

ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS
HISTORY MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

THE BACKGROUND OF TWO MODERN AUTHORITARIAN LEADERS'
RULES BY FOLLOWING THEIR DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES

Kıvanç Köseođlu

116671003

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Murat Dađlı

Istanbul

2019

THE BACKGROUND OF TWO MODERN AUTHORIATARIAN LEADERS'
RULE BY FOLLOWING THEIR DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES
BENZERLİKLERİ VE FARKLILIKLARI ÜZERİNDEN İKİ MODERN
OTORİTER LİDERİN YÖNETİMLERİ

Kıvanç Köseoğlu

116671003

Tez Danışmanı:

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Murat Dağlı.....

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Jüri Üyesi:

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Cihangir Gündoğdu.....

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Jüri Üyesi:

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Yaşar Tolga Cora.....

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: 21.06.2019

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 145

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

Anahtar Kelimler (İngilizce)

1) Otoriter

1) Authoritarian

2) Modern

2) Modern

3) Dönüşüm

3) Transformation

4) Kurumsal

4) Institutional

5) Ulus-Devlet

5) Nation-State

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	23
CHAPTER 1: ECONOMIC BACKGROUND	24
The Effects of Western Market and Free Trade.....	24
The Relations between the Center and Periphery	26
CHAPTER 2: MODERNIZATION	27
The Breaking Point, Sultan Mahmud The Second.....	27
Establishment of Modern Institutions	29
Differentiation in Military Modernization	29
The Reflections of Modernization	33
CHAPTER 3: POLITICAL BACKGROUND.....	35
The Effects of Western Powers.....	35
The Rise of Opposition Movements	37
CONSTITUTIONALIS PERIOD OF THE BOTH COUNTRIES.....	42
CHAPTER 4: The Constitutional Movements of Two Countries.....	43
The CUP was in Power	47
Internal Conflicts between ‘‘Old’’ and ‘‘New’’	50
CHAPTER 5: THE POLITICAL CONDITIONS THROUGHOUT THE GREAT WAR	52
The Mentalities of Political Groups	52

Iran as a Field of Struggle for Western Powers	58
THE MODERN NATIONALIST AUTHORITARIAN LEADERS	62
CHAPTER 6: REGIONS WHERE THEY WERE BORN IN	62
The Conflictual Atmosphere of Macedonia	62
The Conflictual Regions of Iran.....	65
The Unique Conditions of Conflictual Regions.....	66
CHAPTER 7: BIOGRAPHIES OF TWO LEADERS	67
Mustafa Kemal	67
Reza Khan	68
CHAPTER 8: MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR CAREERS	
.....	69
The German Effects on the Ottoman Military	69
The Cossack Brigade.....	70
Military Careers	73
Mentalities of Both Leaders	75
BUILDING A NEW STATE AFTER THE EMPIRE	77
CHAPTER 9: THE STRUGGLE FOR BUILDING A NEW STATE....	77
The Power Struggle between the Cossack Brigade and Gendarmeries	78
Mirza Kuchek Khan, Jangalis, and Ismail Smitqo.....	81
Pre-Congress Period of Turkish National Struggle.....	83
From the Period of Congress to the Republic	84
CHAPTER 10: THE RISE OF THE TWO ABSOLUTE LEADERS	89
Establishment of Central Regular Armies.....	89
Taking Steps for Becoming Absolute Leader	92
The Progressive Republican Party	95

The Republican Movement of Iran	96
CONSOLIDATION OF THEIR POWER AND DESIGNING THE PERIPHERY	99
CHAPTER 11: THE ASSIMILATION AND DESTRUCTION POLICIES OF TURKEY.....	99
To Assimilate Their Identities: Turkey	100
To Destroy Their Symbols, Turkey	106
CHAPTER12: THE ASSIMILATION AND DESTRUCTION POLICIES OF IRAN.....	109
To Assimilate Their Identities, Iran	109
To Destroy Their Symbols, Iran	111
WHAT KIND OF AUTHORITARIANISM?	117
CHAPTER 13: ECONOMIC STRUCTURES.....	117
Corporatism.....	119
The year of 1930 for Kemalist Regime.....	120
CHAPTER 14: THE DEVELOPMENT IN THE FIELD OF CONSTRUCTION.....	122
Building a Capital City	123
Railroads	124
CHAPTER 15: THE IDEOLOGIES OF THE STATES	125
Are They Fascists?	131
International Relationship	132
CONCLUSION.....	135
Bibliography.....	141

ABSTRACT

Turkey and Iran had a great transformation under two modern nationalist leaders, in the first half of the twentieth century. In this study, we will make evaluations about modern nationalist rules of Iran and Turkey, in which similar Western reforms were attempted to implement in the transition process from Empire to the Nation-State, led by Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan. These evaluations will be also included structural problems they faced, the partnerships they built and the groups they struggled with, by consideration historical process, within an integrated and comprehensive textuality.

Throughout the thesis, we will try to evaluate similarities and differences of two modernist leaders, with help of comparative analyses in terms of social, politic, and institutional. The Imperial past of the two countries, which had institutional, administrative and economic differences essentially, became distinct from each other especially with the nineteenth century. Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan took over governments of the two countries which had rather different institutional structures and social dynamics. In addition to this, mentality differences between two leaders also gave clues about the differences which came out during their rules. In respect, even though they adopted quite similar policies in internal politics during 1930s, when two leaders liquidated the opposition movement in their countries and strengthened their authoritarian one-man regimes, the differences between their approaches in the field of international relations caused to different endings for their administration.

ÖZET

Türkiye ve İran, iki modern milliyetçi liderin yönetimi altında yirminci yüzyılın ilk yarısında büyük bir dönüşüm yaşamışlardır. Bu çalışmada, Mustafa Kemal ve Rıza Han liderliğinde, İmparatorluktan ulus devlete geçiş süreçlerinde benzer Batılı reformların uygulanmaya çalışıldığı İran ve Türkiye'deki modern-milliyetçi yönetimlerin, reformları uygularken karşılaştıkları yapısal sorunlara, kurdukları ortaklıklara ve mücadele ettikleri gruplara tarihsel süreci de göz önüne alarak bütünsel ve kapsamlı bir anlatım içerisinde değerlendirmeler yapacağız.

Tez boyunca, iki modernleşmeci liderin yönetimlerinin benzerliklerini ve farklılıklarını toplumsal, politik ve kurumsal açılardan karşılaştırmalı analizler yardımıyla değerlendirmeye çalışacağız. En temelinde, kurumsal, yönetsel ve ekonomik farklılıklara sahip olan iki ülkenin, imparatorluk geçmişleri özellikle 19. Yüzyıl ile birlikte birbirinden farklılaşmıştır. Mustafa Kemal ve Rıza Han birbirlerinden oldukça farklı kurumsal yapılara ve toplumsal dinamiklere sahip olan iki ülkenin yönetimlerini devralmışlardır. Bunların yanı sıra iki liderin aralarındaki mentalite farklılıkları da yönetimleri süresince ortaya çıkmış olan farklılıklar hakkında ip uçları vermektedir. Bu bakımdan, iki liderin ülkelerindeki muhalefetleri tasfiye ettikleri ve Otoriter tek-adam rejimlerini güçlendirdikleri 1930'lu yıllar, özellikle iç siyasette oldukça benzer politikalar izlemiş olsalar da uluslararası ilişkiler alanındaki yaklaşımları arasındaki farklılıklar yönetimlerinin sonlarının oldukça farklı olmasına neden olmuştur.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my special thanks to my thesis advisor Faculty Member PhD Murat Dađlı for his support and patience during the thesis. Without his valuable comments and advices, I would not have formed the thesis with this framework completely and whenever I think of a situation about the field of history, I will think how Murat Hoca would approach to this situation. I would like to thank Faculty Members PhD Cihangir Gündođdu and Yaşar Tolga Cora for agreeing to read my thesis and participate in my jury.

I also would like to express my thankfulness to Faculty Member PhD Başak Tuğ Onaran who always supported me and thanks to her; I could hold on to academic platform, I will never forget her effort and helps for me. And, I am grateful to Assoc. Professor Gülhan Balsoy for teaching me how to evaluate historical sources by different perspectives. I would also thank to Professor Bülent Bilmez for giving me a chance to step into the faculty and since that day, actually, I have taken Bülent Hoca as a model, and I have always felt very lucky to meet him.

I would like to present my great thanks to Ayhan Işık and Mesut Ürün for believing and supporting a curious person working in the bookstore. Their determinations and hardworks inspired me to make the decision to choose my favourite field.

I present my thanks to Yankı Vural for his intellectuality and friendship during the process of this thesis. And, I am thankful to Nevzat Budak for his motivation in terms of mentality and psychology. I also would like to thank most sincerely to Hazal Coşkun for self-sacrificing supports throughout the thesis. When I faced with a difficult situation, Hazal came to my assistance and her contributions were very important subject of my thesis.

I owe my deepest thankfulness to my family. They have supported and encouraged me in every moment of my life. Thankfully, I was born into a family which has intellectual, interesting and oppositional thoughts, thanks to their effects, my mentality was shaped as a curious and a tenacious person.

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, similarities and differences between the rules of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah after the Great War will be examined, by associating their dynasties' background. My main purpose on writing this thesis is comparing two modern leaders' rules by considering two states' great transformations in the transition period from Empire to Nation-state, in terms of institutional, social, economic and politic structures. In addition to my purpose, as an Alawite-Kurdish citizen living in Turkish Republic, I wanted to think and have an opinion about historical processes of the two states in order to find traces which belong to my identity.

Both Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah known as nationalist leaders and they were the founder leaders of modern Iran and Turkey. It is possible to draw a comparison between two leaders, since their attitudes towards Westernist reforms and traditional groups were similar. However, the backgrounds of the countries they took over were different from each other, because they had quite different structures, social dynamics and institutions. In this way, by thinking their rules and reforms, it could be recognized that both two leaders followed different paths and reached different conclusions. Especially, different conclusions made from Republican Movements of the two states, based on many reasons such as institutional, structural and social. Throughout this thesis, I will try to evaluate policies two leaders carried out, difficulties they faced, partnerships they made and international relations they build during 1920s and 1930s.

Economic productions of the states that two leaders took over were similar and they also had similar historical backgrounds. Their economies were based on agricultural production, and also, thanks to free trade, craft and weaving had important places at their traditional economies. By 1920s, the impressions of free trade from Western market had been seen in both two states for three centuries. Between 16th and 18th

centuries, Western powers conducted economic relationships with local markets of Ottomans and Qajars, but with 19th century, Western powers decided to change their approaches and built direct relation with central governments of both states. Thus, they aimed to design Qajars and Ottomans local productions according to their favours. However, it should be stated that Ottomans economy was more articulated to Western economy, as of their geographical advantages. So, when Mustafa Kemal came to power, it was easier to build a relationship with Western economy because of this historical economic maintenance. On the other side, Iran had geographical disadvantages as the country was lack of water foundation, dams and there no active transportation networks, comparing to Turkey. Besides, on contrary to Qajars, in 19th century, Ottomans turned the crisis came from Western Market into an opportunity, to design the relation between center and periphery in favour of central government.

In terms of institution, there was no active tax collection system in both countries, so only little amount of the taxes from periphery could reach to central government. To solve this situation, Ottomans tried to strengthen central institution network with Western economic credits to penetrate periphery actively, with the Tanzimat period. By this purpose, Gendarmerie and Constabulary were established, and with these institutions both institutional structures spread on periphery and finding financial resource became easier. In the field of tax collection system, Tanzimat reformers aimed to change the traditional collecting system -İltizam-. Because of this traditional collecting system, a parallel hierarchy came out in the state bureaucracy in peripheral zones. Ottomans gave the duty of collecting taxes to villagers instead of moneylenders, in order to destroy parallel hierarchy and increased tax incomes. Thanks to these regulations, central government incomes increased by 450 percent and central state structure gained power, after the Tanzimat period. Even though the rules of Abbas Mirza Khan and Amir Kabir took some steps to institutional centralism, economical impossibilities and the reaction of local powers made Shah withdraw the idea of this idea. And Shahs maintained their duties as arbitrators over the peripheral powers, with the guarantees given to Qajar dynasty from local powers.

The relation between center and periphery was directly related to institutionalism. Due to the positive effects of the Tanzimat reforms, especially increased tax incomes, Ottomans built a regular army. With the regular army, Ottomans bureaucracy made a great progress and started to penetrate peripheral zones effectively. Especially in the last quarter of 19th century, Ottomans professional military system was formed with the aid of German experts. This system had the Western curricula and principle of merit. Thanks to this system, foundations of becoming a nation-state were laid. The graduates of this institution would have important roles in political life, military system and social transformation, until 1950s. This situation was different on Iran's side. Qajars, who could not establish Western type institutions like Ottomans during 19th century, did not have an active tax collection system as well, thus, they could not establish regular army. Under these circumstances, Qajars formed their military upon tribes' forces but they had to make concessions to peripheral powers in return. Unlike Ottomans, Qajars, who avoided struggles both inside and outside, could not strengthen their central structure due to lack of rivalry with Western powers. The Cossack Brigades, which were the only regular army of the state, was founded with inspiration of Russian forces in 1879, but they could not become a national army and their main duty was being gentlemen at arms. According to a foreign observer, equipment of the tribe forces was more improved than the central forces. Modern regular army of the central government, Gendarme forces, were founded in the Constitutional period and in short time, they positioned as national army with support of the nationalist, as distinct from the Cossack Brigade. However, gendarmeries would be dissolved because of Western suppression. Yet, when Reza Khan came to power, the most important rival of him would be gendarme commanders.

Even though, the states took over by two leaders had similarities in terms of their social structures, opposition movement of the states were completely different from each other in terms of organisation. In Mustafa Kemal's Turkey, oppositional movement had been deactivated for hundred years. In the period started with Sultan Mahmud the Second and continued with Tanzimat, the power of social opposition, which limited the power of Sultan and his rulers, was dispelled step by step.

Traditional opposition -Zimni Coalition- lost its military power with the abolition of Janissaries in the period of Mahmud the Second and their social organisation was destroyed by confiscating their institutions and economic sources. Throughout Tanzimat and Hamidian period, Ulema and clerics, which were at the position of organising traditional opposition, came under the control of central government completely. On the other hand, the Iranian opposition was different than Ottomans' in terms of organization and groups. Especially, Iranian Ulama was in leader position in the opposition movement and whenever Iranian people faced difficult condition against the central government, they were consulting with Ulama to solve their problems. By the twentieth century, even though Iranian and Ottoman oppositions aimed a common Parliament target, their complaints about the central governments were different, and they were coming from diverse groups. The Iranian opposition led by Ulema had anxieties about economy, and they worried about Western intervention on Iran economy and politics. The Ottoman opposition, which led by exiled entelijiansa and Macedonian officers, aimed to limit despotic government of Sultan Abdülhamid and prevent dissolution of the Empire.

The conclusion of Russo-Japan War in 1904-5 caused a domino effect in Non-Western World and a number of Constitutional movements were seen in this period. By this way, in both countries, Qajars and Ottomans, Constitutions were proclaimed, and their rulers decided to open Parliaments. Participation of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan in these Constitutional processes was quite different from each other. Mustafa Kemal was a member of the Committee of Union and Progress and the organization was the main trigger of opening the Ottoman Parliament. Moreover, when Mustafa Kemal was an officer in the Macedonian Railroad, he indirectly joined the insurrection led by Enver Bey against the central government. In other words, Mustafa Kemal entered to the stage of history as a piece of the structure which was the architect of the Constitutionalism movement. In contrast with Mustafa Kemal, Reza Khan did not participate in the Constitutional movement and there was no notable trace about Reza Khan until the end of the Great War. But when the Cup came to power, there was a power struggle between Fethi Bey and Enver Bey to become War Minister position. Mustafa Kemal got included the group

led by Fethi Bey, but they were defeated and dissolved. After that, Mustafa Kemal was appointed the attache of Sofia in 1913 under favor of his good relationship with the other prominent figure of the CUP. During the attache position, he learned diplomacy. In addition to this, more importantly, thanks to being distant from the central government, Mustafa Kemal was not involved in Armenian Genocide. By 1918, when the leaders of the CUP fled abroad, Mustafa Kemal would become one of the potential candidates for the leader position of the nationalist group.

After the end of the Great War, Kazım Karabekir offered Mustafa Kemal a suggestion about taking the position of leader in Anatolian struggle movement, but Mustafa Kemal rejected him because he wanted to be the War Minister. When the Izzet Pasha government was dissolved by the Sultan, the dreams of Mustafa Kemal were collapsed, and new government led by Damad Ferid Pasha appointed him to Samsun province as an inspector of 9th Army, to save Rums from attack of local Muslim groups. When Mustafa Kemal arrived in Samsun, the National Struggle had begun for six months by the way of Countrywide Resistance Organizations - Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti- in the various zones of Anatolia. Mustafa Kemal attended the Erzurum Congress with the invitation from Kazım Karabekir and then, he was elected to leader position of the Representative Committee -Temsil Heyeti- for Sivas Congress. The main motivation of the CRO was to prevent comeback of Non-Muslim people to their lands and properties, because they had had to flee from their lands to save their lives during the Great War period. In this direction, Turkish nationalists easily incorporated local Kurds into the National Struggle Movement, together with supporting and believing the same Caliph. After the Congresses, the movement moved to Ankara province and at this palace, the Anatolian and Rumelia Countrywide Organization -ARCRO- was founded by nationalists with the idea of becoming an umbrella organization for all CRO branches. In April 1920, Turkish National Assembly was opened, and Mustafa Kemal became most prominent figure in the Parliament. Several members of the Ankara government came from frameworks of the CUP. In short, there was a political maintenance between the CUP and the Ankara government.

The National Struggle movement led by Mustafa Kemal claimed that their struggle was anti-Imperialist but at the background of the movement, they tried to build good relationship with Western powers. While they engaged in combat with Greek forces in the field, Ankara government was sending message to Western powers that their national movement aimed to establish a Western type economic and political structure. On the other hand, Western powers thought that the idea of improving their relations with the Ankara government was the most reliable option, because of unstable structure of Greece in terms of domestic policy. Moreover, Western powers, including Britain, decided to support a powerful central government, as seen Iran, to prevent the Soviet spread on Middle East. The positive atmosphere in the field of international relationship was reinforced by successful conflicts against Greek forces. In September 1922, National Struggle's forces entered to İzmir. Afterwards, the Sultanate was abolished by Ankara government in October 1922 and Sultan Mehmed the Sixth fled abroad. Ankara government aimed to prevent the effect of Caliphate of Sultan Mehmed the Sixth and for this purpose they appointed Abdülmecid Efendi as a new Caliph. Moreover, Ankara government arranged an economic Congress in İzmir to show the Western World that new structure centred in Ankara turned their direction to the West instead of Soviets. In consideration of tendency, the treaty of Lausanne was concluded between Allied power and Ankara government, thus Ankara government was acknowledged by Western World as well and the government officially became an absolute power in Turkey. In domestic policy, the First Group led by Mustafa Kemal dispelled the opposition movement, the Second Group led by Hüseyin Avni, by Law on Treason and new Parliament was constituted without opposition deputies in August 1923. In this circumstance, the National Assembly proclaimed the Republic in 29 October 1923 and Mustafa Kemal became a first president of the Republic of Turkey.

The rise of Reza Khan was less complicated than Mustafa Kemal's way. The name of Reza Khan was not visible in the historical stage until end of the Great War. First time, his name was mentioned as a supporter to the coup led by Colonel Starosselsky against Colonel Clergi for leadership position in Cossack Brigade after the Soviet revolution. The political life of Iran had an important transformation with

the Soviet revolution. After the revolution, Iran transformed into a struggle field between Soviets and Britain, once again. Britain aimed to support a powerful central Iranian government, which was directly controlled by her. In this purpose, Britain targeted to establish a central regular Iranian army, and develop a central bureaucratic network. On the other hand, Soviets tried to form associations with local governments to establish pro-Soviet local governments. Especially, the anti-British atmosphere spread throughout the country because of the discredited Anglo-Iranian agreement in 1919 which led to Iran's economy to come under British protection. In addition to this, pro-Soviet Gilan government was founded by Mirza Kuchek Khan in 1920 and the government had an idea about taking control of central government of Iran. British authorities in Iran recognized the threat of Gilan and they planned a coup with the aid of Reza Khan and Sayyid Zia to prevent Soviet diffusion and maintain British existence in Iran. Reza Khan was one of the important leaders of the Coup d'état in February 1921. Even though Reza Khan was not actively participating in the new government led by Seyyid Zia, he was the strongest figure behind the scenes as a commander of land forces. In a short time, the power of Reza Khan was considered important. For instance, according to a Tehran newspaper, a central regular army could solve bad condition of Iran. The years between 1921 and 1923, Reza Khan entered power struggle with the leaders of Gendarme to establish a central regular army in favour of Cossack brigade. Politically, Reza Khan eliminated several prominent political figures, particularly Seyyid Zia and Qavam es-Saltaneh, and finally, in October 1923, Reza Khan would become both prime-minister and chief commander of army.

Even though Nationalism, which was the most important characteristic feature of the two leaders, became visible in both states with twentieth century, it improved in different way for both. The main difference between Turkish nationalists and Iranian nationalists that in Ottomans, nationalists was in power from Constitutional Period to the end of Great War. Especially, the triumvirate -Enver, Talad and Cemal- took over the government after the killing of Mahmud Şevket Pasha, adopted many Turkist policies. Ethno-nationalist ideas spread on masses through education, press, women's movement, demonstration and marches. Indeed, one of

the reasons of Ottomans to participate in the Great War was to take back the lost lands and bring Turki groups together under the same roof, which means Irredentism. In this way, forces under Enver Pasha would plan to take over Tabriz. They made Anatolia homogenise substantially with Armenian genocide and Rum massacre during the Great War years. On the other hand, in Iran, Nationalists had not managed to take over government until Reza Khan's period. Even though it was possible to see Nationalist tones in several fields such as education, politics and intellectual life in Constitutional period, Nationalist ideas reached to peak during the Great War years, especially with the influence of Gendarmerie. However, when Reza Khan became the leader, secular nationalist ideas had not been superior to traditional ideas yet, even if there had been secularism in educational system.

Even though there were similarities between Western reforms of two leaders, differences of their mentalities could be seen clearly. In this thesis, while evaluating the differences between their mentalities, I will also mention about their hometowns and the conditions of these places as well as their families, children and military careers. Selanico province of Macedonia, the place in which Mustafa Kemal was born, was one of the most cosmopolite cities of the era. Many different groups lived together in this place; thus, nationalist ideas would sprout like mushrooms in here. With Tanzimat period, Muslim groups annoyed by becoming equal with Non-Muslim people on paper and their activities in economic life got reaction by Muslim groups. Apart from this, especially after 1880, there was a big tension and struggles between ethnic groups. As a Macedonian military school student, Mustafa Kemal affected by this conflictual atmosphere naturally. It should be stated that the body of Constitutional movement would be formed by Macedonian officers. On the other hand, Mazandaran region, the place Reza Khan was born in, was under the threat of Russian occupancy during the nineteenth century. However, this region could not reach to an ideological maturity with the effect of Russia, just like Azerbaijan region. Thus, Reza Khan did not raise in an intellectual area like Mustafa Kemal and his region was known with its heroic epics.

Both leaders had similarities in terms of their families. Both families had middle economic statuses. Reza Khan's father Abbas Ali Khan was a soldier and Mustafa Kemal's father Ali Rıza had been an officer before trading. Both leaders were orphaned while they were just children and they attended to military school due to economic reasons. There were nationalist tones in both leaders' roots of their families. Reza Khan's grandfather Murad Ali Khan died during Herat siege in 1856 and Mustafa Kemal's grandfather Hafız Ahmet Efendi was involved in incident in which French and German consulates were killed. Thus, both leaders had nationalist senses in their characters. The institutions they attended in their youth were under the control of Western experts. While Reza Khan's Cossack Brigade was under the effect of Russian completely, Mustafa Kemal's military school was under the control of German Ecole and experts. Both leaders had many duties in their countries during their military careers thus, they had a great knowledge about their countries' social structures. However, there were great differences between the institution they attended in terms of quality. The institution in which Mustafa Kemal received education aimed to raise elite soldiers who would be models for society. Mustafa Kemal's intellectual identity was formed during his student years in Istanbul. In here, while he was interested in opponent ideas and found a platform to discuss these ideas, he was also under the effect of the curriculum created by Von der Goltz, which gave duties and responsibilities to officers and society coordinatively. On the other hand, Reza Khan could not find an intellectual platform and he learned how to read and write by himself. His military career improved with the struggles against "disorder" tribe forces. Mustafa Kemal was assigned in conflictual zones such as some parts of Syria, Tripoli and Beirut while he found opportunities to attend military drills abroad. Besides, Mustafa Kemal had an important duty in Balkan War commanded by Fethi Okyar.

By 1923, Mustafa Kemal was a leader who rose within a modern institutional mechanism and these structures would both limit him and provide some advantage to apply his reforms. For example, multi-party system testing limited his absolute power and secularised institutions helped to carry out what is on his mind. But on contrary to him, Reza Khan would not take over a structure which had institutional

maintenance thus, he would limit the institutions himself because he was the founder of almost all these institutions. By this way, in the institutions built by Reza Khan, hybrid structured institutions can be observed in Iran. For example, Iranian Civil Code incorporated some sharia laws directly. Another difference was that Reza Khan was new in political life. Thus, in his regime military feature would be more decisive and during his rule, security policies would be superior. In the building of nation-state, military would have an important role by the way of educational institution to assimilate peripheral identities. For instance, wearing same uniforms, singing the same march and speaking the same language. After the coup, the first aim of Reza Khan was to create a modern united regular army. He canalized basic consumption taxes in order to provide economic sources for his army. As he had rather regular army, Mustafa Kemal built companies with the local capitalists, with whom he had close relations, to supply equipment and goods. Mustafa Kemal had been annoyed by the union of military and politics since the government of CUP, thus he appointed Fevzi Çakmak as the leader of military because Çakmak was not interested in politics.

1924 and 1925 were the problematic years for the regimes two leaders tried to build. In these years, leaders faced with oppositions both in the Parliament and field. The Republic movement of Reza Khan in 1924, got reaction from the Moderates led by Musaddiq in the Parliament and traditional structures in the field. The leader of organization in the field was Ulema and they thought that the Republican ideas aimed to destroy Islam. In response to these, Reza Khan did not have enough program to persuade and prevent opposition movements. Moreover, supporters of the Republican movement from periphery did not reach on masses and they almost only consisted of local governors and officers. When the news came from Turkey about abolishing of Caliphs in October 1924, the chance of Reza Khan was considerably decreased. Finally, Reza Khan withdrew his Republican ideas after the meeting with Ulemas from Qom province. The similar opposition movement was seen in Turkey, after the destroying of the Second Group, Parliament turned into a homogeneous structure and absolute leader position of Mustafa Kemal got powerful day by day. The second opposition movement came into view among the

leaders of the National Struggle after the proclamation of the Republic. The movement was annoyed the abolishing of Caliphate as well, because they supported the Caliphate to limit Mustafa Kemal's absolute power. The group transformed into a Political Party, as a reaction to corruption during the Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey. The Progressive Republican Party -PRP- was founded led by Kazım Karabekir in October 1924. The party was opposed to the Law on the Maintenance of Order, as they wanted to prevent Mustafa Kemal from working just like a dictator. Indeed, the PRP would be closed by this Law due to the ideas that the Party had relation with the Kurdish revolt in June 1925 and supported reactionary groups. Moreover, after the Law on the Maintenance of Order, Kemalists proclaimed Martial Law and they closed many opponent newspapers and publications, besides Mustafa Kemal had similar rights to dictatorships between 1925 and 1929.

The campaigns of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan were against Sheikh Said and Sheikh Khazal, to provide themselves possibilities to consolidate their powers both in Parliament and peripheral zones. Because the existence of both groups, Kurds and Arabs, posed an obstacle for building ethno-centric nation-state. In consequence of these campaigns, both regimes survived the weak period between 1924 and 1925. Afterwards, Mustafa Kemal designed the condition of the Parliament by his demands and Reza Khan elected as Shah by the Parliament. There was a similar propaganda between Iranian and Turkish regimes against Sheikh Said and Sheikh Khazal revolts. Both revolts were accused of being reactionist and separatist, on the other hand central governments claimed that Sheikh Said and Sheikh Khazal collaborated with Western powers for dissolution of their states. Afterwards, central governments attacked on peripheral groups by the way of education, language, and history as well. Thus, they targeted public memory of peripheral groups to dissolve the connection between their past and present by the aid of these assimilation policies.

During the transformation from Empire to the Nation State, both regimes tried to eliminate the religion symbols of traditional groups. Mustafa Kemal had some

advantages to transform symbols of society from traditional to Western type modern ones. Because, he took over a continuousness in terms of secularized structure and society, which had traces of reforms waves on them socially from the period of Mahmud the Second. Actually, Mustafa Kemal was a reformist ruler who followed the reformist wave which had been going on since the nineteenth century. By this way, respectively, he abolished the Sultanate, proclaimed the Republic and lastly, he annulled the Caliphate in terms of institutional secularization. Ultimately, he founded the Religious Affairs Administration to control Ulema and incorporate them into central bureaucratic network as a state servant. Mustafa Kemal took a step to reflect of his reforms on social life, in this purpose, he closed Religious Courts in 1924, founded Faculties of Theology in 1925, and implemented Penal Law in 1926. On the other hand, the article of ‘‘the official religion is Islam’’ in the Constitution was abolished in 1928 on the purpose of institutional secularization. Moreover, Kemalist regime implemented the Law on Headdress and Regulation on Dressing to transform social life as reference to Western type dresses. Especially, traditional structures were troubled with obligations about Western type hat and dresses because these Western symbols reminded them of Non-Muslim groups in the period of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, as distinct from Reza Khan, Mustafa Kemal brought into force Latin alphabet instead of Arabic alphabet in 1928 and he banned all Sects in 1925 to prevent a parallel hierarchy emerging against central bureaucracy because they had important organization networks within the society.

The conditions of Iranian were quite different than Turkey. Especially, Iranian Ulema had become politicized from the nineteenth century and their political power was seen in the Iranian Constitution clearly in which a group of high ranking Ulema was identified as a consultant organ. Moreover, they maintained their autonomous position against the central state when Reza Khan came to power. Even though Reza Khan conflicted with Ulema when the republican idea of him was revealed, Reza Khan tried to build a good relationship with Ulema in the first years of 1920s. Especially, Reza Khan got into a mutual utilitarianism with the three interpreters of Islamic Law -Mujtahids-. According to this partnership, Reza Khan gave them local autonomy and supported their demands on the local platform in exchange for

acknowledging protection of Reza's regime and being unresponsive to his reforms in the field of religion. The rule of Reza Khan did not implement deeply change in terms of institution; he showed some tolerance with traditional groups instead of conflicting them. In this direction, Iranian Civil Code was constituted with respect to Islamic values. For instance, it included some Shari codes as the rights of divorce and child custody took with father's side and the system of polygamy continued. Moreover, Reza Khan did not close the traditional education institutions, Madrasah, but he standardized their curriculum according to central educational institution to control their independent structures from central government. Reza Khan had similar attitude with Mustafa Kemal against Islamic symbols. He determined to destroy them. In the process of building homogenous nation state, the Law on Headdress and Regulation on Dressing against peripheral groups were important because it was directly related to the doctrine of Populism which was seen in both regimes. Indeed, headdress and dress were important in the traditional groups of society for the identification of one's ethnicity, class and religion. So, these identifications in traditional groups were contrary to homogenous nation state's standardized citizen. Especially, after the visiting of the Shah to Turkey in 1934, the implement of headdress and dress became tighter. On the other hand, in similar way of the Populist practices of Kemalists, Reza Khan abolished the titles to create a new national identity instead of a common identity of Islam which was created by the period of Nasreddin Shah with the religious ceremonies and rituals.

In 1929, there was a great shock in Western World because American centred World Capitalist Market was collapsed. With the effects of the Great Depression, national economies withdrew into their shell and they raised tariff walls to prevent negative effects of the Depression. Turkey and Iran affected by its negative effects as well, in terms of political, economic and social. On the other hand, there were only two Western states that survived strongly within the Depression: Soviets and Nazi Germany. Thus, Soviets and Nazi Germany were models for some countries in the field of economy and politics. By taking inspiration of both Western powers, Turkey and Iran tried to establish a national capital, form a model of statist economy, apply development plan in the field of economy. Also, terms of ideology,

authoritarian, arbitrary and totalitarian tendencies were seen in political life of Turkey and Iran during the 1930s.

There were some advantages and disadvantages when Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan built a national economy in both countries. In Turkey, positively, the central state confiscated properties which belonged to Non-Muslim after the Great War with they destroyed. But, negatively, there was a serious gap in the internal market due to destruction of Non-Muslim capitalists who dominated the domestic market. Kemalists tried to place foreigner capitals instead of Non-Muslim groups, and they received support from Western Banking and credits system to revive local market and create a national capital. But, Kemalist economic approach was collapsed with the Great Depression. Thus, many local companies and producers went bankrupt by the reason of their directed relations with Western credits. In positive aspect, thanks to the confiscated properties and lands from Non-Muslim groups, the central government could build relationship which was based on mutual interests with local groups in terms of economic and political. On the other hand, in Iran, the incomes of central state were increased by the institutional arrangements of American expert, Arthur Millspaugh, under the rule of Reza Khan. By this way, thanks to increase in oil receipts, tariff, indirect tax, and income tax, Iranian economy had a major development during the 1930s. Negatively, the main income of the central state was from oil fields and it depended on the D'Arcy Concession in 1901 which was in favour of Western companies for operating rights. By 1930, Reza Khan was very angry at the imbalance between output and revenues. Because, according to the treaty, while there was an increase in production, there was no increase in oil revenues. Finally, Reza Shah declared the cancellation of the D'Arcy and then, he had to sign an Oil Agreement in 1933 with Western companies under the pressure of internal and external conditions. But the new agreement did not provide any different positive effects on Iran economy. Even it would be involving a sixty years period and it would not be unilateral cancellation.

The statist economies were seen in both countries after the Great Depression. With the difference of socialism, statist economic model moved personal property to

central office. According to model, the central state aimed giving financial support to initiatives from local and by this way, the state took the lead in local companies, and state bureaucrats took over administrative level of these companies. The statist model of economy found place in the Doctrine of Republican People Party in 1931 and 1935. But economic model had negative effects rather than positive effects in local markets. Especially, agricultural productivities were affected negatively from the monopolistic price of the central state which almost determined as low as possible, and this situation damaged workers and peasants. Moreover, an aferist group was emerged within the central government, who took advantage of the system, and they abused their effects on tenders by making irregularities. During the 1930s, statist economies preferred corporatist model, led by fascist Italy. According to model, economic organizations -Corporations- formed a hierarchy from local to the center and they connected directly with fascist leader. Thus, the central state aimed to control working class and local companies to prevent the struggle of classes. The system was of interest to Kemalists and it took place in the Doctrine of RPP in 1935. According to Programme, Turkish society was divided into occupational groups which worked in cooperation with each other and the organization did not include any conflicting classes. And also, Turkish model of corporatism was similar to Ziya Gökalp's solidarist model which also gave Turkish citizens some duties and responsibilities. On the other hand, the development plans originated from Nazi Germany and Soviets were observed in Turkey and Iran during the 1930s. In this direction, taking inspiration from Soviets, five years plans were implemented in terms of industry in Turkey. According to program, some companies were founded with the aid of Russian experts to produce industrial goods in local market such as paper, brick, cement, and glass. In Iran, Reza Khan's regime had a good relationship with Nazi Germany, after the Oil Agreement in 1933. In parallel with this relation, Iran had a great development in the field of industry.

During the 1930s, in political life, the movement of Fascism and National Socialism started to increase in Western World. The important features of these movements were that they were formed with the participation of masses who were annoyed with economic and political conditions of their states. By 1930, there was a difficult

condition in domestic politics of Turkey. On the one hand the conflicts between the central government and Kurdish groups had been maintaining since the Sheikh Said revolt, on the other hand the effects of the Great Depression were felt in the local market, especially in the region of Western Anatolia and Thrace. For these reasons, Kemalist government refrained from a political movement which was organized from masses against Kemalist regime. In 1928, Kurdish groups formed a government around Ararat mountain, including Armenian members, under the leadership of Hoybun organization which was founded by Kurdish entelijiansa in 1927. The government founded a military army led by Ihsan Pasha and conflicts started with Kemalist forces, once again. During the conflicts, Kemalist forces were in a difficult position against the Kurdish forces and they accused Iran of permitting Kurdish groups to use frontier regions of Iran. But, thanks to the effects of bombardments of Turkish Air Force, Kemalist forces had an advantage against Kurdish groups. But Kemalists decided to withdraw their attacks on Ararat Mountain since economic condition of Turkey went bad. Because, they started to fear from a potential opposition movement which could rise from masses against Kemalist regime. Indeed, Kemalist regime had been governing by Martial law since 1925 and the image of the regime looked like a dictatorship. Thus, Mustafa Kemal decided to end the one-Party regime and he asked Fethi Okyar to establish a new Party. By this way, Fethi Okyar founded the Free Republican Party in August 1930. But, the FRP was welcomed with interest in a short time by the masses and Mustafa Kemal was annoyed with this interest, because he thought that the rise of the FRP was actually a reaction to his regime. Finally, the FRP was closed by the request of Mustafa Kemal and after that the most authoritarian period of Kemalist regime started.

The one-man regimes of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah placed special emphasis on the field of construction. Because, thanks to construction activities, both leaders aimed to re-create collective memory by destroying symbols of old regimes, and also, they could penetrate peripheral zones more easily by constructing railroads and roads. So, the symbols of both regimes were in the projects of building capital cities and transportation networks. By this way, Ankara was founded by Mustafa

Kemal as a rival against the historical capital city of Istanbul. And also, Mustafa Kemal established the city in the middle of steppe which symbolized a project that would create a new human and modern society instead of cosmopolitan traditional city of Istanbul. Moreover, Kemalists laid on Western type of parties and entertainments to create a city life which belonged to middle and upper middle class. In Iran, under the reconstruction of Tehran, Reza Shah's regime aimed to destruct classical structures of Tehran completely and a modern structure was constructed such as new streets, boulevards, cafes, and theatres in the classical structures. Positively, thanks to modern middle and upper middle lifestyle in the both capitals, women's participation in public life became more visible and women found a change in business life as workers, teachers, and nurses. On the other hand, the construction process was also effective in terms of transportation. Mustafa Kemal took over more active transportation and road network than Reza Shah. Both authoritarian leaders thought that the most important problem in their countries had been security issue, and they determined the direction of transportation networks in deference to security policies throughout the 1930s.

During the 1930s, the ideologies of both regimes were getting radicalized and also, laicistic and nationalist policies of both leaders would reach the peak. While the peak point for Iran was the beginning of 1940, when the regime was the supporter of Nazism; for Turkey, it was attacks on Dersim, the city consisted of Kurdish-Alawites, in 1938. On the other hand, both regimes tried to establish connection with pre-Islamic past to create a historical continuousness between past and present according to their ideological views. In this direction, pre-Islamic characters named the newly built streets and boulevards, furthermore, symbols of civilizations from pre-Islamic period decorated the new structures. In political life, Turkey entered into the Combining Party and State in 1935, the system was seen in fascist regimes in the West. The Combining Party and State of Turkey system was different than Western type, because, in Turkish version, the regime did not establish connection with masses as seen in Europe and Kemalist regime gave importance to state wing by using security policies primarily. In Iran, after the Oil Agreement in 1933, Reza Shah's regime transformed authoritarianism to arbitrary dictatorship. During these

years, Reza Shah destroyed many prominent political figures, including the names closest to the Shah. In the relationship between the center and periphery, attacks on Mashhad and Dersim were the cruellest operations against peripheral groups. In addition to these, both regimes showed some totalitarian tendencies as many organizations were closed, various presses were banned, and political figures and Parties were destroyed. Nevertheless, it is impossible to say the regimes of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah were fascist. Because fascism came out in the advantage stage of capitalist process, Iran and Turkey did not have any developed bourgeoisie class and capitalist process yet. Moreover, both regimes did not have a Party army as seen in Italy and Nazi Germany. And lastly, Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah did not interest in mobilizing masses around the Party. In international relationship, Mustafa Kemal tried to follow a cautious foreign policy and he kept his regime out of danger by a balance policy. Reza Shah's Iran would take part with Nazi Germany against Britain by taking the support of nationalists and it would be the end of Reza Shah. Reza Shah was deposed from the throne by reason of his good relations with Nazi Germany when the British and Russian forces occupied Iran in 1941 and he died from heart ailment in Johannesburg in 1944. And Mustafa Kemal died from cirrhosis in Istanbul in October 1938.

By focusing on the sources about the period of the two modern authoritarian leaders, we see that there are not enough books that were written by using comparative methods on their ruling period. Even though Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan had many kinds of common features, many writers approached on minimal perspective such as economic, religious, political, and social instead of international perspective. Moreover, some sources fell into mainstream historiographic mistake by thinking of their period. These sources evaluated two leaders as modernizer heroes. They neglected the conditions of their rivals. For example, Sina Akşin and Afet İnan always highlighted how Mustafa Kemal's reforms were unique. They showed the other figures as anti-modernized and traitors. Even though some sources which were written by very close friends of Mustafa Kemal had conflicting ideas with each other. For example, "Atatürk Hakkında Hatıralar ve Belgeler", which was written by Afet İnan, "Çankaya", written by Falih Rıfkı Atay, and "Sınıf

Arkadaşım Atatürk'', which was written by Ali Fuad Cebesoy. But some books are quite successful such as ''Atatürk: An Intellectual Biography'', by Şükrü Hanioglu, and ''Frontier Fiction: Shaping the Iranian Nation, 1804-1946'', by Firoozeh Kashani-Sabet, touch on important points and they were different than the other books written on this period. For example, Kashani-Sabet's book comes in a different context on the history of Iran. She focused on nationalist application of Qajars by media organs and educational system such as curriculum and women magazines during the Constitutional period. Actually, except for Kashani-Sabet book, there are not enough approach about Iranian nationalism from the Nasreddin Shah period to coup d'état. And also, in comparison with the military careers of two leaders, while we can find many sources about the youth period of Mustafa Kemal, there is very little information about the youth of Reza Khan. In many sources, the military career of Reza was starting in 1918. Unfortunately, before the period of 1918, a lot of sources give same monotonous information on Reza Khan's family and provinces where he was born and lived in.

Even so, some books have comparative approaches. Especially, the studies from Eric Jan Zürcher, Touraj Atabaki and Houchang Chebabi give inspiration and thanks to them, we could understand reforms, oppositions, leaders, and political figures of two period as a whole. Moreover, thanks to Stephanie Cronin's wonderful studies on Iranian military, we could learn how did the Iranian military develop from disorder type to a united central army. And other studies ''Iran Between Two Revolutions'' and ''A History of Modern Iran'', written by Edward Abrahamian, provided us very important approaches on constitutional periods of Iran and the period of the Reza Shah's ruling. In addition to these studies, especially, on religious field, Hamid Algar's book ''Religion and State in Iran, 1785-1906: The Role of the Ulema'' and Şahruh Ahavi's book ''Religion and Politics in Contemporary Iran: Clergy-State Relation in The Pahlavi Period'' contribute greatly to our understanding about the relations between the central government of Iran and Islamic groups. Although we have many useful sources, such as books, diaries, and memories, some points should be focused on more. For instance, the relations between Azeris and the central Iran government should be discussed more

deeply from the constitutional period to the Second World War. On the other hand, the partnership of Kurds and Kemalists and the partnership of the Azeris and Iranian government could be researched by using comparative perspective. Thus, some similarities and differences between these two groups, which are founder partners, can be observed. Finally, although Kashani-Sabet's study focused on nationalist waves of the Iranian constitutionalist period, we need much more sources about Iranian nationalist movement to understand what the main organization methods and their motivation were.

In the light of these information, in first part, we will examine both states' economies from starting their transformation in the nineteenth century in order to understand their traditional economic life. Also, along with their traditional economy which usually depended on agriculture and small manufactural handloom, we will try to understand why they failed. For instance, tax policies, concessions in favour of Western powers, ever increased dependence on Western economy in trade, borrowing loans from Western powers. Also, we will try to examine their institutional, political and social modernization efforts through their policies in centralization, homogenization, secularization, education, settlement and the operation of nation-building.

In the second part, we will try to examine their political background of the struggles from nineteenth century to the Republican period. These struggles included the rivalry between center and periphery, the Western intervention on their countries, their political life under the group of autocrats and libertarian leaders, moreover, the path of their constitutional revolutions, the constitutional periods of political structures, the years of the Great War, and the transformation from chaotic order to the nation states. In terms of political life, the CUP will be examined in detail since Mustafa Kemal and his framework were directly related to this organization. Also, we will focus on the struggle between Russia and Britain for Iran, as the rise of Reza Khan was associated with this struggle.

The third part, we will try to understand the background of the rise of the two modern nationalist authorizer leaders by asking these questions: who are they? How

were the environments in which they grow up? How were their professional careers? Which ideas did they come into contact within their early years? What were the differences of their mentalities? What were the characteristics of geographies where they born? How were the social conditions in the cities where they born in? In the light of these questions; firstly, we will try to examine the two military organizations in which Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan grew. Secondly, we will handle geographies as conflictual zones in which two nationalist authoritarian modernizer leaders came from. And, we will search the effects of the conflictual zones on both states' political life. And thirdly, we will focus on their families and childhood and also, we will trace to military careers of the two leaders.

In the fourth part, we will examine the years in which new states were built after the empires. For Turkey, this period will be handled after the World War One, whereas the process after 1919 Anglo-Persian Treaty will be taken into consideration for Iran. Firstly, while focusing on struggles of building new central states after the dissolution of empires, we will approach to authoritarian leaders' relations, rivals and main motivation which gathered around their struggles. Afterwards, we will focus on the relationship of states which were newly built with Western powers by considering conditions which changed after the Great War. Secondly, while analysing the rise of the two authoritarian leaders, we will examine their partnerships and the opposition movements occurred against them during the period of becoming absolute leaders. Moreover, we will argue about the struggles between central powers and peripheral communities remained from empires while handling nationalist policies of authoritarian leaders, in the period of becoming nation states after imperial time.

In the fifth part, we will examine the period between 1924 and 1929 of transforming into nation-states from imperial period. During the period, firstly, two modern nationalist leaders attacked to periphery by using military campaigns. After destroying the local powers, who created potential dangerous their absolute ruling, they appointed military governors to periphery for controlling local region by standards of central regime. And Secondly, two leaders aimed to transform public

Islam into a religion which was limited by the central government. In this direction, central state captured the classical institutions which was controlled by Ulema and the other local religion groups. And, the central government tried to destroy Islamic symbols to disconnect the relations between Islamic communities and their Islamic past. Finally, the central government attacked to religion institutions, which penetrated on social life directly, such as Madrasahs, Cult, and lodge.

In the sixth part, we will observe the authoritarian modernizer rules of the two leaders in the period between 1929 and 1941. Firstly, we will focus on their economies by considering effect of the Great Depression in 1929. Also, we will examine their statist economies and corporatist methods, having regard to examples from Western countries. Also, by observing Ararat Mountain revolts and the Free Republican Party experience, we will mention about the shocking year of Kemalist regime in 1930. Secondly, we will evaluate construction operations of two regimes by the way of building capital cities and railroads. And in the final part, we will observe state ideologies which were under the control of two authoritarian leaders. Thus, we will ask a question: Are they fascists? Afterwards, we will focus on their international relationships under three titles: the relationship between each other, the relationship with middle eastern countries and the relationship with the Western powers.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Turkey and Iran experienced great transformations from the nineteenth century to the 2000s. In this part, we will find out some of the underlying clues from nineteenth century to the final period of the two modern nationalist authoritarian leaders. We will comment on their different transformations by analysing their different historical evolutions such as economic conditions, modernizations and centralizations, and political waves. In this direction, firstly we will examine both states' economies from starting their transformation in the nineteenth century in order to understand their traditional economic life. Also, along with their traditional economy which usually depended on agriculture and small manufactural handloom, we will try to understand why they failed. For instance, tax policies, concessions in favour of Western powers, ever increased dependence on Western economy in trade, borrowing loans from Western powers. Secondly, we will try to examine their institutional, political and social modernization efforts through their policies in centralization, homogenization, secularization, education, settlement and the operation of nation-building. And lastly, we will try to examine their political background of the struggles from nineteenth century to the Republican period. These struggles included the rivalry between center and periphery, the Western intervention on their countries, their political life under the group of autocrats and libertarian leaders, moreover, the path of their constitutional revolutions, the constitutional periods of political structures, the years of the Great War, and the transformation from chaotic order to the nation states.

The Pahlavis' Iran and Mustafa Kemal's Turkey built their countries upon a geography in which interaction between regions and trade routes, such as the Silk-Road and the Mediterranean trade has been establishing for many centuries. Both countries' local economies were depended on agriculture and hand-loom production even though their geographical conditions were different, and Iran had a relatively closed geographical environment. The Iranians lived and worked in the countryside and as far as possible they feed urban with the agrarian surpluses. By contrast with same agricultural production, Iranian had some disadvantages on

water resources as they lacked seas and rivers. Moreover, the water resources were controlled by local landlords in order to control local surpluses (Keddie, 2006: 39).

CHAPTER 1: ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

Both countries lacked policies and incentives on focused on agriculture. (Kıray, 2015: 173). It only depended on ancient technics such as a primitive plough. For example, lack of water storage such as dams and lack of available land-roads for agricultural transportation were the main reasons of the Iranian Famine between 1869-1872 (Sabet, 2018: 111). One of the advantages of Ottoman geography was, the State had many sea routes and natural harbours. Especially, by the last period of nineteenth century, land transportation was very expensive and also non-secure. So, it was hard for any countries to survive their economy without active sea-trade and provide available surplus from peripheral to their cities (Tilly, 2018: 10). For example, the Thessalonica harbour gathered agricultural surpluses coming from peripheral zone of Macedonia and transferred to European countries and Ottoman cities. By doing this, they were trying to keep their economy alive. (Anastassiadou, 2015: 97). Under the ancient technic of farming and classical imperial patronage relationship between the center and local power elites, peasants were the lowest group in two countries, and they paid higher taxes comparing to other parts of the population in Qajars (Keddie, 2006: 51) and the Ottoman as well. With the rising free trade in the nineteenth century, while some peasants were improving their poor conditions, many peasants suffered from worse situations. (Keddie, 2006: 40)

The Effects of Western Market and Free Trade

In the period from sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the integration to the Western capitalist market increased the rivalry between peripheral zones of both states and the central government on the economic field. Iranian periphery had produced a significant quantity of silk, soft Kerman goats and textiles to export Europe (Keddie, 2006: 52) and Ottoman local powers had gained local economic surplus against the central administration (Pamuk, 2018: 12). Losing the control of economic surplus deteriorated Ottomans and Qajars' economic conditions.

Moreover, the economic concessions which were in favour of Western powers, led Ottomans and Qajars become more dependent on West step by step. Thanks to free trade, the industrial British goods reached both states' local bazaars and its negative effects caused breakdown of classical Iranian and Ottoman artisan. Ottoman artisanship experienced the worst destruction in the period from 1840 to 1870 (Pamuk, 2018: 123), besides, according to Suraiya Faroqhi, European manufacturers were one of the several reasons why Ottoman industrial progress did not occur. (Faroqhi, 2014: 295).

A new era had started after the Wars between Russia-Iran and Russia-Ottoman with the treaty of Turkomanchai in 1828 and the treaty of Baltalimanı in 1838 led Iran and Ottoman lose both of their states' economic control against Western countries. Under the conclusions of the Turkomanchai, Russia gained a custom tariff which disabled Iran from demanding more than 5% import tariff on Russian goods (Keddie, 2006: 41) besides, with the Baltalimanı, British goods could enter the Ottoman market with 5% tariff, the Ottoman raw material could enter foreign market with 12% export ratio (Pamuk, 2018: 17).

During the reign of Mohammed Shah, between 1834 and 1848, with the impact of free trade, cheap foreign goods came to market and this led to the first petitions from local bazaars against Western competition. (Keddie, 2006: 44). In short, the results of contacts with Western capitalist economy showed more negative effect rather than positive for Iran and Ottoman economy. Ottomans and Qajars were not able to implement independent economic policies due to these unequal treaties. Western countries, with the advantages coming from free trade, decided to maintain direct relationships with central governments, rather than periphery. (Pamuk, 2018: 14) Thus, western powers tried to design local bazaars for their main demands. For example, in the second period of the nineteenth century, Iranian agricultural export led to some land transformation from food to export crops such as opium and cotton (Moazami, 2018: 42).

The Relations between the Center and Periphery

By the nineteenth century, the lack of institutions caused some economic problems in their economies as well. Especially, there wasn't any properly and efficiently functioning tax collection system. Most of their tax systems depended on various levels of local or provincial tax collectors so, only little payment reached to the central government (Keddie, 2006: 51). The richest agricultural regions of the Ottoman territory, powerful landlords controlled not only gathering agricultural surplus around but also long-distance agricultural trade. In short, local landlords' power was based on territorial economic network (Pamuk, 2018: 89). Moreover, local powers, by seeing themselves as law makers, established their own military forces to collect taxes (Kıray, 2015: 18)

In the nineteenth century, Ottoman government took measures in order to regain the economic and political power and a great transformation between center and region on controlling economic surpluses started in the period of Tanzimat. Ottomans aimed to change classical type of tax collection system, the farming contract -İltizam-. The İltizam system caused a parallel hierarchy without central's consent on the local plane and the moneylenders dominated the local tax system.

In the Tanzimat period, central government tried to change local tax tenders in favor of an ordinary villager such as Mukhtar, sect leader, and board of alderman (Özbek, 2015: 88). In this way, tax system which was controlled by the moneylenders was redesigned in a way that local power elites were limited by central through controlling their economic and social powers. The other solution was an ordinary gendarmerie force which was established in 1840 to control internal security in peripheral zones. (Özbek, 2010: 47) The institution of Gendarmerie played an essential role in progressing modern bureaucratic state. Finally, thanks to Tanzimat reforms, the central taxing income increased by 450% (Özbek, 2015: 43).

On the other hand, Shahs gave up their authorities on the periphery, in favor of the local prominent partners to make them accept their divine position of Sultanate. So, when Shah needed to assign any position about local administration, he had to select zonal prominent figure.

CHAPTER 2: MODERNIZATION

The Breaking Point, Sultan Mahmud The Second

The period of Mahmud the Second was a decisive factor of the Ottoman modernization in the nineteenth century. Many kinds economic, social and military reforms were started in his reign. The Sultan recognized the dissolution of the Empire and he tried to modernize the structures by modelling European methods. The main target of Sultan Mahmud 2 was traditional layers. He targeted to demolish the ongoing system, Zımni Sözleşme, which was consisted of the union between ordinary tebaa, Janissaries army and Ulema against Ottoman government and Sultan. According to Ottoman Zımni Sözleşme, when ordinary tebaa faced difficult conditions by the rulers, they got into partnership with Ulema and Janissary troop and with this coalition, the Zımni coalition, they tried to limit the Sultan or other rulers' powers (Mardin, 1991: 117).

The modernizer Sultan understood the threats of Zımni coalition, and he abolished the Janissary troops in 1826. In this way he blocked the protest movements which came from below. From this date on, with new military order of Tanzimat, the relation between tebaa which includes bazaarist, merchants, an ordinary people etc., soldiers were eradicated. (Mardin, 1991: 116). That was the turning point of why the Iranian mode of opponent organizations well attended, by contrast with the Ottoman oppositions, which was going to include officers, military officers and teachers, such as organization, partnership, and so on. Moreover, the Sultan did not forget the other traditional partner, Ulema. He tried to expropriate the income which was transferred to Ulema (Lewis, 2009: 130). Also, he took the power of appointment by changing the system which Vakıf's administration was chosen by Ulema's (Faroqhi, 2014: 300).

However, these sustaining reforms required more economic sources. So, the following reformers decided to get some loans from Western powers in order to sustain Empire. These loans were used for military purposes and controlling economic surpluses from the peripheral zones (Kıray, 2015: 18). The different path of both states was starting from the Sultan Mahmud to the first loan treaty which was borrowed after the Crimean War in 1856.

In the period following the treaty of Turkomanчай 1828, the concessions given from two states in favor of Western powers, opened the way of political and economic interventions coming from the West. Since both states were struggling with chaotic internal conditions, which deepened with the military defeats against Russian and British forces, economic concessions such as Hunkar Iskelesi, Balta Limani and Turkomanчай, increased both states' vulnerabilities and dependency on the West. In 1830's political, social and economic differentiation between Qajars and Ottomans became more visible. While Ottomans tried to transform the classical methods of politics, between central and peripheries, into a modern centralized state formation, Qajars followed the classical approaches. In addition, Qajars avoided internal conflicts with peripheral powers and external disputes with Western powers. On the contrary, Ottomans' struggle with periphery and wars with the Western powers, helped Ottomans to maintain centralized policies and made the way for Ottomans to become more independent than Qajars.

On the connection between war making and state making, Charles Tilly, talked about four related cases: becoming a state, making War, patronising, and finding a capital from periphery (Tilly, 2018:12). These cases are connected to each other. The War needs economic sources, for more economic sources more patronising on local communities is needed, and for patronizing more powerful state formation on local zones is needed. Thanks to the patronage, the local people came to terms with the institutions of state such as courts, chamber of deputies, and governor of regions.

Establishment of Modern Institutions

After the Sultan Mahmud the second, Ottoman State tried to capture local surplus and the state made some plans about how to gain the taxing funds in a more beneficial way. During the Tanzimat period, Ottoman military could afford internal conquests with Western loans and this enhanced the militaries' strength. Thus, the state incorporated local powers' facilities and through law enforcement forces such as Gendarmerie and police, the state established the right to use of force to locals. Centralized state formation gained strength by patronizing local powers and controlling local surplus, as Tilly suggested.

The taxing steps of Tanzimat on Balkanize caused displeasures within local Non-Muslim communities and these displeasures were resource of thoughts of nationalist movement (Kayalı, 2018:23). Moreover, the unrestrained power of tax collectors and gendarmerie forces led to nationalist union against central government and shaped an Eastern question known as the problem of Serbian, Greek, Bulgar and Armenian (Özbek, 2015:18) became the main topic of conversation within years. As a result, after the Russo-Ottoman War 1877-1878, the opposite groups which were against Tanzimat tools, changed the system of tax collecting which was run from Gendarmerie forces. (Özbek, 2015: 29) So, Ottoman state decided to work with locals instead of armed forces.

Differentiation in Military Modernization

The thought of a Western type of regular army shaped early period of the nineteenth century. Iranian reformers aimed to establish a regular military as a step of defensive modernization (Cronin, 2012:116). The Ottoman Sultan Selim the Third and Fath Ali Shah tried to improve their armies according to British and French styles against the expansionism of Russian and British colonialism. When Russian and British military gained ground on Caucasia and Central Asia, Iranian rulers recognized their modern artillery and equipment. After the defeats , Fath Ali decided to reorganize (Abrahamian, 1982: 77) and improve (Keddie, 2006: 38) Iranian military by following the Ottoman Nizamı Cedid, which was established

by Sultan Selim the third to change the order of military from volunteering basis to compulsory military service (Lewis, 2009: 99) During the Napoleon War, British and French offered some martial assurances to Iran. For example, British sent Captain John Malcom to sign the 1801 Treaty with Iran which promised military equipment and technicians for Iran on the condition that Iran would march towards Afghanistan and France. Moreover, France promised Iran to supply equipment and training if Iran promised to declare War on British (Keddie, 2006: 38).

In the Ottoman side, Mahmud laid the foundation of modern army by abolishing the Janissary troop. The new Ottoman military, known as Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammeddiyye, showed that state institutions include only specific groups, which depended on Sunni Orthodox Islam values, and they did not contain any heterodox structuring. In this direction, central government appointed Sunni İmams to army and the military service got under the influence of Orthodox Sunni thought (Hacısalihoglu, 2010: 81). The first drive of military modernization was led by Prince Abbas Mirza, who governed the Northern Iranian zones, modelled Sultan Selim himself (Abrahamian, 1982: 52). Abbas Mirza tried to construct Iranian Azerbaijan's troops. The region was ruled by Abbas Mirza in this period, and he was the one who decided to send students abroad for military training (Keddie, 2005: 40). But Abbas Mirza's military reforms met with negative reactions in terms of economics and politics; economy could not afford his military expenditures (Abrahamian, 1982: 39) and many tribal and urban leaders opposed to a central army that limit their role and autonomy (Keddie, 2005: 40). On the other side, thanks to Western loans (Faroqhi, 2014: 158) and increasing incomes from peripheral zones, the Ottoman regular military system improved day by day. During the period of Tanzimat, led by Serasker Rıza Pasha, Ottoman military included two main parts: regular army -Nizam- and reserve army -Redif- (Tokay, 2010: 37). The groups of Redif included old-aged Nizam groups' members. This system sustained from the period of Hüseyin Avni Pasha -1870s- (Tokay, 2010: 37) to the period of the Committee of Union and Progress 1910s (Tokay, 2010: 44).

Why did they choose different paths in their military history? To understand, the different paths of military histories between Iran and Ottoman, the relationship between establishing regular military and funding sources should be examined. Convenient financial conditions are the key of establishing a military system and practice reforms. During the nineteenth century, nearly half of the general budget, between 30% and 50%, transmitted to military expenditures (Özbek, 2018: 36). Furthermore, when it comes to 1887, %76 of general budget reserved military costs and payment of debts from Western institutions (Özbek, 2018: 37). During the Sultan Abdülhamid ruling, military expenditures served over the half of budget (Georgeon, 2018:341). Actually, these expenditures state that Tanzimat reformers and Sultan Abdülhamid practiced some coercive methods while their country was turning from classic Imperial structure to modern centralized state. Another negative effect of having powerful military system is having too much bureaucratic staff. The existence of too much staff led to economic demands and unwieldy structure just like the sample of Prussian (Tilly, 2018: 13).

The second issue gave rise to Iranian military modernization was led by Muhammed Taqhi Khan, better known as the Amir Kabir. When he was appointed for state mission to Istanbul, he had deep interest in the Tanzimat reforms (Abrahamian, 1982: 53). After the turn, he became a prime minister. Amir Kabir tried to establish a modern military force by Western style education and training (Keddie, 2006: 49). But there was a big problem that Iran did not have taxing system. Until this time, Qajars wanted to strengthen their defensive modernization, their tax incomes were not increased due to lack of central state institutions. Amir Kabir tried to change this situation, by starting tax collection for military expenditures and he established fifteen factories to supply army properly (Abrahamian, 1982: 54). But his aim got reactions by great masses which included Shah, officers, tribes. (Garthwaite, 2011: 182). Most important of all, Amir Kabir built the country's first secular high school, Darul Fonun, for the purpose of training officials and administration for bureaucracy (Savory, 1978: 87) Also their members were selected among sons of tribes (Abrahamian, 2018). The curriculum of Darul

Fonun included foreign languages, engineering, agriculture, political science, and geography. Moreover, Amir Kabir sent a number of young men to Europe for studies and added foreign scholars to the teaching staff (Eilers, 1978: 305). But, due to financial reasons and the Babi revolt, political instability occurred. (Abrahamian, 1982: 54), Amir Kabir was dismissed in 1851.

After the 1851, the powers against Amir Kabir gave guarantees to the dynasty of Shah and also Western powers promised same type assurance on Qajar dynasty as well. Consequently, Nasireddin Shah put aside military reforms. For this reason, the Iran central hierarchy and bureaucratization did not progress, as they were depended on development of military system (Ahavi, 1990: 55). After this time, the peripheral forces got stronger day by day and they had improved weapons, comparing to central whose military system had not made progress. (Abrahamian, 2018: 16). Thereupon, British diplomat Mark Sykes stated that the Southern tribes were better equipped than the government troops (Abrahamian, 1982: 40).

During the nineteenth century, Ottoman reformers recognized the importance of the internal colonization of provincial. One of the biggest obstacles to modernization was the existence of nomadic groups and their lifestyle. Ottoman understood the classic type of disordered Ottomans structure prevented their policies. Even though, these communities were a part of Ottoman rural life's throughout by the nineteenth century, central government had always tried to limit and local powers by appointing central officers (Mardin, 1991: 111). Within the period of Tanzimat, Ottoman reforms implement regulations on periphery to solve its disorder condition for collected taxes properly and constitute a compulsory military service. For example, the Ottoman Police department was established. The aim was to reorganize the relation between the center and periphery (Tilly, 2015: 6). In addition to this, central government aimed to reorganize rural groups' customs and their living conditions (Özbek: 2015:51).

In this direction, a high Ottoman identity was defined by Tanzimat reformers to create Empire by regulating a common, which was constituted by center, such as

common clothing, common time, and so on. In accordance with describing, the nomadic groups, which lived around the towns, forced to adopt a settled life. Especially, many of Kurdish groups were suppressed to settle on Armenian lands. And also, Caucasians, who were displaced from homeland by the alliance between Ottomans and Tsar Russia in 1860, were placed in Non-Muslim communities' lands (Dündar, 2008: 45). There was a dualism about the existence of nomadic groups. These groups annoyed not only Ottoman reformers but also the towners, including Arabs, Kurds and Armenians, was plundered by these groups. For example, according to Mutedil Hurriyetperveran Party's program in 1909, the central government should take precaution to settlement Arabic regions against attacks from nomadic groups, better known as Bedouin (Kayalı, 2018: 115). On the other side, In Iran, the settlement policies and defining a high Persian identification would be visible under the rule of Reza Khan after a long time. His centralized policy of de-ethnicization applicated in order to eliminate diverse identities and he tried to impose the culture and language of one ethnic group, Persian, on all ethnic groups (Gheissari, 2009: 301).

The Reflections of Modernization

By the twentieth century, Ottoman Ulema had been carrying reformist traces for at least half-century. During the period after Mahmud the Second, Ulema had been limited by the center in terms of administration, economy and politics (Georgeon, 2006: 13). The highest religion official, Shaykh al-Islam, was not independent from the Ottoman Palace. That is to say, he was the only member of the central Ottoman administration. Moreover, during the Sultan Abdülhamid ruling, sons of Ulema were sent to central secular schools in Istanbul and they got married with daughters of local secular families (Kayalı, 2018: 43). In this way, a hybrid urban group was emerged in periphery

On the contrary, in the light of Shiite doctrine, it was natural that the Ulema to lead movements against state (Algar, 1969: 252). With the nineteenth century, as it was seen from Iranian-Russia Wars, Iranian Ulema was effective not only against state

but also, they mobilized society against foreign enemies by announcing Jihad (Sabet, 2018: 79). Moreover, Iranian Ulema was entirely independent not only from central government but also from each other (Ahavi, 1990: 55). The most senior clerics commented about Islamic or politic issues by self-reality. Unlike the Ottoman clerics, which absorbed into the state, the Iranian clerics preserved their decentralized position and institutional autonomy against the center throughout the Qajar period. (Sohrabi, 2011: 314). The Iranian Ulema's economic sources were not depend on the central state budget (Ahavi, 1990:55), their salaries came from the local communities by the organization of Sehmi Imam which provided some proportion over the Muslim taxes.

The Modernization waves reflected on urban life, transportation and public space as well. Thanks to geographic advantages of Ottoman state, such as the effect of historical Mediterranean Sea-trade, and the investment of infrastructural and constructional design, for instance; the line of railways could peripheries to World economy, moreover the existence of the cities which were positioned on historical Mediterranean trade roads, Thessaloniki and Smyrna joined to Western Market. For example, the Pera zone owned a lighting system, some modern cafés, and cabaret theatres. And also, with port Thessaloniki, the city turned into Western style. Since the second part of nineteenth century, modern type of cafes had been opened. In contrast with classical Ottoman coffee houses, modern cafes, hotels, and eating-house helped women to take place in city life. So, these living spaces provided a new code of behaviour (Anastassiadou, 2015: 178). All of these urban progresses contributed a lot to the emergence of secular culture. And also, the old roads were rebuilt through widening in the Ottoman towns (Faroghi, 2014: 302) as the sample of Hausmann's Parisian roads. In the period of 1880s, long-distance voyage had started on the Mediterranean Sea (Zürcher, 2015: 124), thus the Ottoman citizens would reach to European cities more easily.

The impact of modernization also echoed in literary life. Istanbul and other port cities had printing houses which mostly directed by Non-Muslim groups (Mann,

2012: 135). For example, the novel, 'Yüzen Bahçe', was written by Halid Refik Karay, which was about the cruise moving along on the Mediterranean Sea. The other book, Araba Sevdası, was written by Rezaizade Mahmud Ekrem and its plot reflected the new type of urban lifestyle and the new social status brought by modern urban life. Moreover, a new type of the provincial and municipal design, which was designed by the Committee of Union and Progress was in power, was transferred to the Republic of Turkey (Lewis, 2009: 308).

Qajar Iran modernised public space such as press in the period of Muzaffereddin Shah. He was tolerant of press and he tried to open modern secular schools (Behroz, 2018: 62). The great rise of press would be after the Constitutional period of Iran. After the constitution period of Iran, journalism became one of the most popular jobs (Eilers, 1978: 305) and, unlike the censorship of Sultan Abdülhamid, in the first year of revolution, a hundred of newspapers and magazines were published (Kayalı, 2018: 66).

CHAPTER 3: POLITICAL BACKGROUND

The Effects of Western Powers

In international relations, during to nineteenth century, both states were under the effect of Western powers. After the years of the Western powers' hegemony, two despotic Sultans, Sultan Abdülhamid and Nasreddin Shah, came to thrones. On one hand, during their rule, the despotic monarchs tried to balance policy in Western relationship; on the other hand, they aimed to mobilize their Muslim population in domestic politics. Ottoman reformers built a good relationship with Britain and France in the period of Tanzimat. Actually, the Tanzimat period began with the defeat against the Egyptian armies which led by Ibrahim Pasha who was the son of Muhammad Ali Pasha in 1839. After the defeat, Ottoman rulers recognized that Ottoman would not be successful without Western technological and material supports. During the Tanzimat period, Ottoman Sultans had been sovereigns but not administrator of state affairs (Ismail Kemal, 2016: 54). In that time, the state elites were not from the Ulemas and soldiers, but from the officers who worked in

chamber of translation and embassy such as Mustafa Resid Pasha, Ali Pasha, and Fuad Pasha (Lewis, 2009: 165).

After the Prussia-France War in 1871 and the death of Ali Pasha, the political effect of French gave place to German on Ottoman state and from this date on Russia, German, and Britannia struggled with each other to control central Ottoman policy. Britain was supporting liberal ideas and reforms and on the other side, German wing raised on military and construction system such as railway and military school. Besides, Russia was more despotic in political life and they against to reforms made by Midhat Pasha, especially in Tuna province (Lewis, 2009: 216). The Russian effect came to the forefront with Mahmud Nedim Pasha's arrival to Grand Vizier position in 1871 and the rise of Mahmud Nedim showed that British-liberal wing was defeated against despotic Russian wing. In parallel with despotic Russian government, during the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid and Nasreddin Shah, Qajars and Ottomans tended to use despotic methods, such as limiting opposite movements, and tried to revive Islamic values on both sides for instance, rites and ceremonies (Abrahamian, 2018: 23) (Deringil, 2017: 51) supported to mobilize their Islamic communities.

When the time came to 1850s, Qajars' Iran became a buffer zone between two Western powers due to Russian diffusion and British imperialist intervention of India (Abrahamian, 2018: 50). Especially the fear of losing Mazandaran and Gilan, which were provinces in the coast of Caspian Sea, brought Qajar dynasty to collapse (Sabet, 2018: 51) and also, the failure of Herat attack to Afghanistan in 1856 spread too much hopelessness among Iran (Sabet, 2018: 43). As a result, the acceptance of buffer state situation and thanks to some concession on economic field, Western powers gave assurance of Qajar dynasty and Iran's territorial integrity.

The Rise of Opposition Movements

The reaction against Western cultural, political, and economic diffusion gathered both states' opposition movements in the late nineteenth century. Especially, conservative structures found government too passive about Western intervention. These conservative movements tried to limit the power of Sultan by consulting an Islamic parliament. In the Ottoman side, Namık Kemal, imagined a Parliament which was emerged with representatives of Islamic people (Mardin, 1991: 28) The first Ottoman opponent group, which also included Namık Kemal as its member and known as Young Ottomans, opposed to Western type of codes. They tried to mobilize masses through Sharia laws in order to prevent Western diffusion and policies of Tanzimat rulers (Kayalı, 2018: 27). In this direction, Ali Suavi, who was other important member of Young Ottomans, claimed that Ottoman people had to battle against tyrannizers of Tanzimat rulers for their rights claimed by God (Bozarslan, 2018: 141). The Iran opponents wanted to establish an Islamic Parliament as well. In this direction, Akhtar newspaper, which was published in Istanbul, supported Islamicized parliamentarism for Iran (Sohrabi, 2011: 304).

An allergy of Western institutions from Ulema was seen in dual educational system as well. Ulema reacted to foreign scholar who came to improve secular educational system. Al-Musavi, who was the member of Iranian Ulema, claimed that foreign scholars and its curricula caused degeneration of religious values (Sabet, 2018: 128). In addition to religion fear, Ulema was afraid that their monopoly on educational system could break (Algar, 1969: 224). And also, according to Maqala Milli newspaper, if it goes like this Iran might live the fate of India, which was occupied by British forces. (Algar, 1969: 209). There were Westernist ideas among Iranian intelligentsias as well. For instance, Rusenfikren, the Westernist group of Iran, showed interest to the thought of French enlightenment which supported the principle of people's sovereignty, freedom, equality, and fraternity (Abrahamian, 2018: 49). But they were not a majority yet. The other example was, Mirza Malkom

Khan, who lived in Istanbul and had Westernist thoughts, wrote a petition to the Shah about rightfulness of Ottoman reforms and he offered to applicate in Iran by name of Tanzim (Sabet, 2018: 102).

All Iranian groups were cooperated in the first successful mass protest, better known as tobacco protest in 1891-1892, combining Ulemas, modernists, merchants, ordinary people and Westernist groups (Keddie, 2006: 62) Their aim was to protest government policies as economic dependence on West, economic waste, unequal concession in favor of Western powers, losing lands, and injustice (Garthwaite, 2011: 195) (Bozarslan, 2015:38). All of protest depended on two main sources which are anti-West ideology and economic anxieties. On the road to constitutional revolution, political crowd In Tehran and provincial towns mobilized by clerical leadership. It can be said that Iranian Ulema had been very effective in organizing subaltern classes and Iranian intelligentsia made a significant alliance with the clerics.

There is no doubt that both opponent movements were obligated to act distance from the capital city. In abroad, they tried to spread their thoughts and organisations by mass communications such as magazines and newspapers. While the first oppositional presses were published in Paris, Russian Tartarian regions, and Cairo, the Iranian opposition was effective in Istanbul, London, and Russian Azerbaijan. The first Iranian newspaper, known as Qanun, was founded and published by Mirza Malkom Khan, a Western-educated Armenian Iranian, in London, 1889. The Qanun was claiming a fixed legal system and evils of the arbitrary type of ruling (Keddie, 2006: 57) and also it asserted that the Qajar frontiers were in defenceless condition, besides agricultural lands of Iran were abandoned due to unlawfulness and disorder (Sabet, 2018: 105). The other Iranian newspaper, Akhtar, was published in Istanbul. It ran a series of news about criticizing the concessions (Keddie, 2006: 61). At the same time, the Young Turks published some newspapers which advocated to limit the despotic Sultan and in the need of more liberalism. The Mizan was published by Mizancı Murat in Paris and Cairo, 1896 (Mardin, 2008: 98). The Ottoman was

published by Ishak Sukuti, Tunalı Hilmi, and Abdullah Cevdet in Geneva (Mardin, 2008: 144), and the Meşveret was published by Ahmed Rıza in Paris (Mardin, 2008: 181).

The second wave of the movement on the Ottoman Empire emerged in 1889 led by four medical students. Ibrahim Temo, who was from Ohri city in Macedonia and he was number one in the movement, Mehmed Reşid, who came from Caucasia and Ishak Sukuti, who was from Diyarbakir with Abdullah Cevdet from Arapkir province (Lewis, 2009: 267). The first wave of Young Ottomans lost effectiveness in the death of Ali Suavi and Namık Kemal. But, the second wave, Young Turks, depended on the Young Ottoman thoughts such as the importance of establishing a Consultant Parliament and their members felt admiration the Namık Kemal's works. The Young Turks movement developed abroad. In the last decade of the nineteenth century, Mizancı Murad, who was educated in Russia had Islamist thoughts, and Ahmed Rıza, who believed that the liberation of the Ottoman Empire through positivist ideas (Georgeon, 2018: 467), entered into rivalry for the leader position. Mizancı Murad became was the leader and the newspaper of Mizan had been the most popular publishing until 1897. But the new period for the Ottoman opposition was started in 1897. In this period, with the Greco War Sultan strengthened his position compared to oppositions. Moreover, he arrested some of the Young Turks in Istanbul and then he proclaimed the amnesty of 1897. This amnesty was related directly to the Young Turks, (Lewis, 2009: 269) that's why Mizancı Murad had to accept it and he came back Istanbul as requested by Sultan. Accordingly, European opposition group accepted being officers under the Ottoman institutions, such as Abdullah Cevdet attendance in Wien and Ishak Sukuti's work the embassy of Rome (Georgeon, 2018: 469).

After the quite period of between 1897 and 1899, the new era started with Mahmud Celaleddin and his sons, Sabahaddin and Lutfullah. After this time, Prince Sabahaddin, who had liberal thoughts, became the new leader of the Young Turk movement. Under the leadership of Sabahaddin, the first congress of the Young

Turk was gathered in 1902. The congress had two main groups. The first and major group, known as Ottomanist, led by Prince Sabahaddin and Armenian members (Suny, 2016: 182). They advocated establishing a decentralisation by supporting European powers. The second group, better known as nationalist, led by Ahmed Rıza (Lewis, 2009: 274). Even though, the Congress had not built any consensus, the Young Turk movement was diffusing day by day. In this direction, many groups emerged in the period between 1902 and 1906. Most notably, the party of Ottoman freedom led by Mehmed Talat and organized around military officers in the third army in Macedonia (Zürcher, 2015: 141). The main motivation of the party was blocking the influence of Non-Muslim groups on Macedonia. When Doctor Bahaeddin visited Paris to observe the Young Turks in abroad, he recognized the Parisian group was very ineffective (Zürcher, 2015: 140).

After that Doctor Bahaeddin and Doctor Nazim decided to organize opponents not only with propagandas but also organisation within military troops. So, they focused on the military organization (Mardin, 1991: 100). According to this purpose, Nazım Bey visited Thessaloniki and he talked about a union between internal and external opponent groups with the members of party of Ottoman freedom (Enver Paşa, 2018: 40). Even though internal and external groups came to an agreement, the question of “where the high administration would be?” was appeared (Cebesoy, 2016: 127).

For the first time, Iranian people revolted to change not only altering for new Shah but also aiming a new order which was depended on a constitutional law (Kotuoian, 2012: 14). Thanks to the result of Russo-Japanese War in 1904-1905, both opponents ensured that an Eastern state could alter its own bad fate by taking proper steps on administrative field. Iranian and Ottoman groups took example of Japanese modernization and its constitutional government as a secret power against despotic Tsar Russian. After the 1904-1905 War, the despotic tsar had to gather a parliament and this news created a victorious atmosphere among Ottoman opponents (Georgeon, 2018: 541) and Iranian as well. There were some different

partnerships and organizations between the Young Turk revolution and the Iranian revolution groups. The Young Turk movement depended on elites, who came as a fruit of Hamidian period, emerged within military officers, teachers, and journalists. Unlike from Iranian opponents which developed with large base of participation, “Young Turks did not strive for mass mobilization” (Algar, 1969: 207) and they remained unsympathetic to the traditional structures (Sohrabi, 2011: 288). In other words, constitutional movements of these groups based on different social dynamics. Furthermore, one of the countries had Muslim groups, Ottomans, in contrast the other one did not have, Iran.

While Ottoman constitutionalism was claiming an integral ideology to solve the religious and the ethnic conflicts, the Iranian constitutional movement aimed to solve lawlessness, economic deterioration, injustice, insecurity, and lack of protection against the powerful elites. In 1905, the Iranian inflation increased as the cost of sugar 33% and bread 90% (Abrahamian, 2018: 57). After this, the mass who demanded the decline of prices staged a protest against Shah and the central forces quelled with a vengeance (Garthwaite, 2011: 193). The Muzaffereddin Shah gave in to the pressures, without excepting British, and he decided to open the first Iranian parliament in 1906 (Bozarслан, 2015: 39). The first Iranian parliament included bazaarist, clerics, landowners, and officer elites (Abrahamian, 2018: 63) and there were two main groups which were conservative wing and progressivism wing.

CONSTITUTIONALIS PERIOD OF THE BOTH COUNTRIES

In 1907, the two Western powers, Russia and Britain, decided to decline the tension in Iranian zone (Garthwaite, 2011: 201) and they were concerned about the diffusion of German Empire on the Ottomans and the Qajars. Sultan Abdülhamid had a good relationship with German leaders and Ottoman state received some supports on military and construction fields in the last decades of his reign. So, the two Western power made two deals about the relationship with Ottomans and Qajars in 1907. The negotiation of Reval, Tsar Nicolas and the King of British Edward 7 decided to determine the future of Ottoman Macedonia by sharing territories between each other (Georgeon, 2018: 547). The fear of losing Macedonia spread among Ottoman oppositions as it was both center of their movement and the last territory of Ottoman Rumelia which was protecting the capital. The deal caused an explosive power which evoke Ottoman opposition for the Constitutional revolution. For instance, one of the leaders, Enver Pasha, shared the anxiety about the future of Macedonia, as it is seen in memoir. (Enver Paşa, 2018: 49). In this direction, it was the right time to start for revolutionary movement.

The second deal, which was signed in 1907, was Anglo-Russo treaty on Iran, in which Britain and Russia were dividing the Iran between themselves into spheres of influence as Russian in the North and British in the South (Sutton, 1978: 7) which regulated the demanding of concessions (Sabet, 2018: 166). As soon as the treaty was heard, the Iran parliament recognized that Iran was divided by Western powers without any consent from the Parliament. As a result of dividing Iran zones and death of Grand vizier (Garthwaite, 2011: 196), the new Shah, whose name was Muhammed Ali, introduced the martial law and he decided to close the National Consultative assembly (Savory, 1978: 87).

CHAPTER 4: The Constitutional Movements of Two Countries

After the involvement of Macedonians, the Committee of Union and Progress, led by two doctors – Bahaeddin and Nazım- had very strong position in theory and in practice. The new wing of the CUP, the majority of which were Macedonians, depended on educated Ottoman officers who emerged in the years after the 1883 reforms (Hanioglu, 2011: 41). The military institutions were established by Sultan Abdülhamid to bring up loyal employee for state institutions such as military and bureaucracies but ironically the students created the main base of the movement. For example, according to the memoir of Enver Pasha, in military high school years, his classmates and he gathered around heater and they were talking about helplessness of the government and evils of the Sultan (Enver Paşa, 2018: 8).

How was educated officers' world of thoughts in this Sultan Abdülhamid's military schools? Gustave Le Bon, who was the French sociologist and the writer of the famous book "the psychology of peoples", was a very popular thinker among the young military officers in Middle Eastern regions and the Balkans (Zürcher-Atabaki, 2010: 5). He had positivist and some authoritarian ideas. Moreover, in "the psychology of peoples" he claimed that the heroes, within long historical period as Emperors and Prophets, governed the masses just like psychologists (Le Bon, 2016: 12). The Young Turk was taking inspiration from Le Bon and the group viewed themselves superior to the rest of society and they believed that they are the natural leaders of the Ottoman society (Hanioglu, 2011: 44).

The thought of wanting a hero had developed for the period of Sultan Abdülhamid reign. There was no prominent figure in the state other than the despotic Sultan. Sultan Abdülhamid had dualist thoughts on the Ottoman army. While he aimed to make the army militarily stronger, he did not want to make it politically powerful (Georgeon, 2018: 341). So, the two popular heroes of the Russo-Ottoman War, Gazi Muhtar Pasha and Gazi Osman Pasha, were placed under close scrutiny by the Palace (Hanioglu, 2011: 69). Besides, Sultan Abdülhamid reign was criticized by

Young Turks as economic disruption due to the fact that officers did not get their regular salary and they believed that the state was not progressing well (Georgeon, 2018: 522).

The Young Turk revolution of 1908 brought two young commanders to the forefront; Major Enver Bey and adjutant Niyazi Bey. They were principal leaders of the military insurrection in Macedonia (Hanioglu, 2011: 69). Their name well known within opponents and many compositions were made for the honour of their heroism. Actually, the fame of Enver Bey in particular, depended on his conflicts against Non-Muslim guerrillas while he was major officer of Ottoman military in the frontier zones of Macedonia. In parallel with Le Bon ideas, he used an Islamic discourse just like a psychologist of the masses to organize the frontier zones while he was organizing the military insurrection.

In this way, he tried to organize Muslim people against the central government by speaking of unequal conditions between Non-Muslim and Muslim communities which derived from the fear of Western powers over the central government (Enver Paşa, 2018: 23) and Enver asserted that the importance of the Constitutional parliament by exemplifying the last prophet Muhammed who needed an advisory group in his governance period as well (Enver Paşa, 2018: 76). Thus, Sultan had to promulgate the Constitution of the Ottoman in July 1908, better known as Kanun-u Esasi, and he proclaimed opening the Ottoman parliament, as the revolt movement in the Third army of Macedonia could not suppressed by the Sultan.

The constitutional period of both states took different paths and the different government mentalities. Even so, the common characteristics were lack of political programmes. The first Iran parliament was under the influence of traditional structures such as the Ulemas and Diwani families, who were local bureaucratic groups speaking Farsi. In short, they did not have any ideological basis. They were more like elite clubs rather than political parties (Behroz, 2018: 75). Iranian parties lack of any ideological and political union, but the effect of Ulema was reflected in

some decisions. For example, the Shiism became the official state religion. And by the law, the position of consultation was given to the group of Ulemas (Ahavi, 1990: 66). And also, Non-Shiite people were not elected to the first Iranian parliament (Abrahamian, 2018: 64).

Even though, the CUP won in the first election in 1908, the party was not a majority. But the main rival of the CUP was liberty party, Ahrar Fırkası, led by Prince Sabahaddin who could not be successful in the election due to the policy of the CUP. According to the policy, if Muslim people do not elect the CUP, Non-Muslim groups may be stronger and more Non-Muslim deputies attend in the Parliament (Akşin, 2016: 57). In this direction, the CUP won a majority by supporting independent deputies but, the group's majority was only on the paper. The CUP did not have any political programmes and their members were inexperienced in the political life (Georgeon, 2018: 557). Leaders of the CUP learned using violence by acting provocatively such as bombings and bloody attacks (Bozarıslan, 2015: 40). But, some of the members annoyed by these violent methods. For example, in 1908, Mustafa Kemal expressed concerns about this attitude of the CUP, he said Ali Fuad that "the CUP has neither a strong organization nor political program" (Cebesoy, 2016: 145). Afterwards, the CUP failed to organize the party and the military wing separately due to the personal ambition of the Enver Bey. So, military force became very active in social and political life of Ottoman. On the other side, the first Iranian parliament did not change the disorder of Iran society and it did not establish as a national military, economic system, local political authority, and homogenous legal system (Abrahamian, 2018: 60). Under the Parliament, sectional political authorities and their decentralized condition, which came from previous periods, maintained, because the peripheral powers attended as coalition partners in the government actively. Moreover, they represented the most important positions and took profitable economic concessions from the center.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, many of ethnic groups claimed that the territory was their own zones and there were bloody guerrilla fights in the

peripheral zones of Makedonia (Anastassiadou, 2015: 371). Moreover, many political parties struggled with each other by using population, historical sources, and associations with Western powers. It can be said that Macedonia harboured very complex relationship and hostilities. The main members of the CUP and founding fathers of republic of the Turkey came from this territory. Actually, the generation of Macedonian policymakers was not a coincidence. During their childhood and young period, they trained under the cosmopolite condition of Macedonia. And finally, when the revolutionary events erupted, the Macedonian team was ready to march to the center in order to be the new power.

To understand more precisely, we need to look in the background of the transformation between the period of Sultan Abdülhamid and the CUP, that is it to say the transformation from the thought of the Islamism to the Turkism. During the Hamidian period, despotic Sultan tried to reconstruct the thought of the Ottomanism as a supranational identity for Muslims, which ignored Non-Muslims, increased the tension between Muslims and Christian people in the Empire (Hanioglu, 2011: 27). The sultan paid attention to the Arabic provinces due to the effect of losing territory in Balkans. In this direction, the Sultan tried to construct good relationship with Arabic provinces. For example, according to the annual, *Salname*, of 1877, Arabic zones were last in ranking, whereas the annual of 1886, these provinces, as Suria, Hedjaz, Baghdad, Basra, Yemen, and Aleppo, became the top (Kayalı, 2018: 51). According to new bureaucratic approach, the Sultan gave local elites some administrative roles and initiatives, in this way, the Sultan strengthened his legitimacy in these zones (Bora, 2018: 33). Moreover, the Sultan sent the most capable governors to these regions and he gave the salary which was the highest (Georgeon, 2018: 252).

On the other hand, the Sultan attached importance to the other Muslim communities. He tried to form a union with the Albanian and also some local Albanians were appointed the local governor positions (Georgeon, 2018: 258). In addition to this, the central troop of guardsmen was gathered from Albanian people.

Lastly, the Sultan established Hamidian troops to strengthen the frontier zones (Suny, 2016: 50) and to control not only Kurdish tribes but also to transfer the violence of Kurdish to themselves and the Armenians.

The CUP was in Power

When the CUP was in power, it faced very complex network of relationship between the center and peripheries. Already, the party had been struggling with some problems about internal organization as the party involved different layers and figures, also, they tried to change Hamidian relationship with local elites by centralising steps which led to rising the nationalist thoughts within not only Non-Muslim but also Muslim communities. For example, when Mustafa Kemal visited Tripoli in order to keep Ottoman order and to suppress a revolt against the new central government. Mustafa Kemal faced the leader of the revolt and asked him what the main problem is. The leader, who was a local Ulema, talked his anxieties about the new order which threatened their local authority (İnan, 2018: 84).

According to historian Eric Hobsbawm nationalism came out with three main steps (Hobsbawm, 2010: 27); the A type nationalist step which was about the communities organized as cultural leagues. In the last period of the 19th century, Albanians, Arabs, Kurds, and Armenians mobilized around these leagues in Ottoman Empire. For example, the league of Prizren, which was established by local Albanian in 1878, the newspaper of Kurdistan led by Abdurrahman Bedirhan, and the community of Turk-Syrian. But, with the Constitutional period, thanks to freedom speech and politics, these communities attended to legal parties and they took the opportunities which spread their nationalist politics. Step B started with the party of brotherhood of Arabbiye, Uhuvveti Arabiye in 1909 (Kayalı, 2018: 81), Albanians with the liberty -Ahrar- Party in 1908 and the Moderate Party in 1909 (Kayalı, 2018: 114) besides Armenian with Dasnaktsutyun party and social democrat Huchakian Party.

After the 1910s, due to the Turkist centralization policies of the CUP (Hacısalihoglu: 2010: 99) which aimed to assimilate to the Non-Turk communities under cover of Ottoman national identity (Arai, 2013: 18). As a conclusion, the zones of Albanian, Kurds, and Arabs revolted against these policies. And with the independence of the Albanian in 1911, the CUP followed even more Turkist policies. When the Turkish language became an official language, Arabs, Armenian, and Rum wanted to their languages as official languages as well (Kayalı: 2018: 94). With the Balkan Wars of 1912-13, the Ottoman Empire transformed from multi-continental Empire into an Asia country where Arabs, Kurds and Turks were in majority. The violence increased with the boundaries narrowed. From the Hamidian Period, there was a struggle between Ottomans and Armenians, the tension increased especially with the Hamidian troops. Ottomans accused Armenians of collaborating with Russians for an independent Armenia while, Armenians were feeling insecure against the attacks of nomadic groups and their politicians wanted more identity values. The main demands of Armenian politicians from Ottomans were a European governor for the Armenian cities, fair participation for Armenians in the official institutions of the Ottomans, and a decentralized government for the Armenian region (Leart, 2015: 70). In 1915, when the Dardanelles War started, the Empire struggled to stay alive. The Armenian genocide committed under this condition. According to Michael Mann, the incident which paved the way of genocide was the two main groups who claimed rights over same territory. In this direction, first group had the control of state and the second, who was weaker than the first, believed that if a neighbourhood Western power, Russia, support their independence, the second group, Armenians, could be independent. So, the CUP committed Armenian genocide to prevent this condition developing against the first Turkist group. (Mann, 2012: 204). The Armenian genocide was committed in three main steps. Firstly, the CUP wanted Armenians to revolt against Russia in the Great War, but the Armenians of both sides decided to fight for their own countries. Secondly, the CUP decided to practice the deportation law and thirdly, the genocide occurred during the deportation (Mann, 2012: 157).

The disengagement between the central government and independence movement of Arabs led by Sheriff Hüseyin in 1916. The course of processing derived from 1909-1911 disagreements such as Zionist settlement on Palestine, the ineffectiveness of Tripoli occupied by Italian (Kayalı, 2018: 117), and the language politics on the Arabic zones which was not only related linguistic but also with restricting of Arabic language, Arabs were effected negatively due to cultural, religious and national reasons.

The proclamation of the Constitutionalism was not a decisive victory. Both opponent movements in Iran and Ottoman included complex groups and partnership in the road of the revolutions. After their first elections, a very complex scene emerged. Besides, these unplanned and un-experienced governments faced new movements against them within shortly after. The disputes came to the conclusion of the civil War of Ottoman in 1909 and Iran in 1907. On the Ottoman side, the backbone of the CUP depended on the educated officers who studied in the Ottoman military schools. The problem between officers, who were educated with classic Ottoman military system and other officers, who received modern type of military education, came from the Hamidian period. While, in 1884, the ratio of educated officers to un-schooled was 10%, in 1900 that ratio reached to 25% (Tokay, 2010: 40). Even though, Sultan Hamid was a despotic and conservative ruler, he was interested in technical information and established modern institutions (Bozarslan, 2018: 157). When the CUP was government, the party took over the Hamidian institutions and bureaucracy, which had been established within thirty-three years, also the CUP had not had any strong organization in the capital from the beginning. For example, in 1907, when Baha Bey came from İstanbul to Thessaloniki, he went to visit Enver Bey and Enver Bey felt there is no any strong organization in Istanbul (Enver Paşa, 2018: 28). With the revolution, a periphery group, Macedonians, captured the center and this change would lead to establish a new opponent movement against the CUP both in Istanbul and peripheral zones.

Internal Conflicts between ‘Old’ and ‘New’

In 31 March 1909, the new opponent movement included capital Ulemas, self-educated military officers, who got promoted by Sultan for their loyalty, and some members of liberty party such as Ismail Kemal who established members of Albanian. The Ottomans’ power struggle began with the new opponents by occupying the parliament. The liberal wing led by Ismail Kemal wanted a new cabinet and they accused the CUP with being anti-Constitutionalist, the other one was Ulema who was annoyed by the CUP for being irreligious and immoral (Bozarslan: 2018: 44), and last group was uneducated officers who were uncomfortable with young educated officers who substituted their positions and threatened disobediently to them (Zürcher, 2007: 21). Because, the young officers, who had a good relationship with the CUP, accused the experienced and self-educated commandants with being traitors and the reason of the bad conditions of the Hamidian period (Alkan, 2001: 163). For example, with the revolution, some young educated officers did not salute to experienced uneducated commander (Cebesoy, 2016: 159). The power struggle finished by the movement army, which moved from Macedonia to Istanbul, recaptured the Ottoman government and deposed Sultan Abdülhamid.

The second attempt against the CUP came from neutral officers better known as Halaskaran Zabitan, who was uncomfortable with the discrimination of the members of officers, who were close to the CUP (Alkan, 2001: 163). In conjunction with the election in 1912, the CUP won the election by vote-rigging and violence. That meant mobilizing opponents against the CUP and the union combined the forces as the Freedom and Accord party and Halaskaran Zabitan. In addition to this, the Albanian War of independence erupted, and the CUP government fell. Finally, In January 1913, a small group within the CUP regained the Ottoman parliament by an assaulting on the Sublime Porte, known as Babı Ali Baskını, due to loss of the Balkan War and Edirne Province (Alkan, 2001: 210). When the March 1913, Mahmud Şevket Pasha, who was the main representative of the Ottoman army in politics (Kayalı, 2018: 88), was assassinated by the CUP because, the treaty of

Edirne was contained an article about conceding Edirne to Bulgaria (Okyar, 1999: 15). After this time, it can be said that the small group of Young Turk took the control completely and with their triumvirate, they established an authoritarian government.

The constitutional movement of Iran had complex partnership as well. As soon as the first parliament was established, some conservative Ulema led by Fazlullah Nuri, who was the one of the three Mujtahids of Islamic law and supported the revolutionary movement to defend Islam, rejected the thought of constitution because they believed that the only lawmaker was God. And also, they opposed to the idea of equality between Muslim and Non-Muslim (Garthwaite, 2011: 200). The other opponent figure, Muhammed Ali Shah, who became Shah after death of moderate Muzaffereddin Shah, was choosing despotic policies in contrast to his moderate father. A union was established between Fazlullah Nuri and Muhammed Ali Shah against the first Iran parliament. The union was motivated with two main events against the Parliament. Firstly, the Shah was not pleased to the autonomy of the parliament and also, his grand vizier was assassinated. Secondly, the treaty of Anglo-Russian divided Iran into three zones and the parliament was helpless against it. This condition overshadowed existence of the parliament. In 1908, Muhammed Ali Shah decided to close the parliament and the Cossack brigade, commanded by Russian colonel Liakhoff, bombarded the lightly armed constitutionalist volunteers. Moreover, Seyyid Tabatabai and Seyyid Behbehani, two of the three interpreters of Islamic law, were arrested (Abrahamian, 1982: 96).

But the new constitutionalist movement was established against the despotic Shah and Seyyid Fazlullah. The well-attended movement included Bakhtiari tribes, Armenians, Azerbaijanis, so on (Sabet, 2018: 177) and the city of Tabriz was motor power of the movement. In the end, the constitutionalist group led by Yeprem Khan, who was the Armenian commander and mentioned as the Garibaldi of Iran (Abrahamian, 1982: 102) recaptured Tehran. As a result, the Muhammed Ali Shah was deposed, and Ahmed Shah became new Shah. Moreover, Fazlullah Nuri got

hanged and Yeprem Khan became police chief of Tehran. Finally, while Iran constitution law has been changed, Jewish, Armenians, Assyrians, and Parsees could be elected as deputy of the Iran parliament (Sabet, 2018: 178). But the new parliament did not provide any stability and with the occupation of British-Russian in Iran zones, the period of chaos began in 1911. The both power struggles came to end, and after that, the new discourse would come out, which would happen as the central government would accuse peripheral groups of being reactionists during the revolt against center.

CHAPTER 5: THE POLITICAL CONDITIONS THROUGHOUT THE GREAT WAR

During the War, the opponent movements got with contact to the Axis power against the danger of Alliance powers' intervention. Even though, Iran did not attend the War, their territories occupied by the British and Russian. On the other side, in Ottoman, the triumvirate took over the control including Enver Pasha, Talad Bey, and Cemal Pasha and they took joint action with Germany against Alliance power. During the period, the nationalism became most popular political thought and nationalists were getting strong day by day. Both states' nationalists sensed the War as an opportunity to regain territorial fields and spread. A group of German militaries chief directed the control on Ottoman army in terms of appointment and administrative command. Liman von Sander was the main commander of the German groups in Ottoman army. Before the War, Liman von Sanders had some negative thoughts about the Ottoman army. He believed that Ottoman army worthless for the alliance (Sanders, 2007: 57).

The Mentalities of Political Groups

During the period from the nineteenth century to the Great War, there was a negative perception about British and Russian policies. According to Shahs and Sultans, these policies jeopardised the existence of the Ottomans and Qajars' territories and dynasties. In fact, both states were helpless towards two Western empires' diffusion on their territories. The new Western power, German, was perceived positively. So, the German policies not only effective on the Ottoman

nationalist but also Iranian nationalist had a good relationship with the German politicians. In Ottoman side, the main motivation of the triumvirate's decision on attending the War was to gather all of Turks under a single flag of Turkish state and to destruct the evil of Russia (Mann, 2012: 157) (Atabaki, 2007: 30). And also, Iranian nationalists and some members of the Ulema believed that thanks to the Great War, Iran could demonstrate its power to Alliance powers by a liberation war (Sabet, 2019: 197). In this direction, Iranian nationalist came to contact with Ottomans and German Empire. Actually, this alliance not only supported by Iranian nationalists, but also some Ulema believed in Islamic unity, better known as Ittihadı Islam.

The relationship between Ottoman and Iranian Ulemas began with the leadership of Cemaleddin Afghani in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Afghani asserted the importance of Islamic unity under the Ottoman Caliphs. He was one of the leaders of the tobacco revolt in 1891-1892 and his ideas reached large masses (Sabet, 2018: 112). During the great War years, Ayetullah Kashani, who was the prominent figure in the Iranian Ulema and Ulemas from, wanted an alliance with Axis powers too (Sabet, 2018: 194) (Atabaki, 2007: 37). Moreover, Ottoman politician promised Mirza Kuchek Khan, who was the leader of the Jangalis in Gilan, to supply equipment against Alliance power. And also, Germany supported to Iran gendarmerie forces, which were working as a national army including volunteers as well (Behroz, 2018: 79). The forces were led by Muhammad Taqhi Pesyan in the period of the rival Kermanshah government which established by a strong diplomatic effort of Germany and Iranian nationalists, but it was abolished in 1916 (Savory, 1978: 88). In both sides, nationalists targeted to regain the losing territories which were lost within last century.

In the nineteenth century, Iranian foreign policy was characterized by alternation between unrealistic Iranian irredentist thoughts (Griffith, 1978: 367). In Versailles 1919, Nusret el-Devle, who was the foreign affairs minister, claimed some Caucasian zones such as Nakhichevan and Sarakh and some North-West Turkistan

regions for Iran depending on their linguistic structure and similarity between races in Iran and these zones (Sabet, 2018: 200). And there is also that, the triumvirate supported to annex some Middle Asia zones and North Iranian region depending on races' connection. So, the CUP was emphasized Turkist approaches on these zones. Moreover, Ahmed Ağaoğlu, who was the Turkist thinker, described the Turkish world as it is among the Siberia, the Mongolia, Chinana Turkistan, the Caspian Sea, Suria, and Aegean Sea (Arai, 2013: 91). Finally, the collapse of Western battlefront, the CUP ran away from the Ottoman territory in 1918. But, in both sides, the nationalism was transferred to following governments as a rising thought.

The rise of the ethnic nationalism, Turkism and Persianism, progressed in after the 1900. As long as both states' borders were getting narrow, masses mobilized around nationalist groups and they got a national identity against internal autocracy and external enemies such as Western powers under the effect of nationalist ideas. The spectre of nationalism haunted economy politics, mass demonstrations, linguistic and educational areas, publishing, leagues, and Women movements. Actually, these ones were parts of a whole and they were associated with each other. Until the last decades of the nineteenth century, an identity of Persian had been against the Ottomans and Uzbeks in terms of cultural and religious ways (Garthwaite, 2011: 202). The cultural nationalism began with the Hamidian period. When the students who came from peripheral zones attended the central educational institutions, they recognized that students originated in central bureaucrat families, had a privileged position comparing to other students (Kayalı, 2018:58) and this discrimination contributed to cultural leagues within students from periphery.

Beginning from 1900s, the intelligentsias considered the ideas of constitutionalism, secularism, and nationalism to be three vital means to establish a modern, strong and developed Iran. In this direction, the group of intelligentsias aimed three targets. Firstly, they would destroy reactionary power of Shah, secondly, they would eliminate the conservative influence of the Ulema, and finally, they tried to

eradicate the exploitative Western imperialists (Abrahamian, 1982: 62). In Ottoman, Turkish nationalist aimed same targets and tried to follow same roads, throughout the Constitutional Period. Under the occupation of British and Russia, more and more people believed that Iran's only hope was revival of nationalist feelings. Ottomans, during the first and second decades of the twentieth century, Turkish nationalism raised by the sons of the families' leadership who lived in conflictual zones such as Macedonia, Caucasian, and Crimea. These Turkist groups reacted to the thought of Ottomanism. For example, Talad Pasha said "we wasted time in vain transformation of Non-Muslims to identity of Ottoman and the equality between the Muslim and Non-Muslim was a useless effort" (Üngör, 2016: 78). In this direction, the leaders of the CUP tended to establish a Turkish nation state. For example, Bahaeddin Sakir said the Zionist leaders that he wants to establish a unitary Turk state by having Turkish educational system, Turkish judicial system, and Turkish management system (Üngör, 2016: 79).

The nationalist thoughts were diffusing by publishing in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The Akhtar newspaper wrote the importance of the patriotism and it claimed that motherland is like a human body if the motherland is ill, the only therapy would be the act of patriotism¹ (Sabet, 2018: 68). This patriotism reflected on the constitutional movement as well. For example, *hubb-Vatan*, the love of motherland, was one of the main slogans. On the other side, the first modern Turkish dictionary, *Kamus-I Turki*, was written by Şemseddin Sami and it was published in 1901. Sami claimed that the origin of the Ottoman Empire was based on an older Turkish nation (Bora, 2017: 197). Moreover, Mehmed Emin -Yurdakul- wrote a poem which emphasises the importance of being ethnic Turk origin (Bora, 2017: 198). The CUP determined Turkish as official language in the party programmes in 1908, 1909, and 1913. Moreover, some Turkist leagues studied simplification of Turkish language which aimed to remove Persian and Arabic words from Turkish. For example, the *Turk Yurdu* magazine, led by Yusuf Akcura

¹ In a similar example of Le Bon, the destructive masses are symbolized as germs and states as a human body.

and his Tartar friends, was the most important intellectual publishing in the 1910s. The magazine claimed the importance of simplification of Turkish language propaganda (Arai, 2013: 85). In Iran, even though, the studies on simplification of Persian seemed in the period of Reza Shah, Iranian constitution made necessary to read and write Persian to be elected as a deputy in parliament. On the other hand, educational institutions played the role of host to national senses. Their curricula and teachers formed the young generation who would lead the nationalist movements. For example, Iran curriculum includes history, geography, and science. By this means, the idea of holy Iranian land was taught with some historical arguments. For example, in geography lesson, students learned Tehran city as a capital city of Asia (Sabet, 2018: 247).

Beginning from 1910, the CUP gave up liberal economic policies and the party selected national economic policy to develop Ottoman economy without Western intervention (Mann, 2012: 145). The two big thinkers of the Young Turk movement, who were Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura, claimed that establishing nation economy become inevitable for a Turkish nation state (Üngör, 2016: 77). In this way, the CUP aimed to abolish concessions which were in favour of Western powers and the party organized some boycott on Western goods. But the economic targets turned to antagonism against Non-Muslim communities living in Ottoman territory with intelligentsias' supports. For example, Nezihe Muhiddin was a speechmaker in the boycott of 1912 and the boycott transformed to plundering events on Non-Muslim's goods in a short time (Bora, 2017: 754).

In this period, thanks to protest demonstrations, meetings, and mobilization orders, nationalist ideology raised on large scale of ordinary Muslims. For example, according to Liman von Sanders, when the proclamation of the holy jihad, Muslim crowd mobbed for demonstration in Istanbul. After the demonstration, the angry crowd led by official policeman plundered Tokatliyan hotel (Sanders, 2007: 57). On the Iran side, during the Muzaffereddin Shah, the Shah tried to develop national industry which failed due to the existence of concession in favor of Western powers.

And also, a group of Iranian merchants attempted to create a national league named as Islamiyah. The league aimed to encourage the national bazaar against foreigner goods by organizing some campaign in favour of local producers (Sabet, 2018: 134). Moreover, the existence of the Russian in the Northern Iran led to some boycott movements against Russian goods (Sabet, 2018: 187).

The Nationalist thought imposed some duties on women as well. Both states' women intelligentsia and some pro-women magazines had little contributions to the constitutional movements. These women included Nezihe Muhiddin, Fatma Aliye, (Sancar, 2014:93) and Maryam Mozeyen el-Sultaneh and etc. Some intellectual women emphasized one of the most important duty of women is patriotism. The Shikufeh magazine directly addressed women issues as housewifery, child rearing, and cleaning. Even though, the magazine addressed women on housework, it also blended patriotism and motherhood. According to the Shikufeh, the motherland of Iran represented a big national family (Sabet: 2018, 242). In this direction, women were not only keeper of elementary family, but also keeper of the nation. Moreover, the importance of women was to teach of Islamic and nationalist information on her child. For example, Fatma Aliye, who was the daughter of Ahmed Cevdet Bey, had an Islamic tone and Halide Edip -Adivar-, who was the prominent figure in the Turkish nationalist group, accused Ottoman women with being failure in imposing Turkish awareness on their children (Bora, 2017: 747). In addition to Halide Edip, the Turkish national education's curricula gave some duties to women about raising their children as patriotic and with the love of country (Sancar, 2014: 226).

The rise of the Iranian nationalism matured under the invasion of Russian and British and their conflicts over the Iranian territories were absent without any consent from Iranian side, besides the central government could not progress actively due to disorder structure of Iran during the instability period of the 1910s. The years between 1911 and 1921 were defined as chaos years in Iranian history. During the first and second parliaments years, the constitutional revolution did not have any active central government. After the civil War, the second parliament was

established by the lead of the two main groups as Moderates Party, which was led by Sipahdar, Fermanferma, Behbehani, and Tabatabai, and Democrat party, which was led by Taqizadeh and Suleyman Iskenderi. But the second National assembly, between 1909 and 1911, was failure due to not only economic reasons but also domestic conflicts which emerging both two political groups and local tribes.

The central government tried to solve bad economic condition through establishing a Gendarmerie force led by Sweden experts to collect taxes properly. In this direction, Morgan Shuster, who was the American economic consultant, appointed to the minister of economy in order to increase revenue from the peripheral zones. As the last resort, the central government gave concession to some tribes to increase incomes. But, thanks to these domestic concessions Bakhtiari tribe seized control on the Southern Iran and the tribes made a deal with British without permission from the center (Abrahamian, 2018: 73) and also Qashqai seized the trade roads. That is to say, some local powers were getting stronger under these concessions (Abrahamian, 2018: 75). In Political platform, the ultimatum from the Russian about the annoyance on the existence of Shuster led to dissolution of the parliament by the Shah (Garthwaite, 2011: 197). The chaotic years began with closing National assembly in 1911. The political struggle within the Parliament was sharply divided into two rival parties whose “supporters turned the streets of Tehran into bloody battlegrounds”. Moreover, the provinces were destructed in tribal warfare (Abrahamian, 1982: 103).

Iran as a Field of Struggle for Western Powers

The election for the third parliament was in 1914. But when Alliance power attacked Tehran, the Iran nationalist coalition, which included the moderates and democrats, decided to move the parliament to Kermanshah province and they established a countrywide resistance organization led by Muhammed Taqhi Pesyan (Sabet, 2018: 199). But the Kermanshah government failed against the alliance attack. So, demoralization felt within nationalists due to losing last independent region (Cronin, 2010: 49). By 1915, Iran territory occupied from all quarters. Apart

from the alliance powers occupy, some Ottoman troops had invaded the Iran's Western regions and German agents were bringing equipment to the Southern tribes secretly, to control the zones (Abrahamian, 1978: 103). The breaking point of the War was the Bolshevik revolution in 1917. With the Russian revolution, the alliance power was disconcerted, and the Soviet Union decided to explain covert ententes about its enemies. Moreover, the Soviet declaration of the War proclaimed all off unequal ententes, which were the concessions and loans, in favour of the Russia (Garthwaite, 1978: 198). This news was welcomed and aroused sympathy on the Iranian political groups. On the other hand, a historical Anglo-Russo rivalry on Iran revived again.

After the Soviet revolution, Soviet Union and Britannia entered into rivalry for Iran. Britain tried to reorganize Iranian army, establish a constabulary, and strength Iran bureaucracy. The Soviet tried to establish Iran Soviets in regional scales (Savory, 1978: 89) such as the Soviet republic of Gilan and Tabriz. Besides, The Soviets made an effort to build a good relationship with peripheral powers and Ulemas. In 1918, pro-British government was established by Hassan Vussuq ed-Dowleh. The prime minister Vussuq ad-Dowleh made an agreement with the British which meant that British would have economic and political domination on Iran (Griffith, 1978: 368) (Katouzian, 2012: 15). Actually, the main aim of the entente was to prevent the relationship between Soviet Union and peripheral powers. According to the entente, the central state prohibited the arming within local powers and planned an order Iran army (Behroz, 2018: 85). The Vussuq-British entente got reaction from wide range of political groups in which first and foremost were nationalists (Sabet, 2018: 203). Mirza Kuchek Khan responded to the entente and pro-Soviet-Jangali movement led by Kuchek Khan revolted at against the Vussuq government and Britain in Gilan. Finally, the Cossack brigade quelled the continuance of the riot. After that, there were many regional revolts in the Iranian provinces.

By 1920, two important autonomous governments were established with the support of Soviets in Tabriz and Gilan (Abrahamian, 1982: 103). And also, some

tribal chief and nationalist leaders were in control of Kurdistan, Arabia, and Baluchistan zones. All of these movements were against British and the central pro-British government. As recorded by American legation, the main resistance to the British came from the Qashqai tribes in the South and from Mirza Kuchek Khan and the Jangalis in the North (Majd, 2001: 23). Under this condition, British tried to prevent the conflict between the Kaab tribe, which led by Sheik Khazal and they had an agreement on oil production, and Bakhtiari tribe to league all together against the Qashqai tribe in the South. These complex relations network turned to more complicated condition for field of British zone in Iran. In this chaotic condition, there were two choices for British. Firstly, some British policymakers offered a suggestion that left Persia to its own fate. And second choice was to focus on central and Southern zones where were stayed out of Gilan (Abrahamian, 2018: 84). The British selected second possibility. In this direction, in 1921, the British saw that a strong government, which was British protectorate, could suppress the Jangalis and the other threats from Leftist or Russian backed movements (Keddie, 2006: 81).

In 21 February 1921, general Reza Khan, who was the leader of the Cossack brigade in Qazvin, with his three thousand soldiers took control of the Tehran city (Abrahamian, 2018: 85). And under the leader of Seyyid Zia, who was a pro-British journalist (Keddie, 2006: 80), a new government was established by the consent of the Ahmed Shah. Seyyid Zia announced the annulment of the Anglo-Persian treaty, better known as Vussuq-British. And also, he made an agreement with Russia, which withdrew from Iran zones after the establishing of Soviet republic of Gilan, to establish normal relation (Keddie, 2006: 81). Despite of these cooperation, the coup movement was supported by Britain to prevent the rise of the pro-Soviet Jangalis movement.

According to Nikkie Keddie, even though, there is no written evidence about British foreign office on the Coup, the commander of British forces in Iran, General Ironside, backed up Reza's power in the Cossack Brigade and Ironside encouraged

Reza in order to undertake a coup for demolishing the dangerous effect of Jangalis movement (Keddie, 2006: 80). Indeed, due to chaotic condition in Iran and the rise of the Soviet sympathy, there was one option remained for British, which was supporting a Western type of strong central government, included regular army, central bureaucracy networks, and Western thoughts. In this direction, the British minister in Iran said that the most logical way to struggle the Soviet backed local governments, such as Gilan and Tabriz, was to support a nationalist central government, that it to say Seyyid Zia's government (Behroz, 2018: 86). Moreover, according to American diplomatic reports written by John Caldwell, the Coup and was completely depended on British support (Majd, 2001: 64).

On the other hand, Rıza Khan and Seyyid Zia were supported by middle and upper middle classes. These classes were not pleased from radical and regional separatist governments built after the Great War years (Keddie, 2006: 83). And public opinion supported them as well. In 1921, according to a newspaper article, well-armed regular central army could solve all kind of political problems of Iran (Sabet, 2018: 210). Shortly, If Iran wanted to continue being an independent nation, the need was a strong army which restored the authority of the central government on the periphery. After a new central government installed, the period of Civil War was started between Reza Khan's central army and the other decentralized nationalist governments such as Jangalis led by Mirza Kuchek Khan, the Tabriz government led by Muhammed Hiyabani, and the National committee of Khorasan led by Gendarmerie Colonel Muhammed Taqhi Pesyan.

THE MODERN NATIONALIST AUTHORITARIAN LEADERS

In this part, we will try to understand the background of the rise of the two modern nationalist authorizer leaders by asking these questions: who are they? How were the environments in which they raise? How were their professional careers? Which ideas did they come into contact within their early years? What were the differences of their mentality? What were the characteristics of geographies where they born? How were the social conditions in the cities where they born in? In the light of these questions; firstly, we will go over geographies as conflictual zones in which two nationalist authoritarian modernizer leaders came from. And, we will search the effects of the conflictual zones on both states' political life. Secondly, we will focus on their families and childhood. And thirdly, we will try to examine the two military organizations in which Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan grew and also, we will trace to military careers of the two leaders.

CHAPTER 6: REGIONS WHERE THEY WERE BORN IN

In this, we will focus on the cities where leaders were born in and we will try to understand the relationship between nationalists and conflictual zones. Macedonia was one of the most cosmopolitan areas. Many ethnic groups claimed independence on this region and ethnic nationalism fed from many different sources like economy, bureaucracy, politics, religion, military, and so on. Not surprisingly, Salonica was a fertile ground for these ethnic nationalist movements which mushroomed in the nineteenth century. Even though the main aim of the Tanzimat reforms was to fight the ethnic separatism by centralizing and constructing an Ottoman supra-identity, the effect of secular intelligentsias on Macedonian communities increased these nationalist movements (Hanioğlu, 2011: 13).

The Conflictual Atmosphere of Macedonia

By the 1860s, the upper identity of the Ottoman dissatisfied Muslims lived in Macedonia. Muslim felt humiliated against Non-Muslim people in terms of economic and social. They thought that Non-Muslim communities had always had inferior positions comparing to Muslims, but the unequal relation was inversed in

recent years. Some populist thinkers said the ‘‘Muslims turned master to slavery against Non-Muslims.’’ (Mann, 2012: 160). By the 1880s, Salonica turned into a battleground among different communities. For example, the Macedo-Bulgarian revolutionary guerrilla organization and internal Macedonian Adrianopolitan revolutionary organization, which aimed to establish an autonomous Macedonia within possible Balkan federation (Anastassiadou, 2015: 358), were popular organizations in Macedonia. And also, the struggle on religion platform emerged. The hostility between the groups of Greek and Bulgarian began with the establishment of Bulgarian church (Anastassiadou, 2015: 370).

These conflicted conditions served as a school of nationalism for Ottoman young officers. Until this time, Ottoman elites came from the prominent families of the Capital city. But, a new group of the Ottoman elite was born in the conflictual region within suffered Muslim families. For example, the German and France consuls were killed by the angry Muslim crowd during the anti-Western protest in 1876. Hafız Ahmed, grandfather of the Mustafa Kemal, participated in the protest (Hanioğlu, 2011: 18). And also, a new group of Macedonian elites was the main actor of the Young Turk revolutionary movement. The revolutionary started with the beginning of the guerrilla movement led by Niyazi Bey, Enver Bey, and Eyüp Sabri Bey in frontier region of Macedonian periphery. Actually, the group knew that what kind of problems frontier people had who lived in the border areas. Enver Bey said to people who lived in frontier zones that if they lose their land, they will have to leave without even collecting their belongings (Enver Paşa, 2018: 75). However, because of the Berlin entente in 1878, Non-Muslims also could attend in the Gendarmerie forces. This change affected Muslims both economically and socially because the forces included poor Ottoman Muslims and they were working as law enforcement agency. Enver Bey knew these conditions of the Gendarmerie force (Özbek, 2010: 72) and he used this condition during the organization on Muslim.

The Young Turk movement, especially Macedonian officers, were prone to violence, which derived from the regional conflicts among different ethnic groups living in Macedonia. Many ethnic nationalist groups were involved massacres against defenceless villagers. And also, Some Macedonian Muslim gangs, which associated with some Young Turk leaders, carried out massacres as well. For example, in some regions, armless Bulgarians were killed by the Muslim gangs due to the activities of the ethnic nationalist Bulgarian groups on Macedonia. (Üngör, 2016: 72). The conflictual aura forced ordinary people to become more politic and Macedonia society divided into political communities. In this direction, political groups used the polarization in their organization activities and their ideas found many supporters. For example, when Mustafa Kemal was sixteen years old, the Turco-Greco War was erupted. He wanted to attend the War, but his age was not enough for fighting in Ottoman army (Cebesoy, 2016: 21).

According to Michael Mann, the ideological killers believed that their activities such as plunders, homicides, and rapes are right. Because, they thought that achieving their high targets with these bloody ways was permissible as it was for the salvation of their nations. (Mann, 2012: 33). So, especially, the Young Turk focused on frontier zones to mobilize their movement by using hostile rhetoric on the suffered Muslims who were massacred during the Russo-Turkish War in 1877. By the time of the Balkan War, many Muslims, who lived in Macedonia, were massacred and displaced by Bulgarian and the other Non-Muslim groups. The stories, which were transferred by these Muslim witnesses, spread on Ottoman regions. With the Balkan War, a half million Muslim were displaced, including families of the CUP members' leaders. For example, families of Doctor Bahaeddin, Celal Bayar, Abdülhalik Renda, Şükrü Kaya, Mehmed Talad and Mehmed Cavid (Zürcher, 2007: 20), moreover, most importantly, Mustafa Kemal's family migrated from Selanico as well. Thereupon, the members of the CUP became strict on domestic politics against the Non-Muslim groups. Dr. Nazım called for vengeance to Non-Muslim groups (Üngör, 2016: 97). Most importantly, the possibility of

expelling from Anatolia caused anxiety within CUP members. Thus, their anxiety would be one of the important reasons of the Armenian genocide.

The Conflictual Regions of Iran

On the other side, the conflictual zones played a decisive role in shaping Iran political life, because losing territories created comprehensive socio-economic transformation. Moreover, it caused instability in terms economy and social. Big immigrant masses started to emerge, and this situation caused anxieties for central government and peripheral zones. During the nineteenth century, Qajars' Iran lost to Russian, Afghanistan, and British in the Wars and many regions were out of Iran's control such as Caucasian, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. On the other hand, these losses led to emanate a new frontier line. So, Khorasan and Iranian Azerbaijan became the new conflictual zones. On the one hand, the new frontier zones were under the dangerous foreign powers, on the other hand these regions were involved in an interaction with Western type modern ideas. The Herat siege was the important point in the Iran history. The siege of Herat was a great failure for Iran history. After the defeat, the Khorasan province was in danger. Moreover, when the city of Merv was lost, Russian disconnected Iran from Middle Asia regions. The city was the base of Iran in Central Asia, because all of the military and trade roads were connected to the city (Sabet, 2018: 52). So, the Khorasan city was in the danger of Russian one more time again. Furthermore, the Mazandaran and Gilan were in danger too. According to Malkom Khan, Iran would be collapse if it loses these cities (Sabet, 2018: 51). On the other hand, thanks to the interaction with Russian zones, new modern political ideas were spread among Iranian Azeris who came to work in Russian Azerbaijan, thus Iranian Azeris would be the main supporters of the constitutional thoughts.

By the 1920, the fame of the Reza Khan depended on the campaigns against unruly tribes, similarly Enver Bey, in the mountain areas of Mazandaran, Gilan, and Azerbaijan provinces (Garthwaite, 2011: 206). After the 1920, he faced more complex rivals. The disagreement between the Cossack division and Gendarmerie

led to two big revolts. Firstly, the Azerbaijan revolt, led by Gendarmerie Colonel, Kasim Khan Lahuti, who had a good relationship with Kemalists, and connected with Soviets (Sabet, 2018: 213), and secondly, in Khorasan province, the revolt led by Gendarmerie Colonel Muhammed Taqhi Pesyan, who was educated in Germany between Great War years and he established autonomy in Khorasan. Moreover, the most dangerous revolt was the Jangalis led by Mirza Kuchek Khan, who had nationalist thoughts and established a republic in Gilan with the support of Soviet. And lastly, an ethnic revolt erupted led by Ismail Smitko, who had relationship with Kemalist party in Azerbaijan and he tried to establish a Kurdish state. By 1922, all of revolts were suppressed by the Iranian army led by Reza Khan.

The Unique Conditions of Conflictual Regions

The most important point about both state's conflictual zones that these regions had political maturity. Especially, Salonica and Iranian Azerbaijan are very appropriate to discuss their unique political atmosphere. The two regions were the bodies of the constitutional revolution movement. Further to that, socialist ideas and unionization took place in these regions. The first trade unions emerged in Iranian Azerbaijan interacted with Russian Azerbaijan region (Garthwaite, 2011: 198). Thanks to Baku oil companies, many Iranian Azeri got jobs as seasonal workers. These workers carried socialist ideas to Iran. And also, thanks to Russian effect, Social Democrat Party of Iran was established in Baku, 1904. Their program mainly came from the economic demands of the Russian Social Democrat party. The party defended the right of workers such as organize and strike, eight hours daily working time, distribution of land, housing for the homeless, freedom speech, and so on (Abrahamian, 1982: 77). Moreover, during the revolution movement, Iranian Azeris did not want any independent Azerbaijan. They tried to support more democratic government and law under the name of Iranian nationalism (Sabet, 2018: 204).

Another community, especially Jews of Selanico, aimed to force the central government to take democratization steps without the idea of the independence. The

city had industrial companies such as tobacco factories, manufactories, railway and port operation. So, there was a great number of proletarians worked in this company and the city became industrialized (Dumont, 2014: 75). The Jewish communities were not only majority group in the city population but also, they controlled unions. The Selanico, Federation of Labour was founded in 1919 by Abraham Benaroya and Dimitry Vlahov. The federation believed that the Socialism will become superior over all of ethnic nationalism. The federation programmes published in four languages and A. Benaroya said that the nation of Ottomans consisted of different communities in which each of them had own culture, language, and literature (Dumont, 2014: 93). The sample of Selanico and Iranian Azerbaijan showed that these conflictual zones had cosmopolite structures. Their communities were aware of the thoughts of their age. Accordingly, the frontier zones were more interacted with neighbouring countries and Western thoughts comparing to interior zones. In short, it was no coincidence that the rebellion movements in Iran or the constitutionalism and unionism movements in the two countries came to light from these regions.

CHAPTER 7: BIOGRAPHIES OF TWO LEADERS

Mustafa Kemal

The two authoritarian leaders were born in last quarter of the nineteenth century with one-decade age difference. Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan were educated in military school which was established by Sultan Abdulhamid and Nasreddin Shah. Mustafa, who was going to be named Mustafa Kemal, was born in Selanico in 1881. His father Ali Rıza Bey was a taxman, and his mother Zübeyde Hanım, was housewife and her family originated in Anatolia. There was a debate between Ali Rıza Bey and Zübeyde Hanım about which schools were more available for young Mustafa (Hanioğlu, 2011: 19). Actually, it was a very popular discussion for this period. Ali Rıza Bey believed that Mustafa should attend secular school to become more active in social life. But Zübeyde Hanım, who knows how to read and write, would like Mustafa to attend religious school (Cebesoy, 2016: 12) (İnan, 2018: 4). But Mustafa appeared to enjoy his days at secular school, Şemsi Efendi (Hanioğlu,

2011: 20). Until the death of his father, they had relatively a wealthy life in which family could afford a servant and a nurse. But with the death of Ali Rıza, this lifestyle came to end. (Hanioglu, 2011: 19). After years passed unstably, under the influence of the sons of the neighbours, Mustafa decided to be attended military school and he entered the high school which was in Manastır province. The school had a modern curriculum which included hybrid lessons such as French, Arabic, and Persian (Hanioglu, 2011: 22). In this way, Mustafa Kemal started his military career.

Reza Khan

On the other hand, Rıza Khan was born in the village of Elasht, in the district of Savadkuh, around 1870s (Garthwaite, 2011: 206) -some sources such as Lenczowski stated he was born in 1878. The city was in the sides of Alborz mountain valleys and the city remains 110 kilometres northeast of Tehran. Reza was the youngest son of Abbas Ali Khani, who was a major in the Savadkuh regiment, and grandson of Murad Ali Khan, who was also an officer of same regiment and killed at the siege of Herat in 1856 (Lenczowski, 1978: 5). Reza's mother was Nush Afarin Hanım and her family came from originally from Yerevan city but when the city was conquered by the Russian occupy in the early nineteenth century, they migrated (Foran, 1994: 45) (Lenczowski, 1978: 5). The period of the Reza's childhood shares similarity with Mustafa Kemal's. Both leaders' mothers came from immigrant family and also their fathers were officers in the state institutions. And they were orphaned as child. When Reza was fifteen years old, he registered in the Cossack Brigade and he attracted the attention because of his strong, quick, and vigorous features. The Cossack Brigade, which was known as despotic thoughts, formed Reza's stiff character (Garthwaite, 2011: 206). He knew several languages, he talked Mazandaran language with his neighbours, Farsi in national platform, Russian in Cossack army, and lastly Turkish with his Cossack members (Abrahamian, 2018: 86).

CHAPTER 8: MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR CAREERS

The German Effects on the Ottoman Military

During the Hamidian period, the Ottomans had a good relationship with the Prussians to conduct Ottoman military system in terms of educational and administrative fields. In this direction, Sultan Abdülhamid called in German military commanders and scholars. Von der Goltz was the most effective German figure in this period. The impact of Goltz not only reflected on social fields by common militarization of Ottoman people, but it also affected military by establishing schools and a new curriculum. Ottoman military institutions reorganized led by Von der Goltz. During his military administration, thousands of foreign books translated to Ottoman Turkish and old curricula changed by taking inspiration from German education system to create a new officer generation who would be graduated from modern military institutions (Gencer, 2010: 187). Thanks to new military system, ordinary soldiers would start to believe in the knowledge and abilities of their superiors. (Tokay, 2010: 39) It was important because many high-ranking commanders got promotion inefficient ways in the Hamidian period. Moreover, with the Goltz system, the child, whose family had low-income and came from far and wide of the Empire, could attend the military schools. Finally, a new military elite was established by including these students (Tokay, 2010: 38). Even though, Sultan Abdülhamid thought that these institutions would educate officers who were loyal to his own ruling's ideas, the students in the new Ottoman military school were the main participants in the Young Turk revolution in 1908. So, the effect of the Goltz continued in the period of the CUP as well. With the 1913 Ottoman Coup d'etat, the German commanders, such as Liman von Sanders, took over the administration of the Ottoman military completely.

On the other hand, the book, known as ‘‘The Nation in Arms’’, was written Von der Goltz affected not only the military students but also social structure of the Ottomans. According to the book, the Wars are the inevitable events in the modern times and the responsibilities of the War did not only by the military but also all of

Ottoman nation (Hanioglu, 2011: 34). So, the Wars in the modern times can be won if the whole nation is mobilized (Bora, 2017: 41). According to Goltz's ideas, the militarization should be diffused on the all parts of social structures. By 1908, the compulsory military system was brought into force because the senior Ottoman officer believed that the main duty of the officers should be transforming the Ottoman military into a nation army (Hanioglu, 2011: 35). Thanks to the system, thousands of citizens, who lived far from the center, were planned to transform into one type of human mind and body in accordance with nation building. The association of Turk power, Ottoman Power, and Boy Scout organization were established by the leaders of the CUP to prepare enough physical and intellectual conditions before military service during candidates' childhood period. (Bora, 2017: 41) (Gencer, 2010: 192). Under these associations, children were taught some patriotic poems written by Ziya Gökalp and Namık Kemal. For example, when Mustafa Kemal was around Samsun province for national struggle in 1919, he sang an anthem (İnan, 2018: 227), better known as Youth anthem, which was taught in these associations.

The Cossack Brigade

Qajars had not even had any regular army until 1879. The Cossack Brigade was planned by Nasreddin Shah during his stay in Transcaucasia. He recognized Russian troops after recently the ending of Russo - Turkish War in 1878. The Russian Cossack troop escorted the Shah and he was influenced by Cossack's appearance, bright uniforms, and fine horsemanship (Kazemzadeh, 2013: 166). And then, the Shah intended to organize a similar cavalry union in Iran. Finally, the Russian Emperor, Alexander the Second, gave permission to help the Shah and he sent Russian Colonel Domantovich to Iran. He arrived Iran in 1879 and became the leader of central defence troop. Actually, the Cossack brigade was always directed by the Russians and Iranian governments' control over the Brigade was always weak (Cronin, 2006: 110). The main duty of the brigade was for Qajar absolutism against the internal enemies (Behroz, 2018: 81). So, the Shah was dependent on the Brigade. Even though, the Cossack brigade won the Shah's admiration

immediately, the Caucassian commander of Russia recalled Domantovich from Tehran and he refused to send Domantovich back to Persia. After Domantovich the brigade started to get worse day by day, and next four Russian commanders who were sent instead of him, could not maintain the stability in the Cossack brigade and thus troop deteriorated (Kazemzadeh, 2013: 168).

The existence of the Cossack Brigade annoyed the British since Russian effect increased. So, the British tried to control the other Iran forces, such as South Persian force, and the Gendarmerie troops, which was established through financial support from British after the Second parliament. Until the establishment of the Gendarmerie organization, the Cossack brigade had remained as a single force. Despite Cossack brigade's royalist character, the Brigade was passive during the Constitutional movement in 1905-1906 (Cronin, 2006: 110). 1906 was a critical year for Brigade. A new commandant, Colonel Liakhov took over the leader position of the brigade and he immediately began to tighten discipline on the brigade. On June 1908, Colonel Liakhov and the other officers occupied the telegram center in Tehran and bombarded the Parliament (Abrahamian, 2018: 69). With the closure of the parliament, the Marital Law was proclaimed and Liakhov appointed Military governor of Tehran. Until the nationalist forces took over the parliament again in 1910, Liakhov had remained practically dictator of Tehran (Cronin, 2006: 111). Establishment of the Gendarmerie annoyed the Russian diplomatic staff and Cossack members. Actually, they were right to be disturbed. Cossack Brigade was clearly inferior to the Gendarmerie as it was armed, equipped, and trained in a better way (Cronin, 2006: 111).

In 1915 and 1916, the Cossack brigade didn't play any significant role in the political events just as before 1905-1906 events. But its rival, Gendarmerie, was active in the War fields and Iranian nationalist grew a stronger alliance with it (Cronin, 2006: 112). In 1915, the third parliament moved to Kermanshah province. The gendarmerie force led by Colonel Pesyan became a protector of the nation by taking sides with third parliament in Kermanshah. In this year, the Gendarmerie had

a good relationship with the center powers such as Germany. So, internal political situation polarized between the powers of central and allied (Cronin, 2006: 113). While, the Gendarmerie was supported by Germans, the Cossack brigade was influenced by the Russian, and lastly, British established the South Iranian Police to resist the German powers (Sabet, 2018: 199). Under the pressure of the British, the Kermanshah government went to dissolution. Colonel Pesyan resigned his duty and went to Germany for medical treatment and aeronautical education.

After the Soviet revolution, the Cossack brigade was started to control by British due to the financial support from Russian was interrupted. Accordingly, Colonel Starosselsky, who was a White Russian supported by British, became an unchallenged commandant. In 1920, Starosselsky became practically a dictator in the Caspian zones due to suppression of the Gilan revolt (Cronin, 2006: 116). On October 1920, British general Ironside, who would be the decisive figure in the Coup d'état 1921, took over the British North Persian force in Qazvin province. Besides, he said to the Shah that if Starosselsky is allowed to stay, no more British money would be forthcoming for the Gilan campaign (Cronin, 2006: 117). As a conclusion, the Shah appointed an ineffective figure, who was Sardar Humayun, as a commander of the Cossack. But counter manoeuvre came from Ironside and he appointed Colonel Smyth as a financial administration of the Cossack division (Cronin, 2006: 118). At last, Shah could not resist to pressure of British side and Reza Khan became a commandant on Qazvin Cossack with the demands of Ironside and Smyth, instead of Sardar Humayun. On the other hand, the danger from the Jangalis movement threatened the central government and the existence of the British. Under these conditions, the team, which included Colonel Ironside, Colonel Smyth, and Reza Khan decided to make a Military Coup. In this direction, the team came contact with Seyyid Zia. While Colonel Ironside was encouraging the Coup plan in Qazvin, Colonel Smyth was performing some studies in the Tehran such as neutralizing political and military opposition which could prevent the Coup and gave security to the Shah for maintaining his reign the period after the Coup (Cronin, 2006: 122).

The Qazvin Cossack led by Reza Khan entered into Tehran without any resists and Reza Khan and Seyyid Zia took over the Iran government.

Military Careers

The military career of the leaders had progressed in different paths. Reza Khan continued his military career by fighting unruly tribes and his fame derived from the use of machine guns (Garthwaite, 2011: 206). Moreover, he was interested in the technical field of machine gunnery and also, he taught himself how to read and write (Lenczowski, 1978: 5). It is an important point, because education used to belong only to privileged classes who were living in wealth. In 1911, Reza was promoted to second lieutenant and he was a machine gun expert. So, the members of the brigade gave Reza a second name, Maxim (Abrahamian, 1978: 45).

The military career of Mustafa Kemal depended on military education. He attended military school of Harbiye in Istanbul in 1899. He graduated in 1902 and began War academy in 1902 (İnan, 2018: 7). When he was an intern in Damascus, he noticed that the Ottoman army plundered the village around the Damascus. This caused him to see the weak relation and injustice approach of the government towards communities. During the constitutional period, Mustafa Kemal attended to the Young Turk movement, but he had some criticisms about the leaders of the movement. In 1908, Mustafa Kemal was appointed to Tripoli region to regulate internal affairs. In 1909, Mustafa Kemal was the member of the movement army, which suppressed 31 March revolt, as a position of staff officer. Mustafa Kemal got promotion to a major position in the army with the guerrilla War in the Tripoli, 1912 (İnan, 2018: 9).

After the revolutionary movements, new political atmospheres were emerged in both states. During the period, Mustafa Kemal repeatedly criticized the CUP leaders for their politics which were unplanned and arbitrary. The political disagreement was sharpened by the Balkan Wars. Mustafa Kemal had a good relationship with Fethi Bey, who was main rival to the Enver Bey in the struggle of the War minister of the Ottoman army, and Mustafa Kemal belonged to the groups which supported

Fethi Bey. Disagreements between two sides came out with the failures in Şarköy landings (Okyar, 1999: 17). When Enver Pasha took back Edirne Province from Bulgaria, he gained a huge popularity and became a War minister. So, the group of pro-Fethi lost. In final, Fethi Bey resigned to his duty in the army and Mustafa Kemal followed him (Okyar, 1999: 17). But thanks to their good relations with the other Young Turks, Mustafa Kemal was appointed to the duty of Ottoman attaché to Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro (Hanioğlu, 2011: 72). Undoubtedly, Mustafa Kemal learned the diplomacy during his one and a half year of mission. In 1915, Mustafa Kemal resigned his diplomatic position and wanted to attend Great War. He was appointed to the Dardanelles War as commandant of Arıburnu regiment. Mustafa Kemal emerged from this War as the hero of life and death struggle (Hanioğlu, 2011: 77) and his success was heard all over the country (İnan: 2018: 11). In 1916, Mustafa Kemal got promotion to general position and he joined to Syria and then he became an army general of seventh army in Palestine front (İnan, 2018: 13). And finally, Mustafa Kemal was appointed by Damad Ferid, who was the leader of freedom and accord party, to Samsun province to save Rums from attack of the local Muslims (Okyar, 1999: 23).

In 1918, Reza Khan involved in the coup, led by Colonel Starosselsky, which was against Colonel Clergi who was a liberal character. After that, the British removed Starosselsky and the other Russian officers in 1920. Finally, Reza Khan remained as the most important Cossack commanders (Foran, 1994: 45). So, he was appointed to general position of Qazvin Cossack brigade. Before the Cossack army setting out to Tehran, he consulted with British officers, Colonel Smyth and General Ironside, and gave mutual assurance for both of them. In 1921, the Cossack army led by Reza Khan took over the control Tehran city and Reza Khan became a commander of the Iranian land forces. He strengthened his military position by defeating the Jangali movement and the other insurgents (Abrahamian, 1982: 1199). Then he became the minister of War and the chief of the defence staff (Abrahamian, 2018: 88).

Mentalities of Both Leaders

The mentality of the two leaders showed some differences and similarities. Because of the differences in the structure of the cities in which they lived and the education they received; Mustafa Kemal had advantages over Reza Khan in terms of interacting with Western ideas. Mustafa Kemal was from new military elites who were located in Western places such as Selanico and Istanbul, and he had been following the modern Western ideas since his youth. Whereas, Reza Khan was educated in a despotic military institution and unlike Mustafa Kemal, he was far from Western ideas. Actually, two authoritarian leaders used same reforms; Reza Khan had more target-oriented pragmatic approaches. Moreover, the main target of the Reza Khan was to destroy any opponents such as tribal powers, political oppositions, Ulema, so on. Mustafa Kemal also put pressure on the opponents, but he was looking for legitimate ground as well. The ideological capacity of Reza Khan depended on three basic issues which were discipline, order, and the might of the state (Abrahamian, 2018: 89). Contrary, Mustafa Kemal made his policies were more legitimized around six principles which were republicanism, populism, laicism, revolutionism, statism, and nationalism. While Reza Khan was accepting all opponents to his ruling as treasons and separatists (Abrahamian, 2018: 89), Mustafa Kemal took few well-intentioned attempts on oppositional parties. When, Mustafa Kemal gave importance to the art of rhetoric (İnan, 2018: 6), “Reza Khan had no time to devote himself neither to the art of speaking well, nor to philosophy and political theory” (Abrahamian, 2018: 89).

The mentality of Mustafa Kemal depended on two main ideologies which were Turkism and Westernism. He asserted that his spiritual inspiration came from Namık Kemal and his intellectual inspiration originated in Ziya Gökalp (Bora, 2017: 126). Ziya Gökalp, who was the members of the Genç Kalemler magazine, had some Turkist thoughts. Gökalp gave sociology lessons in the University and he asserted that a nation should be consisting of the people who grew up in same type condition and speak the same languages (Üngör, 2016: 82). So, speaking Turkish was essential issue for him. Like many other members of the CUP, Mustafa Kemal

followed Turkist thought too. In Beirut 1906, Mustafa Kemal said to his friend that the main target is to establish a Turkish state (Cebesoy, 2016: 129). And also, he interested in pre-Ottoman Turkish world and he read books of Suleyman Pasha and Leon Chan which were written about these Turki communities living in Middle Asia (Hanioglu, 2011: 65).

On the other hand, Reza Khan was interested in pre-Islamic period as well. He focused on magnificent pre-Islamic Persian civilisations instead of Persian history under the effect of Arabic Islam culture. So, his second name Pahlavi came from a language originated in the period of pre-Islamic and he frequently addressed to Ferdowsi's Shahnameh. Even though, it was banned, Mustafa Kemal also read Namik Kemal in the military school years (Cebesoy, 2016: 43). According to Falih Rifki Atay, who was very close to Mustafa Kemal, the writing type of "the Speech" was very similar to the Namik Kemal's works (Atay, 1968: 542).

Both Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan knew several languages. But there is an uncertainty on how much they know these languages. While some sources stated that Mustafa Kemal speak and read French very well and read German less (Inan, 2018: 366), some sources said that Mustafa Kemal had not any interest in German and also his French was not perfect. (Atay, 1968: 626). Nonetheless, it can be said that Mustafa Kemal and Fethi Okyar read some French books which were written by Rousseau, Voltaire, Augusto Comte, and Montesquieu (Kinross, 1990: 29-34). It is crucial to state that these books formed the base of Western intellectual world. So, Mustafa Kemal was aware of the Western thoughts in his period.

BUILDING A NEW STATE AFTER THE EMPIRE

We will examine the years in which new states were built after the empires, in this part. For Turkey, this period will be after World War 1, whereas the process after 1919 Anglo-Persian Treaty will be taken into consideration for Iran. Firstly, while focusing on struggles of building new central states after the dissolution of empires, we will approach authoritarian leaders' relations, rivals and main motivation their struggles. Afterwards, we will focus on the relationship with Western powers by considering conditions which changed after the Great War. Secondly, while analysing the rise of the two authoritarian leaders, we will examine their partnerships and the opposition movements occurred against them during the period of becoming absolute leaders.

CHAPTER 9: THE STRUGGLE FOR BUILDING A NEW STATE

On the contrary to Ottoman Empire, which took the steps of being centralized and made reforms in various fields such as economy, administration and institution, Iran taken by Reza Khan, did not have central government institutions and also it had a disorder condition which was far from being a centralized structure. Administration of Qajars depended on the relation between a weak Shah and regional governments which consisted of local elites, landowners and ulema. Besides, Cossacks Army, which Reza Khan's power depended on, was competing with gendarme forces since the constitutional period. Between the years 1920 and 1922, series of revolts erupted. Reza Khan would face with these revolts, which were led by Mirza Kuchek Khan and Jangalis in Gilan, Khiyabani and Lahuti in Tabriz, İsmail Simitqo in Kurdistan besides Mohammed Taqhi Pesyan in Mashhad when he tried to establish a central government of Iran.

1919 Anglo-Persian Treaty which had bad reputation because of causing Iran to dominate by British patronage in Economy, led to mutual reaction of Cossacks and Gendarmeries (Cronin, 2010: 46). Even though these two forces had moved together during coup d'état in 1921, it was an unreliable partnership for Reza Khan who was a Cossack officer. After the coup, Reza Khan was seen one of the

prominent figures however his country neither had a homogeneously structured army nor provinces directly controlled by central state

With the leadership of Reza Khan, Iran's regime would be military monarchy. Between the years 1921 and 1922, the biggest rival of Cossack force led by Reza Khan was Gendarme force which gained reputation for resisting against Western occupants. With the help of Gendarmes forces during the coup, Mesut Kayhan, a gendarme commander, became the secretary of war. Moreover, the members of gendarme force were placed in important positions especially in periphery. And Reza Khan, became head of the land forces by taking the title of Serdar-I Sipah (Cronin, 2012: 120). In parallel with coup d'état, regional governors led by Gendarmerie commandants, who came to power in the provinces, made various reforms against classic regional structures, in terms of administration, economy and social. The most important leader of these various coups was Mohammed Taqhi Pesyan. Pesyan, who was appointed as a governor of Khorasan to restore the order, built a revolutionary nationalist regime in Mashhad.

The Power Struggle between the Cossack Brigade and Gendarmeries

After Coup d'état, new prime minister Seyyid Ziya arrested many people from various traditional layer and applied pressure on old elites (Garthwaite, 1978: 206). Qavam es-Saltaneh, the brother Vussuq al-Dawleh, was also one of the arrested politicians. Qavam, the previous governor of Khorasan province, was arrested by Pesyan and sent to Tehran (Cronin, 2010: 58). Pesyan thought that a powerful central government should be established, besides he had a good relationship with Sayyid Ziya, and he had never planned on taking over central government of Tehran. He made modernized reforms in military, economy and social fields. Furthermore, his centralizing policies got reaction from nearly all of traditional groups. Also, he established military commissions (Cronin, 2010: 60) and he tried to limit political and economic independence of religious groups. In this direction, he oppressed Ulema to control their economic incomes of Vakıf and he put military pressure on Shirine regions (Cronin, 2010: 63).

In May 1921, when Seyyid Ziya was detracted from prime ministry, Qavam took this position and Reza Khan was promoted to war ministry. Behind the exile of Seyyid Ziya, the unity of regional powers and old elites, whom he tried to dissolve during his reign, and the partnership of Reza Khan took an active role (Cronin, 2010: 64). After the exile of Seyyid Ziya, on the one hand central government was trying to disable the effect of gendarmes on military system, on the other hand Qavam was aiming to get his revenge from Pesyan. On Reza's side, Pesyan was a potential danger for him because Pesyan was both intellectual and charismatic besides his close relatives took important positions in military such as Senior Hamza Khan and Colonel Haydar Kuli Khan. By saying "Iran could not be worse" under the control of Qavam and holding his ground against him, Pesyan stated that Seyyid Ziya should come back (Cronin, 2010: 65). Reza Khan was approaching Pesyan with caution as he disapproved his authority. Because there were revolts both in Gilan and Kurdistan. Moreover, Reza Khan found it risky to attack with disorganized and ill-equipped Cossacks forces against well-armed gendarmes (Cronin, 2010: 79). At this point, prime minister Qavam appointed Samsam al-Saltanah from Bakhtiari tribe as a new governor to Khorasan. After that, Samsam organized an attack towards Mashhad by cooperating with opposite groups including landowners, merchants, tribes and Ulema. In October 1921, Pesyan died during the conflict with a Kurdish tribe (Sabet, 2006: 213). Gendarmes' forces were sustained a defeat with his death.

Pursuing centralization policies by establishing centre-periphery relationship in periphery areas, Pesyan's ruling in Meshed was like a precedent of Rıza Khan's policies in the coming years. Reza Khan took lessons from both Pesyan's achievements and failures. It was a big disadvantage for Pesyan to face many local powers without having based his power upon a basis which was not solid enough. Contrary to Pesyan, Rıza Khan was going to approach old elites with caution until becoming a shah, just like the example of the year 1924 in which the idea of republic was brought forward. Even so, efforts of Meshed government to penetrate the

region and control autonomous communities in economic, politic and social ways became an example for Reza Khan. Annihilating Colonel Pesyan, who was the strongest rival of Reza Khan, made Reza an uncompetitive condition in terms of military and political.

The second reflection of the power struggle between Gendarme and Cossack units was seen in Tabriz. The revolt occurred in 1922 led by gendarme commander Abdulqasım el-Lahuti. Lahuti, who came from a poor family, was interested in Marxist thought under the effect of the Russian Revolution of 1905. Being a poet at the same time, Lahuti mentioned about social inequality in his famous work *Rençber*. His first insurrectionary experience, as a Gendarmerie commandant, took place in 1913 against the Russian forces in the city of Kum (Sabet, 2018: 213). By 1917, he was already a political figure and a member of the Workers Party in Kermanshah. Even though Lahuti, who spent his exile days in İstanbul, came back to Iran to support on-going Gilan revolt, it was suppressed. In here, thanks to Swedish Gendarme commander Colonel Lundberg, the commander of Sufiyan city, he received his pre-exile rank back. Meanwhile, having suppressed regional revolts, Reza Khan was working on uniting Cossack military and Gendarme troop in a new army structure with the superiority of Cossacks. A revolt outbreaked in January 1922 in Tabriz, which had been the city of revolt a couple years ago.

Although the revolt of Lahuti is seen as Gendarme based, it contains local democrats from Tabriz and the groups within broad political structure, such as Communists and radical nationalists (Cronin, 2012: 121). Democrats from Tabriz, the other great force of revolt other than gendarmes, were motivated to take revenge of Abdulqasım Khiyabani. He was the leader of 1920 revolt and a well-known preacher in the period of constitutionalism. He established a local government called Azadistan and through a constitutional government, they requested national sovereignty and freedom, with the ideal of land of freedom (Cronin, 2010: 117). The revolt, which started in reaction to 1919 Anglo – Persian Treaty, was suppressed by Cossack army due to Khiyabani did not recognize the regime of

Mukhtar al-Saltaneh, the new governor of the region. The suppression of Khiyabani could not solve the demands of the region, by 1922, Tajaddud movement led by Lahuti consisted of Gendarme forces and the attendance of local democrats, which came from Khiabani revolt (Cronin, 2010: 122). Lahuti made contacts with centralized government and he asserted anxieties about new army system of Gendarme. Besides, he also reacted to Cossack uniform and rejected to wear, because the uniform reminded him Tsarist Russia.

Having faced with Tabriz revolt, Reza Khan, on one hand, was deploying his army around the city by preparing a military operation; on the other hand, he was waiting for the dissolution of the revolt by stating that he will declare a general amnesty. Eventually Lahuti recognized that revolution would be failed, and he and a group of participants fled to Soviet Union. After the revolt, there was no obstacle for the central army. Indeed, in the period between 1921 and 1923, Reza Khan was busy with designing Iran army and he eliminated the Swedish, Russian and British elements within the army and replaced them with Cossack regiment commanders (Abrahamian, 2018: 92). Later on, he would be distributing bonus to them, and by reason of the fact that Reza Khan would see them as the guard of regime, he would ignore their misrules such as malpractice, corruption, occupation of state land and disproportionate use of force (Abrahamian, 2018: 94).

Mirza Kuchek Khan, Jangalis, and Ismail Smitqo

The reason why Reza Khan became a leader and a strong figure on Iranian stage is that he demolished all the possible leaders against his reign by suppressing regional revolts successfully. Unlike Mustafa Kemal, Reza Khan's struggle of building a new state was not against the power came from West, but to the regional power from his own country. In this direction, except for Gendarme revolts, the revolt which provided Reza Khan's rise broke out in Gilan led by Mirza Kuchek Khan. British foreign policy had changed since 1919 Anglo Persian Treaty, thus British preferred to work with central Iran government instead of instable regional powers and tribes against Soviet expansionism on Middle East. Although the treaty, on one

hand, transformed Iran to an economic colony of Britain (Garthwaite, 2011: 206), on the other hand, it gave guarantees on protecting Iran in addition to technical and economic supplies (Armaoğlu 1999: 138).

In June 1920, when fleet of Soviet Russia anchored Enzeli, Mirza Kuchek Khan, who was the leader of one of the groups against the treaty of 1919, arrived at Resht city with Jangalis power who were pro-Soviet. In here, Mirza Kuchek Khan, with the support of Iranian Bolshevik and Soviet consultants, established the Soviet Socialist Republic of Iran (Katouzian, 2012: 17). The reason why this revolt was different than the others was not only because of pro-soviet movements but also the region revolt took place that was very close to Tehran. The chance of Kuchek Khan and Jangalis could take over Tehran at any moment, made British to plan Coup d'état as soon as they could. In addition to this, Iranian sympathy for the Soviets was increasing. For instance, British delegate Ravlison told Kazım Karabekir about that Soviets was successful at both in military and propagandas in Iran and he also said that "general political atmosphere in Iran was pro-soviet" (Karabekir, 1960: 93). But in 1921, with the treaty between Soviet and Tehran, Soviet preferred to work with central Iran government, just like British, and declared that it recognized the territorial integrity of Iran (Sutton, 1978: 14). As of treaty, Soviet power withdrew from Iran, so Gilan government got weaker. In August 1921, when Cossack forces defeated rebels in Mazandaran province, Jangalis were dissolved (Sabet, 2018: 212).

Between the years 1921 and 1922, the revolt led by Ismail Simitqo, which included a nationalist tone, took place around Urmia lake in Kurdistan territory. The leader of revolt, which lasted from 1921 to August 1922, Simitqo, also took support from Kemalists time to time. Even if Kemalists claimed that their struggle was anti-imperialist, they did not miss the chance to intervene in Iran's affairs. The pro-Kemalist party in Tabriz led by Ruşeni Bey, focussed on Iranian Azeris against assimilation policies of central Iran government on Azeris in this period (Sabet, 2018: 215). While Simitqo had good relations with this party, he also supported the

idea of independent Kurdistan. In this way, he struggled for land demands of Kurds around Urmia. As Cossack force suppressed the revolt, Simitqo ran away to Turkish side.

The conflicts carried out in the period of building a government after both Iran's and Turkey's imperial time, conducted with the negotiations with Western powers. The attitude of gendarmes was anti-British during the great war period. Building a united army with Cossack superiority was Reza Khan's main motivation in the revolt period. Because, Gendarme forces was a historical enemy of British forces. The relationship between British and Iran was defined as "Utilitarian Buffer State" by Behrooz Moazami in the period of building a new state, the definition of buffer state is used to define the condition of a weak but strategically powerful peripheral country and its relationship with powerful center state. In addition to this, Moazami added the definition "utilitarian" (Moazami, 2018: 85), which adds profits of local powers in Iran periphery to relationship network mentioned above. The utilitarian partnership of these three groups worked together to depose Seyyid Ziya from prime ministry.

Pre-Congress Period of Turkish National Struggle

The process of building Turkey had similarities with the rise of Reza Khan. Ankara government tried to prove Western powers that they were the most reasonable candidate to govern a country. Leader of the struggle, Mustafa Kemal, stated that "Britain is Ottoman's best ally" by Minber newspaper, in October 1918, the period when he was trying to become war minister (Başkaya, 2006: 64). In the years of national struggle, Kemalists faced Western imperialist powers with Westernist ideals. In "Great Speech" -Nutuk-, Mustafa Kemal stated that they did not adopt a hostile attitude towards allied powers during national struggle, on the other hand, they maintained their devotion to Sultan and Caliph (Başkaya, 2006: 56). In this direction, Ankara government emphasized that the CUP, who had a bad reputation because of Armenian genocide, and national struggle did not have any bond, actually, almost all members originated in CUP framework. The target of national

struggle had never been Western imperialist occupants, but local non-Muslim groups. In 1919, Kazım Karabekir who was one of the most figures in Turkish national struggle according to some historian, mentioned 9th army commander Rüştü Bey:” Allied power came out of the Great War so exhausted that they cannot intend to kill a single man. We won’t face with anybody but Rum and Armenian.” (Başkaya, 2006: 56).

By October 1918, due to policies of Ottoman Empire as Armenian genocides and Rum massacres, the CUP members turned into a war criminal. On the other hand, there was a great rage among the public against policies of the Cup as well. The CUP, who had bad reputation, made a decision in their last congress in 1918: changing their name into Countrywide Resistance Organization (CRO) -Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti- from The Community of Union and Progress in their periphery branch. Besides, they changed the secret union named The Special Organization - Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa- into an organisation called The Karakol Society (Çetinoğlu, 2007: 48) (Zürcher, 2015: 205). The main motivation behind the establishment of the CRO was to resist existence of Rum and Armenian in post-war period of Anatolia (Bozarslan, 2015: 293). The Karakol Society transmitted many CUP members who were wanted between October 1918 and March 1920 through covert operation to Anatolia, furthermore they supplied equipment and weapon for the Anatolian struggle movement (Zürcher, 2015: 213). As seen in the examples, even though the CUP leaders were abroad, the Anatolian struggle movement they had planned before came to success. Their members spread on almost all institutions of the country such as Parliament, army, police and telegram organizations (Zürcher, 2015: 203).

From the Period of Congress to the Republic

There were two groups who desired to come to power after the CUP who fled abroad. The first group was Freedom and Accord Party led by Damad Ferid Pasha, who was married to sister of sultan. The second group, which had relationship with the CUP before but stayed out of the triumvirate of party, included Fethi Bey -

Okyar-, Rauf Bey -Orbay-, Fuad Pasha -Cebesoy-, Mustafa Kemal, and etc. When Mustafa Kemal heard about the news on establishment of the new cabinet, sent telegram to the central government led by Ahmet İzzet Pasha in order to become the War Minister (Akşin, 2018: 115). Although Mustafa Kemal came to İstanbul to make political contacts, Ahmet İzzet Pasha's government which was established in October 1919 and could not win the support of Sultan, dissolved within a short period of time. By this way, Mustafa Kemal stayed in Istanbul October 1918 and May 1919. Within this period, before Kazım Bey took over the fifteenth army established in Eastern Anatolia by Enver Pasha to resist Western powers and non-Muslim groups (Çetinoğlu, 2007: 54), besides Karabekir visited Mustafa Kemal and stated that his plan was to establish a national government and he clarified that firstly he would force Armenians, who claimed six provinces in Eastern Anatolia for themselves, to sign a treaty and then go towards West. In reply to Karabekir, Mustafa Kemal stated that his plan was to take place in the cabinet led by İzzet Pasha or Ahmet Rıza (Kazım Karabekir, 1968: 18).

With the Mondros Ceasefire Agreement signed in October 1918, Ottoman army became disarmed and six Ottoman provinces known as "Vilayet-i Sitte", were defined as Armenian regions (Hakan, 2013: 43). And the seventh article of agreement accorded a right to occupy the regions treated allied powers' security (Zürcher, 2013: 201). In the light of the twelfth article of the Wilson principles, CRO claimed that Muslim communities were majority in "Vilayeti Sitte" provinces (Zürcher, 2013: 221). Indeed, the region became homogenized after genocides and massacres within the Great War period. Almost all local supporters of this organization plundered Armenian and Rum goods. Because of these problems, Damad Ferid sent Mustafa Kemal as controller of the ninth army to Samsun. He aimed to prevent local Muslims from allied powers' intervention in the light of the seventh article (Akşin, 2016: 121).

It had been six months since the Anatolian struggle movement started when Mustafa Kemal came to Samsun (Zürcher, 2005: 11). Kazım Karabekir, who had good relations with Mustafa Kemal, was in Sivas as commander of the 15th. army

while Ali Fuad was in Ankara as commander of the twentieth army. There was a great tension within Eastern Anatolian communities, who plundered non – Muslim goods and estates, fearing that Armenians could come back their living spaces (Hakan, 2013: 126). The existence of Kurd deputy Şerif Pasha and Armenian deputy Bogos Nubar Pasha in Paris Peace Conference in January 1919, made a significant contribution to mobilize Kurds, who were partners in crime with the leaders of CUP in the Great War period, under the flag of Caliphate. Mustafa Kemal attended as a deputy to Erzurum Congress in July – August 1919, which was held by Eastern provinces of Countrywide Resistance Organization – Vilayeti Şarkiye Müdafaa-ı Hukuk Cemiyeti. The congress was concluded with the decision of Islamic Union against the idea of Armenian state in Eastern Anatolia (Hakan, 2013: 216). Even though it was announced for West that the Anatolian movement was not related to the CUP (Akşin, 2016: 133), thirty-four members out of sixty were originated in the CUP (Çetinoğlu, 2007:48). In September 1919, the second congress was in Sivas led by Mustafa Kemal. The congress could not be blocked by the Damad Ferid Pasha, because almost all Ottoman commanders in Anatolia were supporting the congress movement. (Akşin, 2016: 138). In congress, homeland, which was surrounded by Turkish and Kurdish frontiers, was emphasized (Hakan, 2013: 282) and the CRO -Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti- all around the country was merged under the title of Anatolian and Rumelia Countrywide Resistance Organization (ARCRO). Damad Ferid, who was helpless against the congress movement, resigned and then in October 1919, Ali Rıza Pasha came to government.

The ARCRO, which was established after the Sivas Congress, aimed to incorporate all regional congresses as an umbrella organization, in contrast to independent congresses in Anatolia, Edirne, Balıkesir, Nazili, and Alaşehir, which were only aiming to support their regions against Greek invasions. Moreover, these groups which could not resist to Greek army had already been in need for a central government (Belge, 2012: 592). On the other side, the governments established by Damad Ferid were instable. Damad Ferid Pasha had ruled the government three times during the period between March and September 1919 and when Greek

occupation happened in May 1919, he had no chance against oppositions both in Istanbul and periphery. In October 1919, Istanbul government led by Ali Rıza Pasha and delegate of the ARCRO negotiated in Amasya, then they decided on delegates of the last Ottoman Parliament (Zürcher, 2013: 226). In December 1919, Anatolian movement moved their center to Ankara province. Simultaneously, British forces occupied Ottoman Parliament and arrested deputies whom they charged with Armenian genocide. In the shadow of this incident, the last Ottoman Parliament was opened with majority of the Anatolian movement and National Pact Declaration -Misak-ı Milli- which expressed the aims of congress movement, was adopted. In March 1920, British occupied Istanbul again and this occupation became the most legitimate basis of Ankara government which was going to be established in April 1920.

While occupation of Istanbul brought Ankara government into the forefront in national platform, the conflicts with Greek forces would make Mustafa Kemal unquestionable leader of the Turkish national movement. With the Sevres Treaty signed in August 1920 by Istanbul government, the Allied powers gave a little territory in North Anatolia of which capital was Istanbul, to Ottomans. According to this treaty, Greeks gained land in West Anatolia and Armenians could establish a government in East Anatolia (Zürcher, 2013: 220). Greek forces moved towards Ankara after this treaty, so that the government became obliged to accept the treaty. However internal affairs of Greece were not ready for a conflict with Ankara government because their King was changed recently, and their prime minister Venizelos was overthrown. Moreover, there was no harmony within Allied powers anymore; while there were some disagreements between Italy and Britain, French foreign affairs believed that the most reasonable structure was the one which would be established by Ankara government (Keyder, 2017: 96).

In September 1920, the army led by Kazım Karabekir attacked Armenian forces and they had to sign the Gumru Treaty in December 1920. Thus, Eastern front was closed as he planned, and the army focused on Western front. Ankara government

started to build close relations with Soviets. In April 1920, Mustafa Kemal asked Lenin for Soviet's support in their struggle against imperialism (Armaoğlu, 1999: 194), and in return Ankara government was recognized by Soviets officially. Conflicts with Greek forces in the Turkish national struggle began with Inonu War I in January 1921. After the conflict concluded with success of Turkish army, Allied powers started to withdraw from Anatolia. Italian forces sold their weapons to Ankara government and it was claimed that some French army members attended Ankara government as soldiers (Keyder, 2017: 96). Meanwhile the British decided to support Ankara government which had a chance to become a strong central government against Soviet diffusion in Anatolia as the example of Iran. By this way, British would guarantee the road to their colonies in East. On the other hand, Ankara government signed a treaty of friendship with Soviets (Zürcher, 2013: 230). At this time, both Allied powers and Soviets accepted the ultimate victory of Turkish force.

Despite of internal disturbance, Greek forces managed to reach around Ankara after several conflicts with Turkish forces. Even though there were acute discussions within Ankara government, the Parliament gave Mustafa Kemal position of supreme military commandery (Demirel, 2012: 51). With the victory of Battle of Sakarya, which took place between August and September 1921, Greek forces started to withdraw. Almost for a year, there were no conflicts between the two forces. In this period, France withdrew from Anatolia for the advantage of Ankara government and British started to arrange meetings about the withdrawal of Greek forces from Anatolia (Zürcher, 2013: 232). Through Turkish attack in August 1922, Greek forces were completely dissolved. In September 1922, Turkish forces arrived at Izmir. At this time, there was an anxious wait in Ottoman Palace. In 1st October 1922, sultanate was abolished and Sultan Vahdettin flee abroad a British ship. The day after his departure, Ankara government prevented Sultan Vahdettin's possible plans in abroad by determining Abdulmecid Efendi as a caliph.

After this stage, Kemalists eliminated pro-Soviets groups within Turkish army, and Ankara government turned its face into Western powers. In November 1922, Soviets were angry at Kemalists and they accused Mustafa Kemal and his group of being bourgeoisie (Armaoğlu, 1999: 198). In October 1922, the negotiations started with Armistice of Mudanya between allied powers and Kemalists continued with the Lausanne Peace Conference but was not the ultimate one. By organizing an economic congress in İzmir between February and March 1923, it was shown that the direction of the government of Turkey was the Western-type capitalist economic system (Akşin, 2018: 179). Lausanne Peace Conference, which gathered again in April 1923, concluded as a treaty in July 1923. While Ankara government was officially recognised with the treaty, National struggle ended with the victory of Kemalists.

CHAPTER 10: THE RISE OF THE TWO ABSOLUTE LEADERS

The most important foundations of Reza Khan's Iran and Mustafa Kemal's Turkey were their regular armies, throughout the building period. Both leaders rose in their countries through military and their rise were depended on their military successes when were the leaders of their armies. Reza Khan, who became the commander of land forces after military coup, positioned as War Ministry after a little while. Mustafa Kemal came to the position of supreme military command before Sakarya Battle and this position became one of the titles used for him during his ruling, such as head teacher. While Reza Khan was asserting the military tone of his regime by wearing military uniform all the time, Mustafa Kemal was expressing that his regime was Western type by wearing civilian dresses in daily life. Both leaders got the support of nationalists while building national central military.

Establishment of Central Regular Armies

The main basis of the new regimes, military forces, transformed into a regular, united and modern structure through requests of the leaders. In this direction, leaders would build their power upon new army. The first target of Reza Khan in military was to embody disordered forces throughout the country in a united army

based on leadership of Cossack forces. By 1922, a united army was established which included gendarmes' forces, tribe forces, South Persian forces and Cossack forces and the number of the members reached nearly 20.000 (Abrahamian, 2018: 92). Moreover, Cossack commanders were appointed in the place of foreign consultants and commanders and all army wore the same uniform (Sutton, 1978: 20). At the beginning of the period of National Struggle, Mustafa Kemal did not have an army to lead like Reza Khan. He acted in unison with Karabekir's army at the beginning of national struggle. Different from Reza Khan, Mustafa Kemal did not face with regional revolts while building a regular army, except for the crisis occurred with Cherkas Ethem who was Paramiliter commander of West Anatolia.

Cherkas Ethem who was a member of the Special Organization (Belge, 2012: 597), struggled with enemies in West Anatolia by Paramiliter forces before the establishment of Ankara government however, instead of regular army, he wanted to continue with Paramiliter methods. In response to this, Mustafa Kemal discharged Ali Fuad Pasha, who had a good relationship with Cherkas Ethem, from being commander of West Anatolia and brought Ismet Bey to this position. Consequently, the relation between Ankara government and Cherkas Ethem was ruptured and Cherkas Ethem fled abroad. Even though Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan build a regular, united and modern armies, they could not assume control within their armies completely from 1920 to 1924. In the period when the wave of republic came out, Reza Khan recognised the voices against him within his regular army (Moazami, 2018: 178), and in March 1924, he banned his army from going out of the barracks (Cronin, 2012: 126). On the other hand, after the disagreement with Kazım Karabekir, Mustafa Kemal forced to retire Kazım Karabekir from his military duty and Mustafa Kemal appointed Fevzi Çakmak, who had kept his distance from politics, to the position of the general staff.

Building a regular and united modern army would cost a heavy loss in economy. Especially because of financial impossibilities during 19th century, a regular army could not have been established so, when Reza Khan came to power, he faced

difficult conditions. By 1922, he realized that he needs rich economic sources for his united army. In this direction, in March 1922, he took the controlling of many yielding institutions of the country on to improve his regular army. These incomes came from municipality, customs, oil, opium etc. (Cronin, 2012: 121). Mustafa Kemal, who had a relatively regular army structure, was in search for economic sources to modernize army as well. In this way, applications such as expropriation of the board of railways and excise besides enfranchising harbours to national capital helped to find economic sources for the army (Kalyon, 2008: 80). Furthermore, after 1923, military factories were built to supply the weapon and equipment needs. The most important one was in Kırıkkale. Moreover, some private enterprises who had kinship with Kemalists, became the partners of these factories. These relatives included Nuri Kılıgil, brother of Enver Pasha, and Şakir Zümre, Fevzi Çakmak's kin etc. Military expenses took an important place, nearly half of the income, in Turkey's general budget (Kalyon, 2008: 80).

Armies took positions at the center of regimes contributed to nation building period of the countries. Citizen armies, compulsory military system and military education which were created in the nation building period of Iran and Turkey, indicated interwoven relation between militarism and nation building. Wearing the same uniform, speaking the same language and singing for the same march within a central army, showed the project of creating obedient and loyal citizens in states which were in nation building period (Altınay-Bora, 2008: 141). Military became the most important system in terms of education for the state. The same approach was seen in Iran as well. Announcing compulsory military service in 1925, Iran took the support of Socialists and Nationalists but in regional scale this policy caused protests. Reza Khan tried to replace the classical Persian identity coming from Qajars with the ethnocentric Persian identity. In parallel with this purpose, in the first six months of military service, soldiers from all around the country had Persian education (Cronin, 2012: 136). Moreover, all terms of foreign origin in the army translated into Farsi (Cronin, 2012: 136). In Turkey, where militarism was getting popular day by day, a Turkish identity created by Kemalists. According to

the identity, the Turkish army has been the main protector of the Turkish existence since time immemorial (Bora, 2017: 165). The nationalist slogan of “Every Turkish born as a soldier” is the sample of the relation between nation building and military.

Militarism was the moulder in center – periphery relation as well. On one hand, military governors who were appointed to the periphery, became the representation of regime and they led to social transformation, on the other hand, they aimed to assimilate groups, in terms of the central government, with Persian culture by incorporating them into military system. For example, government who had problems with Turkoman groups in Soviets frontier, channelized them into military forces to assimilate them and take advantage of their warrior spirit (Sabet, 2006: 280). After a while, this group spread all around Iran and they turned into supporters of Pahlavi regime. As it is seen, in both states, central standards were imposed upon peripheral groups through military applications.

Taking Steps for Becoming Absolute Leader

In October 1923, Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan rose to the positions of indisputable leadership. While Mustafa Kemal was proclaiming the Republic in 29th October, Reza Khan became prime minister in 27th October. Until this period, both leaders went through periods instability. While Reza Khan did not have huge problems with Parliament until 1924 when he defeated his rivals in field, Mustafa Kemal did not face with military rivals in field but he confronted two opponent groups; first one was the Second Group in the first parliament and the second was the Progressive Republican Party (PRP). Both leaders went through huge problems between 1924 and 1925. While reactions to republic movement in Parliament and field forced Reza Khan to retreat, the PRP in the Parliament and Kurdish revolt led by Sheikh Said in the field forced Mustafa Kemal to declare a state of emergency. In this condition, he would make law on the maintenance order -Takrir-i Sukun- which would provide him opportunity as dictatorship for four years (Chebabi, 2012: 193). On the other hand, both leaders exterminated their opponents and they started to build a regime depended on one man. The difficulty of the period was reflected

on Mustafa Kemal's "Great Speech" -Nutuk-, which demonstrated all issues in detail took place between 1919 and 1925.

The first Parliament, which was active between April 1920 and April 1923, was one of the pluralist structures in the history of Turkish Parliament. While Parliament was facing the Greek threat, Kemalists were also struggling with Ottoman Government in Istanbul. In addition to this, Kemalists were claimed to support the idea of caliphate. Mustafa Kemal, the leader of the ARCRO (Tunçay, 1981:43), of which group was majority in the Parliament, transformed the group into People's Party, in December 1922. In the period started with Greek march and lasted until January 1921, Parliament led by Mustafa Kemal aimed to get closer with Soviets and consequently, various Socialist parties took place in political life. Green Army, which was dissolved in July 1920 as Ethem Bey lost his influence, and Turkish Communist Party, which was founded in Baku and its leader was killed in a homicide in Black Sea, are examples of the socialist party in this period. Mustafa Kemal, on one hand, was trying to prevent influence of Soviets, on the other hand, he built a Communist Party under his patronage, but the party was not recognised by the Communist International (Zürcher, 2015: 235).

Deputies who were against the authoritarian regime of Mustafa Kemal, established the Second Group led by Hüseyin Avni in July 1922 (Demirel, 2012: 62). Except for limiting Mustafa Kemal, they had nothing in common politically. Indeed, Mustafa Kemal tended to be an authoritarian. For example, After the Sakarya Battle Mustafa Kemal pressed the members of the Parliament to declare National Orders -Tekalif-i Milliye- and Independence Courts -İstiklal Mahkemeleri-. Indeed, these institutions would make decisions without consulting the Parliament. In Kemalist historiography, the Second Group was charged with being reactionist but in reality, it had liberal tones (Belge, 2012: 606). About the abolishment of sultanate, two groups raced with each other (Demirel, 2012: 81). The first group, which was under the strict control of Mustafa Kemal, transformed into People's Party and appropriated the wealth of the CRO through a strategic act (Zürcher, 2015: 237).

This acquisition made the group stronger both in terms of economy and organization. With the decision of election in April 1923, Parliament changed the Law on Treason on 15th April. Thanks to the changes in law, none of the deputy from the second group participated in election (Demirel, 2012: 152), and the list of candidates was determined by Mustafa Kemal. The new Parliament gathered in August 1923.

By 1922, Reza Khan, who incorporated gendarme forces in the united army, became unrivalled in the field. From 1921 to 1922, his main aim was to suppress the regional powers. In the period from Coup to October 1923, Iranian Parliament could not provide stability and three different prime ministers governed five cabinets in total (Sutton, 1978: 20). In this process, Reza Khan managed to impose the military programme he wanted upon governments. Whereas, out of these three prime ministers Qavam es-Saltaneh was the one who stood out, Ahmed Shah went to Europe in November 1922, on the excuse that he had health issues. A major part of the society, including Ulema and Nationalists, and members of Parliament were pleased with modernized central government and security provided by Reza Khan after chaotic war years (Garthwaite, 2011: 208). Mohammed Musaddiq, who was going to be the biggest rival of Reza Khan in Parliament later on, declared that he wanted to see him as a prime minister with these words: “I do not think that anybody can be unaware of the services that Reza Khan provided to country (...) as we all know, before him, there was neither travel security nor land and property security...” (Katouzian, 2012: 19). Under these circumstances, Reza Khan eliminated his most ambitious rival Qavam es-Saltaneh and forced Shah to be assigned to prime ministry position, then he assigned to this position in October 1923.

The regimes that Rıza Han and Mustafa Kemal thought for the governments they built were Republican. The government that Mustafa Kemal took over was not stranger to the idea of republic. In Ottoman, there were rumours that Midhat Pasha and Enver Pasha wanted to establish The Republic. And also, Namık Kemal made

reference to the idea of unusual republic by way of Muslim Ummah. Furthermore, in 1919, British general Ravlison stated Kazım Karabekir that republic is the modern regime and there is no nation left in Europe which did not choose republic (Karabekir, 1960: 415). In contrast to Turkey, Iran was both against to the idea of republic had not been mentioned before including Constitutional Period. When Caliphate was abolished in Turkey and Reza Khan came with the idea of republic in 1924, a great number of opposers took a stand against this idea. Reza Khan had military members from periphery, renewal movement in the Parliament and socialist party on his side (Moazami, 2018: 177).

The Progressive Republican Party

In the elections held in July 1923, candidates chosen by Mustafa Kemal competed and a homogeneous Parliament was formed in August 1923. In the Parliament, there were no opponents except for prominent figures of the National Struggle. Under these conditions, Republic was declared in October 1923. The decision got reactions from Kazım –Karabekir Bey, Rauf -Orbay Bey, Ali Fuad -Cebesoy and Adnan -Adıvar- Bey, the fellow fighters of Mustafa Kemal whom he tried to disenfranchise, as they were out of Ankara when it was declared (Zürcher, 2015: 248). Next thing was Istanbul based Caliphate position which was seen as an obstacle by Mustafa Kemal for his absolute power. Abolition of the caliphate was not a possibility to be approved by the fellow fighters of Mustafa Kemal because They were annoyed with the idea that Mustafa Kemal would have been an authoritarian power. Therefore, they opposed the abolition of the Caliphate office, which was the only force against Mustafa Kemal. For instance, Hüseyin Rauf Bey states that protesting Caliphate is ungratefulness (Akşin, 2016: 183).

With the winter of 1924, conflict between the opposite group led by Hüseyin Rauf in People's Party and framework of the party was at the breakaway point. With the argument made about irregularities, happened during the settlement of Muslims from Greece to Rums' properties after the Struggle, groups were separated completely (Zürcher, 2015: 250). The Progressive Republican Party -PRP- was

established in 1924, by deputies who left the Republican People's Party -RPP-, with the leadership of Kazım Karabekir. Aiming an organization based on society, the PRP would face the state (Bozarslan, 2015: 266). The PRP, which was against the Centralist and Authoritarian tendencies, compared the RPP to the CUP in this condition and defended Decentralization and the Separation of Powers (Zürcher, 2015: 250). The leader of the PRP, Kazım Karabekir, stated that the nation came out of war with succession thanks to religion, instead of Westernism and criticized adaptation of the idea of Turcocentric nation instead of Ummah (Bora, 2017: 342). Establishment of the PRP, became a chance for Mustafa Kemal, who had been seeking to eliminate his old fellow fighters from political life for a long time, for his one man-based regime. He was going to eliminate them from politics with the allegation that they had reactionary bonds.

The Republican Movement of Iran

In the 5th Parliament, which was established in 1924, deputies acting together with Reza Khan were in majority. As soon as the Parliament was established, republic campaigns throughout the country were launched (Gartwaite, 2011: 208). Seyyid Hassan Muderris was the leader of the group, which was minority but effective at the same time in the Parliament (Moazami, 2018: 177) and when the ideas of republicanism, they would oppose harshly. When the conflicts spread throughout the country, all the partnerships made until this time were perished. Even the nationalists defended Reza Khan during his rising period thought that they were not ready yet for the idea of Republic (Garthwaite, 2011: 208). Ulema was against to this idea seen as anti-Islamic, because it is a Western type of regime. Meanwhile, in Reza Khan's side, Iranian journals were publishing essays on behalf of republic and caricatures to the detriment of Ahmet Shah and Qajars (Sutton, 1978: 23). Moreover, Socialists led by Suleyman Mirza and Renewal Movement led by Muhammed Tedeyyun were supporting the idea of Republic which seen as progressivist by them (Katouzian, 2012: 21). Republic committees were established in periphery with the support of soldiers and they sent a pile of telegraphs (Atabaki, 2012: 51) (Cronin, 2012:125).

In the middle of the conflicts, Republican administration in Turkey abolished Caliphate, united educational institutions according to Western norms, abolished religious courts and pious foundations. Iranian Ulema understood where republican administration would end up by considering the example of Turkey and they strengthened their resistance. In March 1924, the crowd annoyed by the idea of republic occupied the Parliament and Reza Khan suppressed them (Cronin, 2012: 126). When the suppressed by force, reactions came out throughout the country. When Seyyid Muderris organized merchants against republic (Sabet, 2006: 227), political atmosphere appeared to resemble organized reactions towards the Shah, who were on the way of constitutional monarchy. Reza Khan, who was trying to handle the situation, conducted meetings with the Ulema leaders but the conclusion was unfavourable. The republican movement was eliminated by a coalition among Ulema, merchants and Parliament opponents. In reaction to this, Reza Khan resigned. On the following day, Reza Khan sided telegraphs from all over the country started to arrive. Furthermore, army commanders in East and West were threatening Parliament with march to Tehran (Cronin, 2012: 127). Parliament could not stand with the threats and managed to convince Reza Khan about resuming his prime ministry position by sending a committee. With all these supports, Reza Khan would have one target; to become a Shah.

Republic movements concluded in two different ways for two army-based regimes on the way of modernized. There were many reasons for this. Firstly, Mustafa Kemal took over a mechanism of which Ulema was under the control of government. Depoliticized Ulema stayed silent. Secondly, he abolished Sultanate in 1922 as planned then, nearly in two years, he strengthened parallel political structures based in Ankara against Istanbul. By doing this, he demolished dualism created by Caliphate and Ankara government. Thirdly, Mustafa Kemal established some committees and by using them, he spread the idea that Caliphate was dissolved with the occupy made by Mongols to Baghdad (Atabaki, 2012: 57). And lastly, the nationalists were used to be in the power from the CUP period.

Nationalist movements of the period had secular codes and they supported to that the idea of laicism predominated over the religious beliefs in terms of politics. On the other hand, Iranian nationalists could neither improve their secular ideologies aside from the groups they act together nor build an unequivocal opposition against them, since constitutional monarchy.

CONSOLIDATION OF THEIR POWER AND DESIGNING THE PERIPHERY

Modern nation-states built by two leaders underwent the process between 1924 and 1929 of transforming into nation-states from imperial period in a painful way. At the same time, in the period when Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan consolidated their power, there were two groups on their target: First was, Kurdish, Azerbaijanis and Arabs, who were seen as the groups needed to be assimilated in the light of nationalism and popularism and annihilated. Second was traditional Muslim groups whose beliefs needed to transform under the control of central government by practicing laicism and populism. Aside from these two groups, the revolts of Sheikh Said and Sheikh Khazal against central government were in special position because they were defined by central governments as both “reactionist” and “separatist” movements. With the establishment of the ethnocentric nation states, the central government accused of these two revolts as being reactionary and spy, and co-operation with Western powers.

CHAPTER 11: THE ASSIMILATION AND DESTRUCTION POLICIES OF TURKEY

The two modernist nationalist leaders applied the same methods towards these two groups after 1924 when they would struggle with them. Both leaders firstly applied military and security methods towards these groups which had independent tones. Military governors who were appointed, tried to actualize the conquest of peripheral regions by practicing central rules. In this way, peripheral regions would be governed with authoritarianism and tribes were forced to settle in different areas. Afterwards, central government made impositions in the fields of education, language and history to different ethnic originated communities. By this means they planned to separate these groups from their past and culture. The methods applied by the two leaders towards Muslim groups were same as well. On the one hand, religion was tried to taking control by the central institutions, on the other hand, both leaders aimed to destroy religion's traces in social platform by removing titles and bringing applications as Western type of metric units, quantities and clothing.

To Assimilate Their Identities: Turkey

During the National Struggle, Kemalists emphasized on an idea of common homeland, which was surrounded by Turkish and Kurdish elements, including by Mustafa Kemal. (Hakan, 2013: 282). Moreover, Kemalists promised to Kurds that "right to free development" within the Wilson principles would apply to the Kurds. (Hakan, 2013: 283), was put aside with process started with Lausanne Treaty (Zürcher, 2015: 169). The first reaction came out in 1920 with Koçgiri revolt. The revolt based in Sivas and Dersim, came out in 1918, with organizing of local tribe leaders by young members of Society for the Rise of Kurdistan -Kurdistan Teali Cemiyeti-. The groups attended to Koçgiri Revolt was against Ankara government and based on Kurdish-Alawite people. First one was, establishing an independent Kurdistan (Bruinessen, 2013: 409), and the second one is fear of genocide which happened to Armenians in past years. The revolt was suppressed in a bloody way, many leaders forced to escape were slaughtered. Nuri Bey, who was separatist and one of the leaders of the revolt, also known as Baytar Nuri, took shelter in Dersim by escaping from massacre and continued his activities in here.

The struggle between Kemalists and Kurdish again in 1923. With the aim of establishing an independent Kurdistan, Freedom (Azadi) Community was built in 1923 under the leadership of "Cibranli" Halid Bey, who was the son of a tribe leader and graduated from School for Tribes, established by Sultan Abdulhamid. As distinct from the Society for the Rise of Kurdistan, this community was comprised mostly of people with military experiences, rather than aristocrats (Bruinessen; 2013: 412). Sheikh Said, who was also nationalist Naqshbandi Sheikh and kin of Halid Bey, was among the participants (Bruinessen; 2013: 412). The community, which had the potential of rebellion in 1924, came to the point of explosion with the abolition of the Caliphate. There was not any organized reaction to the abolition of Caliphate, except for Kurdish (Bozarlan, 2015: 268). Kemalists, who were aware of nationalist tones of these organized reactions in addition to religious motivation, both included Kurdish to conservative groups whose beliefs should be

transformed and saw them as a separatist movement against sovereign Turkish ethnicity in the period of building a nation-state.

Indeed, religion and nationalism were intertwined for Kurdish organization in this period. Of Course, language of most of the institutions under the control of various Sects was Kurdish. Thus, Kurdish nationalism since Ottoman period could carry on its activities by way of these institutions. Kemalists applied various politics between 1923 and 1924 to dissolve the multi-identity existence of Kurdish, which seen as a potential danger against nation-state they were building. In addition to politics such as exiling of Kurdish tribes, intelligentsias and nationalists to West Anatolia, which started in 1923, (Bruinessen, 2013: 402) and prohibition of using Kurdish language (Jwaideh, 2016: 397), closing of Madrasahs in 1924, which was a big blow to Kurdish nationalism.

As a consequence, the conflict between Kemalists and Naqshbandi led by Sheikh Said, can be interpreted best as one of chains of reactions against centralization and internal colonization politics. After the declaration of Republic, the religious-based partnership with the Kurds against the non-Muslims was no longer important. With the abolition of Caliphate, termination of the partnership became official. Since the Erzurum Congress in July 1919, things were going bad for Kurds because they were losing their power against centralized government led by Kemalists. Under these circumstances, when it came to February 1925, there was no another chance for Kurds, who have been neglected by modern Turkey, ‘‘except from building a Kurdish state which would be respect Islamic principles’’, as stated by Martin Van Bruinessen (Bruinessen, 2013: 387). In February 1925, Kurdish revolt led by Sheikh Said broke out. The revolt has been described as a reactionary rebellion basing on tribes in the Kemalist historiography and could not be a nationalist rebellion because it did not have awareness of contemporary democratic citizenship (Akşin, 2018: 195). However, the revolt contained tribe relations and tones of religion and nationalism, as the biggest thread Ankara government had ever faced (Keyder, 2017: 108).

In international relations, the revolt broke out in the period when the Mosul Question between Britain and Turkey came to the fore. As the revolt occurred when it was investigated whether League of Nation's Committee should stay in Iraq, which was newly established under cover of British in Mosul region or Turkey (Jwaideh, 2016: 397), made the claim, states that British had finger on the revolt, a current issue in internal politics. However, it was certain that Mosul, in which Turkish and Arabians were minority and Kurdish were majority (Zürcher, 2015: 296), would be a danger for homogeneous Turkish nation state planned to be established. Besides, since the region contained rich oil reserves, it became open to Western intervention. It would be safer to make a deal which would provide yield with British, rather than those risks. Furthermore, it was known that Western governments had been working with the central government both in Iran and Turkey for a while, instead of unreliable tribes or regional powers. In this direction, the idea of a Western government had finger on Sheikh Said revolt that was seemed unrealistic, because the revolt was suppressed by using French-controlled Syrian railway road.

Even the revolt was suppressed through killing "Cibranlı" Halid Bey and capturing of Sheikh Said, deaths during the revolt and forced migration and executions applied by Kemalists afterwards, left an indelible impact on public memory. Moreover, Kemalists executed Seyyid Abdülkadir, former leader of the Society for the Rise of Kurdistan, on the grounds that he attended to the revolt in order to design past. While authoritarian applications and obligatory settlement policies applied in the region after the revolt having a wide coverage on public memory, the Ararat Rebellion which broke out in the following year and last until 1930, showed that an ultimate solution about Kurdish question could not provide from the point of Kemalists.

After Sheikh Said revolt, which was suppressed in a military way, central government made various administrative arrangements including Kurdish regions, most of which had authoritarian regimes. Firstly, they relegated some of the cities, which had problems in administration, to counties by making arrangements in

Ministry of Interior in 1926, in this way; these cities were governed relatively easily by splitting into counties. Cities in which Kurdish were in majority, such as Siverek, Genç, Ergani, Muş and Dersim, relegated to counties (İlyas, 2016: 327). In June 1927, the First Public Controller (Birinci Umumi Müfettişlik) was established, on the purpose of replacing Authoritarian government in Kurdish cities, of which duty term would be expired in October 1927, in accordance with the East Reform Report -Şark Islahat Raporu- (Tunçay, 1981: 174), and İbrahim Tali Bey, who was together with Mustafa Kemal in the committee which landed in Samsun by Bandırma Streamer, appointed to the position. His job definition involved all of the Kurdish cities in East Anatolia. Administrative arrangements made on the region continued by year 1930. In November 1930, ministry of the interior requested the lists of appropriate candidates for the mayoralty from regional governors, in this direction, members of People's Republican Party, who were mostly commanders in general, were appointed as mayors to Diyarbakır, Malatya, Urfa, Mardin, Elazığ, Gaziantep, etc., by ministry of the interior (İlyas, 2016:329).

In internal politics, Sheikh Said revolt occurred in multi-party system. In February, Martial Law was proclaimed and then, Law on Treason, which was associated with reactionism, was proclaimed (Zürcher, 2015: 254). Kemalists targeted both Kurdish and opposition party, the PRP. Member of the PRP were accused of supporting Sheikh Said revolt. But it was the proof that the two groups had no relation, when rebels faced with a resistance and then expelled from Harput where the PRP is powerful (Jwaideh, 2016: 407). The only connection to be established between these groups was that both believed in conservative ideas, contrary to radical Western thoughts of Kemalists. The PRP led by Kazım Kareabekir, who was a politician cared about Islamic tones rather than Western values, also dissented from the Law on the Maintenance of Order, which was made against Sheikh Said revolt by İsmet Pasha Government, due to its limitless possibilities. Indeed, the law which included flexible principles, not only comprised Kurdish cities but also whole country. Opposition publications were closed down by law (Akşin, 2018: 195) (Tunçay, 1981: 142), and dissident journalists faced trial at the Independence Tribunals. Furthermore, the PRP was closed down in 1925 due to exploiting the

religion for political reasons and nearly all fellow fighters of Mustafa Kemal in the party were suspended from politics. With the prevention of İzmir assassination in 1926, of which target was Mustafa Kemal, the framework of former Unionist opponents was annihilated through executions and detentions (Bora, 2017: 139).

In the establishment of Turkish nation-state, assimilating arrangements were made towards non-Turkish groups in the fields of law, language and education, in addition to military applications. In this context, the Constitution of 1924 is a good example in terms of passing from the state of Ummah to nation-state. While there was no word of “Turkish” in the Constitution of 1921, it was used twelve times in the Constitution of 1924. In the Constitution of 1924, citizenship was defined as: “In Turkey, without distinction of race or religion, everyone in citizenship terms shall be called a “Turk”. While this definition assimilated the different ethnic groups such as Muslims, Arabians and Cherkas, on the other hand, it included non-Muslim Armenians and Rums. This situation caused the objection of the Turkist deputy Hamdullah Suphi Bey. As a consequence of the debate, by adding the statement of “‘Turk’ shall be the term of citizenship”, non-Muslims were included to the Turkish definition on paper (Oran, 2016: 252). According to Hamdullah Suphi Bey, Armenians and Rums cannot become Turkish even if they were assimilated. The other point in this debate was the statement of “having same things in heart”, as Rums, Jewish and Armenians had the same languages and schools (Bora, 2017: 220). From this approach, it was understood that Muslim groups which were not ethnically Turkish would be made Turkish through education.

Prohibitive state policies were seen during the CUP period. With the language reform in 1915, signboards in French, German and English were got down and exchanging letters in Turkish became compulsory (Keyder, 2017: 84). In the establishment of the republic, the most common two languages throughout the country were Turkish and Kurdish. In terms of nation building period in the context of internal orientalism, Kurdish were both in majority comparing to non-Turkish ethnic groups and it was hard to penetrate Kurdish existence by the central state institutions because they were living in the region where was close to boundary.

Nevertheless, Kemalists who maintained their struggle would say: "Our mission is to make everyone in the Turkish homeland as a Turk". (Bora, 2017: 224).

Historiography and curriculums played important roles in the transition period from Ummah state to nation-state. Kemalist, intelligentsias who governed nationalist movement, accomplished the duty of historiography by themselves (Yazıcı, 2011: 200). Nearly all of the founders of Turkish Historical Society, which was established to examine Turkish history and civilisation, were well known deputies such as Tevfik Bıyıkoğlu, Yusuf Akçura, Samih Rifat and Reşit Galip. On the other side, in the history textbooks, which were formed to canonize the national pride, the fact that Turkish nation had been building civilisations throughout the history and carried these civilisations to every corner of the world, was processed (Yazıcı, 2011: 200). By attributing great values to Turkish nation, which was shown as one of the cornerstone histories of civilisation and making non-Turkish groups in the national boundaries feel that their history is non-significant, it was aimed to build hegemony. Moreover, through teaching history of the dominant Turkish ethnic group to all groups and thus, making non-Turkish groups as an amnesiac community, their free development was restrained.

The applications carried on under the name of Populist and Laicism, with Mustafa Kemal's aim to control and transform Islamic groups, were parallel to Reza Khan's application in same field. However, the advantage of Mustafa Kemal in the struggle with religious groups, was being a follower of the process of and social, which has been lasting since Mahmud the Second. The reasonable citizens of Kemalist Republic were Turkish, who were also Laicise, Hanafi, Sunni and Muslim (Oran, 2016: 267). As seen in this definition, four out of five mentioned identities were related to religion directly. Indeed, we should state that almost all reforms made in social field aimed Muslim groups directly or indirectly. In order to laicize these traditional groups, which inherited from Empire, arrangements were made in institutive, symbolic and social fields (Zürcher, 2015: 276).

To Destroy Their Symbols, Turkey

At the first stage, Kemalists changed traditional institution under the control of Ulema into new ones within the government. Sharia provisions in the field of law, were restricted by the CUP, to family law (Zürcher, 2015: 277). On the other hand, as it stated in the previous parts, counter to their colleagues, in Ottomans, the leader of the Ulema was like a member of the cabinet who came to position with assignment and Ottomans Ulema, which was controlled. Thus, politicization of the Ulema was blocked. In terms institutional, Kemalists laicized the government starting from the top rank step by step. Respectively, they abolished Sultanate in November 1922, proclaimed Republic in October 1923 and abolished Caliphate in March 1924. It was important that the day when Caliphate was abolished, the title of Shaykh al-Islam and pious foundations were abolished and instead, the Directorate of Religious Affairs was established and connected to the ministry. By this way, the Directorate of Religious Affairs, which was dealing with religious stuff was turned into a ministry (Kara, 2005: 181) and became an institution trying to transform community's beliefs with the constraint of the government (Kara, 2005: 191). Moreover, many Ulemas became officers (Bozarslan, 2015: 269).

In the historical period, both the position of Caliphate and the Directorate of Religious Affairs got the same reactions. Many popular Islamist thinkers of Pan-Islamism, which became popular with the Second Constitutional Period, such as Mehmet Akif, Said Kurdi, Elmalılı Hamdi Yazır and İskilipli Atıf Hoca, criticised the position of Caliphate sharply. According to them, caliphate became the part of political issues instead of meeting the expectations of Muslims (Aktay, 2005: 69). Similar words can be said for the Directorate of Religious Affairs established in 1924. President of the Directorate of Religious Affairs was Rifat Börekçi, who was the Mufti of Ankara, between 1924 and 1941. The process of Laicism continued with the changes in law and education institutionally. In April 1924, Sharia Courts were closed down and in March 1926, Family Law got out of Ulema's control by putting Italian Penal Law into action (Zürcher, 2015: 277). In the field of education, while Faculties of Theology were established in October 1925, instead of Darul

Fonun Schools, and Imam Hatip Schools were opened according to the Law on Unification of Education, instead of madrasas, which were traditional education institutions.

The further step after the institutional laicism was to bring prohibitions to traditional Muslim community for the Islam symbols and signs under the name of Populism. Thus, the road of the state would rotate from Islamic World to Western world. Cloths and especially head wears were very important for traditional Muslims. Even so the country was homogenising in terms of religious variety after the Great War and exchange with Greece, they still had codes which remained from the Empire period. Thanks to head wears, Muslim community could both show the relationship with Islamic unity symbolically and refuse the other Non-Muslim groups (Lewis, 2009: 359). Under this condition, the central government planned to diminish any kind of gathering that opposed the authority on the public. For establishing Western style nation-state and destroying Empire past, it was prohibited to wear Islamic clothes except mosque attendants in September 1925. In addition to this, fez and turban were banned in social life (Zürcher, 2015: 277). When the article: “the official religion is Islam” was removed in the Constitution in April 1928 (Lewis, 2009: 371), there was only Arabic alphabet left as a symbol between the state and Islamic society. In January 1929, Latin alphabet became compulsory throughout the country. Besides, the relationship with the Western world was constructed with passing to Western schedule and time in 1926, starting to use Western numbers in 1928, and accepting the Western standard weight measures in 1931. Moreover, the titles and nickname, which created a parallel hierarchy, were abolished to provide absolute authority over the public under the name of Populism.

The laicism process continued non-stop in the social life. Mustafa Kemal, who thought that civilization was the most important religious order, under the road of Populism, said that “Turkey cannot be a country of Sheiks, Dervishes, disciples, and lunatic.” By this way, the cults were closed in November 1925. The Cults were independent from Ulema, which directed relate on the central government, had an important space in social life. Disconnected from each other, the Cults came

forefront on important historical moments. For examples, in 31 March revolt in 1909 and Sheikh Said revolt in 1925 Naqshbandi cult contributed to rebellions (Zürcher, 2015: 283). The same Cult, led by Ata Efendi in Uskudar, helped the people who tried to pass Anatolia for participating in the national struggle movement (Mardin, 1991: 32). Besides, while the Bektashi Cult supported to Young Turks movement and the National Struggle movement, Mevlevi cult took place in the National Struggle (Zürcher, 2015: 283).

The Sects were organised over the Lodge and Shrine and they had a hidden organization structure. Besides, a great hierarchical relation was set up between Cult leaders and their disciples. This structure could not be confirmed because it was out of the authority of modern Turkish nation state. Kemalists banned all of Cult structures in November 1925 and titles such as Sheikh, Darwish, Disciples, Dedelik were prohibited under the populism application. Under the pressure of laicism process, the Cults had to go underground for a while. Meanwhile, Kemalists frameworks organised by educated groups such as Doctors, lawyers, politicians, officers, teacher in the towns similarly the organization of the CUP members in towns. The Sects which were hidden underground would politicize day by day (Zürcher, 2015: 284) it was shown in Iran.

How did Islamic intellectuals react those application about laicism, populism, and nationalism? In historical platform, Islamist intellectuals showed reaction to the CUP for their Turkist policies. And, they thought multi-national Empire had to continue. The prominent figure, Ahmed Naim, said ‘‘Turkism is a racism and in Islam, racism is forbidden.’’ (Mardin, 1991: 19). The other popular figure in the history was Mehmed Akif, participated in the Ottoman Secret Organization and attended the National Struggle movement (Bora, 2017: 416). Even though he criticized the Caliphate for relations with Muslim society, Akif rejected the abolishment of the Caliphate. Besides, Akif fled abroad for reaction to reforms and Turkist policies (Bora, 2017: 417). Another reaction came from Elmalılı Hamid Yazır. Although he accepted commenting the Koran -Tefsir-, he closed home himself because, he did not accept the application such as the applications of

clothing and head wears (Aktay, 2005: 84). Said Kurdi was the other important figures in the period. He found the abolishment of the Caliphate as impertinent and he estranged himself from social life to protest the changes over the regime (Bora, 2017: 424). All the incidents showed that Islamic intellectuals preferred to go away from social life to give a reaction.

CHAPTER 12: THE ASSIMILATION AND DESTRUCTION POLICIES OF IRAN

To Assimilate Their Identities, Iran

The policies of centralization were on progress in Iran after the 1924. Even though Reza Khan failed in establishing republic, he was still unarguable leaders of Iran. The central military that was invested seriously since 1921, the regular forces were in a superior condition in accordance to tribe forces (Abrahamian, 2018: 122). By the 1924, central government, ruled by Reza Khan, began to process an intensive centralization policy on periphery. On one hand, he was attacking with the latest model guns to big tribe confederations, on the other hand, he was forcing periphery to process some rules that were indicated by the central government. Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan had similarities in proceeding the rules. For example, Reza Khan attacked the Sheikh Khazal, who was the leader of Muhammarah tribe, Mustafa Kemal tried to assimilate Kurdish people after Sheikh Said revolts, and also, he arrested and forced Kurdish people to leave their region.

Reza Khan was systematically attacking tribes to kill their leaders, plundering their lands, and forcing to leave their region. His wild policy was almost unpredictable. At the end of successful operations, he was appointing military governors instead of local administrators, which belong to tribes. By this structure, peripheries were governed by military commissions (Cronin, 2012: 132). Growing military population was a big threat for traditional groups. As the modern nationalist regime grew and gained strength, they threatened Ulema. The central government using his advantage to fight against the tribes with their enemies. When Reza attacked to Qashqai and Bellucci tribes, he used Bakhtiari forces. But, when Reza did not need

them anymore, their relationship (Abrahamian, 2018: 123). His attitude was too aggressive that he executed a very loyal tribe leaders, Lur tribes (Cronin, 2012: 139).

There was a different approach against centralization policies between the periphery groups and the political parties which were organized around the center. A campaign organized by Reza Khan against Sheikh Khazal was the most important example in 1924. The campaign was transformed into a psychological war with the participation of political groups, which were around the central government of Tehran. Leaflets in which Sheikh Khazal was charged with traitor and separatist were distributed in Tehran (Sabet, 2006: 219). On the other side, Sheikh Khazal recognized the danger which was organized against him. On the one hand, Sheikh was in touch with Ahmed Shah, who was abroad, to support him, he sent telegrams to the Parliament showing Reza Khan as an enemy of the Shah and Islam (Sutton, 1978: 25). By 1924, the Arabic region, which was controlled by Sheikh, was a semi-autonomous condition. Moreover, because of common cultural codes between Arabic communities living in Iran and Iraq, Sheikh had a closer relation with Iraq side instead of Iran. Under these conditions, Sheikh tried to protect both his semi-autonomous position and economic status.

By the time when Reza Khan became a prime minister, the central government took some steps to increase tax income coming from the periphery. Reza Khan had an eye on oil reserves which belonged to Sheikh Khazal (Abrahamian, 2018: 91). The partnership between Sheikh and Britain had developed since the British forces found oil reserves in the Sheikh's region in 1908. After the coup d'état, the region remained semi-autonomous structure, but, when Reza Khan became a prime minister, problems started to become. Sheikh Khazal thought that British forces would protect him against a possible attack from Reza Khan. But this time he was wrong. The main British policies on Iran changed with the Anglo-Iranian treaty in 1919. After the treaty, British forces took side of the central government instead of tribes. In this direction, British forces ignored the campaign for Kaab tribe led by Sheikh Khazal and they decided to maintain current relations with the central

government (Garthwaite, 2011: 207). The campaign was suppressed in October 1924 and Reza Khan re-gained his prestige which he had lost during the republican movement.

To Destroy Their Symbols, Iran

In the growing of the central state, the policies of institutionalization of religion, demolition of Islamic symbols, and transformed Islamic society into the lines which was drawn by the central states were implemented in Iran too. Even though two modern nationalist leaders made same reforms, the laicism period were separating from each other in consequence of two main reasons: Mustafa Kemal was more organized than Reza Khan when performing laicistic reforms and Iranian Ulema was politicized in the historical process, especially, from the Constitutional period, but, Turkish Ulema had been depending on central government for a long time. In Turkey, Mustafa Kemal degraded leader of the Ulema into a directorship under the prime-minister office and controlled local Ulema by employing as civil servant. Unlike Mustafa Kemal, Reza Khan took joint action with the leaders of Ulema, Mujtahids, and permitted and supported their autonomies under the patronage of the center. In field of law, Reza Khan showed some tolerance to religious sensitivities. By the way of modernizations on the Legal System, one the one hand, Reza Khan closed down the Sharia courts, on the other hand, he established an Iranian Civil Code incorporated in some canon laws, differently from Turkish Civil Code. Even though Reza Shah had some similarities with Mustafa Kemal in terms of demolition Islamic symbols, he did not close the Sects and Madrasahs, as distinct from Mustafa Kemal. But both leaders controlled whole education institutions by setting an official curriculum.

After the chaotic years, Reza Khan took support from majority of the people, who lived in towns, to build a central state. Reza Khan was faced with the first opposite organization against him with the Republican movement in March 1924. The movement consisted of conservative deputies of Parliament and religious groups of peripheries. Even the three Mujtahids; Sheikh Abdulkarim Hairi, Sheikh

Muhammed en-Naini and Hassan el-Isfahani, to Reza Khan about renouncing the idea of the Republic (Ahavi, 1990: 70). After the republican movement, Reza Khan recognized how Ulema was effective in Iranian political life, once again. From this date on, Reza Khan built good relationship with the three Mujtahids for consolidation of his absolute power again. In this direction, Reza Khan aimed to become a new Shah by regarding what was important for the maintenance of Monarchy according to Ulema and Reza Khan was to be elected by the Parliament as a new Shah in December 1925.

Unlike Mustafa Kemal, Reza Khan did not control Ulema by employing it as government employee, and his relationship with the three Mujtahids depended on mutual utilitarianism. Especially, Sheikh Hairi and Sheikh Naini connived at the rise of the Reza Khan and institutionalized the religion under the central government. In exchange of these, they tried to take support from Reza Khan for their personal demands. In 1922, Sheikh Hairi visited Kum and he recognized the city did not have any spiritual authority -Taklid Mercii- (Moazami, 2018: 201), which was the religious consultant. In a short time, Hairi took hold of the position and he used the social advantages of the position in Kum Province. Moreover, the main plan of Hairi was about the city; he aimed to transform Kum into the most important Shiite center in the world (Ahavi, 1990: 86) (Abrahamian, 2018: 113). As for Reza Khan, he supported an idea in which he would establish a central holy city which he would control directly. Indeed, the city became an Islamic education center with support from Reza Khan and many disciples and Mujtahids took education by newly established educational institutions (Moazami, 2018: 202). The other Mujtahid, Sheikh Naini, rejected his own books, which was written in the Constitutional period, and he turned into a great supporter of Reza Khan. Sheikh Isfahani was only against Reza Khan's reforms of the three main Mujtahids, but his opposition was only a warning to Reza Khan, and he helped Reza Khan to suppress protestors.

During the Qajars, the first secular school, known as Darul Fonun, was opened in 1851. When the time comes to 1911, classical type of Islamic educational

institutions was relatively decreasing compared to Western type secular schools, and, the central government controlled all educational institutions' curricula by establishing a higher educational commission in 1921 (Ahavi, 1990: 80). In a word, Reza Khan took over an educational structure which had been secular since in 1851. The years between 1923 and 1925, Reza Khan formed associations with Ulema and accordingly, Reza Khan acted responsibly towards religion schools which were directly controlled by Ulema. Reza Khan did not close down Madrasahs completely or incorporate the existences of the Madrasahs into secular schools. He aimed a program which would make Madrasahs weaker step by step under the control of the central government. On the other hand, Reza Khan attached religion lessons to secular school curricula. Until 1930, the main purposes of the primary school education for students were defined as "being recognized of the Gods and growing up as skilful people to Iranian society" (Moazami, 2018: 193).

By the 1930s, the effects of the Persian culture, which was reconstructed by central government, was experienced on whole of educational institutions were felt. In 1930, Armenian schools were closed, and the other missionary schools came under the rule of the Shariah and also, Arabic and Farsi became obligate lessons in these schools (Moazami, 2018: 190). Moreover, in 1934, the curriculum of Madrasa was fixed by standardizing at the central national education, and Arabic lessons, which were in the curricula, was changed into Farsi lessons (Abrahamian, 2018: 203). The central government took position of selecting the qualification of Ulema. By the way, Sepahsalar Madrasah turned into a College and it joined to newly established University of Tehran in 1935 (Moazami, 2018: 194). The university became a symbol of the regime in a short time. Faculty of theology, which was within structure of the University, and Sepahsalar mosque, which was very close to the University, were tasked with electing candidates who wanted to be Ulema (Abrahamian, 2018: 112). Both Tehran University and Sepahsalar Mosque served for the policies of institutionalization of religion under the favor of laicism policies of the central government, as it is seen from religious affairs administration of Republic of Turkey.

In the field of law, the control of central state was progressing gradually as well. Reza Khan aimed to incorporate the classical Islamic law under the secular structure of the central state. In historical process, the Islamic law, Sharia, adopted the field of family, property, and commerce directly in Iran. When Ali Akbar Davar, who was coming from an ordinary family, and also a hardworking lawyer, was in the position of the Ministry of Justice, he prepared a Civil Code and it got through Parliament in May 1928. The Civil Code was portrayed as a great transformation, but in fact the Code was secularization of Sharia rules (Ahavi, 1990: 84). The Civil Code was changed in October 1931 and with the change of Islamic courts came under the domination of central state completely. By the way of the amendment, the Islamic courts would interest with issues which were only decided by state courts and public prosecutors (Ahavi, 1990: 85). Thus, only the cases of marriage, divorce and appointing a guardian remained for the field of Islamic courts. Besides, the other prominent figures of the period of the Reza Khan's ruling, Firuz Fermanferma, who was a skilled but an unreliable political character, worked as the Ministry of Justice. During the years under the ruling of the Ministers, they had worked to improve the new legal structure. Finally, some Sharia rules were appeared within the Civil Code invariably. For example, the rights of divorce and child custody took with father's side. Moreover, the system of polygamy was continued (Abrahamian, 2018: 116).

The department of certification and register was established by the Law in 1932. The law caused major economic losses for local Ulema. Because, the Local Ulema was earning great income from the registration of letter of attorney and property (Ahavi, 1990: 84) and with the changed law, these incomes were started to controlled by religious officials who graduated from the institutions included in the central state (Moazami, 2018: 191). The other reform, which reflected negatively on Ulema, was about the power of judicature. In December 1936, the power of judicature was given only to the graduates of the faculty of Law in Tehran (Moazami, 2018: 191) (Ahavi, 1990: 85). By the way of institutionalizing law system, the central government liquidated Judges, who was originated from Ulema, in legal system. As seen in the examples, as distinct from Turkish Judicial System,

which established by taking inspirations from Western countries, Iranian Judicial System was hybrid structure consisting of Islamic codes.

After the controlling the Islamic law during the 1930s, Reza Khan turned the direction of the regime into the West. Reza Shah targeted also the Islamic symbols to control classical Islamic society through building a modern nation state. In this purpose, his reforms on Clothes and Hat showed similarities with the reforms of Mustafa Kemal. Even, after the visiting of Turkey, Reza Shah forced the pace reforms on appearance of Iranians. Clothes and headwear were important in the classical groups of the Iranian society for identification one's ethnicity, class, and religion (Chebabi, 2012: 196). The reforms on clothes began in the period when Reza Khan became Shah. Reza Shah targeted to the tribes to standardize them according to homogenous nation state's norms. Because, the multi-cultural structures prevented the homogenize policy of the central nation-state. Reza Khan obligated tribes to wear Western type of pants and Pahlavi hat by interfering in their traditional type of lifestyle. In addition to the reforms, standard measures and units were accepted by central government not only for having access to the four corners of the country but also to develop the relationship with Western world. In this direction, the metric system and an etalon were accepted, a standard hour system was passed, and the schedule turned lunar calendar into solar calendar (Abrahamian, 2018: 110).

The conflictual period between the central groups and peripheral communities began with the law on Clothes and Hat in 1928. The Law defined the groups, which was exempted wearing clothes and Hat, as Mujtahids, religion members, who passed the central state's exams, Sunni Muftis, and Non-Muslim clerics (Ahavi, 1990: 90). One the one hand, the Law privileged on the Mujtahids and Ulema, on the other hand, the exams prepared by national education ministry became obligatory for the Mullah and the disciples, thus Reza Khan established a control mechanism on religious groups. Moreover, by the way of the law, the members of the state could interfere in Madrasahs whenever they want. After then, by the published decree in January 1929, becoming a student and a teacher was proven

with a certification from the national education ministry (Ahavi, 1990: 91). Thus, thanks to clothes and hat law, religious education connected under the central state mechanism. In parallel of the Turkish laicism, Reza Khan abolished the titles, which created a parallel hierarchy against the central state bureaucracy, under the name of populism. For example, the titles of Sayyid, Hajji, Mashadi, and Karbalai were banned in social life (Abrahamian, 2018: 124). Moreover, Reza Khan banned religious ceremonies, which actualized in public arena, such as the Greater Eid, Muharram, and Zahra (Abrahamian, 2018: 124). The great protest demonstration against the laicistic reforms and heavy taxation (Abrahamian, 2018: 124) was erupted in Mashhad province in 1935. Reza Shah quashed the rebellion tyrannically and he forbade to wear veils in public place (Garthwaite, 2011: 211). As a result, the clothes and hat reforms led to great polarization between secular groups and conservative communities. Especially, after the Mashhad protest, many conservative women locked themselves in the house to protect the Western type of laicistic reforms (Moazami, 2018: 191). Their acting was very similar to the retreat of the Islamist intellectuals from the public space during the republican period.

WHAT KIND OF AUTHORITARIANISM?

The period of 1930s was the most stressful years throughout the Post-War period. The liberal and social-democrat governments converted into right-Wing extremist and fascist rules were based upon the Great Depression of 1929. While the American centred World capitalist market collapsed, national economies withdrew into their shell and they raised tariff walls to prevent negative effects of the Depression. Turkey and Iran were indirectly affected by the chaos in the Western World in terms of economic, political, and social. There were only two countries which were not damaged; Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. During the 1930s, their economic and political systems were a model for many countries. In terms of economy, establishing a national capital, the model of statist economy, and development plans were seen in Turkey and Iran. Besides, politically, Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah, from time to time, applied some Stalinist and Nazist methods such as authoritarian, arbitrary and totalitarian.

CHAPTER 13: ECONOMIC STRUCTURES

There were some advantages and disadvantages when they built a national economy in both countries. In Turkey, positively, the central state confiscated wealthy properties which belonged to Non-Muslims after the Great War with they were destroyed. But, negatively, there was a serious gap in the internal market due to the destruction of non-Muslim capitalists who dominated the domestic market and lacking a Muslim Capitalist class. In 1929, a possibility appeared to strengthen national economy because the article about limitation on tariff, which was valid for five years, was removed with the end of the Lausanne treaty. After the date, in a similar way of other Western countries, Turkey began to apply a high customs wall (Zürcher, 2015: 289) to abolish the dependency of Western market. But the plan came to nothing by the reason of Great Economic Depression in 1929. During the 1920s, foreign capital became dominant over the Turkish economy in substitution for Non-Muslim capital by Banking system. The Banking system supplied Turkish firms with economic credits in order to transform their production structure into in

favor of export (Keyder, 2017: 120). Thus, national market became depended on foreigner credits and their economic activities. Even though Turkish Business Bank and Industrial Bank were established, when the Great Depression came out, local market was deeply affected. Its destructive effect felt especially in the price of agricultural products which decreased. For instance, nearly a thousand firms closed in Istanbul and Izmir due to restriction of credits from Western economy (Keyder, 2017: 123).

Even though, the Iranian economy was under the threat of the Great Depression in the early thirties, by the reason of lowering demand for Iranian products (Keddie, 2006: 92), Iran's economy made a great progress on the way to years of 1940s. In general, the sources of state revenues came from oil receipts, tariff, indirect tax, and income tax (Katouzian, 1992: 113). With the beginning of the twentieth century, some serious oil fields were found out in Iran. But Iranian economy could not profit efficiently since Qajars had entered into an agreement, D'Arcy Concession, which was in favor of Western companies for operating rights. By 1930, Reza Shah was very angry at the imbalance between output and revenues. Because there was an increase in production, there was no increase in oil revenues (Katouzian, 1992: 118). In November 1932, Reza Shah announced the decision about annulling the D'Arcy Concession of 1901. In 1933, he had to enter into a new agreement with Western companies because he was under pressure from the domestic conditions and also the British threats (Hambly, 2007: 238). Besides, Reza Shah aimed to establish a national capital. For this purpose, he announced that concessions favouring foreigners would be abolished in 1927 and also, he dismissed foreign experts, Arthur Millspaugh and the other Belgian economists, from employment to control national economy completely. In this direction, the Central Bank of Iran was established to control and ensure national capital and the Agricultural and Industrial Bank which were constituted to give local capital loans in the field of industry, trade, and transportation (Keddie, 2006: 95).

The model of statist economy was seen in Iran and Turkey throughout the period of 1930s. Instead of socialism, private property was at the center of the statist economy

and it aimed to directed support weak national capital by establishing and conducting. In this way, the central state could be controlled local national capital and it could be helped local industry financially. According to the doctrine of the RPP in 1931, statist model was proclaimed an official economic model (Zürcher, 2015: 291). Moreover, in the Doctrine of 1935, the duty of the state was to help private enterprises and regulate actual activities (1935 CHP Party Programme, Article 5-Ç: 10). The practice of the statist economic programme was similar in Iran as well. Factories were managed by the state officials and bureaucrats and the state acted as a monopoly buyer and distributor for the main agricultural products. But there were some negative effects in both countries. Firstly, there was a privileged elite group, known as *aferist*, and they were imposing irregularities in the tenders which were coordinated by the state. During the statist economic period, the irregularities were very common, and some Kemalists brought the problems to agenda (Atay, 2010: 527). And secondly, agricultural productivities were affected negatively from the monopolistic price policies of the central state which almost determined as low as possible. This situation damaged for workers and peasants.

Corporatism

During the 1930s, statist economies preferred corporatist model. Fascist Italy pioneered the model and it supported the groups of represent national sovereignty in Parliament instead of liberal democracy, economically (Hobsbawm, 1996: 138). According to model, these groups -corporations- formed a hierarchy, which was from local to the center, and they connected with the fascist leader. Especially, the model aimed to control working class laboured in state-controlled companies (Poulantzas, 2016: 226). Nazi Germany and fascist Italy applied the model to destroy the struggle of classes, Kemalist also showed interest to the model as well. According to the Doctrine of the RPP in 1935, the society of Turkey was divided into occupational groups which worked in cooperation with each other and it did not include any conflicting classes (1935 CHP Party Programme, Article 5C: 9) as seen in Western World. Accordingly, the society consisted of farmer, artisan, worker, trader, and capitalists. Actually, Turkish model of corporatism was

showing similarities with Ziya Gökalp's solidarist corporatism model which also gave Turkish citizens duties and responsibilities (Parla, 1993: 130). Mahmut Esat Bozkurt was the important supporter of the corporatist model among Kemalists. As similar way of as fascist government, he was dreaming of a corporatism which kept under the control national industry and labour (Bora, 2017: 142).

Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany were models for Iran and Turkey as economic methods and industrial progressing. In 1933, taking inspiration from Soviets, Turkey implemented an industrial program, known as the five years plan. With the aid of Soviet experts, Turkey focused on industrial production such as textile, iron-steel, paper, brick, cement, and glass (Zürcher, 2015: 291). Because these goods were imported from foreign market, thanks to the five years plan, Turkey would product these industrial goods in the local bazaars. In the field of agriculture, development plans were seen in the period of post-Second War. On the other side, After the oil agreement in 1933, Iran got into a partnership with Nazi Germany economically. In this direction, Iranian industry had made a great progress during the 1930s. In 1941, the allocation to industry and trade were nearly fifty times increased according to the allocation of 1934 and it rose from 3,5 to 24,1 percent of the total budgetary allocation (Katouzian, 1992: 131). Besides, Iran implemented Soviets' plans to increase agricultural productivity. For instance, a five years plan in agricultural fields was carried into effect in 1940 (Keddie, 2006: 97).

The year of 1930 for Kemalist Regime

The year of 1930 was the turning point for the Republic of Turkey. The Kurdish revolt, which was in Eastern part of Turkey, became a peak within the year of 1928. Besides, the Great Depression caused an economic destruction on local market especially in agricultural field. With the Great Depression, the radical opposition movements with the help of masses could come to power, as seen in the rise of the NSDAP. So, Kemalists had some anxieties about opposition movements which could rise from below against their regime. In this direction, Kemalists took two basic steps to prevent possible danger and reduce tension throughout the country.

Firstly, they decided to establish a liberal opposition Party and ended the attack on the Ararat Mountain rebellion. But, Kemalists' plan would be ended concluded in unexpected way.

The Sheikh Said rebellion broke out when Fethi Okyar was prime minister. Mustafa Kemal discharged Fethi Okyar from his position and appointed to Paris as a consul general. In 1930, when Fethi Okyar in Turkey for rest, he filed a report to Mustafa Kemal about the government of Ismet Inonu (Zürcher, 2015: 264). Actually, Fethi Okyar was aware of economic disruption, which was depending on import directly, under the destruction effect of the Great Depression. In addition to economic depression, Kemalists increased tax rates in domestic market to improve economic condition of state (Bozarslan, 2018: 274). Mustafa Kemal said to Fethi Okyar about the one-party condition of Turkish political life that "our view was dictator" (Tunçay, 1981: 252). Moreover, Mustafa Kemal asked Fethi Okyar for establish a liberal Party. Fethi Okyar founded the Free Republican Party -FRP- in August 1930. And also, Okyar was annoyed with the group of aferist who was positioning around the government (Atay, 2010: 531). The Party programme supported a liberal economy and government, encouraged the foreign investments, freedom of speech, and directed election (Zürcher, 2015: 265). The Party was supported by the regions that were affected from the Great Depression such as Western Anatolia and Thrace. Especially, Fethi Okyar's speech attracted intensive attraction in Izmir. Even though the Party did not have active organization in many provinces, it was successful in election held in October 1930 (Tunçay, 1981: 272). On the other hand, when Mustafa Kemal visited Anatolia, the masses were showing no interest in him. At this point, Mustafa Kemal recognized that the rise of the FRP was in actually a reaction to his regime and he intervened in this condition. Fethi Okyar could not resist pressures anymore and he decided to dissolve the Party. Soon afterward, in December 1930, a Messianic rebellion broke out in Menemen, which was near Izmir, and it was suppressed very harshly by Kemalists. Thus, Kemalist regime threated opposition movements in Izmir and they associated the FRP with reactionary rebellion.

The second issue was related to the conflicts which was between Kurdish groups and Kemalist. These conflicts had been since the suppression of Sheikh Said in the Eastern part of Turkey. In politically, Kurdish intelligentsia gathered in Lebanon and they founded an Hoybun Organisation in 1927. In 1928, Kurdish groups formed a government, including Armenian members, under the leadership of Hoybun (Jwadih, 2016: 410). The Ararat Mountain movement had an army led by Ihsan Pasha. Kemalist regime was passing a difficult period economically, and they suffered heavy losses against the movement. Kemalist accused Iran of assisting Kurdish groups by permitting use her frontier regions. the Kurdish forces were in a difficult situation against attacks of Turkish Air Force (Olson, 2000: 81). Because, it targeted not only the Kurdish forces, but also civilian Kurds were exposed to harshly bombardments. But Kemalists ended attacks on Ararat Mountain based upon economic condition of Turkey went badly and they became fear from a potential radical opposition which could rise from below against their regime, as seen in Western countries. But after the attacks on Ararat, Kurdish region were wreck and ruin. Finally, Kemalists alarmed at both issues, experience of the FRP and Ararat revolt, and some Kemalist thought that Turkish society had not been ready for multi-party system yet by the reason of their educational level was not available. after the shocked year for the regime, Kemalist regime would prefer dictatorial and totalitarian methods, in accordance with its radical contemporaries.

CHAPTER 14: THE DEVELOPMENT IN THE FIELD OF CONSTRUCTION

Mustafa Kemal and Reza Khan aimed to change symbols of old-regimes during the period of national-state building. The field of construction was one the of the important symbols in the period. Thanks to construction activities, both authoritarian leaders aimed to re-create collective memory and penetrate peripheral region completely. Accordingly, they took two main steps, firstly, they established modern capital cities, Ankara and Tehran, to serve as a model for other provinces and built transportation networks.

Building a Capital City

The important symbols of the regimes were their capital cities in the period under the two authoritarian leaders. In Turkey, Ankara was founded as a rival towards the historical capital city of Istanbul and this struggle was similar to Russian condition which was between St. Petersburg and Moskov under the reign of Tsar Pedro. Mustafa Kemal established the city in the middle of steppe and the city symbolized a project which would create a new human and society instead of cosmopolitan and traditional city of Istanbul (Bora, 2017: 132). Moreover, the city, which was located in the middle of the country, could penetrate easily to provinces by the transportation network. Kemalists received professional help from a German urban planner, Prof. Yansen, in the building period of the city (Atay, 2010: 488-489).

Unlike Turkey, Iran did not have any railroad, active transportation network, and a constituted municipal system. The building programme of Reza Khan aimed to destruct classical structure completely. In short, the programme was an organised attack on traditional by modern. In this respect, building a capital city as Tehran showed similarity with the modernization reform of Haussmann in Paris in the nineteenth century. Consequently, both capitals, Ankara and Tehran, would form a new public space and by this way, new type of middle-class and upper-class citizens would be established. Accordingly, Iran and Turkish governments forced citizens to attend Western type of entertainments as well (Bozarslan, 2018: 72). Besides, the classical structure of Tehran was destroyed for the construction of modern buildings such as new streets, boulevards, cafes and theatres. (Abrahamian, 2018: 120) (Katouzian, 1992: 111). Thus, the public memory, which connected with the Qajar past directly, was eradicating with new outlook of city that had been building. On the other hand, with the transformation in public life, women were more visible in public space. Moreover, traditional restrictions on women was reduced with women's participation in business life as workers, teachers, and nurses (Keddie, 2006: 110).

Railroads

The construction process was also effective in the field of transportation such as railroad and road. These constructions contributed to central government's penetration in peripherals. According to both authoritarian leaders, the most important problem in their countries had been security issue throughout the 1930s. Thus, both leaders determined the direction of railroad in deference to security policies ² (Radikal, 27 Kasım 2011) (Katouzian, 1992: 116). After the period of the Great Depression, Kemalists planned to construct 800 km. railroads (Zürcher, 2015: 288). In addition to this, Kemalists had nationalized railway line from foreign capital in 1924. On the other hand, even though Iran had very underdevelopment transportation system in 1920, by 1940, there was a great progress in the construction of railroads and roads. For instance, Iranian road had increased over ten times from 1920 to 1940, with the aid of foreign companies (Keddie, 2006: 93). But the great rise was seen in the area of railroad. The Trans-Iranian railroad was the most visible symbol of Reza Shah's constructional site in Iran. The construction of line was started in 1927, and the cost of line was supplied by sugar and tea taxes (Abrahamian, 2018: 103). Thanks to the line, Tehran connected to many cities from North to South. A few years later, another railway project would connect Tehran to Tabriz and Mashhad (Katouzian, 1992: 115). Why did Reza Shah choose railroad instead of road? Musaddiq, who was the member of opposition in the Parliament, asked similar question to Shah. The reply was related to security policies. Because, railroad was more available for military operations, and transfer of heavy military equipment by railways was faster and more efficiently (Katouzian, 1992: 115). As it is seen, transportation policies were determined by the effect of security considerations in the both countries during the period of 1930s.

² For the railway construction of Turkey from 1856 to 2014 <http://www.tcdd.gov.tr/content/31>

CHAPTER 15: THE IDEOLOGIES OF THE STATES

Throughout the 1930s, Laicism and Nationalism were the two main ideologies for Iran and Turkey. Even though both ideologies depended on different historical processes, in 1930's they would reach the peak. While the peak point for Iran was the beginning of 1940's, when they were supporters of Nazism; for Turkey, it was the attacks on Dersim province in East Anatolia, where Kurdish Alawites were in majority. While the governments established by two authoritarians showed similarities in the period between 1926 and 1933, Reza Shah's government, especially the period after 1933, would differ from Mustafa Kemal's regime. From this date on, the Shah established an authoritarian dictatorship, on the other hand, Mustafa Kemal would maintain his authoritarian-Bonapartist government. Even so, similar totalitarian tendencies and radical nationalist atmospheres in both countries throughout the two leaders' rules, showed that they were not different all that in terms of their mentalities. Their relationship would reach to peak during Reza Shah's visit to Turkey.

Even though Reza Shah could not proclaim republic and had been the leader of a Monarchic structure, Parliaments of the two states was important as legislative organs for the politics of two countries, from the Constitutional Period to the mid-1920s. Especially 1925 was decisive for both states' politics. With the proclaim of law on the maintenance of order – *Takrir-i Sukun*- after Sheikh Said revolt, popular sovereignty changed into a kind of nation sovereignty from this date on, and the “nation” was started to represent by a small Kemalist elite (Bora, 2017:136). In the same year, Reza Khan was elected as Shah by Parliament and the next year, he was crowned. After 1925, Parliament elections, which were under the control of two leaders, would be formality (Abrahamian, 2018: 100), and the deputies would be determined by these two authoritarians (Keddie, 2006: 88). In this direction, as of this date, it was seen that almost all laws passed by Parliament, gained approval of the majority (Bozarslan, 2018: 271). Whether with the title of “National

Sovereignty” or “Shah”, two leaders would not only form the Parliament, they would also appoint mukhtars from local governments directly (Başkaya, 2006: 183) (Keddie, 2006: 99). In short, 1925 was a transition year of two leaders on the way of absolute leadership.

The rules of the two states between 1926-1933 can be defined as a Bonapartist dictatorship. In Bonapartism, which is defined as a system in there is an absolute leader on the top and also a state apparatus by governing the communities with the aid of the central bureaucracy in a hierarchical structure (Başkaya, 2006: 175). Moreover, the structure has various of classes which are independent one another, and they had built in a well-defined balance mechanism under the roof of a protective leader, in order to take care of their benefits (Poulantzas, 2016: 352). Indeed, dominant classes of both Kemalist Turkey and Reza Shah’s Iran had a voice by attending central government levels, in other words becoming state officers, in which bureaucracy and military were active. To exemplify, during the Kemalist regime, there were many landlords, clerics and local elites that were members of the Turkish Parliament (Başkaya, 2006: 194-196). Also, many deputies and bureaucrats took place in the levels of institutions depended on central state directly. Iran was same as well. From 1926 to 1940, 84 percent of deputies in the Parliament were landlords, officers, local elites and tradesmen came from dominant classes (Abrahamian, 2018: 98). Moreover, bureaucracy and uncontrolled growth of military in Bonapartist regime were seen in both countries especially in 1930s. In Reza Shah’s Iran military, from upper and middle classes were more privileged compared to Ulema (Keddie, 2006: 90). Bonapartist structure in Turkey, which was under control of absolute leader, included attendance with wide range dominant classes. Indeed, it had wide range in politics from radical nationalist to socialist. For instance, “Turkish Hearths” -Türk Ocakları- and “Kadro” magazine which included socialist ideas (Bora, 2017: 159).

The year of 1933 was breaking point of Iran politic life. That year witnessed two critical events. First one was Oil Agreement signed with the internal and external pressures on Shah, in favour of a foreign company. The second one was destruction

of Teymurtas, who was the second most powerful figure in the regime, by the Shah. With the effect of these, Iran government transformed into a dictatorship (Katouzian, 1992: 109). Even though oil revenues increased due to raise in output of Iranian oil by the new agreement, there was not any advantages different than previous agreement and the duration of the agreement was determined as sixty years and it could not be cancelled without the approval of both sides. After the agreement, the foreign policy of Reza Shah turned from Britain to Nazi Germany. After this date, the political line of Iran would be acting under the effect of Germany. Moreover, with the influence of good relations with Germany, Iranian government's nationalism turned into chauvinism. This chauvinism referred to pre-Islamic root of Iran to stress cultural continuities between the period of pre-Islam and contemporary period. Thus, central government aimed to disagreement Iran from Arabic neighbours and their cultural structures (Hamby, 2007: 239). By the way, the name of country was changed from Persia to Iran referring to Aryan root which was so-called common origin between German and Pers in 1935 (Moazami, 2018: 91) (Abrahamian, 2018: 114). In addition, pre-Islamic Persian characters named the newly built streets and boulevards, also, symbols of civilizations from the pre-Islamic period decorated the new structures (Abrahamian, 2018: 118).

After the period of 1933, the Iranian regime turned to a dictatorship under the leadership of Reza Shah. Even though, there was a huge economic progress made in the period, almost all-important political characters were sent to prisons or exiled, regardless of whether they were close to Shah or not and they were destroyed in there. The death news was reported in newspapers as if it was illness news, such as heart attack (Alevi, 2015:9). To exemplify, these suspicious deaths were Teymurtash, Daver, Fermanferma, Mudarris and Sardar Asad. The organisation of political police controlled by the Shah, was an important symbol of the regime and it even became more powerful than the Parliament (Katouzian, 1992: 123). The regime established prisons in numerous provinces, and they were full of the prisoners. According to Iranian regime's justice system, political prisoners were condemned to harshly penalty and these prisons turned into death center for prisoners. Bozorg Alevi, who was the famous Socialist writer lived in Reza's

regime, stated as a political prisoner that political prisoners were punished more harshly than murderers (Alevi, 2008: 8) and their investigation took long period of time (Alevi, 2008: 58). The opposition movement of arbitrary regime rose from the educational system, which was established by the Shah, a similar dialectical process with the Sultan Abdulhamid and his educational system. These students deserved to be sent abroad by the law of 1928 to take a Western education (Keddie, 2006: 91). These students were affected by the life standards of the Western countries, where they took education, and they came under the influence of ideological atmosphere of these cities (Abrahamian, 2018: 127). So, they would start criticizing the Shah for his despotic regime when they came back to Iran.

During 1930s, Kemalist authoritarianism planned a revolutionist and civilising project over the public. Kemalists focused on social engineering projects which would give duties and responsibilities to public by combining the idea of popularism and nationalism. A quote from Ziya Gökalp's "Kızıl Elma" utters: "public is orchard, and we are farmers", and these words sum the politics of Kemalist regime performed on public. Especially Kemalists, disappointed after the FRP experience, thought that the public is not ready for the Kemalist revolutions yet. About this situation, Yunus Nadi stated: "As it is understood, the ones who believed our propaganda are only ourselves (...) to make revolutions understood by the public, our generation should wait one more time" (Bora, 2017: 134). In this direction, Nusret Kemal Köymen, Kemalist peasantry expert, would say: "The most important duty of a populist state is to increase public to a level in which they would govern themselves as much as possible" (Bora, 2017: 145). A similar view came from Left-Kemalist "Kadro" Magazine. This magazine aimed to support Kemalist revolutions in terms of ideology (Bora, 2017: 160). Moreover, Turkish Hearts stated that their main target is to "strengthen the national consciousness among citizens" (Üstel, 2004: 291). Besides, Hamdullah Suphi Bey, leader of the Turkish Hearths, stated about the main target of the Hearths that "our position is not behind of masses, it is before them" (Bozarslan, 2018: 270).

In 1935, the RPP congress made radical decisions about combining the party and state, which had already united de facto before, officially. According to the party programme, it was determined that general secretary of the party would be the secretary of interior at the same and also, governors in periphery would be provincial chairmen (Başkaya, 2006: 187). With the programme, the six arrows of the RPP, the main doctrines of the party, were determined as the pieces of state's official ideology (1935 CHP Programme, Article 3: 3). The combination of the party and state was proclaimed before in fascist Italy in 1928 and Nazi Germany in 1933. About the union, Hitler said: "Party became a state now, all the power belongs to government" (Poulantzas, 2016: 394). However, this system in those places had a structure in which elements of the party were above the state organization. In Turkey, the system had supporters from both wings, but statist wing was superior. Actually, in the beginning of 1930s, both wings were represented at the political stage. The statist group led by İsmet İnönü focused on internal security and stability in political life, while partisan wing led by Recep Peker, aimed active participation of the masses in politics (Bora, 2017: 140). Actually, the process began when Recep Peker became general secretary of the party in 1931. Especially community centers -Halk Evleri- led by Peker, who interested in fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, had a top to bottom system which included officers, landlords and local elites. The main purpose of community centers is to improve public standards in a similar way to the development of modern races and elite nations through a curriculum (Tunçay, 1981: 320). However uniformed youth organization – Blackshirts- that Peker tried to form by inspiring from Germany and Italy would not be approved by Mustafa Kemal and Peker would be discharged.

The two nation states, under the control of their leaders' authoritarian regime, had been under the influence of nationalist atmosphere during 1930s. For certain, fascist regimes of the West world had effect on their tendencies. Chauvinist applications seen in both countries spread on many fields range from politics to historical studies moreover, from archaeology to literature. Ethnic nationalist politics addressed to pre-Islamic period, combined with new and modern ideas, thus a tradition was invented under the control of two authoritarian leaders. Especially through

institutions, studies were made about phrenology and extraordinary claims were suggested. The most outstanding of them was that the Islamic processors were Turkish and thus, prophet Muhammed might be Turkish as well, according to Turkish History Thesis which came out in 1932 (Bora, 2017: 150) and the idea claimed that all the languages of the world were originated in Turkish according to Sun Language Theory in 1935 (Zürcher, 2015: 281). Moreover, in both countries skulls of historical figures were taken from their tomb and examined (Abrahamian, 2018: 115) (Uzun: 2019: 104).

In internal politics, Chauvinist politics of the nation state were targeting Azeris in North part of Iran during 1930s (Katouzian, 1992: 133), on the other hand, in Turkey, Jewish population in Thrace and Dersim province in which Alawite-Kurdish lived, would be targeted. We stated that, at the beginning of the Kemalist regime, the identification of Turkish in 1924 Constitutional Act only defined the Muslims, in order to keep non-Muslims out, as they would never Turkified because of their educational language. With January 1928, groups led by Turkish Hearths started a campaign called “Citizen, Speak Turkish!”. From this date on, young Turkish started to attack the ones who read foreign newspaper and speak foreign language (Bali, 2000: 3). But, the main target of the campaign was Jewish.

In the process of 1934 Thrace Jewish Pogrom, Milli İnkılap Magazine led by Cevat Rifat Atilhan made anti-Jewish propagandas. They translated Nazi’s propaganda cartoons to Turkish (Bali, 2014: 95-100). Aiming to Turkify Thrace region, Kemalist regime, ignored anti-Jewish propaganda. In July 1934, in the pogrom took place in Thrace region of Turkey, properties of the local Jewish were plundered by local Muslims, and with the violence reflected on formal reports (Bali, 2014: 222) Jewish expelled from the region. The second from targeted by Kemalist regime was Dersim province. The existence of the region in which Alawite-Kurdish were living, had been a problem for Turkish Nation State since a long time. In 1926, county inspector Hamdi Bey mentioned about the risk of Kurdish existence (Beşikçi, 1990: 25), in 1928 Turkish Hearths Congress, the region was defined as a boil (Bora, 2017: 226). In the Kemalist historiography, Dersim region was claimed

to have reactionist elements, on the contrary, Hasan Reşit Tankut, who was one of the Turkish nationalists, mentioned that people from Dersim were godless (Bora, 2017: 226). On the other hand, people from Dersim showed no united reaction towards the attacks from Kemalist regime between 1937 and 1938 (Yıldırım, 2018: 187), indeed the so-called leader of the revolt, Seyyid Rıza, sheltered to mountains during the attacks (Yıldırım, 2018: 184), similar to Iranian ‘‘bast’’ culture. The operation ended in 1938, Seyyid Rıza and the other tribe leaders were executed.

Two modern authoritarian leaders started to gain totalitarian tendencies with the second part of 1930s. The best example for Totalitarian regime was Nazi Germany. As soon as NSDAP came to power, dissolved independent unions, prohibited the strike and dispelled political parties (Poulantzas, 2016: 230). Similar steps were seen in both countries’ regimes. Communist and Socialist propagandas were outlawed by Collectivism law in 1931 (Keddie, 2006: 88). In Turkey, unions were banned (1935 CHP Programme, Article 14: 19), besides both strike and lookout were prohibited, in 1935 with the RPP programme (1935 CHP Programme, Article 66: 49). Moreover, Labour Law of 1936, which was received from Italy, limited the rights of labourers (Zürcher, 2015: 295). In civil society, many organizations and publishes were closed. In 1935, Turkish Women’s Union, Students Corporation, Mason Lodges and Turkish Sports Institution were dispelled. In social life, in both countries, even though improvements were made in emancipation of women, there were regressions in fields of human rights, individual freedom and private security. In political life, in Turkey, where had been governed by one-party regime, it was totalitarian situation that Mustafa Kemal was the party leader and president at the same time. In Iran, arrestment of Socialist fifty-three man in 1937, was an important moment. That group would be the leaders of the Tudeh Party (Keddie, 2006: 88).

Are They Fascists?

Were the regimes of Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal fascist? We named their regimes especially in 1930s as dictatorship. Even though these periods were at the peak of laicism and both leaders were attributed supernatural meanings by elites,

they could not get support of the public. The emotional bond between charismatic leaders and their masses (Breuer, 2017: 254), the mentalities such as anti-Marxist and anti-liberal and Paramilitary forces such as party army (Breuer, 2017: 77) were not seen in both regimes. Apart from these, fascism came out in the advance stage of capitalist process, imperialism (Poulantzas, 2016: 27). Both Iran and Turkey, there had not any developed bourgeoisie class and capitalist process yet. In their regime politics, both of leaders did not aim to mobilize masses. Indeed, Reza Shah did not interest in rhetoric, which was the most significant feature of the leaders, and he did not come to power by election, just like Mustafa Kemal. As a conclusion, even though their anti-conservative ideas, oppressive attitudes such as prohibiting unions and the way they assign extraordinary duties to governors in periphery, may have similarities with fascist regimes; it is impossible to say that regimes of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah were fascist.

International Relationship

The situations of the two countries in international relationships throughout 1930s can be examined under three topics. Firstly, their relationship with each other, secondly their relationships with their neighbour countries and thirdly their relationship with Western countries. Especially third topic would be determinant in terms of their regimes' directions. Mustafa Kemal, who tried to follow a cautious foreign policy, would keep his regime out of danger through a balance policy. By taking the support of nationalist, Reza Shah's Iran would take part with Nazi Germany against Britain after 1933 and it would be the end of Reza Shah.

Even though, Ararat Mountain revolt created a tension between Turkey and Iran, the problem was solved by exchanging lands where were in problematic zone in 1932 (Oran, 2009: 363). After this time, a friendly relationship was established day by day. With the Reza Shah's visit to Turkey, their relation became a peak level in 1934. Kemalist media organs showed huge interest in the Shah's visit, especially, Cumhuriyet Newspaper, which was semi-official media company, gave a headline about the warm relationship between Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal as "two

leaders, head of two brother country’’ (Altan, 2018: 12). In terms of Middle East, there were positive developments in foreign policies of both countries. In contrast to historical process, two countries got in contact with their neighbours. Accordingly, the Sadabad Pact was signed among Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, and Iraq in July 1937. Thanks to the Pact, border problems among these countries were solved, and these countries decided to act together against the existence of Kurdish groups, who lived in frontier zones (Oran, 2009: 366). Apart from these, Turkey and Greece signed a Peace treaty against the expansionist policies of Bulgaria on the Balkans in October 1930 and the Balkan pact was signed among Greece, Yugoslavia, Romania and Turkey in February 1934 (Zürcher, 2015: 297). On the other hand, Reza Shah was using marriages to become a stronger in internal and external policies, similar to the Qajar Shahs marriages in the nineteenth century. For instance, crown prince, Muhammed Reza Pahlavi, was married to princess Fawzia Fuad, who was daughter of King Faruk (Hambly, 2007: 240).

Both authoritarian leaders had different approaches towards Western countries. In terms of economy, both leaders received loans from Western countries in the fields of agriculture, industry and construction. But in ideological, Mustafa Kemal acted with deliberation with radical ideologies in the West and his relationships were based on pragmatic bases. Turkey got in contact with almost all Western countries under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal. In this direction, Turkey participated in Nations League in 1932, and a treaty of friendship with Soviets was signed in 1935. While Turkey supported the status quo consisting of Britain and France, some Kemalists had a good relationship with Nazi Germany (Zürcher, 2015: 298) as well. Moreover, thanks to Montreux convention, Turkey gained control over Straits completely (Zürcher, 2015: 298). Even though there was a problem with France on Sanjak of Alexandretta, the question was resolved in favor of Turkey in 1938.

After the period of 1933, Iran acted under the auspices of Nazi Germany in the field of economic, political, and technic. The German companies played large role in the construction of Trans-Iranian railroad and they supported Iran in term of machinery, mining, industry and building as well (Keddie, 2006: 101). Moreover, German

participated in the institutions of Iran as German technicians and consultants took part in military service of Iran (Katouzian, 1992: 134). When the Second World War broke out, Reza Shah declared neutrality of Iran, but he and his staffs were on German's side. According to the Sadık Hidayet's novel, as is known Haji Agha, Reza Shah was very happy to hear about the Operation Barbarossa and he said that Iran will reach cities in the Caucasia (Hidayet, 2017: 36). On the other hand, the good relationship with Nazis led to becoming distant from Britain. Britain recognized the association between Iran and Nazi Germany and German forces was very much closer to the region with the Operation Barbarossa in July 1941. Firstly, the Allies gave a warning Iran about the activities of German agents in the country (Katouzian, 1992: 134), but they cannot any receive a reply from Reza Shah, Finally, the Allies decided to interfere in Iran by military and Allied forces entered Iran on August 1941.

CONCLUSION

Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah were the most important figures of modernized Iran and Turkey. Both leaders were born in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and they raised in two great dynasties besides, they received education within dynasties' military institutions and afterword, they worked for these institutions as officers. In the late 1930s, both leaders gained many identities. In these identities they were carrying traces of imperial structure, features of a soldiers and modernism. Throughout this thesis, two authoritarian leaders, who desired to make Western type of modern reforms, are examined in terms of the situations they faced, the paths they followed and the conclusions they got, with comparative method by considering their historical backgrounds. During this examination, by following historical transitivity and disconnections of Iran and Turkey with their pasts, - Qajars and Ottomans- economic, social and politic conditions of the countries under the control of two leaders are observed. With all similarities and differences, some inferences were made.

Firstly, central states build by two leaders went into great identity transformations in terms of citizenship relations. Both leaders took over "millet" which had Islamic unions and created by Sultan Abdulhamid and Shah Nasreddin Shah through using Islamic symbols and rituals. According the 'millet', Islam was the core of identity for Ottoman and Persian people. These Islamic citizenship relations maintained their power throughout their Constitutional Periods. But with the Great War years, nationalist thoughts in both countries were on the rise and with the effect of this, the idea of Islamic union started to lose its popularity both in intellectual and social life. Similarly, two nationalist leaders, who took over the power in early 1920s, tried to transform citizenship relations from Islamic unions to ethnocentric identities.

Secondly, two leaders followed similar politics and reforms against peripheral powers and traditional groups, in the period of building nation states. In this direction, these groups which were seen that should be assimilated were mostly

Azeris and Kurds. Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah displaced them with settlement policies while they were attacking directly by restricting their cultures and languages. On the other hand, two regimes tried to take control of religious field which annoyed them as this union was seen superior than the national identities created by them. By this way, two leaders tried to destroy religious symbols and rituals to destruct the collective memory which was the link between imperial period and society. Moreover, especially in 1930s, works about pre-Islamic Persian and Turkish civilizations were conducted through universities. Thus, these theses highlighted a historical maintenance between modern Iran and Turkey with their pre-Islamic past. By these researches, traditions were invented and through them, militarist propagandas came out in both states, as well.

Thirdly, two states took over by two leaders had different governmental structures and social dynamics. That's why, it is getting harder to compare leaders according to their successes on the reforms. Mustafa Kemal's Turkey had some advantages in the transition period from empire to nation state, as of its centralized government structure and homogenized social conditions. Actually, Mustafa Kemal's rule was like the continuation of the Tanzimat period because there was a historical transition between them. Reza Shah did not take over a historical maintenance so, when he became a ruler, he did not have a centralized government structure and he faced decentralized social dynamics.

Fourthly, both Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah conducted similar construction operations. While the capital cities of two states became the symbols of modernization, thanks to railroads and roads they constructed, penetration of central state spread peripheral zones effectively. But Reza Shah was disadvantageous towards Mustafa Kemal. Because middle and upper classes, which existed with modern urban life, had already appeared in some coastal town in the second period of 19th century. Besides, these coastal towns were articulated to modern West life economically and publicly. Especially in the cities such as Selanico, Istanbul and Izmir, there was a secular population in middle and upper classes. Besides, these coastal towns were associated with Western trade and economy. On contrary to

Turkey, Reza Shah's Iran had neither a harbour opens to Western economy nor a secular population.

Fifthly, there were huge differences between Mustafa Kemal's Turkey and Reza Shah's Iran in terms of institutional structure. The most important power behind industrialized Western countries was probably their institutional structures. Ottomans and Iran modernization showed huge differences in terms of institutionalism. Especially with the period started with Tanzimat, Ottomans made many reforms in economy, military and administration fields, by taking examples from West world. It should not be forgotten that all these institutional reforms were connected to each other with central state building. Especially competition and battles with Western countries, contributed to improvements in Ottomans' institutional structure. When it comes to 20th century, Ottoman army made many improvements in technic and administration fields with the aid of German experts and in parallel with this, Ottoman bureaucracy penetrated to peripheral zones more actively. On the other hand, Iran in early 20th century, had neither regular army nor active bureaucratic network. Considering all these conditions, it should not be neglected that during Reza Shah's rule, a huge improvement was made in the view of institutionalism.

Sixthly, there were great differences between opposition structures of Iran and Turkey, under the rule of two leaders. The most important figure of this difference was Ulema. In 1924, Reza Khan wanted to proclaim Republic just like Mustafa Kemal. Because he did not make social preparations in an organized way like Mustafa Kemal and he faced a united opposition, Reza Shah obliged to withdraw his Republic idea. Social oppositions in two countries were completely different in terms of groups and organization. And behind this situation, there was a different historical process. The period of Mahmud The Second was decisive in destroying social opposition movement. During his rule, the Covert Organization -Zımnî-, which included Janissaries, clerics, merchants and regular people; both annihilated Janissaries and controlled Ulema in economic and administrative way. Thus, in early 20th century, there was not any active social opposition movement in

Ottomans and their opposition included elite groups such as soldiers, journalists, lawyers and officers. On contrary to Ottomans, Iran had a different situation. In here, Ulema was at the center of opposition historically and it was the greatest power to limit government. They led to many social protest movements, from tobacco protest to the constitutional movement. In the light of this information, it could be understood why Reza Khan's Republic movement failed comparing to Mustafa Kemal's.

Seventhly, there were great similarities between the conditions of Reza Khan's and Mustafa Kemal's rise as leaders. Both leaders came out after chaotic periods of Great War years. Both leaders managed to get support of various social groups with the claim of building a stabile central structure and public order in internal politics. In external politics, the governments of Reza Khan and Mustafa Kemal got support from Western countries, Britain in particular, because Western countries thought that only a central government could prevent Soviets diffusion in Middle Eastern region. Also, Western powers preferred central governments instead of tribes and regional powers, because the partnership with tribes was instable and unreliable. In this direction, in consolidation of two leaders' positions, the support came from Western countries should not be neglected. For example, Sheikh Said revolt, which was the biggest crisis in Kemalist regime, was suppressed by using railway line, which was in Syria under the control of France. The other example is that when Iranian Arabian region led by Sheikh Khazal had been in a good relationship with British, their relationship was broken down with the attack of Reza Khan against the Arabic zone. Because British neglected the attack and kept stand by Reza Khan.

Eighthly, there were great differences between the mentalities of two leaders. Born in one of the most cosmopolite cities of the world as Selanico, Mustafa Kemal became aware of Western ideas thanks to this city and his student years in Macedonia. Besides, the military school he participated in was completely Western styled. On the other hand, Reza Khan was born in a less cosmopolite city, Elasht, and he received education in Cossack brigade which was under the control of despotic tsarist Russia. Even though both leaders had been in many regions

throughout their countries, Reza Khan had been abroad for only twice until 1941, such as Iraq and Turkey. On contrary to Reza Khan, Mustafa Kemal served as an attaché in Bulgaria and also, he went for an official visit to two Western powers, France and Germany. Thus, because of conflictual atmosphere of Macedonia and having interest to Western intellectual life, made Mustafa Kemal give tolerance to different ideologic groups under his regime, on the condition that they would not cross their limits determined by the regime. So, Kemalist roof included many different political groups, from radical rightists to socialists. Moreover, in external politics, Mustafa Kemal followed a cautious pragmatist politic against the fascist governments of 1930s. Reza Shah was not interested in Western ideologies and intellectual life. Especially after Oil Agreement in 1933, his close relationships with Nazi Germany would lead to his end.

Ninthly, both countries went through similar processes under two authoritarian leaders, especially after the Great Depression period. Both countries were affected by the Great Depression harshly and increased tariff to prevent negative effect of the Depression from Western capitalist market. Thus, both countries passed into statist economic models which was self-enclosed. Both countries took examples by Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia in terms of economy and industrialism, because both these Western countries did not get any harm from the Great Depression. Reza Khan and Mustafa Kemal would make development plans and industrial spurts. Especially with the effect of partnering with Nazi Germany, Reza Shah's Iran would make a great improvement in industrial field by 1940.

Tenthly and Finally, ideologically, after the Great Depression, both regimes would become increasingly authoritarian day by day. In Turkey, Kemalist regime decided to turn into one-party system again after the experience of the Free Republican Party. During the 1930s, Mustafa Kemal was both president of the Republic and party leader of the People's Republican Party. Moreover, there was not any control mechanism to limit power of Mustafa Kemal and his frameworks. Under these circumstances, Kemalist regime officially proclaimed an integration of the RPP and the State in 1935 with the Party Programme. On the other hand, Reza Shah's regime

destroyed the most important political figures of the country in the period starting with the 1933 Oil Agreement, including the names close to Reza Shah. At the end of the process, Reza Shah did not even have a second man of the regime like İsmet İnönü. Throughout the 1930s, the National Socialist German Workers' Party and the National Fascist Party came to power in Germany and Italy. The effects of their rises were seen in internal politics of Iran and Turkey and some totalitarian tendencies came into view in two regimes. Especially, all non-governmental organizations were closed down by Kemalists and Reza's regime with the second half of the 1930s and many newspapers and media organs were banned or closed down. Even though they had some totalitarian tendencies, both regimes cannot be called as fascist. Because the support of the masses in fascist regimes was one of the most important features but both regimes, the leaders of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah, did not follow any active policies to mobilize the masses.

Bibliography

- Abrahamian, Ervand (1982), *Iran Between Two Revolutions*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- (2018). *Modern İnan Tarihi*, İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Ahavi, Şahruh (1990), *İnan'da Din ve Siyaset*. İstanbul: Yöneliş Yayınları.
- Akşin, Sina. (2016), *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Alevi, Bozorg (2008), *Zindan Notları*, İstanbul: Ağaç Kitabevi Yayınları.
- , (2015), *Gözleri*, İstanbul: Febula Kitap.
- Algar, Hamid (1969), *Religion and State in Iran 1785-1906*. London: University of California Press.
- Alkan, Ahmet Turan (2001), *2. Meşrutiyet Devrinde Ordu ve Siyaset*. İstanbul: Ufuk Kitapları Yayıncılık
- Altan, Suna (2018), ‘Rıza Şah Pehlevi'nin Türkiye Ziyaretinin Cumhuriyet Gazetesindeki Yansımaları’, *History Studies*, Volume 10, Issue 4. S.1-20
- Altınay, Ayşegül- Bora, Tanıl (2008), ‘Ordu, Militarizm ve Milliyetçilik’, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Anastassiadou, Meropi (2015), *Tanzimat Çağında Bir Osmanlı Şehri Selanik*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Arai, Masami (2013), *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Atabaki, Touraj (2017), *Devlet ve Maduniyet, Türkiye ve İnan’da Modernleşme Toplum ve Devlet*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- (2017). ‘Kendini Yeniden Kurmak, Ötekini Reddetmek: ‘Pantürkizm ve İnan Milliyetçiliği’, *İmparatorluktan Cumhuriyete Türkiye’de Etnik Çatışma*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Atay, Falih Rıfkı (1968), *Çankaya*. İstanbul: Pozitif Yayınları.
- Bali, Rıfat (2000), ‘Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş!’’, *Kebikeç Dergi*, Sayı 10, s.5-8
- Belge, Murat (2012), *Militarist Modernleşme*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Beşikçi, İsmail (1990), *Tunceli Kanunu (1935) ve Dersim Jenosidi*: İstanbul: Belge Yayıncılık
- Bora, Tanıl. (2017), *Cereyanlar*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bozarlan, Hamit (2015), *Türkiye Tarihi İmparatorluktan Günümüze*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- (2018). Ortadoğu: Bir Şiddet Tarihi Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Sonundan El Kaide'ye. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Breuer, Stefan (2017), Milliyetçiler ve Faşizm, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bruinessen, Martin (2013), Ağa, Şeyh ve Devlet, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Cebesoy, Ali Fuat (2016), Sınıf Arkadaşım Atatürk, İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınları
- Chehabi, Houchang (2012), ‘‘Türkiye ve İran’da Erkekler İçin Kıyafet Kanunları’’, Türkiye’de ve İran’da Otoriter Modernleşme Atatürk ve Rıza Şah Dönemleri, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Cronin, Stephanie (2006), Soldiers, Shahs, and Subaltern in Iran Opposition, Protest and Revolt 1921-1941. New York: Palgrave Macmillian Press.
- (2012). Britain, The Iranian Military and The Rise of the Reza Khan. Anglo-Iranian Relations since 1800. New York: Royal Asiatic Books Press.
- Deringil, Selim (2017), Simgeden Millete 2. Abdülhamid’den Mustafa Kemal’e Devlet ve Millet, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Dumont, Paul (2014), Yahudi-Sosyalist-Osmanlı Bir Örgüt: Selanik İşçi Federasyonu. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sosyalizm ve Milliyetçilik 1876-1923, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Demirel, Ahmet (2012), Tek Partinin Yükselişi, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Dündar, Fuat (2008), Modern Türkiye’nin Şifresi, İttihat ve Terakki’nin Etnisite Mühendisliği 1913-1918. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Eilers, Wilhelm (1978), Education and Cultural Development in Iran During the Pahlavi Era, Iran Under the Pahlavis, California: Hoover Institution Press.
- Enver Paşa (2018), Enver Paşa’nın Anıları, İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Faroghi, Suraiya (2014), Osmanlı Kültürü ve Gündelik Yaşam, Ortaçağdan Günümüze, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Garthwaite, R. Gene (2011), Iran Tarihi Pers İmparatorluğu’ndan Günümüze. İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınları.
- Georgeon, François (2015), Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi 1900-1930. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Hacısalihoğlu, Mehmet (2010), İçerme ve Dışlama: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Askere Alma Türkiye’de Ordu-Devlet ve Güvenlik Siyaseti. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Hakan, Sinan (2013), Türkiye Kurulurken Kürtler (1916-1920), İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

- Hanioğlu, Şükrü (2011), *Atatürk: An Intellectual Biography*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hambly, Gavin R. G. (2007), ‘‘The Pahlavi Autocracy: Riza Shah, 1921-1941’’, *The Cambridge History of Iran: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*, Peter Avery and Charles Melville and Gavin Hambly, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hidayet, Sadık (2017), *Hacı Ağa*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1996), *Aşırılikler Çağı*, İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi
- (2010), *1870’den Günümüze Milletler ve Milliyetçilik*, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları
- İnan, Afet (2018), *Atatürk Hakkında Hatıralar ve Belgeler*, İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Jwaideh, Wadie (2016), *Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihi*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Karabekir, Kazım (1960), *İstiklal Harbimiz*, İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi.
- Katouzian, Homa (1992), *The Political Economy of Modern Iran (1926-1979)*, London: Macmillan Press.
- (2012), ‘‘Rıza Şah Döneminde Devlet ve Toplum’’, *Türkiye’de ve İran’da Yayınları Modernleşme Atatürk ve Rıza Şah Dönemleri*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları
- Kazemzadeh, Firuz (2013), *Russia and Britain in Persia*, London: I. B. Tauris.
- Keyder, Çağlar (2017), *Türkiye’de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Kıray, Emine (2015), *Osmanlı’da Ekonomik Yapı ve Dış Borçlar*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kayalı, Hasan (2018), *Jön Türkler ve Araplar: Osmanlılık, Erken Arap Milliyetçiliği ve İslamcılık*, İstanbul: İş Bankası.
- Keddie, Nikkie R. (2006), *Modern Iran, Roots and Result of Revolution*, London: Yale University Press.
- Kemal, İsmail (2016), *İsmail Kemal Bey’in Anıları*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları: İstanbul
- Leart Marcel (2015), *Ermeni Meselesi*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Le Bon, Gustave (2016), *Kitlelerin Psikolojisi*. Ankara: Yason Yayınları.
- Lewis, Bernard (2009), *Modern Türkiye’nin Doğuşu*. Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınevi.
- Majd, Mohammad Gholi (2001), *Great Britain and Reza Shah, The Plunder of Iran 1921-1941*, Florida, University Press of Florida.

- Mann, Michael. (2012), *Demokrasinin Karanlık Yüzü Etnik Temizliği Açıklamak*, İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Mardin, Şerif. (2008), *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları,
– (1991), *Türk Modernleşmesi*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Moazami, Behrooz (2018), *İran’da Devlet, Din ve Devrim: 1796’dan Günümüze*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Okyar, Fethi (1999), *Fethi Okyar’ın Anıları, Atatürk-Okyar ve Çok Partili Türkiye*, İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Olson, Robert (2000), ‘‘The Kurdish Rebellions of Sheikh Said (1925), Mt. Ararat (1930), and Dersim (1937-1938): Their Impact on Kurdish and Turkish Nationalism’’, *Die Welt des Islam*, Leiden: Brill Publishing.
- Özbek, Nadir (2015), *İmparatorluğun Bedeli*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Özcan, Gencer (2010), *Türkiye’de Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ordusunda Prusya Etkisi. Türkiye’de Ordu-Devlet ve Güvenlik Siyaseti*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları. Yayınları.
- Pamuk, Şevket (2018), *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme 1820-1913*, İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Parla, Taha (1993), *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye’de Korporatizm*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Poulantzas, Nicos (2016), *Faşizm ve Diktatörlük*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Sabet-Kashani, Firoozeh (2006), *Sınır Kurguları, İran Ulusunun Şekillenmesi 1804-1946*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Sancar, Serpil, (2014), *Türk Modernleşmesinin Cinsiyeti: Erkekler Devlet Kadınlar Aile Kurar*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Sanders, Liman von (2007), *Türkiye’de Beş Sene*, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları.
- Sohrabi, Nader (2011), *Revolution and Constitutionalism in the Ottoman Empire and Iran*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savory, M. Roger. (1978), *Social Development in Iran During the Pahlavi Era, Iran Under the Pahlavis*. California: Hoover Institution Press.
- Suny, Ronald Grigor (2016), *Ancak Çölde Yaşayabilirler, Bir Soykırım Tarihi*. İstanbul: Aras Yayıncılık.
- Sutton, Elwell. (1978), *Reza Shah the Great Founder of the Pahlavi Dynasty, Iran Under the Pahlavis*, California: Hoover Institution Press.

- Tilly, Charles (2015), Örgütlü Bir Suç Olarak Savaşmak ve Devlet Kurmak, İstanbul: Siyasol Yazıları.
- Tohidi, Nayereh (2009), ‘‘Ethnicity and Religious Minority Politics in Iran’’, Contemporary Iran, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tokay, Gül (2010), Osmanlı’da Modern Devlet, Güvenlik Siyaseti ve Ordunun Dönüşümüne Dair Bir Değerlendirme, Türkiye’de Ordu-Devlet ve Güvenlik Siyaseti, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Tunçay, Mete (1981), Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Tek-Parti Yönetimi’nin Kurulması (1923-1931), Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.
- Uzun, İsmail (2019), ‘‘Afet İnan’ın Sosyo-Kültürel Çalışmaları’’, Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarih Dergisi, sayı 11, s.103-126
- Üngör, Uğur Ümit (2016), Modern Türkiye’nin İnşası Doğu Anadolu’da Ulus, Devlet ve Şiddet 1913-1950, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, Mehmet (2018), ‘‘Hangi Seyit Rıza!’’, Kürt Tarihi ve Siyasetinden Portreler, Tuncay Şur ve Yasin Çakmak, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Zürcher, Eric Jan (2015), Modernleşen Türkiye’nin Tarihi, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- (2015), Bir Ulusun İnşası: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndan Atatürk Türkiyesi’ne, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Zürcher- Atabaki, Eric Jan- Touraj (2012), Türkiye’de ve İran’da Otoriter Modernleşme Atatürk ve Rıza Şah Dönemleri.