any law, was made an instrument for those who wanted to draw the country into chaos. Many words have been said in the RPP ruling party period to the effect that reaction is rising again, it is becoming involved in politics. But most sadly, the DP who says ‘we will defend freedom of conscience’ today, has walked side by side in those groundless accusations with the RPP as if it was an ally.”⁴²

On the occasion, Prime Minister Menderes interfered from his chair saying, “You wanted to make use of a funeral.” Osman Bölükbaşı answered as follows: “Nobody wanted to make use of the funeral. I return this word to you on behalf of my faction. Menderes, in the capacity of a friend of yours who said, ‘it is an indignity to give a factional colour to a funeral of a national hero,’ I return these ascriptions of yours to yourself. The accusations are totally intolerable.”

The NP was preparing for the 14 May 1950 elections in such an environment and under very negative conditions. Meanwhile every day a new legal investigation about the NP leaders was added to the old ones. Faction Supervisor Fuat Arna was arrested in Ankara on 17 April for statements humiliating the government in an article published in a magazine and brought to Istanbul by Erzurum mail train.

On the other hand, the reaction the accusations the RPP and DP addressed to the NP continued and gained new dimensions each day. *Vatan* editorial writer Ahmet Emin Yalman proposed the following allegations for the agenda in his article published in April 20 1950, three weeks before the elections:

⁴² Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 123.

“There are reputations of NP as if it is drawing up a new plan. According to this, three days before the election, in 20 mosques which are spread among 20 districts of Istanbul, Mawlid will be conducted for the Marshal to provoke the emotions of society and the fuzzy atmosphere which was left half-finished at the funeral will be repeated. By this means, the elections will be undermined in the biggest city of the country and an uprising will be realized on behalf of the destructive powers.”⁴³

This behaviour of the editorial writer -who carried this incogziabile and groundless claim to his column in the journal basing it on a reputation of no authorship that he had only heard- is expedient to constitute the subject to another argument and researched from the point of journalistic ethics. No uprising attempt was experienced in connection with Mawlid, which was a religious obligation, in Istanbul before or during the election day. The first universal direct suffrage held under adjudicator guarantee and secret balloting and open counting principles in Turkey was hence carried. The 14 May 1950 elections: The NP participated in 22 cities in the 1950 elections.

The elections which 7, 957, 055 of the 8, 905, 743 electors voted resulted as follows:

Table 1. The 1950 Election Results.

	Votes Gained	Vote rate (%)	Deputies
DP	4, 241, 393	53.34	397
RPP	3, 276, 656	38.76	69
NP	250, 414	3.10	1
Independents	383, 289	4,80	9

The only representative entering the GNAT from the NP who did not find what he expected was Osman Bölükbaşı from Kırşehir. Bölükbaşı made the following assessment in relation to the result the NP accomplished:

“The DP completed two and a half years in politics and secured its position colloquially when the NP was established. It was not easy to draw the masses -who already entered into Democrat Party desiring to try the DP once to see what it will do- towards the NP side. Just in the same manner, the concern that the one-party regime of the RPP would continue on the condition that the opposing fractions breakup drew the electors towards the DP. The Marshal, the strongest weapon of the NP related to this issue, fell ill before finding time to travel to Anatolia and he passed away one month before the elections. Kenan Öner was also lost before Marshal. On the other hand, the NP’s financial capabilities being far limited, the lack of support from the press caused this result. At long last, the NP participated in the 1950 elections in the shade of a

⁴³ *Vatan* Journal of April 20 1950.

“reactionist-puritanical” the fraction accusation, these baseless rumours affected people psychologically in a certain manner.”⁴⁴

The NP Deputy Osman Bölükbaşı in the GNAT Alone

Osman Bölükbaşı, who won 28, 039 votes, entered the GNAT on 22 May 1950 as the only NP deputy. He stated the following from the Assembly platform on 31 May 1950 in his first speech, which he gave during the Menderes Government Consultations: “The five-year lasting struggle of the Turkish Nation to overthrow the long years of dictatorship, culminated on 14 May. I salute all friends gathered here in the name of the deputies of this nation struggling for independence.”

Bölükbaşı referred to the common past when the DP founders who had been groomed by the RPP school themselves shared the responsibility for the one-party period and said that “many years have been wasted and the improvement of the country precluded in the one-party period” on the government’s agenda and said: “With this assignation, those who compare the propagandas as the ‘RPP Governance’s fitting centuries into years’ time’ which have been repeated for a long time, will be deeply amazed. We will be contented with abandoning the solution of this amazement, this paradox to the members of new and former ruling parties who share a common past.”

Pointing out that those who have illegally oppressed the people in the past should be called to account, Bölükbaşı criticized the parrying of the issue in silence by saying “we will not accuse people of the previous crimes,” and added:

“Judging of the Government Officers Law is creating an actual distinction wall rather than being judicial. As long as this wall remains, justices buttonholing the officers for their crimes is quite difficult. The mission of the new ruling party is to assure the society on struggling with evil and clarifying the past reckonings by abolishing these judicial walls. A government which has been selected by such a nation that has strived hard to discharge a feckless government has no right to wipe the slate clean with a brilliant statement like ‘we will not accuse people of the previous crimes.’ We are not demanding a violent atmosphere to be created as was done in Bolshevik Russia, when we ask the new ruling party make the past pay to account. We only want the walls -

⁴⁴ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 124-125.

which have prevented normal justice conditions from passing through until this day-be abolished.”⁴⁵

In his first speech in the GNAT, Osman Bölükbaşı asked, “The law about the government officers’ giving declaration of properties is also to be applied to deputies, ministers and the president, making all the politicians give declaration of properties to prevent gossip that may cause people to suspect, and not to discredit the government in the view of the people.” Criticising that there was no certainty in the governmental programme also about the laws against the fundamental law as the DP always used in its propaganda, Bölükbaşı stated that these laws, primarily the Press Law, were to be changed immediately, or else the democracy revolution should not be achieved. He finished his words as follows: “We do not see certainty in the programme of the new ruling party; however, we would like to state that we understand that the new ruling party took charge in very difficult conditions, and we wish the May 14 ruling party would be prosperous acting appropriately within the frame of democratic concerns.”

The criticism issues in question here naturally continued, causing both the RPP and the DP to be uncomfortable with the NP. Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, who took the stand by the end of the meetings on governmental programmes, grew angry and denounced Bölükbaşı’s words as “attacks a single man addressed to us on behalf of the NP,” and disbursed such sentences like “the society has discharged them completely and absolutely.” “In these elections, they could not manage to keep even one deputy amongst more than 20 which they had taken away from the DP earlier.” However, he did not give answers that totally elucidated the criticisms. When the RPP’s proposal of letting the opposition speak was rejected and the competency motion the DP deputies gave was accepted, the RPP group and Osman Bölükbaşı left the chamber and did not participate in the vote of confidence.

The General Amnesty Law

The first act of the DP government was to send the draft law envisaging amnesty for crimes before the election date, 15 May 1950, to Parliament on July 3, 1950. Osman Bölükbaşı, who spoke during draft law discussions on the nature of the postponement of crimes in Parliament, also criticized amnesty covering the illegality committed by officials in

⁴⁵ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 125-126.

the one-party era and irregularity of the dubious 1956 elections. Bölükbaşı brought the following considerations to the attention of the iesP in his speech:

“How we can go to the way of amnesty of sinners violating the votes that are the chastity of a nation. How is one person, charging 10 liras to his debt because of a need, condemned, but on the other hand the people who compromise the votes, the future of a nation, are forgiven? The incidents that occurred from the Tanzimat draft, something that everybody wants: to connect government to law, as well as to connect the law to the nation's conscience. If we are not punishing these crimes, how we will impart to the nation that a new era will be opened on 14 May? Friends, the opening of a new era will be possible by the disappearance of the old mentality and the appearance of the new mentality, establishment of new institutions instead of old institutions. Otherwise, only the parties will have changed. Friends, the Turkish nation did not fight to change masters, we fought to be the master. There is no right of this parliament to forgive those that stole the votes and rape the rights and freedoms of this nation. We should not go this way. I think punishment is the future of the charity. In this regard I would like not to forgive them.”⁴⁶

Only the NP was opposed the amnesty law covering Pre-corruption, lawlessness and profiteering before 1950. The DP spokesmen and supporting press tried to defend this with an abstract reason such as peace of mind. DP Ahmet Emin Yalman, known for his closeness to the DP, based his defense of this issue on the following in his editorial in *Vatan* on 13 June 1950:

“However few are the mistakes of yesterday's one-party government, this is required in terms of not running over to please this party. While opening a new administrative era, we cannot wangle through if we are not discharging (forgiving) the arbitrary actions that were respected as usual in that era, performed according to the measures of one-party era. We will expose ourselves in a hideous way before the world's eyes.”⁴⁷

The RPP, taking courage from the DP's attitude, entered into a mood of challenging about questioning the single-party era. The NP evaluated the long conversations of the RPP speakers, saying ‘why are you holding, call them to account’ as these are ‘setting forth with bluff’ and sourced by RPP's power being sure that DP will not take this setting forth.

The NP displayed their opinions on this issue in *Kudret* of 15-16 June 1950 as follows:

“The RPP says openly to the DP, ‘come to power’. Your members are blaming too much about me. If it is not overstepping your line, you trust yourself, call me to

⁴⁶ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 127.

⁴⁷ *Vatan*, 13 June 1950.

account based on these words. You cannot, because there are people in your party doing the same things.”⁴⁸

The NP says on every platform that this challenge intimidates the DP. Another blackmailing weapon in the hands of the RPP is the fact that RPP shared the joint responsibility in every issue with the DP governors so that the DP governors were stepping back by saying ‘we will not create the previous era.’ Another objection of the Nation Party about the scope of amnesty law was stated about not to forgive the officers tortured the nationalist young people including Alparslan Türkeş in 1944. Known as "*Tabutluk*" (*coffin-store*) event, opening of the case about tortures made under the electric light of 1500 candles has faced many obstacles. As a result, during the period that the case opened at Court of Appeal 5th criminal department about the officers who put these tortures, DP forwarded the law that is forgiving these also to parliament.

The NP objected to the fact that the following officers seen as responsible for torture would be covered by the amnesty: Governor Kamuran Çuhruh, Ahmet Demir and Sait Koçak, General Sabit Noyan and Yusuf Ziya Yazgan, Colonel Cevdet Erkut and Galip Kaan and martial law prosecutor Kazım Alöç. The NP argued that the amnesty law was obtained on the DP’s demand and all perpetrators of the “tabutluk” event would be forgiven, as were the government officers who “committed crimes by abusing influence officialdom against rights and freedoms of citizens.”⁴⁹

The First Grand Congress of the Nation Party

The NP’s grand congress was held with 210 delegates on 17 -19 June 1950 in Ankara, in the Bomonti Salon. In the discussions in the first congress the movement of the press against the NP was criticized. Also emphasized were the “reaction" accusations which the DP and the RPP were continuing against the NP. The following issues were expressed in conversations on the subject: The NP was not a fanatic adherent party, but is a secular party. The NP both objected to fanaticism controlling the government and the government acts against any religion with fanaticism. There was no tyranny in the Muslim religion. Freedom of conscience was the modern meaning of this understanding. Another verse in the Qur’an

⁴⁸ *Kudret* of 15-16 June 1950.

⁴⁹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3 , 2008), p. 130.

said, "you have a religion, I also have a religion." This is the expression of secularism. To be both religious and nonreligious is included in freedom of conscience. Osman Bölükbaşı also said in his speech in the Congress, "the NP is a party that wants morality and accuracy in political life, democracy, and rights to dominate in Turkey. The DP and former governors are allied in stamping out reactionaries in the NP.

In the Congress, at which the failure of the 1950 elections was questioned and its main reasons were discussed, the NP's strong opposition prevented the degeneration of the democracy revolution. It emphasized playing the first role in the eventualizing of the 14 May revolution, the struggle which frays class domination in Turkey and the collapse of the RPP's domination, highlighted that the NP remained the only opposition party in the country, as the RPP's situation was known after the DP had come to power. Hikmet Bayur was brought to the party chairmanship in the elections. Bölükbaşı was the general executive board member.

The result of this congress on the structure of the opposition is also valid for present-day Turkey, because the parties are quite similar to each other, in fact, except for the classical ideas the RPP defends.

The Korean War and the Parliament Permission Discussion

The Menderes Government, on 25 July 1950, decided to allocate a military force of 4,500 people to the United Nations for participation in the Korean War, which had started a month before. An assembly decision on this issue was not given, nor was information given to Parliament. The Council of Ministers' decision to send troops, made during a holiday of parliament, was not published in the *Official Gazette*. It is understood from an examination conducted in 1996 that the decision of the Council of Ministers did not exist in the State archives either. This situation caused heated discussions between the government and the opposition. The subject came up 18 times in Parliament. The opposition maintained that important decisions such as war and peace had to be taken by Parliament according to the Article 26 fundamental law. On the other hand, the government stated that the Security Council of Turkey that was party to UN law was dependent on decisions taken. Furthermore, Parliament's permission is not needed. The DP government stated that Turkish troops had been sent to Korea for peacekeeping and not combat. It declared that the authority to send troops abroad had been transferred from the Parliament's authority to the executive branch with the approval of UN law by the government.

Osman Bölükbaşı moved the issue onto the agenda of parliament. Bölükbaşı and Mardin deputy Kemal Türkoğlu together gave the interpellation proposal on the prime minister on 20 November 1950. Bölükbaşı stated that the issue should be handled as a constitutional issue concerning the non transferable authorities of the parliament, first a legal issue free from emotional factors and said the following against the claim: “Bringing the issue to the parliament bench in the current extraordinary world situation would be harmful.”

Osman Bölükbaşı criticized not having received the same guarantees by the Soviet Union against sending troops to Korea in a period when Turkey’s entry to NATO had been rejected. As a result, Bölükbaşı’s lack of confidence behaviour was rejected by the DP votes. Obtaining an additional decision from parliament on this issue was not seen to be necessary, as the government’s political explanations were found to be sufficient. Comprehensive legal evaluations and discussions of UN Charter Article 40, 41, 42 and 43 were done in these negotiations in 1950. Years later, discussions were held on the same base about sending troops to Cyprus, Bosnia, Afghanistan and Iraq. These discussions were held on the minutes of the 1950 Parliament’s meetings.

The Second Menderes Government

After the adoption of the 1951 budget Prime Minister Menderes drew back to form a new government in 8 March 1951. The Menderes government started working by forming the next day. A concrete decision on changing the antidemocratic laws, which they said they would dispose of in one month after coming to power while the DP in opposition was not stated in the new government’s program. The NP spokesman and Osman Bölükbaşı attributed the DP’s attitude to “they are democratic by habit as they were trained at the RPP school,” and they became persistent followers of this issue. While speaking during the 1951 budget meeting at parliament, Bölükbaşı stated that looking into the nine months’ practices of the DP government, “they are attempting to cancel the laws which are the basis of dictatorship and prevent freedom, besides issuing new pressure laws covering elastical provisions.” He implied that “they cannot say that they did not have the opportunity to change important laws concerning the political nature of the country during the nine months of the DP’s government, which shouted freedom during five years in opposition.” Bölükbaşı pointed out that the government had not undertaken any serious attempts to rectify this issue during the nine-

month executing period, but instead saved this as a sorrowful fate “a law about animal thieves was brought to parliament as the freedom movement of government.”

When Osman Bölükbaşı said, “The first Menderes government promised to change the antidemocratic laws but antidemocratic laws on a turtles back cannot reach parliament in ten months.” Adnan Menderes objected from his seat, saying “Bölükbaşı you proposed these.” Bölükbaşı’s replied: “Mr. Menderes desires that these laws will be proposed by me. He has all the states organizations, scholars, the professors, technicians. Even so, a person who was the opposition spokesman for five years and criticized the antidemocratic laws cannot perform this work, but offers this to Bölükbaşı, who is alone in parliament.”⁵⁰

The Second Grand Congress of the Nation Party

427 delegates participated in the congress on 30 May - 2 June 1951 in Ankara’s new cinema. In the General Executive Committee report presented to the Congress, the need to struggle at every opportunity against fundamentalist propaganda especially and to eliminate the hostile alliance with the DP and the RPP formed against the NP was highlighted. Hard criticisms made against the DP and the DP had forgot its promise about opening a new era, the DP that had been willing freedom while they had been in opposition, had been using the state facilities for themselves, the DP was in large error as they identified citizens rights and freedom wants with only their being in charge on report that proportional electoral system on the election of delegates was suggested.

Osman Bölükbaşı said “The NP will struggle with the DP government which is the continuation of the RPP.” The NP General President was changed for a first time in Turkish political life during the 2nd major congress Mustafa Kentli was selected as general president. The previous general president, Hikmet Bayur, was appointed General Executive Board Member.

After the 1950 general elections, the first interval election was held for 20 deputies in 17 provinces on 16 September 1951. The NP participated in this election with 14 candidates in 11 provinces. The NP increased its vote portion by over 100 percent in the interval elections, increased its vote portion to 11.31 percent by polling 5.24 percent vote. On 14 May

⁵⁰ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 133.

1950 it had candidates in the elections in 11 provinces. The DP added 18 deputies and the RPP two.

The Parliament President Elections

The DP ran Refik Koraltan as a candidate again in the parliamentary presidential elections on 2 November 1951. He was elected as president for a second term as a result of voting but a vote was given to Feridun Fikri Düşünsel, Bingöl Deputy. Düşünsel, who had been the vice president of the RPP for many years, joined the DP after the 14 May 1950 elections. The vote went to Düşünsel and was reflected in the press as Osman Bölükbaşı having voted for him, which was considered a joke. The quotes given by Bölükbaşı to Ankara Agency reporters on this topic on 3 November 1951 should be transferred exactly as an example of humor.

“This vote is not a result of a joke, but rather it is very serious. The Democratic Party gave its heart to Düşünsel. I gave only my vote, is it too much? Everyone knows that Refik Koraltan is not acting impartially as parliament president. Nevertheless, the DP Parliament Group stated that they do not want an impartial parliament president by running Koraltan as candidate again. Since a partial parliament president is willed, Feridun Düşünsel, who made difficulties as vice president of the 1946 parliament –this issue was known by Menderes and DP deputies- therefore is a master of Refik Koraltan by comparison. I wanted to protest the government, which is known for not respecting democratic principles, which disregarded specialization by not running Feridun Fikri as candidate. And I voted for him. This is the issue. ”

The Domination and Violence Policies of the DP Government in its First Year

When the first year of the DP, which came to power on 14 May 1950, is considered, it is seen that he showed intolerance of even the most natural criticisms and resorted to harsh precautions. The following words said by Menderes on 29 May 1951 at the Seyhan state congress, express the DP executives’ nervousness and their mood: “We have all the required power to avoid disturbance of the peace in the country. If needed, we have the power to take precautions so strict no bird could fly.” The Managers’ reaction to the discomfort arisen in the DP came from the same mood. President Menderes, who came to Parliament platform after A.

Hikmet Pamukođlu, DP Giresun Deputy, who criticized the government during 1952 budget meetings, said the following: "The friend inside us should leave, climb to mountain, and get detached."

Six DP deputies broke from the DP by resigning or being sent down as a result of the DP's executives' behavior using the debarment. Abdurrahman Boyacıgiller, A. Hikmet Pamukođlu ve Nazım Önen entered the NP among these deputies. As a result, the NP parliament group reached four deputies. A. Hikmet Pamukođlu, President Menderes suggested climbing the mountain, registered to the NP's Altındađ Association, by abiding this terse advice.

Meanwhile, the DP government passed a law on confiscating the RPP's goods on 8 August 1951 and transferred all of the party's goods including the RPP General Central Building to the treasury on September 1951. One of the main targets of this violence and domination policy of the DP government aiming to intimidating the opposition was the NP. *Kudret* which was the NP's organ did not delay in saying that the DP was constantly qualifying the NP as "hatred and revenge party". The DP was forced to end up the publication life of *Kudret* by obstructing official advertising on November 1951. Instead of the NP executives' decision to continue publication with the limited financial opportunities which they could provide *Kudret* stopped publication on 27 July 1952.

The DP government, which sought to dominate the public press with state sources, forced the opposition newspapers to close and transferred, gradually, a large amount of money to newspapers that portrayed the government acts as good in the name of official advertising. The NP speeded up its Anatolian meetings and chose the way of revealing the DP's acts directly to the public in view of this government's hostile policy. The NP spokesman appealed to large crowds. Coming in early to mid-1952, the NP's growth and rapid establishment of organizations will be seen.

The Third Grand Congress of the Nation Party

The NP's Third Major Congress gathered on 15 May 1952 in Ankara's Ulus Cinema. Arif Hikmet Pamukođlu and Adnan Menderes separated from the DP "to climb the mountain" as they voiced different concepts in the party. The NP's evaluations of current political statements and basic elements of the party's strategy were stated in a General Executive Board Work report submitted to the Congress. The following issues were stated in the

recorded report showing that the DP would resort to any illegitimate method to destroy the NP by charging Osman Bölükbaşı and the NP with Communism that the DP was fighting with a vengeance in spite of all efforts for relations with the ruling party to be based on mutual respect and tolerance:

“We would like to inform to the power that there is no possibility to destroy us, nor should it intimidate us. It is understood that the opposition is looking for a custom-made soft power. The reason for this is available in the form of the DP. If you remember that İnönü said in his speech from Giresun State Hall’s balcony five years ago: ‘I wanted the DP's establishment, I made establishment easy, and the party was founded.’ This statement is never contradicted by DP. An opposition party, born with the help of the former chief, surely will want an opposition candidate just like him when acceded.”⁵¹

That the RPP had a front against the NP by making an alliance with the DP and entered into plots was stated, and the NP's readiness to fight on two fronts was implied in the report.

In a report, the democratic philosophy of the NP, founded as a social moderation movement against movements representing excess and immoderation, was defined as follows:

"laws and laws of a state statute according to the conscience of the people.”

Fundamentally people with anti-religious opinions may normally perceive this sort of statement as a blurring of government and religion and may show a hostile attitude, as the expression of conscience according to law naturally defines moral rules only based on religion. The main comments about the Nation Party’s press and publication functions and press freedom are stated in the report as follows:

“We appreciate that the press criticizes us. There is no constructive or destructive criticism for us. Even the bitterest criticism, the most relentless attack, has a constructive character. However, handling the Turkish press as a whole has become inevitable because of the unfair and arbitrary delivery of official announcements. Infrequent discussion of these facts in our independent newspaper gives us grief. Press freedom is destroyed not only by undemocratic laws. This freedom may be sabotaged by the newspapers qualified as ‘reptile press’ in press history and fed by the government not doing its primary task. This issue has been an event since then in our Turkey. But it was not handled, as the one-party system was in place and opposition newspapers were not published at that time. Feeding some newspapers with millions, and trying to deter the others constitutes a new offense for the regime called democracy after the 14th. The only daily newspaper struggling clearly with this deplorable situation is *Kudret*. Because of its courage, we are grateful to this

⁵¹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 137.

newspaper. Our General Executive Board wants to remind the press again that the first political party to defend press freedom sincerely and bravely is the NP. Our party will never betray this cause and will remain the eternal friend and defender of this fundamental freedom."⁵²

At this point, emphasizing the democratic understanding of the NP inside the party will be a correct approach. The understanding and application of the NP on this topic will be explained in the summary below to show an important example, which will show how the “leader authority” and “democracy inside party” discussions held in the 2000s, were put forward by an opposition party newly emerging 56 years ago.

The NP held four major congresses during the period of establishment on 19 July 1948, and closure because of "fundamentalism" charges on 27 January 1954. At each congress the general chairman changed with election; four presidents served in five and a half years. General presidential elections were held with many candidates at each congress. General presidents changed with the votes of delegates in Congress working as general executive committee members under the newly elected general presidents.

The NP staffs claiming and hoping to end the chief system in government administration and political institutions implemented this first sample in their parties. Seeing discussions within the party as a valuable source of development and believing that the grouping inside the party showed freedom of thought and vitality in the party, the NP made this call to delegates on this issue in a report presented at the third major congress:

"Dear delegates (...) although our political opponents want to ascribe to us corruption and factionalism, our party is represented as an indivisible and stable entity. You will protect this great unity and integrity. You will listen to all speeches with tolerance even if they are deprived of moderation. And you will always remember that the most important factor of developing of a political formation is its experiencing a wide diversity of ideas. Those who think that freedom inside the party will weaken us, will always fail. We invite your comments and salute all of you with respect."⁵³

⁵² Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 137.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

CHAPTER 4 THE CLOSURE OF THE NATION PARTY

The Hikmet Bayur Problem and the Kemalism Discussions

The Kemalist reform discussion, initiated by the NP's first general president Hikmet Bayur, marked the third major congress. Hikmet Bayur's attitude toward this issue prepared a base for the "fundamentalism" accusation campaign initiated by the RPP and the DP against the NP and was an important stage of a period resulting in the NP's closure. Bayur said in his speech at the third grand congress, "there is a group within the party that is against the Kemalist reforms, large movements in the Atatürk era were called wrong by some deputies and this period was qualified as domination era by these environments" and he said that he would not stay in the party if this situation were not fixed.

He based his complaints and discomfort on this issue, mainly, on speeches by some delegates at the Istanbul city, county and district congresses and the opposition of Seçkin Haydar to the suggestion of placing a wreath at Atatürk's mausoleum by the president council which was adopted with great applause at the third grand congress. Bayur, whose ideas about the protection of the Kemalist reforms were interspersed in the work report presented to Congress, wanted reflection of these ideas by changing some articles of the party's program. In this context, from the position that the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish-Islamic traditions needed to be clarified, the NP's revolutionary policy change in this direction was proposed with the principle of respect for the national traditions and the customs followed in the the NP's program.

The Party leaders stated that the matters put forward by Hikmet Bayur as vision differences were not valid, he had shown extreme sensitivity. General Sadık Aldoğan, who spoke first to answer criticisms during meetings on the General Administration Council, said the following about the discussion initiated by Hikmet Bayur:

"Freedom of criticism in the NP is an example of freedom of criticism in the civil liberties. There is no freedom in a community if people be afraid to criticize. We say what we think. We will not be afraid to reveal any idea. There is no dispute among the members of the General Administration Committee, including Hikmet Bayur. The regime applied for the fulfillment of a revolution at that time during the establishment of the Turkish Republic was seen as only a vehicle. This is the result of a necessity.

Criticizing; this term is not correct. The limiting of criticisms has been needed for equity s'nce 1945.”⁵⁴

Sadık Aldogan completed his speech by stat'ng that Bayur's concerns had been misplaced with the warning about the abuse of Atatürk's name. “We are asking all parties not to use the names of the holy people, in order not to offend the blessed spirit of Ataturk.”

Osman Bölükbaşı made a speech for two hours targeting the suppression policies of the DP on 17 May 1952. Bölükbaşı said “the country is against a political chaos” headlines of the newspapers stated that first the DP had planned a conspiracy to close the NP. Adnan Menderes was disturbed by the NP's development, and had said “not worry about the NP, we will lock its doors.” Bölükbaşı called Menderes as follows: "I am inviting Menderes to accommodate, locking the door of the opposition means taking the country to dictatorship under a different name. The DP can say that he is not promising anything, but cannot deny that he promises that he will establish a state governed by the rule of law at the end of a freedom struggle.” Bölükbaşı was saying that the DP did not keep his promises about democracy and freedom while he was in the opposition then said that "the DP, denying all his words, formed an oppressive regime under the guise of Turkey's interests. As a result Turkey faced political fundamentalism and the DP executors were political reactionaries” and made the following evaluation of the DP's understanding of democracy: “Friends, to understand the DP, it is necessary to know history. The DP has struggled to establish a state governed by the rule of law and has come to power. What are the results? They have become democratic to the proportion that their needs permit.” Bölükbaşı, emphasizing the Turkish Penal Law article 159 issues brought to the subject by the DP said “the change that the DP wants aims to punish every criticism as an insult.”

He finished his speech with these words: “Menderes, we will not sleep. But we will make sure you do not sleep either, by telling you your accomplishments and the status to the public.”⁵⁵

The Congress was held in an electric environment in which Hikmet Bayur left the salon for minor reasons, and ended with the selection of Enis Akaygen as general president. Hikmet Bayur also was involved in the 21-person Executive Board as a member. The

⁵⁴ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 139.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

delegates at the congress cheered for Osman Bölükbaşı to become general president and endorsed him as a candidate. Bölükbaşı told the delegates: "Maybe I am a good orator, but I have a major short-coming. I am inexperienced. I will keep your countenance as an eternal souvenir. Please do not vote for me."

The Offer from Osman Bölükbaşı

These developments show that the DP was preparing an assassination on the basis of "fundamentalism" against the NP. In this situation Osman Bölükbaşı presented a proposal to the new General Executive Board meeting on 19 May 1952 at 15:00, one day after the congress. The text of the proposal was about adding an "idea-movement" report that was accepted with alliance in congress in order to prevent misunderstandings about the party's thoughts and accusations against the NP, as an addendum to the NP program and internal regulations is stated below:

"These complications which were caused by the desire to attach ideas and affections which do not exist in the program to our party were revealed with the events at our grand congress. I demand and offer to state the comments and the elements determined on the "idea-movement" part of the General Execution Council report approved by the grand congress and to take the decision of reports, this part in writing, as addendum to legislation and program to be printed. A first caution to be prevented from the misunderstandings and refuting the attributes of backwardness against our party which always aims to move forward."⁵⁶

The part, stated in the above-mentioned proposal and entitled idea-movement of the General Execution Council's report, accepted by the grand congress of the NP, was as follows:

"Having reached this part of our report, our general council finds it useful to emphasize the main principles of our party that brought a new idea-movement. We would like to indicate before everything that our party was founded as a political and moderate social movement in the middle of the movements that represent excessive and extremist side. In this regard the NP takes the historical responsibility and duty that any political organization could share. Our party believes that beliefs, morals, traditions and customs make up a large part of social order and these should remain outside the influence of the state and the government. Article 12 of our program on the character and the freedom of conscience has always tried to be out of the wrong and lying propaganda spread by our political opponents. However, we are obviously evolving at the same time. Article 13 of our program shows our qualifications with clarity. We would like to remind those who denounced us for giving assistance to the

⁵⁶ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 141.

reactionaries that these are not more than claims conformed without shame if we were in power, we would bring caliphs and sultans, we would accept old letters we would revive veils and the cage era. This irreversible movement will never occur in our Turkey.”⁵⁷

The DP’s and the RPP’s Exploitation of the Hikmet Bayur Incident

The RPP opposition, taking a place at the forefront of this swear campaign against the NP, made an alliance with the DP on this topic by using Hikmet Bayur. After the third major Congress, in an editorial published on 21 May 1952 by Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, the editor of *Ulus* newspaper, he stated that the use of “Allah and fear of Allah” by some orators in their speeches in congress showed that the NP was a reactionary party and said:

“It is seen that the NP is having a growth and development attack and is soul-searching. Taking place in the NP of educated intellectuals who were formed in the revolution of Atatürk, such as Hikmet Bayur is an enigma which is impossible to explain. Those who are against the Ataturk revolution, accusing Atatürk's era of domination, are saying this in the name of freedom and democracy. They are against the freedom of conscience. The conflict is a secularist fight.”⁵⁸

The RPP spokesman not only executed a sharp condemnation campaign against the NP, but offered to migrate to RPP in order to pull Hikmet Bayur onto their side. The DP followed a double line, on one hand inviting Hikmet Bayur to join the DP, on the other hand continuing to provide financial aid to Büyükdoğu Society. The DP government, trying to strangle NP with “fundamentalism” charges, allocated a large amount of credit to the owner of *Büyük Doğu* (*Grand East*) magazine, Necip Fazlı Kısakürek, and provided large amounts of official advertising to allow the magazine to publish as a daily newspaper. However, there was a change of 180 degrees in the DP's attitude after the assassination of *Vatan*'s editor, Ahmet Emin Yalman, on 22 May 1952 in Malatya. The NP spokesman saw the DP's behavior reforming and acting as freedom defender who had transferred a large amount of money to *Büyük Doğu* newspaper after the Malatya incident.

The Malatya Assassination

⁵⁷ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 141-142.

⁵⁸ Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, *Ulus*, 21 May 1952.

An inconclusive assassination was attempted on the *Vatan*'s editor, Ahmet Emin Yalman, in Malatya by writer Hüseyin Üzmez. The DP government took harsh measures and *Türk Milliyetçiler Birliği* (*Turkish Nationalists Association*) with whom a connection with the assassination incident cannot be definitively made, was closed on 22 January 1953. The President of the Association Sait Bilgiç's immunity was removed and Osman Yüksel Serdengeçti, a member, was arrested. Likewise, proceedings against Büyük Doğu society were initiated with the reason that they were using religion in politics. Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, Büyük Doğu's leader, to whom the DP government had transferred large financial resources and supported at every opportunity up to that date, was arrested too.

The Recorded Democracy

As the preparations of the DP government to close the NP gained acceleration, Osman Bölükbaşı requested the government record his speeches at the Anatolian meetings so that his speech could not be altered while it was written. His speeches at the GNAT Budget Committee on 5 January 1953 were recorded in the parliament minutes as follows: He stated that the government had detected the president's opponents' speeches in the meetings during a speech in the parliament:

“I want to learn with whom and which procedures they detected the opponents' speeches, because it has great importance. It was seen that proceedings started because of words spoken at a political meeting, after a long period as government, president, parliament were insulted. However, the task of the police is to identify a minute when criminal words were expended on meetings and to make the ones who are claimed. Doing so, citizens are protected from defamation and one has the right to protect himself. Standing before citizens after six months or even one year with the wrong notes about a speech thousands heard cannot be accepted with the concepts of liberty and safety. Because the speaker does not know the listeners, the listeners can forget the speeches also. The government, caring for its opponents' safety, should follow a procedure which does not give the opportunity for slanders while occupying the speeches with public safety considerations. For example, speeches should be recorded by a dictaphone. Maybe some of our friends' speeches can be recorded by people who know shorthand or typing. But as I speak very quickly, for example, the parliament president felt the necessity of recording my speeches with a dictaphone as even parliament's expert stenographers failed to record my speeches. As I felt my friend's intention, I needed to record my speech on the twenty-first of last month at a Bursa meeting of the NP and have it placed in front of a notary. Recently I showed these files to my friends and minister of justice with an occasion during the discussions of ministry of justice's budget. If an undemocratic demand, concession demand is not regarded, I would suggest that the minister of interior dedicate a dictaphone under the order of security organization at least for me. If I need to speak in a place, I shall

inform security. They will record my words and my voice with the dictaphone. (Smiles) We will appreciate the movement of the Minister, stating that he had outfitted our safety organization with modern equipment, if he delivers dictaphones to security organizations aiming to protect opponents against slander. There is no need to worry about calling the administration in the country 'democracy with Dictaphone,' because this is a safety measure, it can be said."⁵⁹

The Minister of Interior, Ethem Menderes, responded to the speech by Osman Bölükbaşı saying, "They were determining the spoken words at these meetings as public meetings are movements concerning safety. The government did not think of slandering anyone and the determining of speeches would protect against slanders being invented later at the same time." Bölükbaşı, having the last word again said, he could not agree that the Ministry of Interior's opinion about the minutes kept by officers at meetings would prevent defamations because these notes could be based on defamation and repeated his request for a dictaphone.

The Letter to Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın

The smear campaign initiated by the DP leaders against the the NP was continued, gaining new dimensions in early 1953. Adnan Menderes, charging the NP of using religion in politics, stated that "a law is needed in order to prevent mixing of religion in politics" at the DP consultative congress collected on 7 February 1953. Menderes held a press conference on 4 March 1953 at which he stated that the DP had started an illegal movement against the NP with these suggestive words. Menderes, in an attempt to intimidate the NP, said: Religious issues will be excluded from political struggle. Those who want to use religion in politics will be forced to separate from this way in the near future. The publications against the NP of the DP's newspapers, primarily *Zafer*, gained acceleration. Mümtaz Faik, in an article entitled, "Are We Going to Turn a Blind Eye on the Nationalist Movements?" wrote "it is time to manage the NP and to provide this is a country duty that the DP government should do this duty" in a *Zafer* article dated 4 March 1953.⁶⁰

A decree about using religion in politics was sent to the prosecutor's office a few days after this open threat on the press conference of Menderes. A RPP spokesman also joined the

⁵⁹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 144-145.

⁶⁰ *Zafer*, 4 March 1953

DP's attacks. The DP was unanimous with the RPP against the NP. *Ulus* editor Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın led the RPP side of this partnership. Bölükbaşı gave a statement to the press on 28 February 1953 in response to Yalçın. He invited the accusers to prove their claims and said the following against these multi-pronged attacks:

"People struggling to smother political reactionaries, moan the nation in grip, will not think of making religious fundamentalism an additional problem for the nation. If you do not invite the government to fulfill its duty and to punish the people of whom you wrote that they were using the religion in politics by delivering a proposal to the parliament immediately, you would fit the definition of blackmailer, following a strange aim such as pressuring and threatening your opponent. Although you have accused us of using religion in politics, no judicial inquiry about us had been held.⁶¹

As should be remembered, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın committed to judicial Independence Court and judged the single-party era. At that time Yalçın, consumed heavy words to the RPP, then joined the RPP and became one of the five RPP deputies selected from Istanbul in elections declared to be invalid. Osman Bölükbaşı published a clear letter, criticizing the single-party era, denouncing the NP as a "foul-mouthed party" again, and reminding Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın:

"Please remember those who once called the opposition Russian agents and Communists. Those who want manners and grace to command political life faithfully, should obey these rules first. In the struggle for democracy, those who got low marks in morality and virtue, if they try to defend manners and grace against their opponents one day, they will be met with disgust as a faithless bride asking for earrings from her in-laws even though she came to the groom's house pregnant."⁶²

When Osman Bölükbaşı arrested Hüseyin Yalçın to be judged in the Independence Court after saying "you asked for fundamentalism that has no refugees" against his claim "the NP uses religion in politics," he recalled his crying daughter's words and concluded:

"Mr. Yalçın, your charges smell of the reactions and intentions that sent you to exile and independence court! Your daughter, who saw the policies to arrest you, hugged your neck and said "Dad, you said such things would not be able to happen anymore, the country has achieved freedom, why did you deceive me?" If history were to repeat and we had someone to cry and hug our necks one day, we would tell your daughter's

⁶¹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 146.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 147.

adventure and we would say to them that we would struggle until an administration that was not making innocents such as Hüseyin Cahit's daughter cry."⁶³

The NP's Fourth Grand Congress: Hikmet Bayur's Resignation

The NP's fourth congress was held on 27-29 June 1953 in Ankara in a new cinema salon. The NP completed its organizations in all districts and provinces across the country, founded approximately 20,000 divisions and the foundation period of the party was completed successfully before the congress. In the congress, which started with a tense atmosphere in which the shadow of the discussions about "Atatürk revolutions" in last congress could be felt, Yusuf Kemal Tengirşek was selected to the court presidency. He first withdrew from his task with an excuse. After the elections, after with discussions and done with the open voting, when Professor Vasfi Raşit Seviğ, standing by Hikmet Bayur, lost the elections, Hazım Bozca was selected. The need to comment on the "moderate-conservatism" and "evolution-assertion" principles at Article 7 and 13 of the NP program in the literal sense against the accusations of "opposition revolution" and the "reaction" that were initiated on the purpose was highlighted in the Executive Committee report presented to the General Assembly and it demanded that the Congress take a decision in that direction. During the meetings about the report Hikmet Bayur, who had started the discussions on the previous congress, rejected the concept of "moderate-conservatism" and stated "a nation that stroke for a hundred years could not be conservative and moderate-conservative is suited to the developing nations." Bayur, besides, stated that "the party should choose one of two ways, revolutionary or conservatism and could not get rid of the reactionary accusations of the opposing party if it stayed at midpoint."

Osman Bölükbaşı came to the podium on the second day of the congress and invited Hikmet Bayur to correct the misunderstandings. Osman Bölükbaşı stated following issues: "It is not true to show a whole party guilty just because of several of people's individual acts. Ahmet Emin Yalman wants to stamp a party as reactionary. There is a Hikmet Bayur incident inside the party. I as one of your friend have noticed this for a long time. I told him many times to defend his ideas and tell the public at squares and meetings. But he ignored these and stepped away, saying "I throw out a thesis, do not step in others" as a child. I do not fit this to an honorable person.

⁶³ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 148.

Hikmet Bayur, did not answer Bölükbaşı's speech and said those who wanted to run him as a candidate “my stay at the party is not clear and do not waste your votes.” Hikmet Bayur and his colleagues resigned from the NP the next day on 29 June 1953. Mustafa Kentli was selected as the General President on the last elections at the Congress and Osman Bölükbaşı became a member of the General Executive Board.

The below “statement” which confirms the reforms of Atatürk against the smear campaign targeting the NP. At the end of the congress, it was accepted with the strong applause of 300 delegates.

"The NP charged with the political opponents for his ideas and his trends that do not exist in the political activities and the program's text and the spirit such as retardation. The truth is that the NP designated with the need of the program would not cover the backwardness on the arrangement of the social life and believed that the world is going to a common civilization. As a matter of fact, statements, legislations, by the General Council, it reports presented to the grand congress and the explanations made by our deputy about our party at the assembly showed our sincerity on the issue. However, in order to reject finally the on-purpose acts against our party, the Fourth Grand Congress' purpose as against the party to reject the finally, the Fourth Congress clearly determined and declared these major principles: The Nation Party confirms again that he adopted completely the Republic reforms, done in order the Turkish society to reach the level of contemporary civilization such as the ban of marrying more than one woman, civil law, the closing of dervish lodges, separating religion and state affairs from each other to prevent using the religion in the politics, the gender equality law, the principle of national sovereignty and Republican regime that is the main reform.”⁶⁴

Hikmet Bayur, Prof. Vasfi Raşit Seviğ and his seven friends defining themselves as "those who fight for the sake of the protection of Atatürk's reforms" explained their resignation with a statement including their claims “the NP executers are making the concession of being the revolution enemies.” The claims such as some weakness in the Charter of the NP put the party under the domination of those who were guided by Atatürk hostility some NP executers get along with backwardness ideas in order to gain votes. The separation of Hikmet Bayur from the NP was met with enthusiasm by the newspapers and the editors, speakers of the RPP and the DP. *Zafer* and *Vatan* newspapers, as the DP's press organs, evaluated this as "the triumph of advanced ideas" and continued to make heavy accusations against the NP; on their articles. Ahmet Emin Yalman, editor of *Vatan*, who showed aggressive attitude against the NP and went most forward and wrote "two-headed

⁶⁴ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 156-157.

inside the NP ended with the resignations, the NP that is the party of hatred, hate and backwardness completely and aim to service the evil forces, would questioned by Turkish justice.’⁶⁵

The Final Scene of the Assassination against the NP

The last part of the political war that was initiated with the accusation of using religion in politics against the NP was opened with the initiation of questioning of the NP on 4 July 1953. The party was closed temporarily on 8 July 1953. The Nation Party, which had one and a half million members and approximately 20,000 divisions, and had completed its organization throughout the country, was one of the three parties in Turkey. The NP court case started on 15 September 1953. The party was closed on 27 January 1954. The political life of the party that was in real opposition to the DP government was ended with the decision of the police court and a fine of 250 piaster, which covered two kilos of spinach. The incidents and developments was lived at the last part of this political complot left deep scars on all the NP’s people, who expressed their grief and reactions at every opportunity are stated below. Ankara Republic Prosecutor’s Office, which accepted declarations published by Hikmet Bayur and his friends, defined themselves as "reformist group", while they resigned, as notice, started the preparations of the legal proceedings with reason of acts against reforms and assigned Prosecutor Cemil Bengü personally. The need to prove the claims of those who had separated from the party was declared in a statement published by the NP about the issue. The Ministry of Justice and Republican Prosecutor’s Office were invited to task in order to reveal the truths by accepting these claims as a criminal complaint. These words were stated on statement published with the signature of Mustafa Kentli, the NP General President, dated 2 July 1953:

“A small and mixed minority, who had wanted to corrupt the National Party's Fourth Congress resigned from party as they had not succeeded. They both attributed the reaction to the NP to their statements in the Turkish press and offended a crime according to Turkish laws. The NP General Administration Council, which examined carefully all of the publications of the political opponents decided to apply justice. We are demanding from the prosecutor and the Turkish Justice Attorney to warn all these journals and take action. We regard this task to be transferred to justice and take a

⁶⁵ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 157.

provision as first condition in order to understand the truth and public dignity and honor of immunity. This event is a second defamation conspiracy from the foundation of the NP. The first one was recorded in history an assassination conspiracy against İnönü and connected to a decision in the national historic court. We are still deciding to revert this second conspiracy to a judicial decision. It is concluded that the consulting phrases of the party executors were needed at the investigation executed by Cemil Bengü, Ankara Public Prosecutor. ⁶⁶

Osman Bölükbaşı was not called for the prosecutor as he was deputy, but he voluntarily went and gave statements on 4 July 1953. Bölükbaşı stayed at the Prosecutor's Office one and a half hours, and said the following after coming out: "This is a second Reşat Aydınli incident. We've survived the storm before will we be afraid of the rain?"

The declaration on this issue of prosecution sources that is carrying out the investigation was published on 5 July 1953 in the series, with headline "The NP's secret aspirations" in *Vatan*, the DP's organ: "The NP Istanbul Provincial Organization divided into two groups, reformist and right-wing. "The rightists formed two groups, the caliphates and the mecelle. The NP Headquarters did not consider pursuant reports on this issue, a passive behavior were followed. If these claims were found valid and the case would be opened of acting based on religion against the NP."

Hikmet Bayur's real intentions and goals were revealed by the NP executors on the investigation, started with the claims of supporters on the prosecutor and Hikmet Bayur's resignation statement. The NP General Leader announced the following issues on 1953 at İstanbul about his attitude on the issues and objections about "adherence to the national tradition, to the customs and the traditions" on Hikmet Bayur's NP program:

"We know that all along, there was a small grouping movement in the NP. But the conflict is also possible of each idea of turning into each group. Each group will gather around an idea. It is a mistake to think groups inside the Parties are a result of passion. The National Party collected around Marshal and was formed with a program presented to the public. It should be regretted that one of the founders of the party heading grouping made an opposition to us. This dispute began at the first time of my presidency. Mr Bayur attempted a program amendment at that time and wanted to hook our programs to article 7⁶⁷. All of you know this item: have shares on order of the assembly formation of the creed, morality, the tradition of customs and traditions. They often can not be changed and falls outside the state's influence area. Bayur wanted to make a sense of tradition, or rather according to him, the understanding of a tradition was propounded. And presented to me as an amendment bill, and wanted to

⁶⁶ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 158.

⁶⁷ See Appendix F.

be accepted and in the case of the refusal of the draft he said he would resign from the party. If he has the courage he has been submitting all his offers to the public. The draft said that: 'Our tradition begins with the Republic. "Upon which I said to him: I can not take this bill to Congress, the General Assembly, even the Presidency of the court, because 30 years are not enough time for the formation of a nation's tradition. This period does not allow even the establishment of a human character."

Finally, the second draft came after this proposal was refused. "The tradition has good, and bad. Keep the good and get rid of the bad, he said. "So, you are right but, who will decide if a tradition is good or bad? Instead of the old SheikhuIslam, will we substitute the new mufti of revolutions? If this proposal I would give is rejected, give it to Congress, but here if you can not obtain a majority, what do you? "I asked, I immediately left the party," he said. We took this proposal to Congress last year. But the Bayur said "if the NP would not amend article 7, it would be a very harmful party for the country" by giving the statement on various agencies and and did propaganda in this way. Bayur imputed to us what not even our opponents wanted to say. Finally the Fourth Congress was convened, the current incident occurred. I also would like to say that, the word tradition was just a fake. It's taken from French. The government is a despotic administration on the day it tries to determine which is wrong or right. After Bayur has run riot Malatya incident this time he did not focus on tradition alone. He wanted a state with the right to change of creed, ethics, customs and traditions at any time. However, the state can not intervene in everything human. Bayur attempted to change the substance ten days before the 12th. But therein and finally he did not succeed and congress gathered around us. The amendment that does not believe in the public explicit and the decisions of elected the deputies of the nation is illegitimate. We take this revolution as evolution and that assertion of freedom of conscience ideas does not exist in this country. The state will make a law changing a nation's tradition. Our strength is our program."⁶⁸

The NP Inquiry in the DP Parliament Group

Menderes gave a press conference on 4 March 1953 at the Prime Ministry. He accused the NP and *Türk Milliyetçiler Derneği* (*Turkish Nationalists Association*) for the "green activities" and named the NP "against the parties abusing religion for politics, we should take precautions." Journalists Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın and Cemil Sait Barlas's suggestion to the Prime Minister, "taking precautions against the NP and application of the penal code" was published in *Vatan*, on date 5 March 1953.⁶⁹ The inquiry into the NP started on 4 July 1953, still should have been conducted silently in the pre-stage, but on 7 July 1953,

⁶⁸ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 159-160.

⁶⁹ *Vatan*, 5 March 1953.

it was taken to the DP Parliament Group, to an open meeting with the participation of Prime Minister, where comments were made on this legal subject.⁷⁰

A motion for “pronouncement of government on NP case” was carried in the meeting of the DP Parliament Group, on 7 July 1953. Despite the rejection of some DP parliament members who said “It is not right to have a meeting on the inquiry into the NP as it has been transferred to justice”, there were long discussions about an urgent review of this matter. The result of the voting was, “the majority of the DP’s parliament members voted positive for a debate on the subject in group meeting.” Osman Şevki Çiçekdağ, Minister of Justice, gave a long speech about the legal conduction of the case, and Prime Minister Adnan Menderes followed his speech. Menderes started his speech with answers to the opposing members by saying “The NP uses religion as an instrument for politics, taking this political view so far that it disturbs the peace and calmness of the public” and claiming “persons in this party, who appear to be supporting this religious reactions must be identified individually, those exist in every status and expand in society”. He also predicted the conclusion of the case: “The NP abuses religion, follows illegal paths and all these facts will be revealed after a legal investigation.” The day following Prime Minister Adnan Menderes’s speech, on 8 July 1953, the NP was closed temporarily.

The Nation Party Case and the Permanent Abolition

One month after the date when the investigation started on 4 July 1953 and the temporary abolition of the NP on the 8 of July, there was no lawsuit brought against the NP, but the media continued campaigns aimed to condemn the party in advance. So the NP consulted the prosecutor and the government. The NP General Secretary Fuat Arna applied to the Republic Attorney General and the Prime Minister on 30 July and on 16 August and asked for a public lawsuit against the NP as soon as possible. Ankara Republic Attorney General Cemil Bengü finished the investigation on 26 August 1953 and brought a lawsuit for the abolition of the NP with a 61 page indictment on the 15 September 1953. The indictment of the attorney was released as a free newspaper supplement by *Vatan*, which supported the DP. The next day Osman Bölükbaşı made a statement about the delayed indictment of the Attorney General which asked for the abolition of the NP: "Against all the efforts of the

⁷⁰ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 161.

Republic Attorney General which seemed to be politic, did nothing more than asking a 10-Lira fine and one-day prison sentence for the directors of the NP, so it's enough to show how unfair and improper the charges against the NP were."

On the other hand, the NP published a statement on 6 September 1953 :

"There is nothing against the law and the human rights in our requests. The 7 and 12 articles of our program shown to be the reason for the abolition of the NP today, are the same as the United Nations Law, which is supported by Turkey itself. We may be imprisoned today, the privacy of our homes may be violated, but the true lovers of liberty are never afraid of tyranny and menace. No poor excuse for a dictator can kill the love of liberty in our hearts. We will not change our way in spite of the crisis! Our mission is not complete. "⁷¹

The NP lawsuit started on the 26 September 1953 in the Ankara Fourth Lower Criminal Court, with presiding Judge Memduh Balamir. Before the stages of the court, we should summarize the evidence, claims and the charges in the indictment of the NP.

The Attorney General asked for the permanent abolition of the NP by this charge in his indictment:

"Since the establishment and especially from the end of 1950, the broadcasts and the activities and finally the Fourth Grand Congress and the following events show their direction and the mentality, and the party program and rules have sentences completely available to confirm this mentality. Every member of this party and the organization and the General Council, grand congress and the general president, governance and general politics and applications and program and rules are totally against all the revolutions achieved since the establishment of the republic and confirmed by the constitution and our other laws. They are after a removal of laicism and the replacement of laicism by applications fitting society, willpower, traditions and beliefs according to their aims and mentalities such as garments, veils, turbans, the Arabic alphabet, mecelle code, polygamy, and private Islamic community organizations, and thereby caliphate and Islamic Law and a strong Atatürk antagonism dominates them."⁷²

The conclusion and request part of the indictment asked for a total abolition of the party governance by suggesting that "The NP stands for an illegal corporation based on religion, denomination and religious orders which hides its real purposes," and claimed the party director was expected to be punished according to Turkish Criminal Code section № 526, which was about "establishing a corporation based on religion, denomination and religious orders with its purpose kept disguised."

⁷¹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 167-168.

⁷² Ibid., p. 168.

The 13 party director suspects in the the NP case were: Dr. Mustafa Kentli , Enis Akaygen, Fuat Arna, Nurettin Ardiçođlu, Ahmet Tahtakılı , Ertuđrul Akça, Lütfü Bornovalı, Suphi Batur, Dr. Yesari Bilgisev, Galip Bilge, Mehmet Ali Derman, Cemal Islak, Hasan Dinçer. Osman Bölükbaşı was a member of the Parliament, so they appealed to the Minister of Justice for the cancellation of his privilege of arrest. Prosecutor Cemil Bengü could not bring solid and serious evidence in his indictment accusing the NP's members and organizations, which had 1.5 million registered members and 20,000 organizations countrywide. These strong accusations remained a thesis based on newspapers and rumors on a fragile background.

The accusation on the indictment was based mainly on Hikmet Buyur's and his allies' public declaration given in the press as they were leaving the NP. The Prosecutor suggested that the arguments in the letter of resignation confirmed that the NP was making religion an instrument for politics. He was so exaggerated that he even put this "subjective determination" in his indictment: "Hikmet Bayur and his allies fought against the actions of Atatürk and revolution antagonists inside the party as a general president until 1950, but they were deprived of effective opportunities from the middle of 1950." "MP Istanbul City Governance had 25 members who wanted to reestablish the constitutional reign by destroying the revolutions" and that was given as an other strong support for the accusations in the prosecutors indictment actually had come true. The events was brought to court as evidences that the party had interfered with reactionism, such as reading the Fatiha prayer before the homage in the opening ceremony of the NP Istanbul Kađıthane Association, and Dr. Mustafa Kentli's reading a verse of the Qur'an saying "there is no enforcement in religion" in a party meeting organized in Malatya. A picture showing Hacerülesved in the Ankara Gülveren Association and in the local centers was suggested to be clear enough to show "how far the mentality settled in the NP and the religious propaganda and the inspiration generalized."

Prosecutor Cemil Bengü showed the first part of the 12th section of the party program as important evidence revealing that the NP had become a political association with secret aims that The Community Law forbid in its indictment. The first part of the 12th section of the NP party program said: "Party accepts that it will keep religious issues separate from government issues. It accepts everyone's conscience and religious freedom and the right to practice prayers in their own way and chosen languages sacred. "⁷³

⁷³ Millet Partisi, *Program ve Tüzük* (İstanbul: Teknik Basımevi, 1948).

This part of the indictment is given below without any interpretations to show how a principle which appeared in the United Nation's basic international statements was interpreted by the prosecutor who in this case sued for political purposes. Prosecutor Cemil Bengü, who became a member of the Parliament and a minister from the DP later, stated in his deep jural argument which made an history about the law and the justice:

"The NP added nothing to the Fundamental Law and the religious and conscience freedoms with its statement which accepts everyone's right to perform religious practices in their chosen language in the 12th section. So, there must be another secret purpose. This interesting statement may be accepted to be prone to the accusations of citizens who have the right to perform prayers in their chosen language may learn Qur'an alphabet, read and write with the Qur'anic alphabet, so they may leave the Latin alphabet which means to refuse the Alphabet Revolution because as a result of the changes led by the revolution in the alphabet used for Turkish writing, Latin alphabet is used instead of the Arabic alphabet and the the Latin alphabet is not suitable for religion."⁷⁴

In the first trial of the NP case on those accusations on the date of 26 September 1953, the NP directors rejected the accusations in the indictment which took 2.5 hours to read, saying this case was a political conspiracy and the justice had been made an instrument of that. By the way NP directors were sued for personal cases other than the NP case and General Sadık Aldoğan, Nurettin Ardiçoğlu and Fuat Arna were arrested and stood trial. NP General Secretary Fuat Arna underwent a trial in military court on the charge of "performing activities to harm national benefits."

While the NP case was going on, Osman Bölükbaşı sent a telegraph to Prime Minister Menderes on 30 September 1954 stating, "Menderes used the sentence 'justice abolished the NP' as a defense for himself but in reality be abolished the NP himself, and one day he will pay for this."

The text of the telegraph which Bölükbaşı sent to Menderes reveals Bölükbaşı's deep feelings regarding this sad situation for a part of the nation which had voted for the NP and his balanced Menders.⁷⁵ The last trial of the NP case was on 27 January 1954 and Judge Emin Gebizlioğlu asked the suspects for their last words of defense. The charged directors of the NP stated that they were not guilty and made no defense and accepted the decision on the

⁷⁴ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 170.

⁷⁵ See Appandix D.

judge's conscience. Nurettin Ardiçođlu answered the judge with his last statement, "we are waiting for your decision; may this comedy end now."

The Fourth Lower Criminal Court declared the abolition of the NP, sentenced the nine leaders one day in prison day prison, abolition of all organizations of the party and a 250 Kuruş fine to the suspects with the sentence.⁷⁶ The directors of the NP appealed this result. On 7 May 1954, the Second Penalty Department of Court of Appeal reversed the judgment of the court approving the objection of the NP. The Court of Appeal's reversal of the judgment was based on this argument:

"For the NP to become a corporation based on religion, denomination and religious orders is possible by showing illegal activities identified with legal entity. There is no evidence in the file to abolish the party. Likewise it is not determined in the file what kind of accusations are bound to the suspects who underwent the trial representing the General Administrative Council and the legal entity of the party. Conclusion of sentence is reversed on this legal ground."⁷⁷

The Republic Attorney General objected to the Court of Appeal's reversal of the judgment and the file went to the General Council of Appeal Penalty Department for the final decision. The General Council of Appeal Penalty Department accepted the abolition decision of the Lower Criminal Court and confirmed it on 21 June 1954. After that the Minister of the Treasury published a statement on 20 July 1954 to transfer all NP properties to the treasury.

Thus the Nation Party became history. The abolition of this party which had over 20,000 organized groups, overnight by a political scam which Menderes personally led, while the elections were close, caused widespread reactions. Istanbul University Fundamental Law Ord. Professor Ali Fuat Bařgil, known as a supporter of the DP, made a statement about this issue to the press against the DP.⁷⁸

Menderes Leaves the Parliament Bench

During this political conspiracy process resulting in the abolition of the NP, Menderes charged the NP with using religion as an instrument for politics in every means and openly tried to affect and direct the justice mechanism by speaking out on his oral assaults on the

⁷⁶ See Appendix E.

⁷⁷ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Dođan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 173.

⁷⁸ See Appendix F.

issue which is transferred to the court. He accused the NP directors with such heavy claims as "having the ambition to commit treason against our country."

Osman Bölükbaşı invited Menderes to declare solid evidence and the base of his accusations and gave a censure motion on the issue. The enquiry was rejected by the votes of the DP parliamentarians. Bölükbaşı and Menderes had heated arguments in the Parliament about this topic. Two examples of this are given below. The DP brought the legislation about the Protection of Conscience and Meeting Freedom on 20 July 1953 to the Parliament. Heavy punishments were brought for propaganda that aieds to use religion as an instrument of politics in this stage legislation. In the discussion meetings of the draft, Minister of Justice Osman Şevki Çiçekdağ mentioned the abolition case of the NP which had been transferred to the court, and illegally started to read some of the statements from the file of prep investigation. Thereupon Osman Bölükbaşı took the floor and said that it was against the law and there was no support for the accusations directed against the NP. He spoke directly to Menderes, who was up for the commission meeting:

"The Prime Minister knows well what kind of anti-revolutionist and polity opponent reactionary ideas are brought up in the Democrat Party congresses. For the anti-revolutionist events that took place in the Democrat Party Çorum congress, even the President felt the urge to make a political visit to Çorum. If an investigation is necessary for an accusation, Adnan Menderes must be the first man to investigate the misuse of religion for politics in this country and provoke reaction. The RPP General President İnönü accused Menderes and his government with provocation of reaction in Parliament. Ahmet Emin Yalman, who stands for the best man in government today, accused Menderes of misuse of religion for politics and provocation of reaction for years in the past. While they were repeating the arguments that "they give the official bulletins to the newspapers that have the qualifications of a newspaper and are useful to the democratic life of the country", Adnan Menderes was feeding the *Büyük Doğu* newspaper which supports reactionists, from the national treasury. He was a sponsor of reaction by this way. "⁷⁹

In a response, Adnan Menderes stood up and said: "I cannot stay here while this man speak this way in front of me," and left the commission hall. Bölükbaşı replied to Menderes as he was leaving the hall: "The killer of democracy, you will always encounter us as long as you act in this manner. You were not that sensitive while accusing us, honorable sons of this country, with treason on the Parliament bench. You did not think about our honor at all. You have to be patient enough to hear the truth now."

⁷⁹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 175.

The second argument between Bölükbaşı and Menderes which took place in the Parliament on 18 November 1954. While Menderes was speaking on the bench about the past accusations of the RPP against the DP in the past, Bölükbaşı interrupted from his seat:

Menderes: We know that he (İnönü) traveled village by village by white train despite that he was a president. He defined Demokrat Party members as '*Balkanik Komitadjies*' and accused the Demokrat Party members of being 'Communists'.

Osman Bölükbaşı: You do the same thing today, we encounter the heaviest accusations from you.

Chief: Bölükbaşı, do not interrupt the prime minister's words.

Prime Minister Adnan Menderes: (continues) we all know how far he misused the title of president, the national tools and money. We have fresh memories of them. We all remember these. (continuous claps from the left side)

Osman Bölükbaşı: Be a man to bring the censure motion to the bench.

Prime Minister Adnan Menderes: (to the Chief) Silence this man.

Osman Bölükbaşı: I am a member of the Parliament, you cannot call me 'this man'.

Prime Minister Adnan Menderes: Dear friends...

Osman Bölükbaşı: this place is not your farm. Be a man to bring my censure motion to the bench. I will prove here what kind of a slanderer you are.

Chief: Bölükbaşı, I invite you to silence...⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 176.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

The Political Conditions

This thesis presented the information about the events that took place in the NP life cycle. No comment any was made effort was made to give the dialogs, debates and the events as they were. However, it should be considered that the meaning of each event were different than was declared or said. After the single-party period, all the suppressed oppositions came out suddenly and a double-faced speaking method emerged for the sake of being careful. For the public, this scary period lasted much longer than it did for the elite.

Between 1946 and 1960, instead of free will and self-determination, a feudal environment led the public. Surely, the desire to escape from the despotic single-party administration and the economic progresses effected this process.⁸¹ The common characteristics of the single-party and the following new parties were that there were no certain economic or political programs. The sayings and the ideas were always about the regime or the promptly developed opposite ideas of the opponents.⁸² Sarıbay writes that “Historically the parties came out from the parlements that they had been in. The different ideas in the same parliament led these people to make their own groups in the same parliament, and it’s called a political party. However, this situation is an exceptional event for today. Now the main resource of the political parties are their born out of the parlement.”⁸³

If this principleis followed, it is seen neither the NP nor the DP came out of the parliament. The leaders of each party had been in the same RPP group with a couple of exceptions. It is also the proof of suppressive administration in the single-party period. Then the same people of the same party –the RPP- made different parties. Even Marshal Fevzi

⁸¹ Atilla Hun, *Çok Partili Sisteme Geçişten Günümüze Siyasi Değişmeler* (Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 1995), p. 18.

⁸² *Millet*, 12 June 1947.

⁸³ Ali Yaşar Sarıbay, *Türkiye’de Demokrasi ve Politik Partiler* (İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2001), p. 16.

Çakmak showed his ideas in the Independence War. The reason is the events that happened were the result of the very different process that was executed in the new Turkish Republic. There was another experience that made people hiding their real ideas or believes. It was in the very close history and had terrible consequences. The first demonstration of the opposition party was the TcCF (*Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası-Progressive Republican Party*). ‘Şeyh Sait’ rebellion, the murder of the Ardahan deputy Halid Paşa in the corridor of Parliament, İzmir assassination had been realized in this period and six deputies had been executed by the Independence Court in the same period. The most important one, ‘*Takrir-i Sükun Kanunu*’ (*Law on the Maintenance Order*) had been accepted in this 1923-1927 period and the basis of the single party regime had been settled.”⁸⁴

All these situations kept the public from expressing their real ideas. To speak in opposition did not exist as to say the real opinions instead it was to criticize the opposite idea of the dominant power with their arguments. It is thus very normal to search for other ideas behind the statements of the people of this time. Especially the ones who make opposition to the regime party –the RPP- are always trying to say something else.

The Role of the Religion

Looking at the NP members and the supporters, it is seen that they have a common sense of religious values. They were sensible regarding religious beliefs and the traditions. But together with these feelings their ideology did not contain a pure religious will. The dominant religious idea was to think about the religion as the tradition of the Turkish nation. It is just like Ziya Gökalp’s idea. The NP supporters had no vision of a universal religion concept like the Ottoman Empire sultans. If it is proposed that some people in the NP defended the universal ideas about religion, it was not a Qur’an based religion idea these were more in the tradition of Ottoman nationalism. Ottoman nationalism meant the latest times of the Ottoman Empire and these Ottomans also considered religion as a tradition.

Also the very well known religious leader of the time expressed his ideas about the NP as follows: “If the NP’s ideological bases depend on Islam nationalism not racist nationalism, the NP should be integrated to the DP. It is not suitable for there to be two different parties with the same ideology.” “During these times when the Islamic moral values are growing

⁸⁴ Nevin Yurdsever Ateş, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin Kuruluşu ve Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası* (İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 1998), p. 105.

weaker and the civilized moral values are growing stronger, if the NP takes the majority of the votes and if they make the government, the NP -with only 30% pure Turk citizens inside the party- they will force the 70% of other nationalities to be against the Turks and Islam.”⁸⁵

Therefore, while we are researching the NP we can not say that they were more religious than the DP. It means that the religious people may have chosen the DP to make politics. Then it may be asked what the main difference of the NP was.

The Extremists and the Moderates

In the formation period of the NP party, a quarrel broke out about the characters of the people. It was not about their religious thoughts, how they expressed their ideologies. Some wanted to use soft political methods and moderate sayings and the others wanted to make their speeches with very extreme ideas. So we may discuss which one was a more religious way of expressing ideas. Therefore, the NP can be seen to have been defending their religious values at high volume, but it is only a matter of method. It did not mean that the DP did not defend religious ideas.

However a distinction must be made between the reactionists and the religious people. It can not be said that the reactionist or fundamentalist people were religious. It means that we would accept that religion represented or taught these negative philosophies. But it is clear that it was not acceptable, especially if the greatest times of the Roman Empire or the Ottoman Empire are concerned. We may easily see that the fundamentalism or reactionist behaviours destroy nations. Of course it may be another study but the NP is considered to have been reactionist, it doesn't mean that the NP was a religious party. It may be said that the NP defenders were under the effect of reactionist traditions.

Another character of the NP was liberal thought. According to the NP party program and the declarations of the party leaders, they did not accept the tradition of a man having more than one wife. They also did not accept caliphate. Under these conditions, if they did not accept these two very important Islamic treats we they could not have been religious party. It may be considered to have been a kind of revolutionist party which had more traditional

⁸⁵ İsmail Mutlu, *Bediüzzaman'ın Görüşleri Işığında Parti ve Siyaset* (İstanbul: Mutlu Yayıncılık, no. 2, 1994), p. 118.

ideas.⁸⁶ The extremist nature of the party leaders and their imotional speeches made the NP different than the DP.

The İnönü Opposition

In fact the main characteristics of the NP policy came from the İnönü opposition.⁸⁷ The DP leaders sought to keep the level of tension low against the leaders or people. They targeted the executions. However, the NP leaders insisted on criticizing the personalities of their opponents. The biggest target of the NP was İnönü. İnönü would mean the regime and the government and the opposition to İnönü wouldn't be acceptable by the bureaucracy. Therefore the NP fought with İnönü, but their real fight was with the whole regime and the whole bureaucracy. But the DP fight was with the specific events and their fight does not seem to have been against the whole regime in this period. Of course, the non-religious applications and anti-democratic history of İnönü put the NP into a different position even if they did not have very strong religious ideas.

The Supporters and the Effect of the Press

Millet versus Büyük Doğu

Likewise the other things, the press was also under the control of the single-party regime for a long time. Parallel to the multi-party formation, new newspapers came out with the different ideas but these were not independent press, they were the media of the each party to announce their politics to the public. *Millet* and *Kudret* newspapers were the supporters of the NP. *Kudret* was more like a communication media with the public. But, especially *Millet* was accepted as the organ of the Nation Party's ideology. The main one of the main focus of *Millet* was communism. They were opposed to communism strongly. There were many articles about the red-danger –communism. They called it the “Red-Plan”.⁸⁸ They published news about the different kinds of attacks of the Russia. Their biggest concern was education.

⁸⁶ Kemal H. Karpat, *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1959), p. 364.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 364.

⁸⁸ *Millet*, 14 August 1947.

They thought that the first step was to change the education items. The red-plan removed the religious lessons from the education list of items.

Millet polled the religion lessons in the school from the first day of its publication and the polls said that they were very much necessary.⁸⁹

Millet also promoted Atatürk and Ziya Gökalp. The main enemies were the RPP and İnönü and it was matched these dangers with the Red-danger.

One of the idea for the basis of the Red-Danger scenarios was as follows: “After 1946, despite the multi-party period, religion and the nationalism were used to fight Soviet communism. In the struggle between the parties, the religion motive had the priority. And the exploitation of the religion became a competition.”⁹⁰ We may compare the *Millet* newspaper with *Büyük Doğu*. The *Büyük Doğu* was a religious group and the DP was the supporter of the group led by Necip Fazıl Kısakürek. It shows us that the DP and the NP can not be differentiated by their religious thoughts, we may only catagorize them by their approach to the RPP.

The End of the Nation Party Movement

In conclusion, during and after the Independence War, there was a long, hard struggle against the thoughts of the Ottoman Empire. The policy of the new republic was to claim that the Ottoman traditions were the enemy of the civilization and so was the religion. Despite the successful establishment of the new regime, the public did not forget their traditions and they did not absorbed the sayings of the single-party leaders. Hanioglu writes “The success of the westernism of ‘İkinci Meşrutiyet’ was argued everytime. The influence of the westernism on the absorbtion of the republican ideology can be a criteria, however, the resistance of the public to the republican regime can give us another idea.”⁹¹

The people liked the new economical opportunities and the new life style compared to the Ottoman era, but they never fogot their traditions or their religion.⁹² The establisher of the

⁸⁹ *Millet*, 12 June 1947.

⁹⁰ Hüseyin Atmaca, *Bir Köy Çocuğunun Serüveni* (Ankara: Abis Yayıncılık, 2009), p. 558.

⁹¹ M. Şükrü Hanioglu, *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Zihniyet, Siyaset ve Tarih* (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 2006), p. 48.

⁹² Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, no.4,1966), p. 307.

single-party was very far from the public. However, the regime was very strong and determined to continue. Therefore they fought with the opposite ideas in the public over their representatives in the Parliament. They closed parties, they sentenced deputies, they tried to change the traditions. They had a very long period of training under the single-party regime. The Nation Party was established at the time that the single-party regime founders requested to change the system under their control to integrate the country to the global system. However the NP founders interpreted this new conditions as unlimited freedoms. They attacked the regime directly and used the traditions and the nationalism to keep the people on their side. However, they were not successful because of their extremist methods. And the party was closed.

Bibliography:

- Yeşil, Ahmet. *Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*. Ankara: Cedit Neşriyat, 2002.
- Sarıbay, Ali Yaşar. *Türkiye'de Demokrasi ve Politik Partiler*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2001.
- Hun, Atilla. *Çok Partili Sisteme Geçişten Günümüze Siyasi Değişmeler*. Ankara: Ümi Yayıncılık, 1995.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Bölükbaşı, Deniz. *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı*. İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, 2008.
- Atmaca, Hüseyin. *Bir Köy Çocuğunun Serüveni*. Ankara: Abis Yayıncılık, 2009.
- Mutlu, İsmail. *Bediüzzaman'ın Görüşleri Işığında Parti ve Siyaset*. İstanbul: Mutlu Yayıncılık, 1994.
- Karpat, Kemal H. *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1959.
- Karpat, Kemal H. *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1967.
- Yücel, M. Serhan. *Türkiye'nin Siyasal Partileri*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2005.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Zihniyet, Siyaset ve Tarih*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 2006.
- Toker, Metin. *Tek Partiden Çok Partiye*. Tarih Serisi, Vol. 2.. Ankara: Milliyet Yayınları, 1970.
- Goloğlu, Mahmut. *Tek Partili Cumhuriyet*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi, Vol. 2, 2009.
- Geyigdağı, Mehmet Yaşar. *Political Parties in Turkey: The Role of Islam*. New York: Preger Publishers, 1984.
- Kaynar, Mete Kaan. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Siyasal Partileri: 1923-2006*. Ankara: İmge Yayınları, 2007.
- Millet Partisi. *Program ve Tüzük*. İstanbul: Teknik Basımevi, 1948.
- Ateş, Nevin Yurdsever. *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Kuruluşu ve Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 1998.
- İmga, Orçun. *Tek Partili Dönemde Ankara: Siyaset ve Yerel Demokrasi*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları, 2006.
- Turan, Şerafettin. *Çağdaşlık Yolunda Yeni Türkiye*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, Türk Devrim Tarihi, Vol. 4, no. 1, 1999.
- Tümur, Taner. *Türkiye'de Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, no. 3, 2003.

Kudret Gazetesi. November 1948, June 1950.
Kuvvet Gazetesi. May 1947.
Millet Gazetesi. June 1947, August 1947.
Özgür Düşünce. No. 3, 1966.
Tanin Gazetesi. July 1947, May 1952.
Tasvir Gazetesi. April 1948.
Siyasi Günlük. February 1947.
Ulus Gazetesi. July 1947, October 1947, January 1949, May 1952.
Vatan Gazetesi. January 1948, March 1948, April 1950, June 1950, March 1953.
Yeni Forum Gazetesi. August 1981
Yeni Sabah Gazetesi. February 1947.
Zafer Gazetesi. March 1953.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REPUBLICAN NATION PARTY (RNP)
AND
THE 1954 ELECTIONS

The Establishment of the RNP and the Pressures of the DP

Two weeks after the abolition of the Nation Party on 27 January 1954, they established the *Cumhuriyetçi Millet Partisi - CMP (the Republican Nation Party – RNP)* on 10 February 1954. Except for general president Mustafa Kentli, all of the directors of NP took place as the creators of CMP. Creators who have signatures in the establishment application of the party are: Enis Akaygen, Ertuğrul Akça, Sadık Aldoğan, Fuat Arna, Suphi Batur, Lütfü Bornovalı, Abdurrahman Boyacıgiller, Mehmet Ali Derman, Cemal Islak, Saadet Kaçar, Enver Kök, Ahmet Oğuz, Ahmet Tahtakılıç and Osman Bölükbaşı. It is another issue to examine if this party is really an extension of the NP by comparing the differences and similarities with NP.

The RNP represented by two members in the Parliament, Osman Bölükbaşı and Abdurrahman Boyacıgiller, explained the party's mission "to establish a national order to rule human rights over Turkey and to guarantee them with trustable laws" in the party program. The guaranteed principles they wanted to take place in the Fundamental Law for such a national order are listed below:

Section 3- The rights and freedoms that take place in the Human Rights Universal Manifesto published by United Nations to be clearly identified and guaranteed in our Fundamental Law.

To have the right to sue against laws against the Fundamental Law.

To forbid and prevent the notice of motion against the Fundamental Law.

The change of the Fundamental Law will be bound to more secured restrictions than we have today.

Independence of the courts and keeping the judges distant from affects and influences of every kind to be guaranteed by the Fundamental Law.

The government officials are subject to rules and principles described by the Fundamental Law.

Modern national principles such as laicism, religion and conscience freedom are described and confirmed by the Fundamental Law.

Political parties to become corporations identified and guaranteed by the Fundamental Law.⁹³

It may be argued if those principles appeared in our laws and Fundamental Law even in 2000's Turkey, it was also requested to have double parliament, to establish a Constitutional Court and a Noble Judges Parliament in CMP's program.

The Noble Judges Parliament which may be compared to the High Commission of Judges and Prosecutors of today, was predicted to have no relation to legislation and executive power, and this parliament which no component of the executive power including the Minister of Justice cannot affect to be the one and only authority about assignment, appointment, promotion and the transfer and all the other personal rights and discipline issues of the judges. On the other side, the laicism principle was defined as below in the program:

Section 12- Separation of religious and government issues, preparation and administration of the national and government laws according to scientific principles and national demands, besides to respect and guarantee the religious and conscience freedoms as every other kind of rights and freedoms is the description of our party's laicism concept. Laicism is never an antagonism of religion.⁹⁴

The 1954 Elections

Eighty-one days after the establishment of the RNP, general parliament elections were held. Adnan Menderes, the Prime Minister, suggested the elections be held on 2 May 1954 and the GNAT confirmed it on 12 March 1954. The RNP -formerly the NP-, that all of its organizations abolished, had to continue election work in very difficult conditions and restricted opportunities in such a short period as 11 weeks. The RPP and the RNP came up to make an alliance in the elections in March 1954 and directors of the two parties started to contact each other. The idea of the alliance of the two opposition parties worried many, including the DP in the 2 May elections, which gained a great importance for the future of the polity, because it was clear that the DP government was determined to commit every kind of illegal act and pressure to establish a dictatorship. This possibility of alliance was one of the most important indications that there were great differences between the RNP and the NP.

Hikmet Bayur, who had been a tool of the government during the abolition of the NP, did not waste time joining the press campaign against the possibility of this alliance. After he left the NP, ran as the Manisa candidate in 1954 elections from the list of DP, which he had protested and criticized heavily for years. He published a statement directed to the RPP on 18

⁹³ Cumhuriyetçi Millet Partisi Programı ve Tüzük, 1954.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

March 1954. He claimed that the RPP was no longer the party of Atatürk and the revolutions, and he invited the true members of the RPP to resign if the RPP made an alliance with the RNP in the elections. But there was no need for "the true members of the RPP" to leave their party following the invitation of the DP's new transfer Manisa candidate Hikmet Bayur, who lobbied to protect the revolution even against the party of Atatürk.

The RPP-RNP alliance did not happen because they could not come to an agreement on a common list and candidate decision, so the two parties decided to go to elections separately. The RNP worked out their election campaign in a short period of time. They did the last meeting one day before the election restrictions started, on 28 April 1954. Osman Bölükbaşı as the final speaker, spoke to a big crowd in Kızıtaşı Square in front of Fatih Mosque. He made a comparison of the promises that the DP had given before his government and their actions of the present time. He said: " They neither gave up the totalitarianism, nor abolished the laws that support it. If Menderes calls something white, you should know that he definitely has called the same thing black four years before. The trick is the same; the only difference is the Democrat Party novices are replaced with the masters of the RPP."

Bölükbaşı also criticized the words of Adnan Menderes about the RPP leader İsmet İnönü: "Adnan Menderes who made the Law of National Welfare in order to protect the honesty and reputation of the citizens, is swearing at İnönü, who is a glorious commander who won in the war in spite of all his faults today," he said. "Who is swearing?" he asked, "it is Menderes who kissed the hands of İnönü for 16 years."

As we see, Osman Bölükbaşı spoke in the same manner as politicians do today, and his tactics moved away from the political view of the NP party completely. In fact, the RPP spirit travels from party to party in different forms. Actually it is well understood that every winner of the elections would be the spirit of the RPP. Five political parties attended the elections on 2 May 1954. By the end, 9,095,563 people voted, of a total number of 10,262,063 recorded electors. The DP had 5,513,659 votes and a rate of 58.42% won 93% of the chairs in parliament with 503 members of 541 total. RPP had 3,193,471 votes, got 31 parliament members. The CMP was the third party, with 480,249 votes and a rate of 5.3% got 5 chairs in the parliament. He sent these 5 members to the parliament: Osman Bölükbaşı, Ahmet Bilgin, Tahir Taşer, Mehmet Mahmutoğlu and Osman Alişiroğlu.

The CMP directors published this statement about the result of the election: "The CMP was established on 10 February and in 81 days until the elections we had to establish our organizations and work for the election at the same time, and we had nearly half a million

votes. This result is very valuable under the circumstances today. The majority of the members were exposed to every kind of slander in old the NP, underwent great pressure, thousands of organizations were locked all over the country, but still it means that the Turkish people showed great sympathy to the new established the CMP after all those misfortune. We were sadly worn out under very heavy pressure. We could reorganize 81 days before the election and went to election in 41 cities. If the Turkish people had not vote for us because they thought that we could not win under this circumstances and their votes would have been wasted for nothing, they are completely right for their own sake. They were unfair to us, but we willingly gave up our rights. There is no doubt that the people did the right thing, and they are excused to act this way. We lost the elections but the loser should be accepted as the winner under this circumstances."

APPENDIX B
THE HISTORY OF THE NATION PARTY'S FOUNDERS
IN THE DEMOCRAT PARTY

First Steps with the Democrat Party

Since the Nation Party (NP) came out from the Democrat Party movement, it is important to show the development of the opposition to the single-party system with the DP and then we may understand the NP's notions with this perspective. The Democrat Party (DP) was born in 1946 as a public movement that sought national power over social and governmental life in the process of transition from a single-party to a multi-party system. The DP's activities, from its formation in 1950 to its dissolution by the military revolution of 27 May 1960, does not comply with the foundation ideas or motives of the DP in 1946; however, the inspiration for the Turkish Nation for ideas of freedom, democracy, and claiming their own future were certain.

This fight for law, honor and justice under heavy and negative circumstances of repressive governance in the single-party period inspired the Turkish nation for democratic struggles, thus a new period in our political life was started. The 1946 movement is a milestone in the history of our democracy. The Republican Public Party (RPP) and National Chief (Milli Şef) İsmet İnönü started this introduction process for the multi-party system. The first serious opposition movement, the DP, was founded by people nurtured by the RPP that actively participated in the single-party dominance in significant positions. Many members of the Nation Party (NP) had entered into political life in the DP. They were charged with the duty of inspection. Osman Bolukbasi is one of the closest witnesses and performers of the NP's political journey throughout his 28 year political life span. For this reason, his memoirs have significant importance for research on the NP.

Organizing the DP in Anatolia was not easy under the circumstances of 1946, under the single-party rule. The Governor, district governor, gendarme and police pressure, systematic harassment and tracking, physical obstacles including the use of violence and provocations were the main obstacles in the DP's way. Psychological insecurity caused by the recent multi-party system experiences (the 1925-1930 Terakkiperver Fırka and Serbest Fırka)

and the reluctance of the people because of the pressure of the RPP, made their efforts to form a new party more difficult. The DP entered into the political world under these conditions.

The Zonguldak Meeting

The Zonguldak Meeting exemplifies the tense and the bizarre media activities within the transition process to a multi-party system. There was a serious crisis between the RPP and the DP after the elections of 1946. Prime Minister Recep Peker accused the DP of provoking people to rebel and he reminded the DP to act according to the Independence Court laws which still existed. He threatened them openly and directly. Minister of Interior Sökmensür accused the DP of following the tactics of the communists and said that they were trying to create “Red Fascism.” Minister of Public Works Cevdet Kerim implied that the DP had been founded only one year earlier, declaring “competence should not be left in the hands of a one-year-old toddler with the smell of milk in his mouth.”

Osman Bölükbaşı’s talk in the Zonguldak meeting of the DP within this tense environmental conditions was considered a crime, was published on 16 May 1947 by *Kuvvet* newspaper:

“Party Inspector Osman Bölükbaşı came to platform with applause, delivered his unscripted 130-minute oration frequently interrupted by applause. He started by addressing the accusers which were claiming the party meetings were provocations, Bölükbaşı said: ‘I am happy to address you as a representative of a party that accepts obedience to law as the highest honor and duty, and desires the same for all people. Considering the legal self-defense of an injured party to be a provocation shows the loss of the humanistic feelings of our opponents. Threats such as the still-valid Independence law will not take us away from our legally drawn way. We have trust in justice, as we have infinite courage and determination against injustice. Like the story of the German peasant who said to the Prussian King, “You are the King, but Berlin has German judges,” we say, “You can do nothing, there are unnamed Turkish judges of rising justice of Turkey who take their orders from their consciences.”’⁹⁵

As is clear from these arguments, the politicians of this period were far from the media of party programs, country problems, foreign policy or similar concrete topics.

After a short period of time the DP rose continuously and became stronger and completed its organization very fast. The masses showed great interest in the public movement of the DP and supported it despite the negative circumstances. The Anatolian peasants especially felt revulsion for the RPP and supported the DP as a light of hope. This caused great worries in the RPP, and pushed them to undemocratic solution searching. One of

⁹⁵ *Kuvvet*, 16 May 1947.

the solutions was pulling the elections to be held in October 1947 to 21 July 1946; a method that was encountered frequently until a short time ago. This decision was made on 10 June 1946 in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT) with an absolute majority of the RPP. The RPP aimed to make the elections early to keep the DP unorganized and inefficient in the elections, considering that the DP was founded on 7 January 1946, just five months before the election. After the decision of an early election, the DP had only six weeks to prepare. In this time span, the DP organized in 63 cities, 300 district centers and many villages, and could nominate only 273 candidates for 465 parliament members in 45 cities where the DP participated in elections.

The 21 July 1946 election was the first parliamentary election with multiparty and the direct suffrage was enacted on 5 June 1946. According to this law, the inspection of the elections was left to governmental attendants and municipal council members selected in the last elections without the DP's participation, instead of independent courts. A majority system was accepted instead of a relative system. Elections were made by the rule of open vote and closed counting. Moreover, the entire government's mechanisms were united to make propaganda to the RPP's advantage by *fait accompli*. Governors, district governors, and all official attendants were mostly working to the RPP's advantage. The Governor of Yozgat openly accused the DP of having communist motives, while governors sent written orders to regional attendants telling them to help the RPP nominators. The Governor of Bolu, Naci Rollas, sent an official instruction to Akçakoca's district governor advising him to help and support the RPP's nominee. The district governor of Akçakoca did not accept this, and resigned on 16 July 1946 after revealing this instruction. The so-called district governor who later joined the DP was Fuat Arna. Governor Naci Rollas, who gave this order to Fuat Arna, was awarded with four months of vacation by the RPP cabinet, under the name of punishment.

That and similar applications were spread around the country and intensified antipathetic air over the RPP while increasing the DP's power. President İnönü entered elections as the leader of RPP apart from his official title. Marshal Fevzi Çakmak, one of the heroes of the Turkish War of Independence, was on the DP's list as an independent İstanbul nominee. Osman Bölükbaşı became the Yozgat nominee, six months after his entrance to politics. The elections of 1946 were a shady and unfair episode in our political history. Elections with a high participation rate, 75 percent, the DP had positive results at the beginning, when the vote counting proceeded. The returning news from countryside showed that the RPP was advance

than the rest. In addition to the injustice elections and pressure on the DP before the elections, the RPP government managed to destroy the security of votes and ballot boxes. DP nominators were not allowed into the rooms where votes were counted. The counting of votes was done under the supervision of the governors, the district governors and the RPP nominees. In the elections of 1946, where every possible deception was made, the election papers and thus the election results were changed. The DP won the elections in İstanbul, with 18 of 27 parliament members. This was done with the help of the personal efforts of Marshal Fevzi Çakmak by limiting the distortion on election papers and additionally with the help of the the organized works of the head of the DP İstanbul President advocate Kenan Öner on the night of election.

According to the election results, which were declared after three days, the RPP won 395 and the DP won 64 of 456 parliament members. Considering the reports of the DP's regional representatives, the DP must have won nearly 280 of the parliament members. Despite having 93,000 votes, Yozgat nominee Osman Bölükbaşı did not win a seat in the parliament because of the vote-box tricks, according to the DP reporters. The dubious election results caused a great reaction and anger throughout the country. The change of the votes -by considering the honor of the Turkish people, started arguments in the DP about not entering the GNAT and returning to the nation's bosom (*sine-i millet*). These arguments started the process of separation and disjunction in the DP.

Disintegration Process of the DP

In the first multi-party election during the transition to a democratic parliamentary regime, held 21 July 1946, the Turkish people proved their political majority and strengthened the hope for a real democracy. Although the DP's political reckoning with the single-party authoritarian regime was prevented by vote-box scams, the Turkish people won their first round against the RPP mentality which is underestimated their political culture and mind. Even though the public willpower did not reflect on this parliament, the Turkish people made clear their will to protect democracy, political rights and freedom. Just after the declaration of the election results, the public discussions began in the DP. Marshal Fevzi Çakmak and Kenan Öner led a group requesting the DP's return to the nation's bosom instead of the GNAT, and development of a new policy for a heavier opposition. In return for this strategy, the administrators in the DP, including the four founders, wanted to ease the tension and

continue the opposition in parliament. Finally, this vision prevailed and the DP group joined parliament on 5 August 1946. Discussions on the legality of the 1946 parliament and nation's bosom continued until the first congress of the DP on 7 January 1947 and became the major factor in the disintegration and the discharge process.

The year following the elections of July 1946 was a tense and depressive period with the government party and the opposition then their relationships became to breaking point. After the resignation of the Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu on 6 August 1946, Recep Peker, one of the founders of the single-party system, a hawk, became the Prime Minister. The proviolence policy of Peker's government increased the tension in an environment already fraught with the anger and the negative reaction to the 1946 elections. The transition to a multi-party system was jeopardized. After the opening of GNAT, the DP group continued questioning the legality of Parliament and followed an aggressive opposition policy. Those DP members that could not get into parliament started to an intense program in public to strengthen the DP's organization. Osman Bölükbaşı participated in the DP meetings as a speaker and was on the front-lines in propaganda activities. The Anatolian meetings of the DP caused major worries in the RPP. The RPP press made provocative publications against these meetings, with unfair criticism such as "idle crowds" and "street shows."

The RPP's provocations were featured in the parliament platform heavily. After the response by the Prime Minister Recep Peker to the criticism of Adnan Menderes on 18 December 1946 during the hearing of the budget law for 1947, the DP group left the parliament. The Prime Minister Recep Peker, a hawk in the RPP, said: "We have listened to the reflections of an aspect which is describing the life of a powerful country. We have listened to a pessimistic and psychopathic speech from the voice of Adnan Menderes". In reaction to these insulting words, the DP group left the parliament and boycotted it for 10 days. They returned to the parliament on 28 December 1946, on the intervention of the President İnönü.

With or without intention, there is a picture harmonious with the transition process. According to this picture, nobody defended his real opinion, belief or ideology. No one followed a political or an economic program with their criterias. The opposition was only against the RPP's methods, which thus can be called opposition of the RPP's existence. However, while protesting the RPP members and policies, nobody dared to oppose the ideology of the RPP. The government of Recep Peker, apart from their violent policy to suppress the opposition, also started a provocation strategy to break up the DP. The RPP

government conducted a systematical manipulation campaign to control the “extremist” group inside the DP, thus trying to deepen the separation of the ideas in the DP. It can be argued whether it was useful for the development of Turkish democracy since it led to the more mature ideas of later political parties.

First Grand Congress of the DP

The DP's first big congress gathered in Yeni Sinema on Anafartalar Street in Ankara on 7 January 1947, on the first anniversary of the party. The congress continued for four days with the participation of 906 delegates, and ended on 10 January 1947 with the declaration of the Charter of Freedom. The first congress worked with great enthusiasm in the environment of ongoing discussions on the legality of the parliament and the intense political conditions caused by the RPP's violent policy against the opposition. Nadir Nadi, the editor-in-chief of *Cumhuriyet* newspaper, described the air of the first congress in his article on 11 January 1947: “The city congress of the DP resembled a founder parliament meeting rather than a political party meeting. All speakers in the congress touched on the subject of the constitution. We also heard poetic and lyrical words trying to describe a romantic longing for freedom. A speaker, for instance, said that the rulers without crowns have been ruling the country for 23 years. Another said that the red sultans had pounded the public during the same period.”

Mükerrem Sarol, one of the leading administrators of the DP, describes the congress as follows: “We considered ourselves as the first rebels of the French Revolution. Some of us talked like Danton, some like Robespierre.” Mümtaz Faik Fenik associated the DP congress with the Erzurum and Sivas Meetings in an issue of *Vatan* on 8 January 1947. Years later Celal Bayar said, in his book *My Prime Minister Menderes* (“Başvekilim Menderes”), there was a “revolution air” in the Main Cases Commission where the Charter of Freedom was reviewed.

The most detailed evaluations on the DP's first grand congress submitted by Samet Ağaoğlu's book, *Siyasi Günlük, Demokrat Partinin Kuruluşu (Political Diary, The Establishment of the Democrat Party)*. The most important source on this subject is this above-mentioned memoir of Ağaoğlu.

The congress became a show and it witnessed the first rebellion of national power idealism in Turkish democratic history. The DP's opposition strategy after the shady elections of 1946 and the aggressiveness of this strategy were the most debated subjects of the

congress. The congress focused on soft or hard opposition strategies, and it results with grouping in the DP. The struggle between these two opinions continued at the Main Cases Commission led by Adnan Menderes which was formed for national issues. The supporters of heavy opposition said that entering parliament would mean legalizing the RPP's totalitarian policy and 1946 elections. This group included the names of Kenan Öner, Mükerrerem Sarol, Mustafa Kentli, Osman Kapani, Samet Ağaoğlu and Osman Bölükbaşı. As written in Samet Ağaoğlu's memoir, Adnan Menderes said, "The friends who insist on that idea are free to leave us," in the discussions at the Main Cases Commission, thus seeding the disintegration in the DP.

The congress' decisions were opened to the Turkish nation with a declaration under the name of the Charter of Freedom. This was an indication of a determination to fight for democracy and was a national oath. The Charter of Freedom with great reflections and reactions from the RPP included the following terms:

"Laws against constitution, that suppresses the legal rights and the freedom of the citizens and the emergence of the free national will, should be voided. A democratic election law should be enacted to secure the national sovereignty principles and the citizens' votes. This law should be under the inspection of the courts and the judges. The administration should be objective. The presidency and the leadership of a party should not be one and same person, they should be separated from each other."⁹⁶

A vital verdict of the Charter of Freedom was the authorization of the party administration to withdraw from parliament. With the majority of the votes and with the applause from the standing delegates of the congress, it was decided that if the RPP resisted these democratic requests of the DP, the RPP would be on its own with responsibility to the Turkish nation, who were the most important judges.

In the case of rejection of these requests in the GNAT, the DP group fully authorized its General Administration Board to go back to the nation's bosom and continue this fight there. Soft and hard opposition debates were solved with this compromise.

The DP General Administration Board Elections and the Separation

The second contention in the congress was the question of who should be chosen to the central decision organs. The party founders wanted General Administration Board members among parliament members, so they could easily keep their influence stronger.

⁹⁶ Kemal H. Karpat, *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1967), p. 159.

Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes and Fuad Köprülü were openly active in ensuring that people close to them would be chosen and they wished to limit the number of members, against the trend in the congress for selection of the young members. The developments in the grand congress had deep and permanent reflections on the DP's future. Samet Ağaoğlu considered the selection of only four young generation members to the General Administration Board to be a victory of Celal Bayar and the old generation, and said: "The main reason behind the domestic competition in the DP was the contrast between the moods of politicians brought up by the single-party administration and sincere belief in the democratic regime, and the clash of these contrasts. The grand congress events are the best examples of this; these examples constitute the beginning of the later disintegrations."

Samet Ağaoğlu comments on the events and the developments in the DP's first congress in his memoir, *Siyasi Günlük*: "The congress witnessed the events that would affect the entire political life of the DP. It staged fights between the old and the new guard. The DP left the first grand meeting with an image of solidarity, but in fact, it was separated into two, even three parts."

Disturbances after the First Congress

Starting a provocative campaign for the exclusion of "extremists" in the DP before the congress, the RPP reacted greatly on the congress results, especially to the Charter of Freedom and cherished the defeat of "extremists" in the congress. Nihat Erim, in his article "After the DP Congress" in *Ulus* newspaper of 12 January 1947, said: "Extremists gathering around Marshal could not defeat Celal Bayar. The selection of Bayar for the party leadership is a guarantee of the continuation of democratic life."

The RPP's provocations increased. They especially targeted the full authorization of the party administration with the Charter of Freedom, with heavy criticism and accusations. Prime Minister Recep Peker accused the DP of provoking the public with the threat of returning to the nation's bosom and he reminded him of the still valid laws of the Independence Courts as a threat.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs Sökmensüer answered an oral question about Communist activities in January 1947, saying, "suggesting the lawlessness in the elections and shading the legality of parliament and government, resigning from the parliament and taking this challenge to the public is a tactic of communists." Newspapers that supported the

RPP published articles accusing the DP of wanting revolution thus the DP members were made the targets of the heavy accusations.

Resignation of Bölükbaşı from Party Inspection

The DP administrators wanted to stop to these extremists in the party after the congress. Fuad Köprülü was the focal point of nearly all conflicts inside the party that caused disintegrations. In an interesting statement in *Siyasi Günlük* by Samet Ağaoğlu, who left the DP in 1957 and got close to İnönü, he wrote that one week after the congress, Fuad Köprülü wrote an article targeting and criticizing the people in the party whom he considered to be aggressive opposition supporters very strongly.

Campaign against Marshal and the Accusation of Communist

The Minister of Internal Affairs, Şükrü Sökmensüer, in a speech on 29 January 1947 in parliament about the communist activities in Turkey, said that Communists were following the tactic of questioning the legality of the parliament and the government, thus taking the opposition out of the parliament. The Minister went further, saying the DP had been following this communist tactic and that Marshal Fevzi Çakmak was an instrument of the communists. This ugly accusation towards the well-known Marshal, a hero of the War of Independence, a brother-in-arms of Atatürk and an anti-communist, was made based on Zekeriya Sertel's letter and a note found from the papers of the chief of the illegal Communist Party, Şefik Hüsnü.

An article alleged to have been written on 29 July 1946 by Şefik Hüsnü, entitled, "Class Struggle Views after the Elections," makes the following statements: "The democratic opposition and Marshal can state that they do not accept the legality of the elections, and national will power was unable to show itself in parliament, and they have taken the struggle to the public. Once the struggle is taken to the public, to the villages, we have to join with all our power and support Marshal and the DP, arranging all of our organization and activities."

Zekeriya Sertel's letter, dated 2 September 1946, bears similar opinions and states that the communists consider that Marshal's resignation from the parliament and the defense of his thoughts the most natural and necessary act. Marshal answered the accusations of the RPP with his explanation in *Yeni Sabah* on 5 February 1947:

"I am one of the people who considers communism is very harmful to this country. For this reason I was insulted deeply when they wanted to take communists into the army and the navy. I insisted despite the intervention of significant members of the RPP.

But they gave the authority of founding a party to Şefik Hüsnü and to 34 certified communists to guide the workers. I officially warned the government of the supportive activities of the old National Education Minister. They did not listen to me and later, they talked about a nest of communists in the Village Institute of Hamidiye.”⁹⁷

After the explanation of Marshal of an old education minister supporting the communist activities, Hasan Ali Yücel, who had been on duty for many years during the single-party government of the RPP, asked Marshal the following question in an open letter published in *Ulus* on 8 February 1947: “Is it really me, old national education minister, in your declaration? Who are the supported communists and how were they supported?” The answer came from Kenan Öner, former counselor of the Ministry of Justice and President of the DP Istanbul. Kenan Öner, in his “open letter to the former National Education Minister” in *Yeni Sabah* on 16 February 1947, said: “I will remove your curiosity about the communists that have been supported by you and how you have supported them. In fact, I could not decide if your hesitation is feigning ignorance.”

After this, Hasan Ali Yücel sued Kenan Öner for libel and slandering. On the first day of the trial, 17 February 1947, Kenan Öner asked for the right to prove his allegations and declared that he was ready them. After receiving the right to prove, Kenan Öner proved his allegations. Finally, the court decided that the allegations of Kenan Öner -Hasan Ali Yücel was a communist had been proven, and so decided on the abatement. The Supreme Court cancelled this appealed decision. However, the case was closed after the death of Kenan Öner. Administrators in the DP were quiet about these ugly accusations against Marshal.

For this reason, Dr. Mustafa Kentli, one of the leading members of the DP, resigned from the Izmir DP Court of Honor and wrote the following in an article, titled “Marshal and Parties” in *Yeni Asır* newspaper on 11 February 1947: "As a democrat, I regret that only individuals supported Marshal against the RPP’s war against him. Marshal himself as a major power equals a few opposition parties. If Marshal wants to lead the DP, we accept that as a certain victory factor. If there are people among us who can not accept that, they will not only be defeated in the party, they will also be wiped out from freedom challenge.”

One of the main reasons for the DP’s founders’ silence on this subject was their discomfort with Marshal’s moral weight, reputation and influence in the party. Some of the dissident members called in the First Grand Congress for the selection of Marshal as DP Leader instead of Celal Bayar. But Marshal was reluctant in this matter. The spokesmen of the

⁹⁷ *Yeni Sabah*, 5 February 1947.

RPP were pleased with this. After the elections of 1946, Marshal was unhappy with events in the DP, and he distanced from the DP administrators. Worried because of Marshal's influence in the party, founding members of the DP searched for ways to get rid of him. An independent nominee in the DP's list in elections of 1946 who contributed greatly to the DP's development, Marshal was excluded. These statements in *Siyasi Günlük* are important, as they show the true feelings of the DP founders towards Marshal:

“Celal Bayar, in his presenting of Marshal in a General Administration Board meeting speech on 27 February 1947, said: “Marshal is not as naive a person as we think. He wants to rule every side, as he has his whole life. On one side, he is trying to supervise the left world with Tevfik Rüştü Aras and Zekeriya Sertel; on the other side, he is trying to supervise us.”⁹⁸

These attitudes toward Marshal showed that the DP's founders wanted to have absolute leadership in the party. They were determined to use every method to exclude Marshal from the party, and they would not regret using undemocratic methods. Their new target was Marshal. The DP's administrators who were not brave enough to take a stand openly became hopeful because of the RPP's accusation and the libel campaigns.

In reply to the RPP's “Danger of communism and Marshal as an instrument,” in a speech in Adana on 24 February 1947, Osman Bölükbaşı said:

“People are trying to scare the public with empty and unreal words, such as there is a close foreign danger, and there is a danger of communism.” They should not forget that their mistake, based on the motives of the party benefit, may cause public apathy against a real threat in the future. People are saying “Communists, working with Russian Money” about the Democrat Party, and now implying the same words for Marshal. They are people who try to use a false coin again. Saying ‘There is a threat of Communism’ in a country like Turkey, where people are attached to their property and traditions, is nothing but political fraud. Like the fact that you can not reach the sun, these accusations and stains cannot reach us. A threat against the Turkish country, will face no party, they will face a bayonet party which is the warrant of our freedom. Lastly, we should say that we are the instrument of the public interest, Fundamental Law. In a word, we are the party of the Turkish people's freedom fight, not an instrument of the communism and the ambition.”⁹⁹

Behçet Kemal Çağlar's article in Ankara Akşam Haberleri on 26 February 1947, titled “goofs of an inspector,” Bölükbaşı's declarations were criticized and accused of “hypnotizing

⁹⁸ *Siyasi Günlük*, 1947.

⁹⁹ Deniz Bölükbaşı, *Türk Siyasetinde Anadolu Fırtınası: Osman Bölükbaşı* (İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, no. 3, 2008), p. 63-64.

the public toward the threat of communism and helping communism actively.” The article also says that the DP members idolized Marshal.

APPENDIX C
THE TELEGRAPH OF BÖLÜKBAŞI TO MENDERES

Bölükbaşı'nın Menderes'e Telgrafı

Adnan Menderes

Demokrat Parti Genel Başkanı

Ankara

Millet Partisi'nin şahsında, Türk demokrasisine karşı hazırladığınız suikastın mesuliyetini açıkça omuzlarınıza alacak kadar cesur ve dürüst olunuz. Atatürk ve inkılap gibi hürmete şayan varlıkların gölgesine sığınmayınız ve bütün inkılapların temeli olan milli hakimiyet prensibine "dini irtica var, inkılaplar elden gidiyor" bahanesi ile kıymayınız. Sonra, hiçbir hizmetiniz bu lekeyi alnınızdan silemez.

21 Kasım 1952 tarihinde Kayseri'de söylediğiniz nutukta, intakı hak kabilinden "Türk Milletinin siyasi haklarını gasbetmek için daima dini irticai tehlikesi ileri sürüle gelmiştir" diyen ve dini irticam ve inkılap aleyhtarlığının bayraktarlığını yapan, Büyük Doğu gazetesini her ay devlet kasasından on iki bin lira vererek besleyen ve büyüten Adnan Menderes olduğunuzu bu millet unutmayacak ve kalbinizle ağzınız arasındaki farkı isabetle teşhis edecektir.

Milletin yegane sığınacağı yer ve ümit kaynağı saydığı adalet müessesesinin şeref ve itibarını, birçok müesseselere musallat olagelen siyasi ihtiraslarınız uğrunda lekeleyerek, onu peşin kararlarınızı tescile memur muti bir alet haline getirmek ve böylece suikastınızın kurbanları arasına sokmak teşebbüsünüzden vazgeçiniz. Böyle hareket ederseniz, "Padişahın nüfuzu her yere girebilir, fakat adaletin kapısından içeri giremez" diyen Abdurrahman Paşa gibi şerefli bir adliye nazırına tahammül gösteren müstebit bir Sultan Abdülhamit'ten daha kötü olarak tarihin sizi kaydetmesine mani olabilirsiniz: İnsanlık ve tarih cesur olan diktatörleri korkaklarından ayırır ve onları bir nevi takdir eder. Cesaretiniz varsa "Millet Partisi'ni adalet kapattı" sözünü kendinize siper yapmaz, maksadınıza başka yoldan ulaşabilirsiniz. Filhakika Demokrat Parti Meclis Grubu'nda milletvekillerine hitaben "Mahkeme elbette Millet Partisi'ni kapatacaktır. Kapatmadığı takdirde iki satırlık bir kanunla bu partiyi kapatmak sizlere düşen tarihi bir vazifedir" dediniz ve böylece iki satırlık kanunlarla parti kapatmak ve zulüm yapmak tasavvurunuzu açıklayan meşhur Bolu nutkunuzu teyid ettiniz. Sizin için bu ikinci yol daima açıktır. Zira 400 mebuslu bir gruba

hakimsiniz. Bu yolu tercih ederseniz, bir başlı istibdat ile dörtyüz başlı istibdat arasında bir fark olmadığını, esasen Demokrat Parti iktidarı devrinde kavramış bulunan Türk milletine, bu hakikati, bir kere daha anlatmak suretiyle belki kayda değer bir hizmette de bulunmuş olursunuz.

Millet Partisi'nin kapılarına vurduğunuz kara kilidi, azmimize ve vicdanlarımıza asla vuramayacaksınız. Mücadele sahası boş kalmayacaktır ve suçlarınızın hesabını vereceğiniz gün gelecektir.

Unutmayınız ki, yıllarca Şefim diye elini öptüğünüz ve temsil ettiği nizamın alkışçılığını yaptığınız İnönü'ye sövmek imkanını size veren feleğin çarkı dönmekte devam ediyor. Meclis kürsüsünde Millet Partisi'ni vatan ihaneti ile itham ettikten sonra sokağa tükürmek cezası olan bir lira hafif para veya bir gün hafif hapis cezası ile koca bir partiyi boğdurmak isteğinizin ilhamı ile bu teli çekiyorum.

Hüküm, "Mağrurlanma padişahım, senden büyük Allah var" diye gelmiş olan Türk milletininindir.

Osman Bölükbaşı

APPENDIX D
FOURTH LOWER CRIMINAL COURT DECISION

Dördüncü Sulh Ceza Mahkemesi Kararı

4. Sulh Ceza Mahkemesi, metni aşağıda aynen yer alan hükümlerle, MP'nin kapatılmasına, dokuz yöneticisinin birer gün hapislerine, partinin tüm teşkilatlarının feshedilmesine ve sanıkların 250'şer kuruş para cezasına çarptırılmasına karar vermiştir:

"Siyasi bir cemiyet olan ve Cemiyetler Kanunu'nun hükümlerine tabi bulunan Millet Partisi'nin mucib sebepli kararımızda tahlil ve izah olunduğu şekilde kuruluş ve programının 7, 12 ve 13. maddelerinin taşıdığı mana, maksad yönünden din, mezheb ve tarikat esaslarına dayanan ve gayesinin saklayan dernekler durumunda bulunduğu anlaşılmış, idareci maznunların bu yoldaki sözlü, yazılı ve müsamahalı hareketleri de bunu teyid etmiş ve mahkemenin vicdani kanaati de bu yolda hasıl olmuştur. Böyle bir cemiyetin idaresini bilerek deruhde eden maznunlardan Doktor Mustafa Kentli, Enis Akaygen, Fuat Arna, Ahmet Tahtakılıç, Ertuğrul Akça, Lütfi Bornovalı, Suphi Batur, Doktor Yesari Bilgisev, Nureddin Ardıçoğlu'nun sabit görünen suçlarına uyan Cemiyetler Kanunu'nun bazı maddelerini değiştiren 4919 sayılı kanunun 9. maddesinin b ve d fıkralarını, aynı kanunun 5927 sayılı kanunla değişik 1/33 maddesi ile Türk Ceza Kanununun 526/1. maddesi gereği birer gün hafif hapislerine ve Millet Partisi'nin Ankara'da bulunan merkez ve diğer bucak, ocak ilçe ve il bütün merkez şube teşkilatının feshine ve 250'şer kuruş cezanın maznunlarından ayrı ayrı alınmasına ve devlet hazinesinden peşin sarfedilen masrafların da maznunlardan alınmasına, Enis Akaygen ve Doktor Yesari'nin 65 yaşlarını doldurmalarından Türk Ceza Kanunu'nun 29. maddesi gereğince adli tevbihlerine ve diğer maznunların mani bir halleri bulunmadığından 89. madde gereğince cezalarının teciline, maznunlardan Galib Bilge, Mehmed Ali Derman, Cemal Islak ve Hasan Bilge'nin beraatlarına, temyiz yolu açık olmak üzere karar verilmiştir."

APPENDIX-E

THE REACTION OF ALİ FUAT BAŞGİL

Ali Fuat Başgil'in Tepkisi

MP'nin seçimler yaklaşırken bizzat Menderes'in öncülüğünü yaptığı siyasi bir tertiple, 20 bini aşkın ocak teşkilatı bir gecede kapatılması büyük tepkilere yol açmıştır. DP'ye yakınlığı bilinen İstanbul Üniversitesi Anayasa Ordinaryüs Profesörü Ali Fuat Başgil bu konudaki tepkisini 13 Temmuz 1953'de basına şu sözlerle dile getirmiştir:

"Millet Partisi'nin kapatılmasını, demokrasi yolunda gelişmemiz için müthiş bir darbe telakki ederim. Bugünkü Demokrat iktidarın iş başına gelişine az çok hizmet etmiş bir adam sıfatıyla, Millet Partisi hakkında bu iktidarın aldığı son kararı teessüf ve teessürle karşılarım. Benim nazarımda bugün Türkiye'de demokratik manada bir iki parti varsa bunlardan biri ve başta geleni Millet Partisi'dir. Halk Partisi ancak 1945 tarihinden itibaren, İkinci Dünya Harbi'ni Garp demokrasisinin kazanması üzerine parti olmağa başlamıştır. Ondan evvelki Halk Partisi demokratik manada bir parti değildi. Sadece bir kuvvet oligarşisi teşkilatı idi. Tıpkı İtalya'daki Faşist Parti, Almanya'daki Nasyonal Sosyalist Parti gibi.

Demokrat Parti'den kurulduğu andan itibaren çok şeyler bekledik ve Türkiye'de demokrasinin kökleşmesini temine hizmet edecek bir teşkilat telakki ettik. Benim bu görüşüme memleketin büyük bir ekseriyetinin de iştirak ettiğini, 1950 seçimleri ayan beyan göstermiştir. Böyle bir ümit ve temenni ile iktidara gelen bu partinin düşüneneceği tek bir şey vardı. Dört sene zarfında Türkiye tarihine karşı borçlu olduğu vazifeleri yapmak ve dört sene sonraki seçimlerin neticesini hiç düşünmemekti. Halbuki Demokrat Parti iktidarı bunun tamamıyla aksini yapmış ve iş başına geldiği günden itibaren 1954 seçimlerinin akıbetini düşünmüş, yani sandalyesine dört elle sarılmıştır. Bunda da memleket ve tarih nazarında müthiş bir hataya düşmüştür. Milliyetçiler Derneği'nden sonra bugün de Millet Partisi hakkında bu iktidarın reva gördüğü antidemokratik muamele ve hareketler, bu hatanın bir devamı ve neticeleridir.

Millet Partisi'nin bildiğimiz şekilde kapatılması, memleketin müstakbel demokratik inkişafı bahsinde maalesef çok kötü bir örnek teşkil etmiştir. Yazılarımla ve sert denilecek tenkitlerimle bir zamanlar çok hücum ettiğim şef rejimi bile Millet Partisi gibi yirmibin küsur şubesi olan, memlekette hiç olmazsa bir buçuk milyon vatandaşı sinesinde toplayan bir siyasi fikir ve kanaat gruplarını kapatma yoluna gitmemiştir. Muvaffakiyetleri uğrunda çalıştığım, hatta bir çok maddi ve mesleki menfaatlerimi feragatle feda ettiğim Demokrat iktidarın cesaret bulup bunu yapmasından cidden eza duydum."

APPENDIX F
THE NATION PARTY PROGRAM
ORIGINAL TEXT

Millett Partini

PROGRAM ve TÜZÜK

PROGRAM :

I — Ana Prensipler	: Madde	1 — 34
II — Devlet ve Hükümet İşleri	: »	35 — 47
III — Adâlet İşleri	: »	48 — 65
IV — Ordu ve Askerlik İşleri	: »	66 — 70
V — İç İşleri	: »	71 — 76
VI — Dış İşleri	: »	77 — 78
VII — Maliye İşleri	: »	79 — 87
VIII — Eğitim ve Öğretim İşleri	: »	88 — 104
IX — Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım İşleri	: »	105 — 114
X — Kalkınma İşleri	: »	115 — 130
XI — Orman İşleri	: »	131 — 136

TÜZÜK :

I — İsim ve maksat	: Madde	1 — 2
II — Üyeler	: »	3 — 8
III — Teşkilât	: »	9 — 10
IV — Yürütme Kurulları	: »	11 — 26
V — İnzibat Divanları	: »	27 — 44
VI — Başkanlar	: »	45 — 50
VII — Kongreler	: »	51 — 73
VIII — Mali Hükümler	: »	74 — 78
IX — Parti meclis gurubu	: »	79 — 95
X — Geçici Maddeler	: »	97 — 107
XI — Lâhika	: »	108 — 110
XII — Partiyi takdim edenler (müessisler)	: »	111

PROGRAM

I

Ana Prensipler

MADDE 1 — Cumhuriyet, Adalet, liberallik ülkülerine ve Milliyetçilik esasına bağlı «MİLLET PARTİSİ» adı ile siyasi bir Parti kurulmuştur.

MADDE 2 — Partinin gayesi samimi ve emin seçim ile tezahür edecek olan Milli iradeyi hakim kılmak; bu iradeye ve insan haklarına uygun bir Hükümetin tesisine ve bekasına çalışmaktır.

MADDE 3 — Parti bütün faaliyetinde yalnız meşru ve kanuni yollar-da yürümeyi kendisine vazife bilir. Bu vazife ihtiyaca uymayan, ferdin tabii hak ve hürriyetlerini tahdit ve ilga eden kanunları tenkitten ve onların islâh ve tadiline çalışmaktan feragati tazammun etmez.

MADDE 4 — Parti, Devleti, insanların cemiyet halinde ve barış içinde yaşamak ve birbirine yardım etmek hususunda duydukları tabii arzu ve ihtiyaçdan doğmuş devamlı ve medeni bir zaruret telâkki eder.

Devletin gayesi, hürriyet, emniyet ve en zengin bir tenevvü içinde gelişmesi zaruri olan insan şahsiyetinin serbesstçe teşekkül ve inkişafına engel olmamak, şahsi faaliyetleri halk için ve halkın muvafakati ile uzlaştırmak ve adaleti temin etmektir. Binaenaleyh fert haklarını cemiyet haklarından ayırarak onun dununda bir mahiyet taşımasına; ve fertlerin âmme menfaati icabı olarak görecekları zararın tazmin edilmemesine müsamaha edilemez.

Cemiyet kadar, ferdin de hayati menfaatini koruyacak usullerin tatbikini isteriz.

MADDE 5 — Parti, adaleti, herkese hakkını vermek hususunda sarılmayan devamlı bir irade olarak kabul eder. Bu mahiyet Devletin eseri olmayan, Devlete tekaddüm ve ona rehberlik eden, onun selâhiyetlerini tahdit eden üstün bir hak mefhumunu zaruri kılar. Normal her insan nefsinde bu hak ve adaletin manasını taşır.

Hak, bizim için yalnız ameli bir takdir prensibi değil; ahlâki bir gaye ve bir iman unsurudur.

Biz hak ve adalete inanıyoruz.

MADDE 6 — Parti, hakiki Demokrasinin samimi taraftarı ve müdafii-
dir. Biz bundan fert hak ve hürriyetlerini devamlı teminat altında tutan;
ve her biri bir hukuk devleti teşkil eden Batı demokrasilerini kast ediyoru-
ruz. Bir zümrenin, bir içtimai sınıfın diktatörlüğünü istihdaf eden doğu
örneği demokrasiyi mağşuş ve totaliter bir rejim addederek reddediyoruz.
Partimizin demokrasi telâkkisine göre azlığın çokluğa tahakkümü nasıl
gayri meşru ise, çokluğun azlığa ait insan haklarını çiğnemesi de aynı de-
recede gayrı meşrudur.

Parti, anayasamızın hakiki demokrasiye uymayan hükümlerinin ve
bilhassa Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi siyasi umdelerini Devletin ana vasıfları
haline sokan ikinci maddesinin kaldırılmasını ister.

MADDE 7 — Parti, içtimai nizamın teşekkülünde itikatların, ahlâkın,
geleneklerin, örf ve adetin büyük hisselerini tanıır. Bunlar sık sık değişmez-
ler ve devletin nüfuz sahasının dışında kalırlar.

MADDE 8 — Parti, memleketin istiklâlini ve toprak bütünlüğünü boz-
mak ve insan haklarını ihlal etmek maksadını güden veya yabancı siyasi
partilere alet olan, fert ve cemiyetlerin faaliyetlerini gayrı meşru sayar. Bu
cümleden olarak devletin ve devlet adamlarının hayat haklarını inkâr eden
anarşistler, şahsi ve siyasi hürriyet ve mülkiyet haklarını reddeden komü-
nistler ve insanların ve milletlerin hukuk eşitliğini tanımayan naziler hak-
kında kanuni korunma tedbirlerinin alınmasını zaruri görür.

Parti din müessesesine ve milli ananelere hürmetkârdır.

MADDE 9 — Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin ana vasıflarından olan milliyet-
çilik Partimizde ana prensiplerinden biridir. Bize göre millet mefhumunun
en ehemmiyetli unsuru bir nevi düşünce ve bir his birliğidir ki, milli vic-
danı teşkil ve müşterek bir hayat ve istikbale inancı tazammun eder. Milli
şuurun teşekkülünde dil birliğinin büyük hissesini kabul ederiz.

Parti, «Ben Türküm» diyen ve kendisini Türk sayan her insanı Türk
olarak kabul eder, Türklüğün çok eski ve şerefli medeni mazisine ve pek
büyük ümitle dolu istikbaline inanır, eğitim ve öğretim müesseselerinde
milli şuurun kuvvetlenmesine elverişli bir programın tatbikini milli bir
vazife bilir; ve okul dışında dahi gençliğin bu imanla yetişmesine çalışma-
yı lüzumlu sayar.

MADDE 10 — Aile müessesesini, cemiyetin temeli ve yüksek manevi
bir kıymet olarak kabul eden Partimiz onu tehdit eden kötü cereyanlarla
mücadele etmeyi ve aile bağlarını kuvvetlendirecek her türlü tedbirleri al-
mayı cemiyetin bir varlık şartı sayar.

MADDE 11 — Memleketin mesnet ve istikbali olan gençliğin demokra-
tik ve milliyetçi bir ruh ve zihniyetle yüksek ahlâkî vasıfta ve şahsiyet
sahibi birer vatandaş olarak yetiştirilmesini bir gaye kabul eden partimiz
onlara parti mülâhazalarına kapılmadan tahsil çağında her türlü yardım

ve kolaylığı sağlamak ve hayata atıldıkları zaman layık oldukları kıymeti vermek ve geniş inkişaf imkânları hazırlamak azmindedir.

MADDE 12 — Parti, din işlerinin devlet işlerinden ayrı tutulmasını kabul eder. Herkesin vicdan ve itikat hürriyetini ve dilediği dilde ve dilediği şekilde ibadet etmek hakkını mukaddes tanır.

Parti, Türkiyede muhtelif din ve mezheplere mensup cemaatların dini maksatla teşkilât vücade getirmelerini ve dini vakıfların bu teşkilâta devredilmesini tasvip ve müdafaa eder.

Bu teşkilat kendi mensuplarının din işlerini tanzim ve idareye selâhiyetli olmalıdır.

Parti ilk ve orta tedrisata din dersleri ilâve edilmesini ve üniversitelerde ilâhiyat fakülteleri ihdasını muvafık görür. Fakat din derslerine iştirâk, öğrenciler reşit oluncaya kadar, aile reisinin irade ve ihtiyarına tabidir.

MADDE 13 — Bizim kabul ettiğimiz devrimcilik; insan tabiatını ve içtimai amil ve şartları zorlamadan daima ilerlemek manasında tekâmül-cülüğün başka bir kelime ile ifadesinden ibarettir. Millet ve memleketi her sahada müterakki memleketlerle muvazi yürütecek ve medeniyet icaplarına uyacak her faaliyette istikbali göz önünde tutarak, sarsıntı vücade getirmeden, millî ve içtimai faaliyeti idare etmeye taraftarız.

Her devrin icabatını tesbit etmek o devirde yaşayan neslin mukaddes hakkı olduğunu kabul ediyor; ancak her hamlenin geriliğe imkân bırakmadan ananelerimize ve milletin iradesine uygun ve hakiki ihtiyaca tetabuk eder şekilde tanzimini istiyoruz.

MADDE 14 — Parti, hiç bir ferde, bir zümreye veya içtimai sınıfa hususi bir hak, bir imtiyaz veya asalet unvanı tanımamak manasında halkçıdır. Halk mefhumunu vatandaşların heyeti mecmuası olarak kabul ediyor. Bu tarif şu cihetten mühimdir ki, kendilerine halk demokrasileri adını veren bazı rejimler vatandaşlardan bir kısmını halktan addetmemek, diğer kısmının diktatörlüğünü istemek gibi tasvip edemeyeceğimiz bir esas gütmektedir. Bu telâkki yalnız içtimai adalet hissine aykırı olmakla kalmaz; halk tabakaları ve içtimai sınıflar arasına kin ve nifak sokar.

Bu sebeplerle parti halkçılığı eşit haklara sahip bütün vatandaşların iyiliği ve umumun refahı için çalışmak ve hayat şartlarını islâh arzusu olarak kabul eder; tek mil kanunlarımızda fert ve zümre imtiyazına delâlet edecek ayrılıkların kaldırılmasına çalışmayı halkçılığın bir icabı sayar.

MADDE 15 — Parti, her vatandaşın dürüst çalışmak şartıyla asgari bir maişet vasıtası ve bir mesken tedariki hususunda âmme kudretinden müzaheret beklemesini muasır insan haklarından tanır. İnsanlar bilhassa ihtiyarlıklarında, malûliyet ve hastalıklarında açlık ve sefalet korkusu duymadan yaşamalıdır. Parti bu gayelerin tahakkukuna yarayacak iç-

timai sigorta plânları hazırlamak azmindedir. Yiyim, giyim, sükna ve iş alanlarında asgari maiyet hadleri her türlü ihtikâr ve istismar hamlelerinden masum tululmalıdır. Ve muhtekirler ağır surette cezalandırılmalıdır.

MADDE 16 — Parti, mülkiyet ve tasarruf hakkının adilâne olmayan bir surette tahdidini ve servetin devlet eli ile idaresini terviç eden bütün rejimlere aleyhtardır. İnsanlar malların müştereken tasarrufu rejiminden, şahsi mülkiyeti sağlayan, medeni kanunların himayesi altında yaşamak için vazgeçmişlerdir.

Parti, âmme menfaati namına yapılacak kamulaştırmaları ancak mahkemelerce takdir edilecek değer pahası peşin verilmek şartıyla tecviz eder. Mal ve mülkü bu suretle elinden alınan fert, hâdisede âmme menfaatinin mevcut olup olmadığı, mülkiyet hakkının lüzumsuz ihlal edilip edilmediği hususunda mahkemeye itiraz hakkına malik olmalıdır. Mevcut istimlak kanunlarının birleştirilmesini bu esasın bir icabı sayarız.

MADDE 17 — Parti, vadantaşın çalışma hevesini kıran ve yaşama şartlarını güçleştiren aşırı vergilere aleyhtardır.

MADDE 18 — Parti, gayri meşru yollardan servet edinilmesine karşı şiddetle mücadele azmindedir.

MADDE 19 — Parti, hukuki ve iktisadi emniyet ve istikrarı ihlal eden, kat'i ihtiyaç olmağdan sık sık kanun değiştirme itiyadına ve vatandaşın kanuna uyma imkânını güçleştiren kanun çokluğuna aleyhtardır ve bu durumu islah azmindedir.

MADDE 20 — Siyaseti, milletin refah ve saadetini temin için yapılan ve ahlâk esaslarına dayanan bir faaliyet olarak kabul eden partimiz bu esaslara uymayan hareketleri siyasette mubah telâkki eden sakat ve zararlı zihniyetle mücadeleyi başlıca hedeflerinden saymaktadır.

MADDE 21 — Himaye, iltimas, haksızlık, rüşvet, suiistimal, karaborsacılık ve israflarla mücadeleyi parti milli ve ahlâki bir borç telâkki eder.

MADDE 22 — Parti, ekonomi sahasında mutedil liberal akideye sadıktır. Şahsi mülkiyete, şahsi teşebbüse, meşru rekabete, açık pazarda serbestçe ayarlanan fiyatlara ve iş bölümüne dayanan serbest mübadele ekonomisine taraftardır.

Bizim liberalliğimiz (bırakın yapısın) formülü ile ifade edilen başı boş liberalizm değildir. Biz gerek devlete, gerek fertlere ait her türlü tekele, sermayenin haksızlıklarına, aşırı kâr ihtirasına, hileli ticarete, haksız istismara, iktisadi buhranlardan doğan büyük kütle istirap ve sefaletine, milli ve milletler arası ekonomi ahenk ve müvazenesinin bazulmasına lakayt kalamayız.

Biz bu hususlarda devletin tanzimci müdahalesine taraftarız. Bizim reddettiğimiz meslekler mahsul veya istihsal vasıtaları üzerindeki şahsi

mülkiyet hakkını devlet lehine ihlal ve ferdi teşebbüsleri tahdid ve ilgaya meyyal olan devletçilik ve sosyalistlik ile halen Türkiyede en müfrit şekli tatbik edilmekte olan devlet sermayeciliğidir.

Bir taraftan ferdi teşebbüsü ve şahsi mülkiyeti servetin istihsal, tedavül ve inkisamında esas tuttuklarını ve diğer taraftan devletçi olduklarını iddia eden siyasi partiler sarih bir tenakuza ve abes içerisine düşmüşlerdir. Bu prensip karışıklığı yüzünden ve bir kısım solcu unsurların yardımı ile devletçilik Türkiyede devlet sermayeciliğinin en müfrit şekline inkılap ve ekonomî müvazenesini alt üst etmiştir. Partinin hedeflerinden biri de devlet sermayeciliğinin ihtiyatla ve tedricen tasfiyesi olacaktır.

Prensip olarak devlet, ziraat ve ticaretle ve — harp endüstrisi müstesna olmak üzere — sanayi ile iştigal edemez; gemiciliği ve sivil havacılığı tercihan hususî teşebbüslere bırakır. Bu şubelerde devletin vazifeleri gittikçe artan ferdi teşebbüs kudretine gittikçe genişleyen bir yer vermek üzere azalmak zorundadır.

Biz, devlet fabrikalarını yerli taliplerine, tercihan kooperatif ve anonim şirketlere, hakiki kıymetleri mukabilinde, vermek veya içinde çalışan mühendis, memur ve işçilerin maaşları nisbetinde hissedar olarak teşkil edecekleri anonim şirketlere devrederek memur kadrolarını ve vergi yükünü hafifletmek azmindeyiz.

Nümune, üretme ve tohum islah çiftlikleri müstesna, devlet çiftlikleri ve zirai kombinalar tedricen ilga edilerek devlet elindeki topraklar derhal topraksız çiftçiye tevzi edilmeli; devletin bütün ticaret ofisleri, sözde anonim şirketleri, tedricen ilga edilmeli; kooperatifler devlet vesayetinden ve lüzumsuz müdahalelerinden kurtarılmalıdır. Bununla birlikte müstahsili koruma tedbirleri idame ve tekemmül ettirilmelidir.

Parti ferdi ve yerli sermayelerden rağbet görmeyen işlerin, bu arada limanlar, büyük su işleri ve enerji kaynakları, demir yolları, posta, telgraf ve telefon tesisatının devlet eli ile yapılmasını ve işletilmesini tasvip eder.

MADDE 23 — Memleketin her sahada hakiki ihtiyaç ve imkânlarını mütehasıslara tetkik ve tesbit ettirerek umumi bir kalkınma ve gelişme plânı hazırlanmasını ve bu işte yabancı mütehasıslardan da faydalanılmasını zaruri görmekteyiz.

MADDE 24 — Parti, dünya milletlerinin müşterek bir medeniyete doğru tekâmül ettiğine, Türkiyemizin de bu maksatla bütün milletlerle samimi iş birliği yapması lüzümüne kanidir.

Fakat her hangi bir millet kendi ihtirasını tatmin için başkalarına tahakkümden vazgeçmedikçe ona karşı nefsimizi muhafaza zaruretlerine uymayı varlık şartı sayıyoruz.

Parti, Türkiyenin Birleşmiş milletler müessesesinin sadık bir üyesi ve faydalı bir unsuru kalmasını ister.

MADDE 25 — Parti, her vatandaşın dünya için barış ve emniyet un-
suru olmasını sağlayan insanî bir kültüre sahip olarak yetişmesini, insanî
dayanışma, iyi komşuluk, muahedelere sadakat, itidal ve bütün insanlara
karşı şefkat terbiyesi içinde gelişmesini kendi milletimiz ve milletler aile-
sinin refahı ve saadeti için temel dâva addeder.

MADDE 26 — Hürriyet, bütün siyasi programımızın temel taşıdır. Biz-
ce her fert dilediği gibi hareket edebilir ; yeterki başkasının eşit hürri-
yetine zarar vermesin. Başkasına zarar vermenin bir kötülük olduğuna ve
hayır ve şer mefhumları ahlâk sahasına ait olduklarına göre hürriyetin ah-
lâki bir temeli ve vazife hissi ile bir irtibatı vardır.

Partimiz şahsi ve siyasi hürriyetlerin, asrımızda, ferdi tecavüzlerden
ziyade hükûmetlere verilen geniş selâhiyetler yüzünden tehlikeye düştüğü-
ne; ve bu selâhiyetlerin azami derecede takyidi lüzumuna kanidir.

MADDE 27 — Ferdi ve siyasi hürriyetlerin zaruret hududunu aşan
her takyidi tahakküm ve istibdadın ifadesidir.

Partimiz, teşrii kuvvetin dilediğini yapabileceği fikrine, devlet muva-
cehesinde hiç bir ferdi hak ve hürriyetin mevcut olmayacağı prensibine da-
yanan totaliter devlet telâkkisini reddeder.

MADDE 28 — Partimize göre insanların ihlal edilemez tabii hak ve
hürriyetleri şunlardır:

Hayat, şahıs ve binnetice mesken masuniyeti, vicdan, fikir, söz, neşir,
seyahat, haberleşme, sözleşme, çalışma, mülk edinme ve onları saklama ve
kullanma, veraset, toplanma, cemiyet ve şirket kurma, her türlü haksızlığa
karşı meşru mukavemet ve hükûmeti tenkit hürriyetleri.

Partimiz, ferdin hak ve hürriyetine tecavüz korkusundan masun yaşa-
mak hakkını tabii sayar.

Bu esaslı insan haklarından seyahat ve haberleşme gibi, bazılarının
yalnız milli kanunlarla teminat altına alınmayacağına kani olan parti, mil-
letler arası münasebetlerde de kanun devrinin başlaması için azami gay-
ret sarfetmek azindedir.

MADDE 29 — Bu tabii hakların kanun dışı takyidini içtimai ve siyasi
bir suç sayar ve istibdadın kötü bir alâmeti addederiz. Binaenaleyh bu hak-
lara tecavüz kimin tarafından vaki olursa olsun hiç bir hususi merasime
tabii olmadan umumi hükümler dairesinde adalet mahkemelerinde yargı-
lanarak terhip ve tecziyesini sağlayacak tedbirlerin bir an evvel alınmasını
bir zaruret sayarız.

MADDE 30 — Parti, Kanuni müsavata ana prensiplerinden addeder. Hiç bir fert veya topluluk eşit olmayan bir hak iddiasında bulunamaz; başkalarına yasak olan fiilleri kendisi için mübah göremez.

Kanunun herkes için mecburi ve müsavi vasfı fertler, fertle devlet müesseseleri, içtimai sınıflar, siyasi partiler, dinler ve mezhepler arasındaki münasebetlerde de muteberdir.

Parti, herkesin şahsi liyakat, kabiliyet ve mesaisine göre hisse almasını tabii ve meşru telâkki eder.

Cumhuriyet her türlü imtiyaz ve inhisarların ilgasını muktazi olduğundan, parti, Cumhuriyeti müsavat ülküsüne en uygun idare şekli olarak tanır.

MADDE 31 — Menşeyini millî iradedden alan âmme kudreti bir fert veya zümre lehine ve binnetice diğerleri aleyhine kullanılamaz.

MADDE 32 — Parti, kanunları keyf ve hevese tabii kılan hikmet'i hükümet telâkkisini, halkı devamlı ve haksız zararlara sokan nef'i hazine zihniyetini istibdat mesnetleri olarak tanır ve bunlarla mücadeleyi borç bilir.

MADDE 33 — Türkiyede hiç bir makam ve hiç bir kimse kendisine kanunen ve sarahaten verilmemiş olan bir otorite ve selahiyeti kullanamaz. Kanun, ferdi hakların kötü kullanılmasını önleyecek tahditler koyabilir. Ancak bu tahditlerin anayasaya aykırı olup olmadıklarını ve zaruret had-dini aşıp aşmadıklarını takdir selâhiyetini haiz bir yüce mahkemeye kat'i lüzum vardır. Bunun ihdasını parti, önemli hedeflerinden biri sayar.

MADDE 34 — Parti, memleketimizde hürriyetin teessüsü için fert haklarının teminat altına alınmasını zarurî görür.

II

Devlet ve Hükümet İşleri

MADDE 35 — Parti, bazı fevrî cereyanların kanunlaşması imkânını önlemek ve kanunların daha esaslî surette incelenmesini sağlamak için Halk tarafından seçilmiş bir Ayan Meclisinin kurulmasını zarurî görür.

MADDE 36 — Her iki meclis üyelerinin adetleri, vazifeleri ve intihap usul ve şartlarının millî ihtiyaca uygun şekilde yeniden tanzimini lüzumlu görüyoruz.

MADDE 37 — Cumhurbaşkanı bir devre için seçilmeli; aynı zatın bir seçim dönemi geçmeden tekrar seçilmesi caiz olmamalıdır.

MADDE 38 — Cumhurbaşkanı her iki meclisin birlikte yapacağı bir oturumda bu meclislerin üyeleri arasından seçilmelidir.

MADDE 39 — Cumhurbaşkanı, hükümet başkanını bu iki meclis üyeleri arasından seçmelidir. Bazı bakanların meclisler dışından seçilmesi de mümkün olmalıdır.

MADDE 40 — Cumhurbaşkanı partiler dışında bağımsız kalmalı ve seçimden itibaren parti ve zümre cereyanları ile alâkasını keserek kendisini bütün millete maletmelidir.

MADDE 41 — Her iki meclis üyelerinin seçimlerine ait usul ve vazifelerini icra tarzının millet hâkimiyetine ve demokrasi icaplarına en uygun yeni bir seçim kanunu ile tesbitine çalışılacaktır.

Millet vekili adedinin azaltılmasına; ve vekillikte geçen müddetlerle tahsisatlarının emeklilikte hesap edilmemesine taraftarız.

MADDE 42 — Bütün seçimlerin her çeşit müdahale ve tesirden, hile ve tahakkümden masun yapılabilmesi ve seçim neticeleri üzerinde hiç bir fesat ve tahrif olmadan millet irade ve hâkimiyetine uygun olarak tahakkuk edebilmesi için lüzumu kadar müeyyideler teminine çalışmayı bir vazife sayıyoruz. Seçimlerin adli kuvvet mürakabesi altında yapılmasını doğru buluyoruz.

MADDE 43 — Bakanların vazife ve mesuliyetini gösterecek hususi kanunların yapılmasını isteyen anayasanın 47. nci maddesinin biran evvel tahakkukunu istiyoruz.

MADDE 44 — Bakanlıklara ait mürakabe ve teftiş işlerinin salim bir tarzda yapılması için teftiş teşkilâtının, icra kuvvetinin tesirinden kurtararak, tam bir istiklâlâle sahip kılmak maksadiyle gerekli tedbirlerin alınmasını zarurî görmekteyiz.

MADDE 45 — Adama iş değil, işe adam düsturuna bağlı olan partimiz, mesuliyet ve halka hizmet duygusu taşıyan yüksek vasıfta ve az sayıda müreffeh memurlarla âmme hizmetlerinin görülmesine taraftardır.

Memurların hal ve istikballerinden emin olmaları, terfi, tayin, nakil ve tecziyelerinin amirlerin keyf ve arzusuna göre değil, liyakat ve istihkaklarına göre yapılmasını, devlet işlerinin emniyet verici esaslara bağlanarak salim bir tarzda yürütülmesini istiyoruz.

MADDE 46 — Emeklilerle dul ve yetimlerin ve malüllerin maaşlarının adâletli olarak tayinini ve zamanın geçim şartlarına göre uygulanmasını, vazife görürken alınan para ile emekli maaşı arasındaki farkın da isabetli bir şekilde tesbitini doğru buluyoruz.

Emeklilere ait kanunlar birleştirilmelidir.

MADDE 47 — Lüzumsuz zaman ve enerji sarfına sebep olan kırtasiyecilikle mücadele etmeyi ve halkın işlerinin kolaylıkla ve süratle görülebilmesini temin edecek her türlü kanunî ve idarî tedbirlerin alınmasını zarurî sayıyoruz.

III

Adalet İşleri

MADDE 48 — Adalet işlerinin kaza birliği esasına uygun bir şekilde sağlanması ve hususî mercilere verilen salâhiyetlerin kaldırılması lüzumuna inanıyoruz. Yalnız ordunun sırf askerî işlerinden doğan suçların askerî mahkemelerde duruşma ve hükme bağlanmasını istinai olarak caiz görüyoruz.

MADDE 49 — Memlekette adâletin tam tecellisini temin edebilmek için adli teşkilatın ve bilhassa yargıçlarımızın her türlü tesirden masun ve kâmil bir istiklâl içinde çalışmasını adâletin ilk şartı olarak kabul ediyoruz, bunun için de hâkimlerimizin tayin, nakil ve terfilerinin hiç bir teşrii ve idarî makamın müdahalesi olmadan bizatihi kendi teşkilâtları arasında icrasını temin azmindeyiz.

MADDE 50 — Bütün mahkemelerin kuruluşuna, derecelerine ve vazifelerine dair esaslı bir mahkemeler teşkili kanunu vücade getirilmesi ve teşkilâtın dağınık hükümlerden kurtulması şarttır.

MADDE 51 — Asliye mahkemeleriyle yargıtay arasında ikinci bir kaza kademesinin bulunmasını adâletin esaslı bir teminatı sayıyoruz.

MADDE 52 — Sulh mahkemeleri dışında kalan bütün mahkemelerde toplu hâkim sistemi âmil olmalı, ancak buna imkân husulüne kadar, aslı mahkemelerin bir kısmında istisnai olarak, tek hâkim usulü tatbik edilebilmelidir.

MADDE 53 — Adâletin kabil olduğu kadar külfetsiz, masrafsız ve kolay tevziine taraftarız. Usul kanunlarımızda neticeyi geciktiren merasimin kaldırılmasına çalışmakla beraber işlerde sürat olsun diye adaleti alt üst etmek zihniyetine aleyhtarız.

MADDE 54 — Adâlet cihazının ihtisasa yol açacak bir çığırda işlemini istiyoruz.

MADDE 55 — Doğu bölgesinde çalışan yargıç ve savcılarının hizmet müddetinin tayini ve bundan sonra diğer bölgelere nakil hakkının temini için, ayrı hükümler konulmalıdır.

MADDE 56 — Günün şartlarına tabî olarak (Hava Hukuku) adıyla ayrı bir hukukun vücade getirilmesi lüzumuna inanıyoruz.

MADDE 57 — Adli Tıp Müessesesine lâyük olduđu önem verilmesi ve adli tabiplerin çoğaltılması ve memleketin başka yerlerinde de adli tıp teşkilâtı vücutte getirilerek bu mesleğin cazip bir hale sokulması adâlet umde-lerimizdendir.

MADDE 58 — Yargıtay başkanlarının muayyen müddetle ve intihapla yargıtayın bütün yargıçları tarafından seçilmesini ve bunlara yargıçlık maaşından fazla olarak ve vazifelerinin devamı müddetince başkanlık tahsi-satı verilmesini esaslı bir teminat olarak nazara alıyoruz.

MADDE 59 — Matbuat suçlarında juri usulünün kabulüne taraftarız.

MADDE 60 — Adli Zabıta kuvvetleri müstakil olarak savcının em-rine verilmelidir.

MADDE 61 — Yargıçlarımızın, bütçenin müsaadesi nisbetinde, azami huzur ve refaha erişmesini adâlet şartlarından biri sayıyoruz; bütün adâlet cihazının sıkıntısız yaşayacak imkân ve vasıtalarla techizini istiyoruz.

MADDE 62 — Memleketin kalabalık ve müterakkî yerlerinde çocuk suçlarına bakmak için hususî mahkemeler açılmasını ve bu mahkemelere tercihan kadın yargıçlar seçilmesi istiyoruz ve çocuklarımızın ar hislerini zedelememek için bu kabil dâvaların gizli görülmesini medeniyetin icapla-rından sayıyoruz.

MADDE 63 — Tevkif evlerinin ceza yerlerinden ayrılmasını ve tev-kifhanelerin kabil olduđu kadar ceza mahkemelerine yakın olarak tesisi suretiyle sanıkların, bilhassa hükümden evvel, teşhirine imkân verilmeme-sini lüzumlu görüyoruz.

MADDE 64 — Ceza evlerinin insanlık hislerine uygun, sağlık ve me-deniyet şartlarına muvafık bir hale getirilmesini ve hüküm yiyenlerin, ma-nen ve maddeten yükseltip iş sahibi yaparak, iyi bir vatandaş halinde cemi-yete iadesini sağlayacak mahiyeti haiz olmasını istiyoruz.

MADDE 65 — Bu bölüm hükümleri askerî adâlet teşkilâtına de şâmil olmalıdır.

IV

Ordu ve Askerlik işleri

MADDE 66 — Yurdun Savunmasını sağlayacak olan Ordumuzun bu vazifeyi daima ve şerefle başaracak bir kudrette teşkillenmesi ve bu mak-sat dahilinde techiz edilmesi esastır.

Millî Savunma ihtiyacına göre daha barış zamanında her türlü hazırlıkların yapılmış olması ve takip olunacak Eğitim ve Öğretimde bu esasların daima gözönünde bulundurulması lüzumuna kani bulunuyoruz.

MADDE 67 — Yurdun bütün millete ve millî kudrete dayanan savunmasını lâayık olduđu önemle daima ön plânda tutmak için (Yüksek müdafaa Meclisi) nin bir kanunla ve kat'i olarak ihdas ve teşkil edilmesini ve bu meclisin vazife ve selâhiyetlerinin de bu suretle belirtilmiş olarak işleminin teminini lüzumlu görüyoruz.

MADDE 68 — Başbakanın ve Bakanların vazife ve selâhiyetlerini belirtecek yeni kanunların icabına göre Genel Kurmay Başkanlığının ve Yüksek Askerî Sûranın vazife ve selâhiyetlerinin yeniden gözden geçirilmesi ve bu esaslara göre düzenlenmesi lüzumuna inanıyoruz.

MADDE 69 — Yurdun savunmasını temin etmekle mükellef olan Ordumuzun askerlik, terfi, emeklilik ve bu gibi esaslı kanunlarında zamanın icap ve ihtiyaçlarına göre gerekli olan tekâmül ve islâhların yapılmasını da lüzumlu buluyoruz.

MADDE 70 — Parti, Ordunun kapalı veya açık şekilde siyasetle işgal etmesine ve siyasete alet edilmesine şiddetle aleyhtardır.

Dış İşleri

MADDE 71 — Parti, Ordunun kapalı veya açık şekilde siyasetle işgal etmesine ve siyasete alet edilmesine şiddetle aleyhtardır.

V

İç İşleri

MADDE 71 — Bu günkü idari teşkilâtın ruh ve zihniyet, muamelât ve idare usulü bakımlarından ihtiyaca tekabül eder mahiyette bulunmadığına inanıyoruz. Bu teşkilâtın ihtiyaç ve demokrasi icaplarına en uygun bir tarzda olabilmesi için ciddi ve ilmî tetkiklere dayanmasını lüzumlu görüyoruz.

MADDE 72 — İdarecilikte hükmî şahıs olarak temel birlik bucak olmalı ve bucak idarî muhtariyete sahip bulunmalıdır. Onun halkça seçilmiş bir meclisi ve bu meclisce seçilmiş bir de bucak başkanı (Nahiye Müdürü yerine) bulunmalıdır.

MADDE 73 — İllere ve bucaklara verilen yetkiler şahsa değil bucak meclislerine ve İl Genel Meclislerine ait olmalıdır. Valilerin, kaymakamların ve bucak başkanlarının yetkileri tamamen idare işlerine münhasır kalmalıdır.

MADDE 74 — Belediye Başkan ve üyeleri ile mahallî meclislerin bi-lâistisna Millet Vekilleri hakkında kabul olunan seçim usulüne muvazi bir

tarzda vatandaşların serbest iradeleriyle yapılacak seçimle teşkil edilmesini istiyoruz.

MADDE 75 — İdare cihazlarının milletin tabii haklarını ihlâl ve Adâlet Teşkilâtı üzerinde müdahale ifade edebilecek bütün faaliyetlerden mutlak surette uzak kalmasını ve memlekette mevcut siyasi partilerin hiç bir faaliyetine iştirak etmemelerini isteriz. Muhtariyeti haiz Müesseseler mensupları hariç olmak üzere Devlet ve Hükümet Teşkilâtına mensup herkes siyasi partilere girmekten, ceza tehdidi altında, men edilmelidir. (Seçime iştirak müstesnadır).

MADDE 76 — Âmme hizmeti ile vazifeli olan hiç bir kimse hususî hizmetlerde istihdam edilmemelidir.

VI Dış İşleri

MADDE 77 — Dış siyasetimiz istiklâl ve mülki temamiyetimizin muhafazası esasına dayanır. Meri ittifak muahede ve hükümleri mahfuz kalmak şartıyla bütün dünya devlet ve milletleriyle dostluk ve barış içinde yaşamak dış siyasetimizin hedefidir.

MADDE 78 — Partimiz, birleşmiş milletler anayasası hükümleri dairesinde, kendileriyle tarihi, manevi ve kültürel alâkamız olan milletlerle dostluğumuzu kuvvetlendirerek müteakabil tesanüt temin edecek bir siyaset takip etmeyi tarihî bir borç ve dünya barışını sağlayacak en esaslî bir âmil telâkki eder.

VII

Maliye İşleri

MADDE 79 — Malî siyasetimiz yalnız şeklen değil hakikaten de denk bir bütçe ile hükümet idâresini teminden ibarettir. Masraf bütçelerinin millî takatla mütenasip, hakikî ve zarurî ihtiyaçlara uygun tarzda tanzimini istiyoruz.

Vergilerin tahakkuk ve tahsillerinde adâlete riayet edilmesi, sarflarında kayıtsız, şartsız her türlü israf, sefahat ve lüksten sakınılması lüzumuna kaniiz. İmkân bulundukça müterakkî vergi sistemini tercih ediyoruz.

Vergi itiraz mercileri heyetinin Belediyelerden ve Ticaret Odalarından seçilmiş üyelerden vücade getirilmesini bitaraflik icabından buluyoruz.

MADDE 80 — Dahilî ve Haricî borçlarla bütçede muvazene tesisine çalışmak müsrif hükûmetlerin şiarı olabilir. Borçlanma ancak Millî Savunma zaruretleriyle ve milletin istihsal kudretini yükseltecek maksatlarla yapılmalıdır. Her ne sebeple olursa olsun, Millî ve İktisadî İstiklâlimizi tehlikeye düşürecek bütün hareketlerden içtinap edilmelidir.

MADDE 81 — Asgarî mâişet haddine tekabül eden kazanç ve gelirlerden vergi alınmamalıdır.

MADDE 82 — Malî işlerimizin yürütülmesinde ihtisasa büyük bir yer verilmesini, âmme hizmetlerini görecek olan her türlü devlet teşkilâtının makul ilmî esaslara göre kurulmuş olmasını zarurî görüyoruz.

MADDE 83 — Memlekette mevcut enfilasyonu inkâr edecek yerde bunu önliyecek tedbirlerin alınmasına, emisyonlardan kabil olduğu kadar kaçınılmasına dikkat etmek vazifemiz olacaktır.

MADDE 84 — Açık ve gizli mütemadiyen genişletilmekte olan İnhi-sarcılığı tedricen tahdit etmek ve bunların de istihsal masrafını azaltmak ve memleket iktisadiyatını harap etmeyecek ve müstahsilleri tazyikten kurtaracak tarzda usullere bağlamak hedefimiz olacaktır.

MADDE 85 — Sıhhî ve zarurî seyahatlerde döviz tedârikini güçleştiren engellerin mümkün olabildiği kadar hafifletilmesini ve lüzumsuz yere döviz israf edilmemesini istiyoruz.

MADDE 86 — Devlete menfaat temini bahanesiyle ferdin tasarruf ve mülkiyet haklarını ihlâl eden ve müsadere mahiyetinde olan istimval ve istimlâklere nihayet verilmesine taraftarız.

MADDE 87 — İktisadî faaliyeti daraltan, millet üzerinde gayritabii tesirler yaratarak mübadeleyi güçleştiren vergi ve resmilerin yavaş yavaş ortadan kaldırılmasını temin azmindeyiz.

VIII

Eğitim ve Öğretim İşleri

MADDE 88 — Parti, Millî Eğitim ve öğretim işlerini bütün faaliyetinin temeli sayar. Devlet ve mahalli idare bütçelerinden bu işe ayrılacak masraf ihtiyacı karşılayacak ve geçen ihmalleri telâfi edecek bir hadde va-

sıl olmalıdır. Türk milletinin ileri milletlerin kültür ve medeniyet seviyesine yükselmesi hedefimizdir.

MADDE 89 — Parti, bütün öğretim ve eğitim işlerimizin memleket ihtiyacını en iyi karşılayacak umumi bir plâna bağlanmasını zarurî görmektedir; İrfan faaliyetimize sağlam ve istikrarlı bir yol ve gidiş hazırlamak, öğretim işlerinin ana programını vücuda getirmek ve bütün işleri buna göre ayarlamak için (Millî Eğitim ve Öğretim Şûrası) kurmak lüzumuna inanmaktadır.

Bu şûranın nasıl teşkil olunacağı, kimlerden vücuda getirileceği ve vazifesi bir kanunla tesbit edilecektir.

MADDE 90 — Yapılacak programlar millete ilim ve teknik bilgilerle beraber millî ve ahlâkî terbiye verecek surette nizamlanmalı; Türk gençliğine millî iman ve ülkü aşılacak ve kuvvetlendirecek bir maksat takip etmelidir.

MADDE 91 — Tahsilin devamı müddetince öğrencilere şahsî teşebbüs ve içtihat kabiliyeti ile yaratıcılık ve yapıcılık fikir ve terbiyesi verilmeli ve onlar amelî hayatta muvaffak olacak surette yetiştirilmelidir.

MADDE 92 — Millet in ilim ve teknik alanlarında yükselmesini sağlamak maksadıyla muhtelif ilim ve fen şubelerinde araştırma enstitüleri kurulmasını lüzumlu görmekteyiz.

MADDE 93 — Parti, bütün bilgilerin ilerlemesini sağlamak için her bölüme mensup en değerli bilginlerden mürekkep ve tam istiklâle sahip (Akademi) lerin kurulmasını faydalı görür.

MADDE 94 — Memlekette sanat ve meslek okullarıyla fabrika çırak kullarını çoğaltmak, küçük sanat ehlini bollaştırmak ve okulların hayata bağlılığına ehemmiyet vermek eğitim umdelerimizden olacaktır.

MADDE 95 — Mektep çağını okumadan geçirmiş vatandaşlara okullar dışında ve bilhassa askerlik hizmeti esnasında okuma yazma ve mümkün olabildiği kadar lüzumlu bilgiler verilmesine çalışılacak, okuma yazma bilmiyen iş sahiplerinin bu ihtiyaçlarını karşılamak üzere akşam dersaneleri açılacaktır.

MADDE 96 — Bütün eğitim ve öğretim üyelerinin maiyet darlığı çekmeden vazifelerinde muvaffakiyetlerini sağlamak ve lâıyk oldukları yüksek itibar ve mevkii kendilerine temin etmek azmindeyiz.

İlkokul öğretmenlerinden kabiliyeti tahakkuk edenler eğitim teşkilâtının en yüksek derecelerine kadar çıkabilmek fırsatını bulmalıdırlar.

MADDE 97 — Partimiz, yabancı dil tahsiline lüzumu kadar önem verilmemiş olduğunu kabul etmektedir. Bunun için de okullarımızda buna lüzumu kadar yer ayrılmasını zarurî görüyoruz.

Yurdumuzun muhtelif yerlerinde yabancı dil üzerine tedrisat yapan okullar açılmasını ve bu okullarda yabancı dil bilir öğrenciler yetiştirilmesini istiyoruz.

MADDE 98 — İlk öğretim, eğitim faaliyetinin temelini teşkil eder. Bu sebeple parti, bütün yurt çocuklarının bir ilkokulda yer bulabilmesini ve ilk öğretimden istifadeyi güçleştiren âmillerin en kısa bir zamanda ortadan kaldırılmasını vazife bilir.

MADDE 99 — Köy okullarının de beşer sınıflı olmasının teminine çalışılacaktır.

MADDE 100 — Kalkınma plânına göre köy okulları yapılırken esasen varlıkları pek dar bulunan köy halkının durumunu büsbütün güçleştirecek mükellefiyet usulünden kaçınılması lüzumuna inanıyoruz. İnşaat ve tesisatta lüks ve israftan sakınılarak en sağlam ve en sade yapı tipleri tercih edilmelidir.

MADDE 101 — Doğu ve Güney bölgelerimizde Üniversite açılmasına ve Üniversite bulunan yerlerde icabeden müesseselerin yapılması suretiyle birer Üniversite sitesi kurulmasına taraftarız.

MADDE 102 — Liselerle yüksek okullarda ehliyet ve liyakat gösteren seciyeli ve memlekete bağlı ve itina ile seçilmiş gençlerden devlet hesabına kabil olduğu kadar çok okuyucuların müterrakî yabancı memleketlere gönderilerek memleket ihtiyacına göre yüksek ihtisas sahibi olmalarını ve bunların ciddi mürakabeye tâbi tutulmasını temine çalışacağız.

MADDE 103 — Beden Terbiyesi ve her nevi sporun memleket çapında teşvik ve tamimine, spor işlerinde hayatımıza ve maddî şartlarımıza uymayan şeylerden kaçınılarak imkânlarla göre yerli malzeme ile kazırlanmak suretiyle ucuz ve elverişli bir hale getirilmesini doğru buluyoruz.

MADDE 104 — Şehit çocuklarının devlet okullarında parasız ve yatılı olarak okutulmasını istiyoruz.

IX

Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım İşleri

MADDE 105 — Millet sağlığı meselesini, toptan ele alınması gereken bir memleket davası olarak görüyoruz. Hastalıkları iyi eden, hastalık sebeplerini ve hastalıklara karşı mukavemeti artıran iyi edici ve koruyucu bir sağlık politikası güdülmesi esasî amacımızdır.

MADDE 106 — Lüzumlu sıhî tesis ve tedbirlerin az zamanda plânlaştırılıp gerçekleştirilmesi için yüksek sıhhat şurasına kâfi selâhiyetlerin verilmesini lüzumlu görüyoruz.

MADDE 107 — Memleketin sıhî durumunu iyileştirmek; bilhassa çocuk ölümünü azaltmak için lüzumlu tedbirlerin alınması hedeflerimizden biri olacaktır. Bu gayeye erişilmek için halkın ihtiyacını karşılayacak surette şehir ve kasabalardaki hastane noksanlarının ikmâlîne çalışılacak, doğum evleri islâh ve tevsi edilecek ve hükûmetle mahallî idarelere ait hastaneler fakir halk için bedelsiz açık tutulacaktır.

MADDE 108 — İllerin mümkün olan yerlerinde sanatoryomla preventoryom tesis edilecektir.

MADDE 109 — Köylerin sıhî durumlarıyla meşgul olmak üzere mümkün olan bucaklarda bir hekim bulundurmayı ve küçük bir eczane ile dispanserler açmayı lüzumlu görmekteyiz. Buna imkân bulunmayan bucaklarda hiç değilse birer küçük sıhîye memuru ile birer ebe çalıştırmayı ihmal edilmeyecek bir zaruret olarak kabul etmekteyiz.

MADDE 110 — Verem, frengi, trahom, sıtma ve bu gibi hastalıklarla mücadele teşkilâtı tevsi ve takviye edilecektir.

MADDE 111 — Kimsesiz ve yoksul çocuklara cemiyet yardım kollarını açmalı ve onların istidat ve kabiliyetlerine göre tahsil ve terbiyelerine yardım etmelidir.

MADDE 112 — Partimiz, memlekette fuhuş, kumar, sefalet, serserilik ve dilencilikle mücadeleyi kendisine bir borç bilir.

MADDE 113 — Dışarıdan gelen göçmenlerin memlekette yerleştirilmesi hususunda, sefaletlerine meydan vermeden itiyat ve kabiliyetleri ve yurdun millî ihtiyaç ve savunma zarureti bakımından hem vatanın, hem de göçmenlerin menfaatine en uygun bir usulün temin ve tatbikini istiyoruz.

MADDE 114 — Yurdumuzda her medeni ve içtimai faaliyetin hayırlı ve tam neticeler verebilmesi için çok esaslı bir iskân ve imâr plânı tatbikini lüzumlu görmekteyiz.

X

Kalkınma İşleri

MADDE 115 — Millî istihsal kuvvetlerini uyandırmak ve çoğaltmak, milletin daimi menfaatından ilham alan bir harici ticaret siyaseti takip et-

mek, hususi teşebbüsleri teşvik ve bilhassa fertleri ekonomi hayatında kendilerine düşen işleri görmeğe hazırlamak gibi şekillerde devletin iktisadi faaliyete tanzimci olarak karışmasını caiz görmekteyiz.

MADDE 116 — Milletimizin en büyük ve en çok ihmal edilmiş kütlesini teşkil eden köylülümüzün bir an önce kalkınmasını milli refah ve içtimai adaletin icabı sayıyoruz. Bu sebeple kanunlarımızda bilhassa köylü ve işçilerimizin medeniyet seviyesini yükseltmek, istihallerini artıracak ve değerlendirecek bütün tedbirleri almak, hak ve menfaatlerini korumak en mühim dâvalarımızdan biri olacaktır.

Köylü ve çiftçinin kendisine ve ailesine yetecek toprağa ve onu işletecek vasıtalara sahip olması hedeflerimizden biridir.

Bu maksatları temin için bilhassa aşağıdaki maddelerde gösterilen tedbirlerin alınmasını lüzumlu görüyoruz:

a) En Kısa zamanda devlet topraklarını topraksız veya toprağı yetmeyen çiftçiye en uygun şartlar altında dağıtmak ve bu işe adalet kaidelerini bozmadan aşırı büyük arazileri satın alarak devam etmek.

b) Umumi ahkâma göre toprak satın almak isteyen çiftçiye kolaylık göstermek.

c) Sulama işlerine önem vermek ve suların zararlarını önleyecek tedbirler almak.

d) Sıhhi ve ucuz köy evleri yapılmasını sağlayacak tedbirler almak.

e) Köy yollarının ana yollara biran evvel bağlanmasını temin etmek.

f) Zirai sigortaların kurulmasını teşvik ve temin eylemek.

g) Ziraat Bankasının sermayesini artırmak ve çiftçiye daha faydalı olmasını sağlamak.

h) Çiftçinin muhtaç olduğu ziraat alet ve makinalarını en kısa zamanda temin ederek maliyeti ucuz ve bol mahsul elde etmesini sağlamak. Münaşip yerlerde bu alet ve makinaları hiç değilse tamir edecek atelyelerin vücuda getirilmesini teşvik etmek.

i) Çiftçinin muhtaç olduğu hayvanları kolay ve ucuz tedarik edebilmesi için memleketin hayvancılık politikasını buna göre düzenlemek.

1) Tarım bölgelerinin hususiyetlerine göre gerekli tarım deneme, islah ve üretme istasyonları açarak çiftçinin muhtaç olduğu her türlü hububat ve yem nebatları tohumları tedarik etmek ve bu müesseselerle çiftçinin ziraat bilgisini kuvvetlendirmek.

k) Memleketin zirai mahsullerini kıymetlendiren ve çiftçinin kalkınmasını sağlayan ziraat sanatlarını memleket sanayiinin ön plânında tutmak ve bu işte kooperatifçilikten de faydalanmak.

MADDE 117 — Memlekette sanayiciliğin inkişafı ziraat aleyhinde bir istikamet almamalıdır.

MADDE 118 — Tarım işlerinin mahalli hususiyetleri üzerinde fikir ve mütalâa beyan ve rehberlik etmek ve halkın ziraat bilgisini çoğaltmak için kurulan ziraat odalarının yetkileri artırılmalı ve bu odalar işler bir hale getirilmelidir.

MADDE 119 — Memlekette veteriner teşkilâtını mevcut hayvanları sıhhi mürakabe altında bulundurarak salgın ve bulaşık hayvan hastalıklarıyla ciddi surette mücadele edecek; at, sığır, koyun ve keçi gibi hayvan neslinin islah ve teksirine yardım eyleyecek ve hayvan sağlığını korumak için tesisi faydalı olan kursların idaresini temin edecek bir hale getirmeyi zaruri görmekteyiz.

MADDE 120 — Her iş ve meslek için ucuz kredi sağlayacak müesseselerin vücut bulmasını teşvik etmek ve kolaylaştırmak kararındayız.

MADDE 121 — İşçinin grev yapmak hakkını kabul ediyoruz. Ancak bu hak işçi ile iş veren arasındaki mukaveleleri ve diğer işçilerin çalışma hakkını ihlâl edemez. Grevler hususi bir kanunla tanzim edilmelidir.

MADDE 122 — Ekonomimizin çabuk gelişmesi için kooperatiflerin her türlü siyasi tesirlerden kurtularak çoğalmasını en müessir vasıtalarından sayıyoruz.

MADDE 123 — Memleket sanayiinin gelişmesi için bilhassa ham maddesi yurttan bulunan sanayi teşviki lüzumuna inanan parti, bu sahada gümrük himayesini zaruri görür. Bununla birlikte bu himayenin sanayicileri eski usullerle ve az çalışarak aşırı kazanç sağlamak ve füzuli bir pahalılığa sebep olmak yoluna sevk etmeyecek ölçüde olmasını isteriz.

MADDE 124 — Yabancı memleketlerden getirilecek olan her türlü ulaştırma vasıtaları (Binek otomobilleri ve emsalleri hariç) ile memlekette temini kabil olmayan ziraat ve sanayi alet ve makineleri ve memleket iktisadiyatında müessir olan iptidai ve ham maddeler ile makine, kitap, tıbbi ecza ve levazım, matbaa alet ve edevatı gibi maddelerin gümrük resimleri ile muamele vergileri asgari hadde indirilmelidir.

MADDE 125 — Küçük sanat erbabının himayesini ve bilhassa iptidai maddeleri memlekette yetişen sanayiinin ve ev tezgâhlarının teşvikini istiyoruz.

MADDE 126 — Parti, ta çıraklık ve öğrenme devrinden ihtiyarlık ve emeklilik devrine kadar şuurulu ve düzenli bir işçi siyasetinin tesbit ve tatbikini ve imkân dairesinde bütün ihtimalleri karşılayan bir işçi sigorta usulünün ihdasını ve tekemmül ettirilmesini ön plânda tutar.

MADDE 127 — Parti, yurdumuzun çabuk kalkınması için yerli sermayelerin kifayet etmeyeceğini takdir eder. Bu bakımdan faydalı büyük işlede kullanılmak üzere yabancı sermayenin memlekette karşılıklı bir güven içinde çalışmasının teminini lüzumlu görür.

MADDE 128 — Yurtta belediye hudutları içinde ve dışında ulaştırma ve taşıma vasıtalarının hususi teşebbüslere bırakılmasını ve hükümet ve belediyelerin daha ziyade mürakabe vazifesi görmesini tercih ediyoruz.

MADDE 129 — Emniyet ve istikrarı Ticarî hayatın zaruri bir şartı saymaktayız. Sun'î tedbirlerle tesisine çalışılan ticari muvazeneğe, devletin lüzumsuz müdahalelerine ve meşru rekabeti ihlâl eden bütün hareketlere aleyhtarız.

MADDE 130 — Deniz mahsulleri istihsal ve ticaretine taalluk eden teşebbüslerin gelişmesi için icabeden bütün tedbirlerin alınmasına ve bu teşebbüslerin teşvikine önem verilecektir.

XI

Orman İşleri

MADDE 131 — Orman işlerinde düsturumuz ormanın ve gelirinin sahibine, verginin hazineye, işletmenin hususî teşebbüse ve mürakabenin devlete ait olmasıdır.

MADDE 132 — Devlet ormanları yalnız sahipsiz ormanlara hasredilmeli; evvelce eşhasa ait olanlar sahiplerine iade edilmeli ve kamulaştırma yüzünden vukua gelen zararlar adilâne tazmin olunmalıdır.

Millî ormanlar genişletilmeli ve eşhas tarafından yetiştirilmiş ve yetiştirilecek olan ormanlara bilhassa önem verilmeli ve bu nevi teşebbüsler teşvik edilmelidir.

MADDE 133 — Baltalıklar öteden beri onlardan faydalanan köylerin mânevi şahsiyetine mal edilmelidir.

MADDE 134 — Devlet ormanlarının muhafazası mahallî idarelere, işletmeleri de devlet mürakabesi altında hususî teşebbüslere bırakılmalı; ve yeri kalmayan bugünkü işletme teşkilâtı tasfiye edilmelidir.

MADDE 135 — Ormanlarda devlet mürakabesinin şekil ve tatbik tarzı ile bunların muhafazasını sağlayacak hususi kanunların millet menfaatinde en uygun şekilde tanzimini istiyoruz.

MADDE 136 — Baltalıkların köylü için haiz oldukları hayatî önemi

gözönünde tutan partimiz bunlardan istifade tarzının aşağıdaki şekilde tesbitini zaruri görmektedir:

a) Baltalıklarda tesbit edilecek maktaların köylülerin ihtiyacına göre taksim ve tefriki köy ihtiyar heyetlerinin mürakabesi altında ve kendi aralarında yapılmalıdır.

b) Baltalıklarda toprağın kuvvetine göre 10-20 seneye ayrılmış kesme plânları yapılarak köy odalarına evvelden asılmış ve ilân edilmiş bulunmalıdır.

c) Baltalıklar için makul ve muhik şekilde her sene tesbit edilecek rusum, köy ihtiyar heyetleri tarafından istifade edeceklere adilâne taksim edilerek kesim mevsiminden önce, muhtarlarca gereken memurlara makbuz mukabilinde teslim edilmelidir.

d) Baltalıklardan alınacak mahsulün kullanılma tarzına devletçe müdahale edilmemelidir.

XI

Orman İşleri

MADDE 131 — Orman işlerinde düsturunun ormanın ve gelişiminin hazineye işletme ve mülkiyetine nispeten tesbiti ve mülkiyetinin devlete ait olmasıdır.

MADDE 132 — Devlet ormanları ve diğer ormanlar hakkında Millî Ormanlar Kanununda ve diğer kanunlarda hükümler geçerlidir. Millî ormanlar geliştirilmeli ve eşas tarımdan yetiştirilmeli ve yetiştirilecek olan ormanlara bütçesiz olarak ve bu nevi teşebbüsler teşvik edilmelidir.

MADDE 133 — Baltalıklar ödenen benî olanların faydalanma köylülerin mânevî şahsiyetine mal edilmelidir.

MADDE 134 — Devlet ormanlarının mülkiyeti mahallî idarelere, işletmeler ve devlet mülkiyetinde bulunan şahsiyetlere bırakılmamalı ve yeni kazanılan bu tür işleri teşvik etmeye teşvik edilmelidir.

MADDE 135 — Ormanlarda devlet mülkiyetinin şekli ve tatbiki tarzı ile bunların mülkiyetini sağlayacak mahallî kurumların millîyet mezasına en uygun şekilde teşkilatlandırılması teşvik edilir.

MADDE 136 — Baltalıklarda köylü için hazine odakları hayati önemi

T Ü Z Ü K

I İsim ve Maksat

MADDE 1 — Partinin adı (MILLET PARTİSİ) dir. Merkezi Ankara'dır.

Yurdun lüzum görülen yerlerinde Tüzükde yazılı teşkilât kademeleri olacaktır.

MADDE 2 — Partinin maksat ve gayesi programına uygun şekilde millet ve memlekete hizmettir.

Teşkilât II

Üyeler

MADDE 3 — Partiye girebilmek için:

- Türk milletinin istiklâlini ve vatan bütünlüğünü parçalamayı hedef tutan veya demokrasi esasına uymayan ideolojilere saplanmamış ve komünist olarak tanınmamış olmak .
- Şeref ve haysiyet kırıcı, insan haklarını çiğneyici bir suç yüzünden hapis cezasıyla mahkûm ve kötü şöhrete sahip bulunmamak.
- Türk kültürünü ve partinin program ve tüzüğünü kabul etmek.
- Millet vekili seçmek hakkına malik olmak şarttır.

MADDE 4 — Partiye girmek isteyenler iki partili tarafından talibin ikametgâhının bulunduğu yerdeki teşkilâta tanıtılır.

MADDE 5 — Tanıtmayı yapan partililer talibin üçüncü maddede yazılı şartları haiz olduğuna kefalet etmiş mevkiindedirler.

MADDE 6 — Partiye kaydolmak isteyen yurttaş program ve tüzük

hükümlerini kabul ettiğine ve senede 120 lirayı geçmemek üzere muayyen bir aidat vereceğine dair bir taahhütname itasına mecburdur.

Kayıtlar müracaat edilen Ocak kararı, Bucak veya ilçe yürütme Kurullarının tasvibiyle tekemmül eder. İntisap eden şahısların hüviyeti kaydedildiği mahal ile Bucak ve İlçe kütüğüne yazılır.

MADDE 7 — Talebi kabul veya Bucak ve İlçe kurullarınca tasvip olunmayanların İl yürütme Kuruluna müracaat ederek itiraz etmeye selâhiyeti vardır. İl Kurullarının verecekleri karar katidir.

Girmek şartlarını haiz olmadıkları halde kaydedilenler inzibat divanı kararıyla partiden çıkarılır. Bu karar katidir.

MADDE 8 — Başka siyasî teşekküllere intisabı dolayısıyla hükümet teşkilâtının üst tabakalarında vazife almış ve o teşekkülleri temsilen Millet Meclisinde, İl ve İl Belediye Kurullarında çalışmış veyahut partilerin genel ve İl yürütme kurullarında faal bir vazife kabul etmiş olanların, partiye kayıt ve kabulü İl yürütme kurullarının tasvibine bağlıdır. Bu kurullar tereddüde düşerlerse genel yürütme kurulunun mütalâasına müracaat ederler. Bu hususta verilecek İl kararı menfi mahiyette olursa talibin Genel yürütme Kuruluna müracaatla itiraza hakkı vardır.

III

Teşkilât

MADDE 9 — Partinin selâhiyetli uzuvları şunlardır:

- A) Kademelerin yürütme kurulları.
- B) Bunların kongreleri.
- C) İl ve Genel İnzibat Divanları.
- D) Genel Yürütme Kurulu.
- E) Büyük Kongre.

Bunlardan başka Parti Meclîş Gurubunun da ayrı bir yürütme kurulu ile inzibat divanı vardır.

MADDE 10 — Parti teşkilâtı idarî taksimata tâbi değildir. Lüzum görülen yerlerde Genel Kurul münasip gördüğü kademe teşkilâtını kurabilir. Ancak Bucaklara tâbi olacak Ocak Teşkilâtının tesiri ilçe yürütme kurullarının tasvibine bağlıdır.

IV

Yürütme Kurulları

MADDE 11 — Her Yürütme Kurulu kendi kongresi tarafından gizli

oyla seçilir. Bu kurul Heyetleri Ocaklarda üç kişidir. Bucaklarda üçten az ve beşten fazla, ilçelerde beşten az ve yediden fazla, illerde yediden az ve dokuzdan fazla, Genel Yürütme Kurulunda da dokuzdan eksik ve onbeşten ziyade olamaz. Bu hadler dahilinde miktarların azaltılıp çoğaltılması kendi kongrelerinin ve acele hallerde de üst yürütme kurullarının tasvibi ile mümkündür.

MADDE 12 — Teşkil edilen her kurul, ilk toplantısında gizli oyla aralarından birini Başkan, birini başkan vekili, birini kâtip ve birini de muhasip seçerek keyfiyeti karar defterinde tesbit ettikten sonra tasdikli suretini üst kademe kuruluna yollar. Adedi müsait olmayan kurullarda kâtiplik vazifesi Başkan vekili tarafından görülür.

Genel Yürütme Kurulu kendi üyeleri arasından bir genel başkan vekili, bir genel sekreter ve bir muhasip seçer.

MADDE 13 — Yürütme Kurullarının vazifeleri gelecek kongreye kadar sürer. Üyelerin tekrar seçilmesi caizdir. Yürütme Kurullarının Başkanları ilk kongreden sonra, bir devre geçmedikçe yeniden Başkan seçilemezler. Nesebî birinci ve ikinci derecede olanlar aynı yürütme kurulunda birleşemezler.

MADDE 14 — Ocaklarda 10, Bucaklarda 25, İlçelerde 50, İllerde 100 ve Genel Kurulda 200 liradan fazla sarfiyatın Kurul kararıyla yapılması lâzımdır. Her teşekkülün borçlarından dolayı Yürütme Kurulu heyetleri partiye karşı müteselsilen mesuldür. Parti namına dâva açmak İl kurullarının tasvibiyle mümkündür.

MADDE 15 — Her Yürütme Kurulu en az haftada bir gün heyetin çokluğu ile toplanır. Ve kararlar mevcudun ekseriyetiyle verilir. Her kararın karar defterine geçirilerek onu verenlerin imzalarıyla tevsik edilmesi mecburidir.

MADDE 16 — Kongre, Yürütme Kurulları için, muayyen miktarın bir mislini de yedek üye olarak seçer. Herhangi bir suretle vazifeden ayrılmış olan üye yerine bu yedeklerden en çok oy almış olan getirilir. Bu suretle ikmal kabil olmazsa o kademenin delegeleri tekrar ve derhal toplanarak hasıl olan noksanı doldururlar.

MADDE 17 — Yürütme Kurullarının mutad üç toplantısında arka arkaya bulunmayan ve mazeretini de bildirmiyen kimse istifa etmiş sayılarak yerine yedek azadan biri getirilir. Kuruldan ayrılan üye, vazife sahiplerinden biri ise heyet arasında tekrar yapılacak gizli seçimde en çok oy alan üye bu vazifeye geçirilir.

MADDE 18 — Her Yürütme Kurulu her şeyden evvel mensupları arasında sevgiyi artırmağa, geçimsizliği önlemeğe, teşkilâtı azamî surette genişletip kuvvetlendirmeye, yapacağı toplantılarla partililer arasında program ve prensiplerimizi izah ederek partiye bağlılıklarını çoğaltmağa, eline

geçen her fırsattan istifade ile tertip edeceği konferans ve mitinglerle halkın partiye karşı güvenini tezyide, program ve tüzük ile karar ve talimatnamelerin muktezasını yerine getirmeğe, partililerin inzibat cezasını istilzam eden hareketlerinden dolayı takibat yapılmak üzere şikâyetle bulunmağa, seçimlerde parti namına aday gösterilmesi memlekete faydalı görülenler hakkında gerek doğrudan doğruya ve gerek üst kademenin sorması üzerine mütalâa ve kanaatlarını vakit geçirmeden bildirmeğe, parti teşkilâtı arasında samimi yardım ve faaliyeti temine, kongrelerin kararlarını tathika, kabul edilen dilekleri yetkisi dahilinde olanları icra ve olumyanları üst kademe Yürütme Kurullarına ve ilgili makamlara iblağa, üst kurullardan kendilerine sorulan hususları vakit geçirmeden cevaplandırmağa, muvassal faaliyet raporlarıyla bütçe, bilânço ve hesap hülâsalarını kongreye yetiştirmeye mecburdur.

Her Yürütme Kurulu kendisine bağlı kurullar üzerinde teftiş ve mürakabe selâhiyetini haizdir. Tüzük ve programa aykırı olmamak şartıyla bunların mesai tarzlarını tayin edebilir.

Yürütme kurularının hesaplarının teftişi ve mürakabesi parti müfettişleriyle üst yürütme kurulları tarafından yapılır.

MADDE 19 — Bunlardan başka Genel Yürütme Kurulu aşağıdaki görevlerle de mükelleftir:

a) Parti program ve tüzüğünün tatbiki, mesai tarzının tanzimi, ihtisas komisyon ve büroları teşkili ve genel sekreterle müfettişlerin vazife ve selâhiyetlerinin tesbiti gibi faydalı gördüğü şeylere dair talimatnameler yapmak.

b) Büyük kongre mukarreratına, program ve tüzük hükümlerine uygun şekilde bütün teşkilâtı idare etmek.

c) Lüzum gördüğü İl veya İlçelerde teşkilât kurmak.

d) İl Yürütme Kurulları ve İnzibat Divanları seçimlerini tetkik ederek tüzük hükmüne aykırı olduğu anlaşılanları mucip sebebi gösterilmek şartıyla feshederek yenilenmesini mahallerine bildirmek.

e) Teşkilâtın bütün muamelelerini teftiş ettirmek, uygunsuz olanları islâh ettirmek ve inzibat cezasını mucip görülenleri ait olduğu divanâ sevk ettirmek.

f) İstişari mahiyette olmak üzere tayin edeceği şekilde illerden delegeler celbederek lüzum hasıl oldukça parti meselelerini — mesuliyeti kurula ait olmak şartıyla — tetkik ve müzakere etmek.

g) Lüzumu halinde bütçelere tahsisat ilâvesine, muayyen hususlara sarfedilmek üzere istikraz akdine karar ve selâhiyet vermek.

h) Cemiyetler kanununun kabul ettiği şartlara uygun tarzda, gayri menkul iktisap ve tasarrufu, devir ve ferağı için karar ve il kurullarına selâhiyet vermek.

i) Parti varidatını artırmak için faydalı tedbir ve çareleri arayıp bulmak.

1) Üç ayda bir partinin umumi faaliyeti ve muhtelif meseleler hakkında görüş ve düşünüşünü tamimlerle bildirerek teşkilâtı tenvir etmek ve tüzük ve programa uygun şekilde direktifler vermek.

k) Parti, tüzüğünün müphem ve tefsire muhtaç hükümlerini İl Yürütme Kurullarının göstereceği lüzum üzerine — yeni bir hüküm ifade etmek ve program ruhuna uygun olmak şartıyla — tefsir etmek.

l) Partinin hükümet ve diğer Partilerle olan münasebetlerinin şeklini tayin ve muayyen meselelerde parti görüşünü tesbit ve ilân etmek.

MADDE 20 — İl Genel Meclisi üyeliklerine seçilecek adaylar ilçe yürütme kurullarıyla bir arada yapılacak müzakere neticesinde, gizli oyla tefrik ve İl Yürütme Kurulları Başkanları tarafından ilâ olunur.

Belediyelere seçilecek üyeler, belediye hududu içinde bulunan Bucak, İlçe ve İl Yürütme Kurullarının üyelerinden teşekkül edecek müşterek heyetin ekseriyeti ve gizli oylarıyla verilecek karara göre yine İl Yürütme Kurulları Başkanları tarafından ilân olunur.

MADDE 21 — Millet Vekili adaylarının dörtte üçü mahalli teşkilât, dörtte biri de Genel Kurul tarafından tesbit edilir. Aday hesaplarındaki kesirler Genel Kurul lehine vahide iblağ olunur.

Mahallî teşkilâta bırakılan kısmın tesbiti Bucak Başkanlarıyla İl ve İlçe Yürütme Kurul üyelerinin bir arada toplanmasıyla teşekkül edecek aday meclisinde gizli oy ile seçilerek yapılır.

Her adayın kazandığı oy miktarını göstermek suretiyle netice bir tutanakla tesbit edilerek Genel Kurula bildirilir.

Genel Yürütme Kuruluna bırakılan dörtte bir kısım bu kurulca gizli oyla tesbit olunarak illerden gelen listelere ilâve edilir. Bu suretle tekemmül etmiş olan umumi aday listesi Genel Kurulca münasip vasıtalarla yurdun her tarafında ilân edileceği gibi her ile ait adaylar da mahallerine bildirilir.

MADDE 22 — Genel Yürütme Kurulu icabında Ankara'dan başka bir şehirde de toplanabilir.

MADDE 23 — Büyük kongre partiye bir fahri başkan seçebilir. Fahri başkan genel yürütme kuruluna dahil olduğu takdirde bu kurulun toplantılarına başkanlık ve parti namına neşir edilecek beyannameleri imza edebilir.

MADDE 24 — Genel Başkan veya genel sekreter Genel Yürütme Kurulunca alınmış olan kararlara dayanan beyannameleri imza eder.

MADDE 25 — Yürütme Kurulları cemiyetler kanununda yazılı defterleri muntazaman tutmağa mecburdurlar.

MADDE 26 — Yürütme Kurullarının tüzük hükmüne göre selâhiyetleri olmıyan hususlarda yapacakları tebligat muteber olmaz. Bu yolda hasıl olacak ihtilâf bir üst kademe Kurulunca hallolur.

İnzibat Divanları

MADDE 27 — Parti mensuplarının program ve tüzük hükümlerine uymayan hareketlerinden dolayı haklarında inzibat takibatı yapmak üzere partinin inzibat Divanları vardır. Bu Divanlar Genel İl ve Yürütme Kurullarının buldukları yerde vazife görürler. Bunlar illerde beş ve merkezde yedi üye mevcut olmadıkça vazife göremezler.

MADDE 28 — İnzibat Divanlarının üyeleri İl kongreleriyle büyük kongre tarafından mürettep miktarın iki misli (illerde 10 ve merkezde 14) olarak gizli oyla seçilir.

MADDE 29 — İnzibat Divanları kendilerine tevdi olunan her işin tetkikine başlamadan tekmil miktarın yarısından bir fazlasını kur'a ile ayırır. Bu fazla, yardımcı üye fazifesini görür ve mazereti halinde asıl üyenin vazifesini ifa eder. Heyette noksan bu suretle ikmal edilemezse tamamlayacak kadar üye ikinci kur'a ile seçilir.

MADDE 30 — Heyet teşekkül edince gizli oyla içlerinden birini Başkanlığa, diğerini de kâtipliğe seçer. Kura ve seçim keyfiyeti bir zabıtlarla tesbit olunarak dosyasına konulur.

MADDE 31 — İnzibat divanlarında program ve tüzük hükümleriyle Parti hukukunun müdafaa ve muhafazası (Savcılık vazifesi) o yürütme kurulunun Başkanına veya tevkil edeceği üyeye aittir. Aleyhine takibat yapılan kimse de partili bir arkadaşı kendi müdafaasına tevkil edebilir.

MADDE 32 — İnzibat Divanına bir hadisesin intikali için ya bir Partilinin veya Yürütme Kurullarından birinin yazılı şikâyetinde bulunması şarttır.

MADDE 33 — Ciddi delillere sahip olmadığı halde, partili bir arkadaş aleyhine kötü niyetle şikâyetinde bulunup ta isbat edemiyenler aleyhine muvazir şikâyetinde bulunmağa, hakkında fuzuli inzibat tahkikatı yapılan kimse ile İl Yürütme Kurulunun hakkı vardır.

MADDE 34 — İl Yürütme Kurulu ve İnzibat Divanı üyeleri hakkında açılacak inzibat tahkikatı genel inzibat divanına; ve Genel Yürütme Kurulu ve İnzibat Divanına dahil partililer hakkında da Büyük Kongreye aittir.

MADDE 35 — Savcılık vazifesini görecek Yürütme Kurulu Başkanı veya Vekili inzibat divanında isbatı vücut imkânını bulamadığı takdirde mazeretini divana bildirmeye ve yürütme kurulu da yerine başkasını ikameye mecburdur.

MADDE 36 — İnzibat divanlarına kura ile seçilen vazife sahiplerinin hüviyetleri bu divanca bir hafta içinde taraflara bildirilir. Alâkadarların beş gün zarfında muhik sebeplere istinaden bitarafılığı ihlâl edeceği tahmin edilen üyenin reddini istemeğe hakları vardır.

Böyle bir talep vukuunda aleyhine itirazda bulunulan üye veya üyelerin yerine tefrik haricinde kalan üyeler arasında kura ile ayrılacak yeter sayıda üye, red hakkında bir karar verilmeye kadar, ikame olunur. Red talebi haklı görülürse yeni seçilen üye veya üyeler esas, karara bağlanıncaya kadar vazifelerine devam ederler.

Red hakkında verilen karar ister müsbet ister menfi olsun kat'idir. İnzibat divanına kura ile seçilen üye vazifeye başlamadan evvel kendini reddetmek hakkına maliktir.

MADDE 37 — İnzibat tahkikatı, savcılık vazifesini gören zatın iddia namesi okunmakla başlar. Bundan sonra dâvalının hüviyeti tesbit edilir, ve hadise hakkında müdaffası dinlenir. Şahitler dinlenir, yazılı ve yazısız deliller tetkik olunur; bunlar hakkında alâkadarların diyecekleri anlaşılır. Tahkikatın genişletilmesi icap eden bir nokta kalmayınca savcının esas hakkındaki mütalâası dinlenir. Alâkadarların da, son diyecekleri anlaşıldıktan sonra tahkikatın hitamı anlatılır. Bundan sonra divan heyeti kendi aralarında keyfiyeti müzakere ile karara bağlar. Yapılan tahkikat yalnız davalıların aleyhinde değil, lehindeki delillerin de tetkikini istilzam eder. Gösterilecek müdafaa delilleri nazara alınmadan karar verilmesi caiz değildir.

MADDE 38 — İnzibat divanlarından verilen kararlar aleyhine tefhim tarihinden itibaren onbeş gün içinde savcılık vazifesini gören kimsenin ve bu kararın yazılı olarak kendilerine tebliğinden itibaren aynı müddet içinde de alâkadarların itiraza selâhiyetleri vardır.

İtiraznameler diğer tarafa tebliğ ve o kimse bir hafta zarfında cevap vermeğe davet olunur. Kat'i çıkarma kararları itiraz vaki olmasa bile, müddetin hitamını müteakip, vakit geçirilmeden itiraz merciine sevk olunur. Bu mercilerin verecekleri karar kat'i dir. Diğer cezayı ihtiva eden kararlara müddeti bittikten sonra itiraz edilemez.

MADDE 39 — Katiyet kesbetmedikçe hiç bir karar infaz olunamaz. Ancak işin İnzibat Divanına tevdiinden evvel İl Yürütme Kurulları tarafından, ihtiyatî bir tedbir olarak, hüküm sonuna kadar parti işlerinden muvakkaten ayrılma kararı verilebilir. Evrakın tevdiinden sonra bu tedbiri almaya İnzibat Divanları de selâhiyetlidir. Bu karar aleyhine itiraz edilemez.

MADDE 40 — İnzibat divanlarının verecekleri kararın itiraz mercii, bu hüküm İl divanınca verilmiş ise genel inzibat divanı, genel inzibat divanından sadır olmuşsa büyük kongredir.

MADDE 41 — İnzibatî takibat, buna sebep olan fiilin ikâından itibaren bir sene geçtikten sonra zaman aşımına uğrar.

MADDE 42 — İnzibat cezaları: ihtar, geçici ve daimî çıkarma cezasıdır.

İhtar cezası, buna müstahak olan partiliye fiilinden dolayı nasihat ederek benzer hareketlerde bulunmaması için, yazı ile dikkat nazarını çekmekten ibarettir.

Geçici çıkarma cezası bir haftadan bir seneye kadardır.

Geçici çıkarma cezası, buna mahkûm olanın kararda yazılı müddet zarfında parti ile alâkasını kesmekten ibarettir. Bunlar, müddetin devamınca parti lokallerine giremezler.

Daimî çıkarma cezası, bu karara lâıyk görülen kimsenin hayatı müddetince parti ile alâkasını kesmekten ibarettir. Bu cezaya müstahak olanlar memleketin hiç bir yerinde parti lokallerine giremezler; ve partinin hiç bir teşkilâtına tekrar kaydolunamazlar.

MADDE 43 — Bütün cezalar, buna mahkûm olan şahsın kayıtlı olduğu teşekkülün kütüğüne kaydolunur. Geçici çıkarma cezaları, İl Yürütme Kurulu Başkanı tarafından kendisine bağlı teşkilâta, daimî çıkarma cezası da, genel merkez tarafından bütün teşkilâta tamimen bildirilir.

MADDE 44 — Başka parti ve teşekküller nam ve hesabına çalışanlar, parti tesanüdünü ve muvaffakiyetini ihlâl edecek surette fesad hareketine kalkanlar, parti namına gösterilen adaydan başkasına oy veren, oy toplıyan ve parti adayı aleyhine halk yanında propaganda yapan daimî olarak partiden çıkarılır.

Partiye intisap için muayyen şartları kaybedenler hakkında da bu ceza verilir.

VI

Başkanlar

MADDE 45 — Partinin herhangi bir kademesindeki başkanın, hak hususunda diğer mensuplardan farkı yoktur. Ancak vazife bakımından kendilerine ait hususi yetkileri bulunur .

MADDE 46 — Başkanlar buldukları kademenin çevresi dahilinde partiyi temsil eder.

MADDE 47 — Partinin resmi sözcüleri, genel yürütme kurulu üyesi bulunduğu takdirde fahri Başkanla Genel Yürütme Kurulu Başkanı, Başkan Vekili, genel sekreter ve bu kurulun seçeceği sözcülerdir. Yalnız bu

sözcülerin beyanatı partiyi ilzam eder. İllere taalluk eden hususlarda il yürütme kurulu başkanı veya kurulun seçeceği kimse sözcülük vazifesini görür.

MADDE 48 — Bağlı buldukları üst ve kendilerine bağlı alt kademe ile muhabere ve evraka imza vaz'ı Başkan veya vekiline ve genel sekretere aittir.

MADDE 49 — Her başkan imzasını taşıyan evrak ve yaptığı her muameleden dolayı mesuliyeti kabul etmiş mevkiindedir.

MADDE 50 — Parti, sözcülerinin partiye izafe etmedikleri makale ve beyanatları şahsi addolunur.

VII

Kongreler

MADDE 51 — Kongrelerin toplanma zamanı mevsim ve iklim şartlarına göre illerin Yürütme Kurulları tarafından tayin edilerek vaktinden bir ay evvel Genel Yürütme Kurulu ile alt kademe teşkilâtlarına bildirilir. Bu kongreler, büyük kongrenin yapılma tarihi olan Mayıs ayna kadar vazifelerini bitirmiş olmalıdır.

MADDE 52 — Ocak kongreleri ocağa kayıtlı üyelerin umumundan terekküp eder. Bu üyelerin yüze kadar olan miktarı için üç, bundan yukarı her elli üye için de birer delege seçerek onlar vasıtasıyla Bucak kongrelerine iştirak ederler. Ocağı olmıyan Bucaklar da birer Ocak addolunurlar.

MADDE 53 — Bucak kongreleri kendi delegeleri adedinin yarısı kadar üye seçerek bunlarla ilçe kongrelerinde kendilerini temsil ettirirler. Ocağı olmıyan bucaklar da kendisine kayıtlı üyelerin yüze kadar olan kısmı için iki, bundan fazla her yüz üye için de birer delege seçerek doğrudan doğruya İlçe kongrelerine iştirak ederler.

Bucağı olmıyan ocaklar kendi mevcutlarının yüze kadar olanı için bir, ve bundan yukarı her yüz ve küsuru için birer delege seçerek ilçe kongresine gönderirler.

MADDE 54 — İlçe kongreleri, kendi delegelerinin üçte biri, İl kongreleri de mevcut delegelerin beşte biri nisbetinde delege seçerek üst kademe kongrelerine iştiraki bunlarla temin ederler. Mürettep adetten fazla olan her küsur birer iblağ olunur.

MADDE 55 — Seçilecek delegelerin mutlaka seçen kongreye iştirak edenlerden olması icabetmez. Kongresini yapan Kurula dahil bir Ocakta kayıtlı bulunması yeter.

Kongrelerde bir vazife alabilmek veya teşkilâta her hangi bir vazifeye seçilmek için de o kongrenin delegesi olmak şart değildir. Yalnız seçileceği teşekküle bağlı bir Ocak veya Bucakta kayıtlı olması kifayet eder.

MADDE 56 — Her kongre tayin edeceği delegenin bir misli kadar da yedek delege seçer. Bu yedekler mazeretleri dolayısıyla kongrelere geleme-yecek delegeler yerine kaim olur. Fakat bu hal asıl delegelerin mazeretleri olmadan iştirak etmemeleri için kendilerine bir hak vermez.

MADDE 57 — Her Partili, hüviyet varakasını göstermek şartıyla — her kademe kongresinde ziyaretçilere tahsis olunan yerde bulunabilir. Fakat bunlar münakaşa ve müzakerelere iştirak edemezler.

Kongrenin yapıldığı kademenin Yürütme Kurulu üyelerinin oya iştirake hakları yoktur. Ancak alt kademe kongresinden delege seçilmişlerse rapor ve hesapların tetkik ve münakaşası bittikten sonra oy vermek hakkına malik olabilirler.

MADDE 58 — Herhangi bir üyenin kongrelere iştirak edebilmesi için aidat borcunu tamamen tediye etmiş bulunması lâzımdır.

MADDE 59 — Meclis Gurubu de mevcudunun üçte biri nisbetinde de-lege seçerek büyük kongreye iştirak eder.

MADDE 60 — Kongrelerin toplantı mahal ve zamanı, müzakere olu-nacak hususlarla birlikte yürütme kurulları kararıyla başkan tarafından vaktinden en aşağı yedi gün evvel ilân ve alt kademe başkanı vasıtasıyla delegelere bildirilmelidir.

MADDE 61 — Kongre, yürütme kurullarının, başkanı, bulunmazsa vekili tarafından yapılacak yoklama ile delegelerin en aşağı yarısı bulundu-ğu anlaşıldıktan sonra açılır. Muayyen günde bu nisap hasıl olmazsa topları ertesi günün aynı saatine bırakılarak mevcut ile faaliyete başlar.

Yoklama, yalnız mevcudun adedini tayin için değil, seçilen delegelerin tüzük hükümlerine uygun şekilde intihap edilip edilmediğinin de tesbitine şamildir. Bir alt kademenin kongresinde seçim için bir yolsuzluk iddia edilmiş bulunursa kongre mesaisine başlamadan evvel bu ciheti seçeceği bir komisyon vasıtasıyla tetkik ettirdikten sonra karara bağlar. Aleyhine itiraz olunanların müdafaa hakkı olmakla beraber bu husustaki reye iştirak ede-mezler.

İtiraz kongrece kabul edilirse usulsüz seçildiği anlaşılan üyeler mü-rahhaslar arasından çekilirler ve onlara ait intihabın yenilenmesi bekle-nilmeden işlere devam olunur.

MADDE 62 — Kongrelerde her seçim mutlâka gizli oyla yapılır. Gün-demin konuşulmasına geçilmeden evvel faaliyetin intizamını temin etmek için bir başkan, bir başkan vekili ve lüzumu kadar kâtip seçilir. Büyük

kongrede başkan vekili ikidir. Kongrelerde başkanlık divanının işari oyla seçilmesi caizdir.

MADDE 63 — Seçimlerin hepsinde delegelerin gösterecekleri divan adaylarının mutlaka delege olması icap etmez. Ancak delegeler dışında seçilenler oy sahibi olamazlar.

MADDE 64 — Her kongrenin gündemi o teşekkülün yürütme kurulu tarafından tertip olunur. Fakat alelâde kongrelerde delegeler kendi gündemlerine hakimdirler. Mevcudun çokluğu ile gündemi tadile, başka maddeler ilâvesine ve sıralarını değiştirmeye selâhiyetleri vardır. İşlerini kolaylaştırmak için içlerinden lüzumu kadar komisyon teşkil edebilirler.

MADDE 65 — Her kongrede üst kademe için seçilen delegelerin isim ve adresleri kongre başkanı tarafından derhal yukarı kademenin idare kurulu başkanına yazı ile bildirilir ve seçilen delegelere de birer vesika verilir.

MADDE 66 — Yoklama bittikten sonra kongre zamanındaki yürütme kurulu evvelki devreye ait faaliyet raporu ile bilânço ve bütçesini kongrenin tasvibine arzeder.

Bundan sonra gündemin diğer maddelerine geçerek partinin mahallî hareket ve faaliyetini inceler, alt kademe kongreleriyle kendi delegelerinin dileklerini tetkik ederek selâhiyeti dahilinde olanları kendisi hal ve olmayanları üst kademelere arz edilmek üzere oranın yürütme kuruluna tevdi eyler. Kendi idaresine bağlı teşekküllerin yürütme kurulları heyetinin, on birinci maddede muayyen hududu aşmamak üzere, arttırılıp eksiltmesini, teşkilâtın genişletilip daraltılmasını karara bağlar, üst kademe teşkilâtına yapılacak nakdi yardım miktarını tayin eder, varidatı arttırmak ve aidat tahsilâtını tanzim etmek için icap eden tedbirleri arar ve bulur, parti faaliyetinden azami fayda temin edebilmek için tatbik edilmesi icap eden çareleri düşünür.

Her kongre üst kongreye gönderilecek delegeleri ile kendi yürütme kurulunun üyelerini bir misli yedekle beraber seçer ve faaliyetine son verir.

MADDE 67 — İl kongreleri bittikten sonra genel yürütme kurulu en uygun zamanı — mayısı geçmemek üzere — tayin ederek vaktinden en az bir ay evvel Büyük Kongrenin yerini gündemi ile birlikte il yürütme kurullarına bildirir.

MADDE 68 — Büyük Kongrede genel başkan ve genel yürütme kuruluna dahil üyelerin diğer kongrelerden farklı bir selâhiyeti yoktur. Bu kongreye seçilecek delegelerin kendini seçen il teşkilâtına dahil üyelerden olması lâzımdır.

MADDE 69 — Büyük Kongrenin mesai tarzı diğer kongrelerinki gibidir. Ancak partinin en yüksek organ ve hakimi, adetâ teşrii kuvveti ol-

masına göre partiyi ilgilendiren her şeyi incelemek yetkisine maliktir. Genel yürütme kurulunun hesaplarına bakar, bütçesini tetkik ve muvafık görürse tasdik eder, partinin biten sene zarfındaki faaliyetine dair genel yürütme kurulunun tanzim edeceği tafsilli raporu dinler, icap ediyorsa tenkit eder, parti ve memleketin hayrına faydalı bulduğu direktifleri verir. Partinin umumî faaliyetinde gördüğü hata ve aksaklıkları göstererek islâhî çarelerini tavsiye eder, itirazen tetkiki kendine ait olan genel inzibat divanının kararları ile doğrudan doğruya kendi bakacağı inzibat işlerini tetkik ve muktazasını tayin eder. Genel başkanı ve yürütme kurulu için mürettep üye miktarının iki misli ile genel inzibat divanının 14 üyesini seçer.

Genel başkan bir seçim devresi geçmeden tekrar seçilemez. Genel başkanlık inhilal ederse kongreye kadar vazifesi başkan vekili tarafından yapılır.

MADDE 70 — Genel Yürütme kurulunun verdiği karar veya mevcut delegeler yekûnunun beşte birinin ileri sürdüğü talep ile tüzük ve programın tadili Büyük kongreden istenebilir. Ancak tâdilâtın yapılması Tüzükte beşte üç ve programda üçte iki nisbetinde ekseriyetle mümkündür. Programdaki ana prensiplerin tadili teklif olunabilmek için delege mevcudunun üçte ikisi tarafından istenmesi ve beşte dördü tarafından karar verilmesi lâzımdır.

MADDE 71 — Fevkalâde hallerde büyük kongrenin vaktinden evvel de toplantıya daveti mümkündür. Ancak bu davet ya genel yürütme kurulunun veya tekmlil yürütme kurullarından dörtte birinin, yahut parti üyelerinin beşte birinin talebiyle yapılabilir.

Fevkalâde içtimalarda gündeme dahil olmayan maddeler müzakere olunamaz.

MADDE 72 — Her kongre delegelerinin müzakere mevzuuna dahil hususlar hakkında irad ettikleri nutuk ve ileri sürdükleri mütalâalardan dolayı haklarında inzibat takibatı yapılamaz. Ancak kongre başkanının mevzu ile ilgili görmediği sözleri kesmeğe ve nezaket dahilinde müzakerenin devamını temin edecek tedbirler almağa yetkisi olduğu gibi bunlara riayet etmiyenleri o celsedeki delegelerin çokluk kararı ile dışarı çıkarmağa da selâhiyeti vardır.

MADDE 73 — Her oturumun tutanak hülâsası ertesi toplantıda, son celsenin tutanak hülâsası da kongrenin sonunda okunarak başkanlık divanı tarafından imza ile tevsik edilir.

VIII

Mâli Hükümler

MADDE 74 — Partinin gelirleri şunlardır:

a) Senede 120 lirayı geçmemek üzere üyelerin verecekleri aidat.

b) Partiye yapılacak bağışlar.

c) Genel Yürütme Kurulunun tertip edeceği piyangolarla İl Yürütme Kurullarının tasvibiyle yapılacak müsamereler hasılatı.

MADDE 75 — Hiçbir Kurul gündelik ihtiyacından fazla parayı yanında bulundurmaz. Bu paralar, mevcut olan yerlerde, Bankaların birinde ve olmayan mahallerde Yürütme Kurullarının müşterek mesuliyetleri altında saklanabilir. Paraların bankaya verilip alınması başkanla muhassibin müşterek imzasıyla yapılır.

MADDE 76 — Cemiyetler kanununun 2. inci maddesinin 12 fıkrasının tatbik şeklini tayin Büyük Kongreye aittir.

MADDE 77 — Tahsilât için Parti mühürünü havi makbuz vermek ve sarfiyat için vesika ve makbuz alarak bunları Parti defterine geçirmek mecburidir. Hilâfında hareket hadisenin ehemmiyet ve mahiyetine göre İnzibat Divanlarınca takdir olunacak cezayı istilzam edeceği gibi icabederse adli takibata da yol açar.

MADDE 78 — Kıymetli evrak ve makbuzlar Genel Yürütme Kurulu tarafından bastırılarak teşkilâta tevzi olunur.

IX

Parti Meclis Gurubu

MADDE 79 — Partiye mensup Millet Vekilleri Partinin Meclis Gurubunu teşkil ederler.

MADDE 80 — Bu gurup mevcut Millet Vekillerinin yarısından bir fazlasıyla toplanır.

MADDE 81 — Partiye mensup Millet Vekilleri Meclisin her toplantı devresinde birleşerek gizli oy ve ekseriyetle bir Başkan, bir Başkan Vekili, ve beş üye seçerler. Gurup Yürütme Kurulunu teşkil eden bu yedi Millet Vekili yine gizli oyla içlerinden birini kâtipliğe diğerini de muhasipliğe seçer.

MADDE 82 — Başkan ve bulunmadığı zamanlarda Başkan Vekili Gurup ve Yürütme Kurulu toplantılarına Başkanlık eder.

MADDE 83 — Gurubu teşkil eden Millet Vekilleri görecekları lüzum üzerine verecekları kararları ihtisas komisyonlarına ayırılır. Bunların adedinin tayini de guruba aittir.

MADDE 84 — Gurup Yürütme Kurulu, Meclis faaliyetinin devamı müddetince hiç değilse haftada bir toplanır. Meclis faaliyette bulunmadığı zamanlarda da Başkanları lüzum gördükçe üyeleri toplantıya çağırır.

MADDE 85 — Yürütme Kurulu dört ayda bir gurubun mali vaziyetini Millet vekillerine izah eder.

MADDE 86 — Mecliste Gurup namına söz söylemek Gurup Umumi Heyetinin tayin edeceği sözcüye aittir. Müzakere sırasında diğer üyeler de sözcüye yardımda bulunabilirler.

MADDE 87 — Gurup Heyetince karar verilmedikçe Mecliste Hükümetten istizahta bulunulamaz. Sual tavrı vermek için böyle bir karara ihtiyaç yoktur.

MADDE 88 — Partiye mensup Millet Vekilleri, Mecliste, Gurup ve Meclisin kayıtlı oldukları komisyonlarında hazır bulunmalı, müzakerelere iştirak etmeli ve Partiyi ilgilendiren hususlarda azami hassasiyet göstermelidirler.

MADDE 89 — Guruba dahil her millet Vekili program ve Gurup Umumi Heyetinin kararı hilâfına hareket edemez; ve oy veremez; ve bu hareketi mazur göstermek için hiç bir sebep ileri süremez.

MADDE 90 — Gurup Üyesi, kendi heyetlerinin münasip göreceği miktarda aidat vermeğe mecburdur.

MADDE 91 — Parti Gurubu Üyelerinin teşrii vazifelerinden doğan hareketlerinden dolayı tatbiki icabedecek inzibat muamelesi için gizli oyla içlerinden on üye seçerler. Bunlar Gurubun İnzibat Divanını teşkil ederler.

MADDE 92 — Gurup İnzibat Divanının teşekkül ve vazifesini ifa tarzı Parti İnzibat Divanlarının aynıdır.

MADDE 93 — Gurup üyelerinin partiyi alâkadar eden hareketlerinden dolayı yapılacak inzibati takibat da Genel İnzibat Divanı ile Gurup İnzibat Divanı için seçilmiş olan üyelerden ayrı ayrı kura ile ayrılacak üçer kişiden teşekkül eden heyete aittir. Bu Divana iki İnzibat Divanı üyelerinden biri kura ile seçilerek Başkanlık eder.

MADDE 94 — Gurup İnzibat Divanının kararları aleyhine itiraz gurup umumi heyetine, ve muhtelit İnzibat Divanının kararı aleyhine de Büyük Kongreye yapılır.

MADDE — 95 — Gurup Yürütme Kurulu ile İnzibat Divanı üyelerinin teşrii vazifelerinden dolayı aleyhlerine yapılacak inzibat takibatı Gurup Umumi Heyeti tarafından gizli oyla seçilecek dokuz kişilik hususi bir Divana aittir.

Geçici Maddeler

MADDE 96 — Genel Müteşebbis Kurulu Partinin Genel Yürütme Kurulu vazifesini görür; partiyi takdim edenler (müessisler) büyük kongreye kadar bu kurulun tabii üyeleridir; bunlar üçte iki çoklukla ve daha sonra alınan üyelerin de iştirakile üye sayısını on beşe kadar çıkarabilirler. Fakat bu kurulun üye sayısı yediden az olamaz.

Madde 97 — Genel müteşebbis kurulu nisabi haiz olunca gizli oyla ve adi çoklukla içlerinden birini Başkan, birini Başkan vekili, birini genel sekreter ve diğerini de muhasip seçer.

Takdim ediciler Partiye Fahri Başkan seçebilirler.

Büyük Kongre toplantısına kadar Genel Müteşebbisler Kurulu üyeleri İl Kurullarında da vazife alabilirler.

MADDE 98 — İlk teşkilâta Yürütme Kurulları zarurî olarak yukarıdan aşağı teşkil olunur; ve Müteşebbisler Kurulu adını alır.

MADDE 99 — Genel Müteşebbis Kurulu bir ilde teşkilât yapmayı lüzumlu gördüğü takdirde, orada bu şartları en ziyade haiz olanlardan birini tercih ederek kendisinin de samimi muvafakatini aldıktan sonra o İl müteşebbis kurulunu kurmak vazifesini kendisine tevdi eder.

Bu zat, kendisiyle siyasi kanaat birliğinde olduğuna ve beraber çalışmakta ahenk ve muvaffakiyet temin edeceğine emin olduğu ilk arkadaşını seçer. Bunu müteakip onların ittifakiyle üçüncü, üçünün ittifakiyle dördüncü ve dördünün oy birliğiyle beşinci seçilir. Ve bu usul ile Müteşebbis Kurulu tamamlanır.

Bu seçimlerin her biri iştirak edenlerin imzalarını ihtiva eden bir tutanakla tesbit ve İl müteşebbis kurulu karar defterinin ilk numarasına derç olunur. İl Müteşebbis Kurulu beşe baliğ olunca çalışmaya başlayabilir.

MADDE 100 — Kurul çalışacak hale gelince gizli oyla aralarından birini Başkan, diğerini Başkan vekili, birini kâtip ve bir diğerini de muhasip intihap ederek bunu da karar defterine geçirdikten sonra tasdikli suretini Genel Müteşebbis Kurula gönderir. Bu kurulun tasvip kararıyle vazife başlar.

MADDE 101 — Her müteşebbis kurulun ilk vazifesi kendisine bağlı müteşebbis kurullar vucuda getirmektir.

İlçe, Bucak ve Ocak müteşebbis kurullarının kurulması İl müteşebbis kurulları için tayin olunan usule tabidir. Ancak bunların teşekkülü üst kademe kurulunun tasvibi ile tekemmül eder. (Madde—11)

MADDE 102 — Müteşebbis kurulların yeter derecede faaliyet gösteremedikleri veya üyeleri arasında esaslı geçimsizlikler hasıl olduğu takdirde üst kademedeki kurul, daha üst kademe kurulunun tasvibi ile, o kurulda değişiklikler yapabilir.

MADDE 103 — İnzibat divanları teşkil edilinceye kadar vazifesi İl ve merkez Müteşebbis Kurulları tarafından görülür.

MADDE 104 — Yapılacak teşkilâtın lüzum gösterdiği masraf mahallî kurullara aittir.

MADDE 105 — Genel Müteşebbis Kurulu ilk Büyük Kongrenin azâmi bir sene içinde toplanmasını mümkün kılacak surette bütün kongrelerin toplanış zamanlarını ayarlar.

MADDE 106 — Bu ilk kongreler tüzük hükümlerine göre teşekkül ederler; vazifeleri teşkilâtı sahiplerine devretmek ve kurullarını teşkil etmektir.

Büyük Kongre, Genel Yürütme Kurulu ile Genel İnzibat Divanını seçer ve partinin program ve tüzüğünde gerekli değişiklikleri yapar.

Delegeler partinin program ve tüzüğü üzerinde lüzum görecekları değişiklikler için hazırlıklı olmalıdırlar. (Madde 70)

MADDE 107 — Meclis Gurubunun mevcudu bu Tüzükte yazılı olan yürütme Kurulu ve İnzibat Divanının teşkiline imkân verinceye kadar bunlara mevdu vazifeler Meclis Gurubu Umumi Heyetince görülür.

XI

Lâhika

MADDE 108 — Tüzüğün 66 cı maddesinin tatbikında Cemiyetler Kanununun 2 ci maddesinin 7 numaralı bendi delâletile 19 ve 20 ci maddeleri esas tutulur (1)

(1) Cemiyetler Kanununun 19 cu maddesi:

Madde 19 — Umumi heyet içtimasına nizamnamesine göre bulunması lâzım gelen azalar çağırılır ve en az üç gün önceden içtimain günü, saati, yeri, ruznamesi en az iki gazete ile ilân olunur ve Hükûmete bildirilir.

Madde 20 — Umumi heyetin içtimai, ilân olunan ve hükûmete bildirilen gün ve saatte muayyen yerde yapılır.

İçtima geri bırakıldığı takdirde en az üç gün evvel aza yeniden çağılır ve geri bırakılma sebepleriyle yeni içtimain tarihi ve yeri ruzname ile beraber iki gazete ile ilân olunur ve Hükûmete bildirilir.

Umumi içtimain birden ziyade geri bırakılması caiz değildir.

MADDE 109 — Tüzüğün VII kongreler bölümünde yazılı 68 ci maddeden 73 cü maddeye kadar olan altı madde hükümlerinin tatbikında Cemiyetler Kanununun 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 ve 26 cı maddelerine uyulur (2)

MADDE 110 — Tüzüğün 76 cı maddesinin tatbikında Cemiyetler Kanununun 27 ci maddesi esas tutulur (3)

(2) Cemiyetler Kanununun 21 - 26 cı maddeleri:

Madde 21 — Umumî heyette yalnız ruznameye konan maddeler müzakere olunur. Ancak mevcut azanın en az yirmide biri tarafından müzakeresi istenen maddelerin ruznameye konması mecburidir. Kararlar mevcut azanın ekseriyetine verilir. Her azanın yalnız bir reyî vardır.

Madde 22 — Aşağıda yazılı hususlara umumî heyet tarafından karar verilir:

- a) Ana nizamnamenin tadili,
- b) Hesapların tedkiki,
- c) Bütçenin tasdiki,
- d) Cemiyetin feshi.

Madde 23 — Umumî heyet içtimaî reis veya varsa vekili, yoksa idare heyeti reisi tarafından açılarak içtima nisabı anlaşılacak üzere yoklama yapıldıktan sonra aza arasından bir reis ile reis vekili ve lüzumu kadar kâtip seçilir.

İçtima bu suretle seçilen reis veya reis vekili tarafından idare olunur. Zabıt ve yazı işlerini de kâtipler idare eder.

Madde 24 — Umumî heyetin müzakere zabıtları reis ve reis vekilleri ve kâtipler tarafından imzalanarak saklanır.

Umumî heyet kararları da ayrıca karar halinde yazılarak aynı suretle imza edilip saklanır.

Madde 25 — Umumî heyet içtimaında idare heyetine seçilecek azanın hüviyetleriyle ana nizamnamede yapılacak değişikliklerin bir hafta içinde o yerin en büyük mülkiye âmirine bildirilmesi mecburidir.

Madde 26 — Cemiyetlerin merkez idare heyetleri üç zattan az olamaz. Bu heyetler resmî ve hususî işlerde cemiyeti temsil eder. İdare heyeti azasından bir veya bir kaçına temsil selâhiyeti verebilir.

İdare heyeti her yıl o yıl içindeki muameleleri, hesapları ve gelecek yıla aid bütçeyi umumî heyetin tasdikine arz etmeğe mecburdur.

Ancak ana nizamnamesine göre umumî heeyti bir kaç yılda bir toplanan cemiyetlerde idare heyetleri, yukarı fıkrada yazılı mecburiyeti geçen ve gelecek içtima devresine ait olmak üzere ifa ederler.

(3) Cemiyetler Kanununun 27 ci maddesi:

Madde 27 — (*) Derneklerin feshi, genel olarak, Medeni Kanun hükümlerine bağlıdır. Şu kadar ki, bir derneğin kendi kendini feshe karar verebilmesi için tüzüğüne göre toplanacak olan genel kurul üyelerinin en az üçte ikisinin huzuru şarttır.

Bu suretle çokluk elde edilemediği takdirde ikinci defa toplanmak için 20 nci maddeye göre üyeler çağrılır. Bu çağrı üzerine toplanacak üyelerin sayısı ne olursa olsun fesih keyfiyeti görüşülebilir. Ancak bu suretle yapılan toplanma ve görüşme sonunda fesih hakkındaki kararın mevcut üyelerin üçte iki oyu ile verilmesi şarttır.

Derneğin feshi, idare kurulu tarafından beş gün içinde 4 üncü maddede yazılı idare makamlarına bildirilir.

(*) 4919 sayılı kanunla değişik şekli.

XII

Partiyi Takdim Edenler

(Müessisler)

MADDE 111 — Partiyi millete takdim edenlerin (müessisler) alfabe sırasıyla isimleri, soy adları, meslek ve adresleri aşağıda yazılıdır:

1 — MAREŞAL FEVZİ ÇAKMAK (T. C.)

İstanbul Milletvekili - Çankaya Caddesi No. 8 Çankaya - Ankara

2 — ENİS AKAYGEN (T. C.)

İstanbul Milletvekili - Sanatoryom sokağı No. 4 Yakacak - İstanbul

3 — HİKMET BAYUR (T. C.)

Tarihçi, Gazeteci - Selânik Caddesi - No. 72 Yenışehir - Ankara

4 — KENAN ÖNER (T. C.)

Prof. Avukat - Valikonagi Caddesi - Yüce Apartmanı - No. 9 Harbiye - İstanbul

5 — DOKTOR MUSTAFA KENTLİ (T. C.)

Atatürk Caddesi No. 334 Alsancak - İzmir

6 — OSMAN BÖLÜKBAŞI (T. C.)

Çiftçi - Kuşdili mahallesi No. 20 - Kırşehir

7 — OSMAN NURİ KÖNİ (T. C.)

İstanbul Milletvekili - Karanfil Sokağı No. 32 Yenışehir - Ankara

8 — GENERAL SADIK ALDOĞAN (T. C.)

Afyonkarahisar Milletvekili - Serçe Sokağı No. 26 Yenışehir - Ankara