

THE CONTRIBUTION OF KAZIM KARABEKIR PASHA TO DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY

Şuayip TURAN

Academician, Çankırı Karatekin University, Rectorate, International Relations

ABSTRACT

The paper aims to analyze the contribution of Kazım Karabekir Pasha to democracy in Turkey in the Republican Period. In this study, I try to explain why Kazım Karabekir Pasha is so important for Turkish society and also what kind of lessons that the Turkish Society can take. This study is very important as the today's youth are looking for efficient, magnificent and historic leaders from the past. Kazım Karabekir Pasha's life will set light to this gap. He struggled for the salvation and freedom of the Turkish society to have a democratic governance in the country. In this study, the impact of his contribution to the development of democracy in Turkey is evaluated. While analyzing this issue, a brief information about the background of the situation is given in order to get concrete ideas about their efficiency in the concept of democratic governance. When he and his friends reached their aims then they worked for the welfare and happiness of the Turkish community. Their fundamental aim is to achieve more democratic governance in order to have good and strong relations between all layers of the society so as to increase the level of participation to the elections. He is one of the pioneers of the democratic governance in Turkey.

Key Words: Kazım Karabekir Pasha, Democracy, Leadership, Political Party, Republican Period.

INTRODUCTION

The twentieth century has been a remarkable period of challenges and contrasts. While it has been a hallmark for enlightenment, achievement, and eye- blinding advances in science, technology, economic growth and globalization, it is also a period of incapacity and injustice. Some leaders are the keystone in the historical perspective of a nation. Kazım Karabekir Pasha is one of the magnificent leaders whom have ever been seen in Turkey. This paper firstly gives important turning points in his life then expresses his successes. Actually, there are some vital rules that must be followed in order for democracy to operate in a country and to maintain its existence forever. One of the rules is that the armed forces should act in accordance with the powers of the member of parliament that use the authority of sovereignty for the people. It has not been sufficiently complied with this rule in Turkey during building period of the republic. Politics could not keep itself far from the shadow of the military throughout the Republic history. The status of the army inside the administrative unit in the Ottoman state and modernization

efforts over the military at the last period of the Ottoman state have impacted significantly on the early Republic of Turkey. The Republic of Turkey is an ottoman balance. Therefore, this situation was normally met in the early stages and was assumed to be the case for that day. Kazım Karabekir Pasha was one of the magnificent generals and also he was the member of parliament. He had crucial roles in the independence war and he also had vital roles to have a more democratic life in the administrative unit and also in the country. Some of the experiences lived during the foundation of the Republic have the most important role in the military's influence on politics. In the end, what we can get from his life is discussed.

There have been several barriers to the functioning of the political institutions in Turkey in the framework of the democratic principles in the modernization process that has started since the last decades of the Ottoman Empire. The military's attitude against politics is vital for the future of democracy and for the sustainability of democracy in a country. Democratization in the Republican period has not reached the intended degree as it was thought and realized as the transfer of the Western experience as a good example. Turan (2018) said that "democratic values are not peculiar to the West and its culture; therefore, it can be learned practically like any other system" (p.140). On the other hand, the people on the power in the republican era targeted Western societies in achieving the level of contemporary civilizations. Yet, Zguri (2012) emphasized that "democracy is something that people learn with time and practice" (p.432). Kazım Karabekir Pasha was the defender of modernization through politics via enlightening public. He formed political parties, yet he was pushed off the politics as he was disagreeing with the idea of modernization through military method.

KAZIM KARABEKİR PASHA AND HIS EFFECT ON POLITICS

It is meaningful to have a brief biographical section of Kâzım Karabekir Pasha (1882-1948), who is absolutely one of the vital actors in the early period of modern Turkey. Kâzım Karabekir Pasha was the son of an Ottoman pasha and he was born in Istanbul in 1882. He took his education at the military schools of Fatih and Kuleli, and immediately afterwards at the Military Academy (Harbiye Mektebi) and the General Staff College (Erkân-t Harbiye Mektebi). Kâzım Karabekir Pasha graduated with honors in 1905. At the Military Academy, he met Mustafa Kemal, who was a senior for a year. In December 1906, while serving in the staff of the Third Army in Macedonia, he joined the Ottoman Freedom Association (Osmanlı Hürriyet Cemiyeti). This is the name of the secret committee, which was established in Thessaloniki in September 1906 and it is allied with Committee of Union and Progress, or CUP (İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti) in 1907 in Paris. Later on, it was formed the constitutional revolution under the Committee of Union and Progress, CUP in 1908. Kazım Karabekir had the opportunity to work closely with Enver Pasha, yet Kâzım Karabekir Pasha never played a very vital role in the CUP. Karabekir's vocational career concentrated on the path of a good soldier. He took part in the Caucasian front, in Iraq and at the Gallipoli strait in the WWI. He succeeded in being appointed the Fourteenth Army Corps Command (previously Ninth Army) in Eastern Anatolia with his head office in Erzurum in the early 1919. In July 1919, he also worked for the preparations and goodness of the well-known congress of Erzurum in that region. Kazım Karabekir, military commander both in Ottoman time and the independence war, achieved considerable success in

the army. Zürcher (2010) states his sayings as “we fought the independence war. If its creators do not write it, its history will become a fairytale” and “Incorrect information is a source of disaster” (p.22) cited in *Istiklâl Harbimiz Our Independence War*). Kazım Karabekir wrote the materials with concrete clues such as written documents, oral evidence or official documents of the time. Unfortunately, most of his works could not be published freely as he was seen as an enemy of the republic. Most of his books were published posthumously. It is quite interesting to learn from the sayings Zürcher (2010) “Kazım Karabekir refused to arrest Mustafa Kemal after the latter had come to Erzurum in 1919, even though he was ordered to do so by the government, and the fact that he continued to support him as leader even when he was dismissed from the army and his army inspectorate was offered to Kâzım himself. Mustafa Kemal only survived as leader thanks to the open support of Kâzım Karabekir” (p.23). Karabekir had a part in all the crucial events that marked Atatürk’s life, for this reason they can be seen as parallel lives.

However, he was not at the forefront of politics at that time. In the Ottoman period, he was engaged in fighting on the front as a soldier and not joined the executive power in the government. Karabekir Pasha started to stand out in the national struggle against armistice of Montrose. It ensured the establishment of a healthy working ground by gathering the Erzurum Congress which is the first effective congress of national struggle and ensuring the security of the congress with its own corps. Although he had not attended the meetings since 1920, he was in name a member of the Grand National Assembly. In the process of proclamation of the republic, the consultation environment changed and Karabekir Pasha remained in the position of an excluded one. Kazım Karabekir Pasha should have meant that the Republic was not mentioned in the evaluation of the future of the country and that the Republic, which did not come on the agenda at the time, was declared as an order. The feeling of exclusion existed by Kazım Karabekir Pasha was also found in other companions who made important contributions to the National Independence and remained outside the process of proclamation of the Republic. For this reason, the proclamation of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Pasha's fellow friends had difference of opinions with this development.

Kazım Karabekir and his colleagues were disappointed to see that the management style, which was deemed appropriate for the country, was carried out without considering their ideas. Their reactions to the proclamation and the process were caused by this feeling of exclusion. Indeed, his companions in general did not criticize what the Republic could be or could not be, they had acted in a critical manner even as the Republic was declared precipitately. During the work of the Assembly, opposition groups were formed and Karabekir Pasha has also passed the opposition over time. Karabekir was in accordance with the pioneering group of the national resistance movement, which has been gradually cut from the center of power since 1923. He and his colleagues stood out against the group, around Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the extremist and authoritarian political tendencies. Başkan (2010) informed that “in November 1924, the first leaders of the independence war, Rauf Orbay, Refet Bele, Ali Fuat Cebesoy and Kazım Karabekir, who enjoyed repute and respect both in the army and among the masses, formed an opposition party in the parliament. The party was joined by others, who resigned from Atatürk’s party” (p.148). The opposition party gathered mostly Pashas-Generals from the army. This party also took the attention of the largest press of Turkey. The press, namely newspapers supported

the ideas and activities of the opposition party. There was an intense prospective opposition among the prestigious generals in the army; therefore, the opposing second party from the existing political party members before a real second political party was formed. Actually, it was so distinct that everyday political debates had two poles. The opposition members were accused of being anti-republic and even pro-sultan. Aydınli (2004) stated “although leaders of the opposition declared repeatedly that they were in favor of the republic, national independence and liberties, explaining that ‘national liberty is the real source of the republic not the other way round, the debate had already become one of regime security, with a tendency to create pro and anti-elements. Çavdar reports a speech by a constituent representative of the government, Recep Bey, who says that he carefully followed the opposition’s speeches and noted that ‘not once did they mention the word Republic’. As Atatürk was such a farsighted leader that he foresaw potential danger in the political arena, he urged the generals to select between councilors or military ones. They all resigned from their duty from army and chose civilian parliamentarians in order to take active role in the politics under the opposition group. The struggles of the domestic power were in the setting up a second political party for the dynamics of change in the country. They were doing this for a more democratic administration system in the country. Çavdar (2004) quoted from Hüseyin Çahit Yalçın, that one of the publishers of the daily newspaper ‘Tanin’ that “the current dominant single party is only paying lip service to democracy... the republic is not a true republic if it is not based on democracy” (p.264).

Progressive Republican Party – PRP was not able to be successful in the interim elections since its establishment on November 17, 1924. The interim elections were done in a hurry before PRP completed its party organization. Yüceer (2002) stated that “the PRP participated in the negotiations within the Assembly and expressed its opinion on the issues, bringing criticism and questions and displayed an active opposition. Particularly in the Parliament's 1925 Budget Talks, PRP fulfilled its duty and criticism, and the opposition party, which supervised the power in the Parliament” (p.538). Yeşil (2002) summarized the party program as that “Progressive Republican Party – PRP was strongly in favor of general liberties and rights... individual liberties and consequent debate would fix the defects that exist in our public system... Individual liberties would be effective at every level... In order to show their sincerity about individual liberties and freedom they would have a high level of within-party democracy” (p.446).

The reason for the opposition is that the first group formed around Mustafa Kemal had a radical attitude towards the modernization of society after the war. However, according to Karabekir Pasha, “this modernization should be done not by means of a revolutionary method yet by a gradual way, but by spreading over time rather than suddenly. Moreover, in these modernization studies, the values of society should not be ignored” (Mumcu, 2006: 154). In 1924, he and his friends founded the first opposition party of republican Turkey, Progressive Republican Party – PRP (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası). This was a very curial step for democracy in order to ensure multiple voice for the opposition too. Therefore, this party was the first opposition party of the republican period for the sake of democracy. “The party advocated the end of political repression and murders, granting the right to life to the opposition and taking a liberal attitude in the economy. In their party constitution, it stated that “this party respects religious beliefs and thoughts” (Armağan, 2009: 256). He resigned from the army to become a

member of parliament and was elected president of the new party. Mikail and Karabulut (2017) declared that “after the Progressive Republican Party (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Firkasi) completed its establishment, it started criticizing the government. It increased its criticism even more during the by-election, carried out for the thirteen deputies, claiming that it had been exposed to pressure. Meanwhile the party’s attitude to regard it as useful to instrumentalize religious elements against its rivals caught Mustafa Kemal’s attention, who had been struggling to realize secular reforms successfully. Thus, the party was labeled as anti-republican and reactionary by Mustafa Kemal Pasha” (p.512) Kazım Karabekir’s party was closed because of the pressure and Takrir-i Sükûn Law in 1925. The members of the party and the program of the Progressive Republican Party were allegedly linked to this uprising and the party was closed on June 5, 1925. After this stage, Karabekir Pasha had to withdraw from active to a passive position in politics. After the assassination of Izmir in 1926, he was isolated from all politics (Kandemir, 2007: 9). He was out of the political life from 1926 to 1938. He was held under house arrest for long years. In these years Kazım Karabekir stayed in Istanbul and he dedicated his life to writing many books. He turned back to politics in 1938, after the death of Mustafa Kemal. Kazım Karabekir was elected from Istanbul deputy to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey again in 1939. In 1946, he was nominated as a candidate for Republican People's Party for the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. He won the election and he even carried out as president of that body until his death in 1948. Although Kazım Karabekir considers that some steps should be taken towards modernization and westernization, he is against the oppression of the people under the name of revolution. Moreover, he was not a suitable person to reach Mustafa Kemal's previously planned goals despite Kazım Karabekir’s contributions and pioneering role in the independence war. Kazım Karabekir Pasha became increasingly opposed and engaged in a competition with Mustafa Kemal. Kazım Karabekir thought that increasing Mustafa Kemal's own powers was the opposition of the popular will. While defending his thoughts, he struggled without a certain political party. Later, he expressed his thoughts within the Progressive Republican Party by establishing with some friends who were at one with him. This party wanted to limit the personal powers of Mustafa Kemal, the separation of powers, increased parliamentary control over the government and an end to arbitrary jurisdiction embodied in the independence courts (Altan, 2001: 39). According to Kazım Karabekir, it was necessary to convince the people in the modernization and it had to be provided with a real representation of the parliamentary regime (Koçak, 2009). However, this attitude of Kazım Karabekir was not evaluated within the framework of legitimate opposition. The thoughts expressed by Kazım Karabekir in this political movement both the aforementioned political movement and the names in this movement forced them to pay heavy prices (Avcı, 2007: 98). Kazım Karabekir was tried by execution because Mustafa Kemal was allegedly assassinated in Izmir, yet he was acquitted. Kazım Karabekir had the rank of corps of the military. It is also known that the officers who were in the army during the trial protested Karabekir's trial (Armağan, 2009: 250). It is highly probable that the Independence Court, which had conducted the proceedings, had made the decision of acquittal under the influence of Mustafa Kemal. Mustafa Kemal could not afford to take part of the army in that process. After Izmir assassination court, Kazım Karabekir observed in a passive position, continued his life in surveillance, and did not have any political effect until Mustafa Kemal's death in November 1938 (Karabekir, 2005: 142). After being a member of the parliament in 1939, Kazım Karabekir made efforts to oppose the mistakes related to himself and

the national struggle. He thought that Mustafa Kemal's speech told us that national struggle the adventure was biased, subjective and aimed to put forward itself. He tried to explain that Mustafa Kemal tried to take over the successes of the commanders of the national struggle and ignored them (Karabekir, 2005: 142). Karabekir Pasha, as a determined and confident person, had no character to act in the absolute submission of another person's command. This feature of Karabekir was a risk for Mustafa Kemal. Mustafa Kemal wanted to work with a team that would act in obedience to reach his own ideals in terms of reforms. The characteristic structure of Karabekir was not suitable for this profile that Mustafa Kemal wanted. The forces that have different opinions within the society cause the emergence of power by struggling in order to dominate and to suppress their views (Çam, 1999: 23). In the framework of this definition, it can be said that Kazım Karabekir has acted with a concern for not being opposed to the state, which is a legitimate authority, despite the struggle for power. By disqualification of Kazım Karabekir and Progressive Republican Party together, the Republic of Turkey became increasingly authoritarian regime even totalitarian and military nature and the society entirely taken under pressure. It was also seen that the value of the society had been tried to be altered. The material and spiritual assets of the society were tried to be given to a certain segment. This situation caused a negative picture in terms of democracy. Although Kazım Karabekir had defeated the political struggle he did not use his position in the army. He was very well-known and successful general at that time. He did not want to uprise to the governance of the republic as he was a statist human. It is no doubt that the state and society would be harmed by such a struggle of him and his friends. On the other hand, Karabekir Pasha was a person who did not hesitate to make visible worship and similar things in compliance with the religious-based values. This characteristic of Kazım Karabekir was not in line with the idea of consecrating religion as the dominant understanding of the early republic. Therefore, he was put out of action because of his religious ideas and he was liquidated. The dominant idea of the state was shaped according to the ideas of Mustafa Kemal. He preplanned to abolish the Islamic institutions immediately and put Islam under state control. Mahmut Esat Bey (1926) stated that the motto of that time as "religion should be respected as long as it remains in the sphere of conscience". After the great victory in his memoirs about the rule and the status of the caliphate, Pasha who shared his ideas spoke about the necessity of not having İstanbul as the capital, preventing the involvement of the members of the dynasty in the affairs of the state and the existence of the caliphate in the dynasty (Karabekir, 2008: 1254). Mumcu (2009) stated that it was seen that Karabekir Pasha thought to abolish the sultanate and not to remove the caliphate from the dynasty (p. 40).

The society was no longer allowed to adopt democratic reactions, and the community had to act with the fear that a small democratic reaction will justify a bloody raid. Kazım Karabekir and his friends made attempts for democracy and formed Progressive Republican Party. Yet, this party was closed because of the being reactionary. All the channels opposing the regime were prevented and a certain group's ideas became the dominant character of the period by the military pressure on the society. Such practices continued till the transition to a multi-party system. Actually, it has been arbitrarily acted in the dissemination of social values. At that time, the people who oppose Mustafa Kemal and his ruling cabinet were seemed as betrayers. Kazım Karabekir was the pioneer of the opposition group namely second group in the Turkish Grand National Assembly. They were forced to give a life-and-death struggle and they were on trials in

many times in courts. They were suppressed so as to speak aloud. In this context, Turkey's democracy, has seen quite a loss from the liquidation of Kazım Karabekir and his political movement of Progressive Republican Party. Great obstacles to the development of the consciousness of democracy have been realized. As we are living in the global world, the time changed quickly and the ruling party had to release some democratic issues after the death of Mustafa Kemal. The community had been hesitant of the slightest reaction or demonstration against the ruling elites owing to security concerns. If the society had reacted, they would have paid their acts' responses with their live or his freedom. Therefore, this price was something that everyone could not afford.

The closure of the Progressive Republican Party established by Kazım Karabekir and the punishment of its members for various penalties demolished democracy. As there was no other parties or opposition groups, the ruling system in Turkey was condemned to one-party system. If Kazım Karabekir Pasha's party was allowed in the political arena at that time, revolutions made for sake of modernization would be more accurate as they would be done in accordance with the people' wishes and needs. The societies preferences were brought to the agenda with the hand of the Progressive Republican Party during the revolutions laws. In this way, a very large level of development could be achieved in advance, both for economic development and through democratic competition in other areas. Moreover, there would be no need to maintain the gains achieved in modernization with a military protection. However, since the revolutions were made using military force and then the protection of these reforms were transferred to the military wing. Afterwards, the options of intervening in politics in order to protect the reforms of Atatürk. have been on the agenda and the army has always acted with the idea of keeping politics under control. In other words, the basis of military interventions throughout the Turkish Republican history of the Republic is the understanding of the early Republican era. In this belief, it was accepted that modernization should not be realized through democratic means or by giving political parties the opportunity to do politics, yet by the force of arms with the support of the army. Due to this thought, the Progressive Republican Party, which was founded by Kazım Karabekir Pasha and his colleagues, was not granted permission to do politics. This caused our democracy to start at least twenty or twenty-five years behind. Mikail and Karabulut (2017) deduced that "M. Kemal had accused the Progressive Republican Party, which propagated as We want the caliphate back! We do not want the new laws. We are fine with ottoman code of civil law (mecelle) Madrasah, Islamic monastery: we are going to protect you; unite with us! Because Mustafa Kemal's party abolished caliphate. He is damaging Islamism. He will make non-Muslims out of you, and make you wear hats!' In its party programs, of making promises which contradicted the regime and using religion as a flag and of being a product of traitorous minds, a shelter and support for the fanatics" (p.521). Actually, M. Kemal wanted to reach his preplanned goals through revolutionary methods, yet Kazım Karabekir tried to realize his ideas through evolutionary method when the society wanted or needed. This huge differences between two major characters of the early Republican era separated from each other both in politics and social life. Yeşil (2002) stated that "the religiously sensitive circles strongly supported the PRP, which they believed to have been established as a reaction within the Assembly, as a result of the abolition of the Caliphate. The PRP defended that Mustafa Kemal's foreseeable for society should have not been with a rapid and revolutionary mindset, but with evolution, evolutionary

and gradual way” (p.547). People and groups who think in this way had also become supporters of PRP. The organization of the PRP, the opening of branches and the political activities have been realized to reflect this way of thinking. On the other hand, they were not reactionary party. They were Turks and had religiously sensitive. Yeşil (2002) declared from the general inspector of the PRP, Ismail Nuri Bey’ speech in the in the opening ceremony of the Beykoz branch in Istanbul: “We, as from Beykoz, were loyal and sincere Republicans, and we were Muslims and Turks. No reaction and betrayal against the Republic could not live between us, and our blood had always been endowed to the order of the Republic in terms of crushing this kind of movement wherever it was” (pp.249-250). The members of the Party felt the need to emphasize how much they were attached to the Republic. In the political life of six months’ time, the members of the parliament had an active opposition to the ruling party. Kazım Karabekir had the leadership of this movement. Grand National Assembly of Turkey’ official report (1976) clarified that “Kazım Karabekir Pasha stated that they were against the law of Takkir-i Sükûn, that this law was elastic, restricted the freedom and rights of the nation, it was not an honor for the Republic to accept this law, and the Independence Courts were out of date for the Turkish Republic. On the other hand, Konya deputy Refik Bey, addressed to the opposition members especially to Kazım Karabekir Pasha as; did not be in futile worries and hurries. With this law, our Constitution, the security and rights of the nation were guaranteed. When it came to the life of the Fatherland and the Nation, it was above all else” (p.135). Kazım Karabekir Pasha always defended the idea of freedom of nation and also freedom of press. Therefore, in the assembly, Kazım Karabekir Pasha harshly criticized the restriction law. Grand National Assembly of Turkey’ official report (1976) stated that Kazım Karabekir Pasha insisted his disagreement to the law as “...with the adoption of this law, press in the country would be restricted. İsmet Pasha, I would like to present to you that in the twentieth century, the nation was not able to be ruled by suspicion and doubt” (p.146). All in all, Progressive Republican Party – PRP was banned because of its reactionary activities and opposing the Republican People Party. In accordance with Article 6 of the Party, it was found out that they made religious allegations with the claim of saving the hometown from irreligion. Therefore, it was decided that awesome events took place during the emergence of the last reaction and rebellion (Sheikh Said Rebellion), and it was decided to close the PRP with the hand of Ankara Independence Court. Çiftçi (2005) stated that when considered in terms of management, Karabekir's personality is prone to a participatory, collective, consultative (democratic) structure of governance. The reflection of this characteristic in the political behavior or opposition of the Republic and its aftermath has been frequently seen. Karabekir also attaches great importance to science and expertise in management. This should be regarded as having a rather modern thought in the sense” (p.57). It can be said that Karabekir, a member of a family from Karaman, who raised a large number of soldiers, was a bound, successful and determined in military life yet he could not show much success in political life due to the conditions of the period.

CONCLUSION

The establishment of the PRP was a requirement of a multi-party, democratic regime. However, in the circumstances of the day, the young Republic had problems because of the fact that there were no time and ground conditions for living in a multi-party life and being open to criticism. The motions, criticisms and inquiries of the PRP to the parliament at that time brought more

harm to the benefit of a new regime that had not yet been recognized and was trying to settle. Mustafa Kemal Pasha had the tendency to compete the reforms and revolutions in a moment for the sake of Republic. Yet, the opposition party, PRP had the exact opposite ideas on the revolution. They defended evolutionary method but in a gradual way by spreading over time rather than suddenly. The new party got many supporters as soon as it was established as PRP's conservative founders fueled the Republican opposition in the country with the idea of reinstating Caliphate. Under the condition of the country, Turkey has taken over the Republican era, emerged from the war burnt, destroyed. Each side was in need of reconstruction. The majority of the population was poor and uneducated. The PRP program was usually created in the liberal line of 'liberty, minimum statism and foreign capital should be encouraged, decentralization should be adopted in administration'. The PRP's principles did not comply with the requirements of Turkey at that time. For the view of Republicans, the conditions at that time required a strong, central government.

Karabekir defends the supremacy of the will of the nation and the nation-state. He is in favor of a libertarian government. He believes that steps should be taken in the fields of education, culture, economy and industry for Turkish community development. Karabekir's conservatism and religion have an important place in society. Therefore, the importance of religion revealed a different understanding of modernization in him. He is in favor of the transformation through the evolution of society within its own dynamics not through a rapid process, sudden and unexpected way. Karabekir advocates mobilization and speed in scientific and technical breakthroughs. It can be said that Karabekir had a modernization project that was not at all in conflict with Islam and at peace with Islam. Therefore, at the time of the revolutions, he did not initially lean towards at some revolutions and even objectively opposed some of them intellectually. The abolition of the caliphate and the proclamation of the Republic and the letter revolution are the leading ones. Insel and Bayramoğlu (2017) stated that "a modernization perspective of the period's weak bourgeoisie, reconciled with religion and tradition of the Progressive Republican Party because of article 6 of the party program. Karabekir and other members of the party could not escape the claims of reactionary and conservative by the government. On the other hand, PRP's article 6 was politically very legitimate. As the ruling party wanted to hold power itself and protect on its own, the members of the ruling party claimed such ideas in order to protect Republic. As a result, we can summarize Karabekir's views on religion and politics as he who believed deeply in religion, considers himself a conscientious person; he hated religious bigotry. In politics, he believed democracy derived from societies own peculiarities, freedom and liberty and inclusive governance.

He is so important for Turkish society as he is one the fundamental leaders in Turkish history. He spent his most fruitful years in the battlefield. He and his friend supplied a colorful and bright country which cleared from the enemies. On the other hand, if it is looked his political and social life, again it is seen a huge charter. He worked as both a general and a parliament simultaneously. Then he founded his own party but because of the pressure, it was dissolved very soon. Apart from his political life, he produced forty books which are qualified in terms of quality and quantity. Most of the authors may not have such a talent. It is really great when we think his military, politic and social life, that's to say, he is successful in all these areas. All in

all, he has done more than what expected.

REFERENCES

- Altan, M. (2001). *Darbelerin Ekonomisi*, İstanbul: İyiyadam Yayıncılık.
- Armağan, M. (2009). *Korku Duvarını Yıkma*, İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Avcı, C. (2007). *İzmir Suikastı*, İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.
- Başkan, B. (2010). What made Atatürk's reforms possible? *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 21:2, 143-156, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09596411003619798>
- Çam, E. (1999). *Siyaset Bilimine Giriş* (6. Baskı), İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Çavdar, T. (2000) *Türkiye'nin Demokrasi Tarihi* (History of Democracy of Turkey), İmge Kitapevi, 2.Baskı, Ankara, pp.263.-269.
- Çiftçi, A. (2005) *Kâzım Karabekir'in Siyasal Hayatı*, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- İnsel, A. and Bayramoğlu, A. (2017). *Bir Zümre, Bir Parti Türkiye'de Ordu*, Birikim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kandemir, F. (2007). *Cumhuriyet Tarihinde Yakılan İlk Kitap*, İstanbul: Yağmur Yayınları.
- Karabekir, K. (2005). *Bir Düello Bir Suikast* (Yay. Haz.: Faruk özerengin), İstanbul: Emre Yayınları.
- Karabekir, K. (2008). *İstiklâl Harbimiz. C.I-II*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kocak, S. Ö. (2009). "Türkiye'de Yargının Örgütlenmesi ve Adalet Sisteminin Problemleri", *TBB Dergisi*, Sayı: 85, s. 403-413.
- Mahmut Esad Bey, (1926). "The Turkish Government's New Civil Code: Address by Mahmoud Essad Bey, Minister of Justice, on the Presentation of the New Turkish Code of Civil Law to Ismet Pasha, Prime Minister" *Current History* 24 (July 1926): 582.
- Mikail, E. H., & Karabulut, A. (2017). The Political Developments in Turkey during Atatürk's Period. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 7, 511-523. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2017.74040>
- Mumcu, U. (2006). *Kazım Karabekir Anlatıyor*, Uğur Mumcu Vakfi Yayinlari, Ankara.
- Mumcu, U. (2009). *Kâzım Karabekir Anlatıyor*, Uğur Mumcu Vakfi Yayinlari, Ankara.
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi (1976). Cilt 15, TBMM Matbaası, p. 128, Ankara.
- Turkish Grand National Assembly. (1925). TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi [Minutes of the Turkish Grand National Assembly], 25 February, Vol.14, session 4, pp.306-9.

- Turan, Ş. (2018). Failed Transition to Democracy in Egypt., Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Turkey.
- Yeşil, A. (2002). Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası'nın Siyasal Kimliği, Türkler Ansiklopedisi, Cilt 16, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, pp. 547, Ankara.
- Yeşil, A. (2002). Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası [Progressive Republican Party, Cedit Neşriyat, p.446. Ankara.
- Yüceer, S. (2002). Cumhuriyet Dönemi Çok partili Hayata Geçiş Sürecinde İlk Girişim: Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası, Türkler Ansiklopedisi, Cilt 16, yeni Türkiye Yayınları, p. 538, Ankara.
- Zguri, B. (2012). Challenges for democracy in countries affected by the Arab Spring. Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 417-434.