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Abstract

This article primarily focuses on the political life of Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, who had been renowned as an intellectual and academician in his very young ages. In this essay, his life has been examined in two phases in order to demonstrate a fuller picture of his role in the modern Turkish political history. In the first phase, he appeared rather as an intellectual and academician who has affiliations with nationalist movements and organizations at the time. During this time he seems not to have had a direct involvement in active politics, but usually kept the dialogue channels open with political elites of both the Second Constitutional Period and the Republican rule. In the second phase, Köprülü played a decisive role in Turkish politics, i.e., together with his fellows and allies, won a historical sliding political victory and transferred Turkey to a multi-party democratic regime, which eventually turned out to be the beginning of the personal tragedy of Köprülü.

This article aims to depict the political life of Mehmet Fuat Köprülü (or Köprülüzade Mehmet Fuat as before the Surname Law of 1934) mainly through the memoirs written by his contemporaries from various wings of the Turkish politics, ranging from his fellows and rivals in Democrat Party (hereafter DP) to his political opponents in Republican People’s Party (hereafter RPP). By doing so, this essay also expects to contribute to the history of Turkey’s transition from a single party rule to multiparty democratic regime after the collapse of Ottoman Empire and the emergence of Modern Turkey in the first half of the twentieth century.

It would not be wrong to say that the active political life of Fuat Köprülü began after the rise of an oppositional movement under the environment shaped by the post-World War II circumstances. Although he was first involved in politics upon the encouragement of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and became MP in 1935, his political life has remained low-profile until the mid 1940s.1 His active political life in fact took a start through the establishment of Democrat Party (Demokrat Parti). In the period before DP, he stood out as a scholar rather than a politician.

In the Second Constitutional Period, Köprülü met Ziya Gökalp, the founder of modern Turkish nationalism, and particularly after the Balkan Wars, supported the nationalist policies of the Committee of Union and Progress (Ittifak
Passive Politics: Köprüli as Professor

In an early date, Köprüli joined the academic ranks of the Ottoman University (Darülüşün) in Istanbul at the age of 23 as a result of his close relationship with Ziya Gökalp. During his teaching duty in the university since 1913, he has also followed closely some particular political developments at the time. Furthermore, he took part in the activities that CUP organized in Turkey as well as abroad during the Second Constitutional period. Especially after its leaders determined to promote “Turkist” policies, CUP began to approach to organizations such as Türk Ocağı, a popular nationalist society at the time, so as to benefit from the arguments and thoughts that many nationalist intellectuals as the members of the society including Fatin Köprüli declared in Türk Yurdu, the major periodical of the society. In course of time, this rapprochement between CUP and Türk Ocağı caused many intellectuals from the society to join the ranks of CUP as well as to be appointed to some state posts. 4 Apart from the relation through Türk Ocağı, for example, Köprüli worked as an editor in Hâk Gazetesi, a CUP owned newspaper, for a while in this period. 5

Some members of Türk Ocağı were also sent to neighbouring areas like Iran and the Caucasus and some countries in far east like Afghanistan, India and Turkistan in 1911 by the Ottoman Intelligent Service (Tecrület-i Mahsus), which was founded by Enver Paşa, in order to propagate Pan-Islamist and Pan-Turkist ideas. 6 Furthermore, Yusuf Akçura, Hüseyinzade Ali, Ahmed Ağaçgil, Halim Sabit and Fuad Köprüli were sent to different places in Europe for the same aim in 1918. 7 An archival document also clearly demonstrates that Köprüli was appointed to the Directorate of Eastern Matters (Ümumd-i Şarîhîye Müdâlibûlûgû) in relation to the Intelligence Service. 8 But it must be pointed out here that according to the information in this document, it is hard to claim he had a direct relation with the Intelligence Service. The correspondence between the Ministries of Education and Defence on his appointment suggests that his relation was rather indirect, but he was at least deliberately involved in propaganda activities of the Service.

As a professor and intellectual, Köprüli’s relation with the political establishment continued in the Republican period as well. He was usually among the names whom the new Republican rule consulted on its reform projects in the country. For example, Mustafa Kemal had meetings with the representatives of the press, university and army so as to measure the reaction to the secularizing reforms. In this vein, he met a group of academicians including Köprüli as the Dean of the Faculty of Literature, İsmail Hakkı Baltaçoğlu as the Rector of the Darüşşûlû, Tahsin Ayyıldız as the Dean of the Law Faculty and others in early 1924 when many radical reforms such as the unification of education (Tevhid-i Teşrihat Komisi) and the abolishment of the caliphate were undertaken. Likewise, Köprüli and his friends were frequently invited by Mustafa Kemal to his kiosk to talk about the methods and objectives to be adopted in the Turkish educational system in which radical secularizing projects were eventually carried out. 9

Following these meetings, Köprüli was appointed as the Undersecretary of Ministry of Education in 1924. He remained in this position for eight months. One of his important achievements during this period was the foundation of Türkîyat Enstitûsü (Institute of Turcic Studies). He also became the president of the institute that made substantial contribution to the field. In Türkîyat Mevzuatı, the periodical of the Institute, Köprüli published many articles such as “Lütfi Paşa” 10, “Meddalhâr” 11, “Oğuz Etnolojisi Dair Notlar” 12 and “Anadolu Boylukleri Tarihiine Ait Notlar”. 13 Another important aspect of the Institute was its role as a forum to bring together the Turkish intellectuals who migrated from Russia. Köprüli also played a role to introduce them to the intellectual circles in Turkey. 14

Another important development in which Köprüli was involved took place in the Faculty of Literature in Istanbul in 1922. In a lecture in the faculty, Riza Tefvik, a literature professor, was alleged of insulting Turks, saying that Fuzuli, an Ottoman poet of the 16th century, was not from Turkish origin. In reaction to his alleged thoughts, students decided to protest him and boycott all classes. In the meantime, they also prepared two declarations and presented them to the Council of Professors (Meclis-i Mektebîsin) of the Faculty, in which they complained not only from Riza Tefvik, but also other professors and instructors such as Ali Kemal, Cenab Şahabeddin, Hüseyin Daniş and Barsamyan Efendî. The students demanded that all these names should resign. 15 The Council, composed of İsmail Hakkı Bey, Mustafa Şekip, Yalıka Kemal, Cemil Bey, Macit Bey, Avram Galanti, Necmeddin Sadık Bey, Ahmed Naim Bey, Ahmed Refik, Köprülizade Fuad and some others, took the case seriously. After their final decision, Riza Tefvik and Hüseyin Daniş would resign, Barsamyan Efendî’s case be investigated. But Ali Kemal and Cenab Şahabeddin were cleared from the allegations by the Council. Disappointed by the decision, the rebel students attempted to find new allies from other faculties of Istanbul University. In the
meantime, the case began to appeal the interest of the Istanbul press and critical opinions increasingly appeared in the newspapers. The figure most criticized by the press was usually Köprülüzade Fund due to his supposed role and power in manipulating the Council.

Despite the boycott and protest, the rebels failed to achieve their aims. But they went further in protesting and threw eggs over the five professors as well as Köprülüzade Fund. After a couple of months, because it is understood that the students would not end the boycott, the university administration eventually found a solution so as to appease the students that all the accused professors were temporarily suspended from teaching.

Köprülü was also included in the religious reform projects proposed in the early Republican rule. To this aim, a special committee was formed in 1928 under the presidency of Köprülü. Following the formation, a controversial report that was attributed to the Committee was prepared. The report proposed major reforms in Islam such as some radical changes in the forms of daily rituals including replacing Arabic with Turkish as the ritual language. However, it appeared later that the report was, in fact, written by İsmail Hakkı Baktacılı, a member of the Committee, by his own as a draft so as to work on in the Committee. Köprülü tried to arrange a meeting to discuss the details of the report, but the Committee could not find a chance to talk about the report and eventually dissolved without reaching an agreement on the outline of reforming Islam.

Köprülü also appeared to be involved in the university reform of 1933. In the implementation of the reform project, the Minister of Education Reşit Galip was harshly criticized by many due to his uncooperative acts. This caused an opposition against him to occur in the academic circles under the leadership of Köprülü, whose opinions were overlooked by the minister. The opponents of the minister also reported the situation to Atatürk and lobbied for his discharge from the ministry. The opposition succeeded and consequently Reşit Galip was dismissed from the post. This generated two outcomes: First of all, after Reşit’s dismissal, the academicians had chance to make contributions to the process of university reform. Secondly, some lecturers of Istanbul University (called Davrümüz before the reform) who had resigned in order to protest the attitudes of Reşit Galip resumed to teach.

The First Turkish History Congress: Opposition of Köprülü Through Sources

The other major involvement of Köprülü in a heated political debate was his assessments of "the Turkish Historical Thesis (Türk Tarhi Tezi)", first proposed in the First Turkish History Congress. This thesis may be seen as the name of the Republican social project in which the Turkish society was attempted to be restructured around a new notion of nationalism. Having left the old imperial social form of multiple identity, the Republican elite aimed to turn the current society, which inherited an imperial legacy containing multiple identities, to a society possessing "a monolithic identity", a new concept of Turkish nationalism. In addition, the Republican elite apparently believed that Turkish nationalism was a crucial solution to the social, economical, political and cultural problems of Turkish society.

A historical thesis on the origin of Turks was formulated by some historians in order to support the nationalist aim of the new Republican rule. To this effect, Afet İnan, a young Republican historian, made a presentation in the First Turkish History Congress, arguing that the native public of Central Asia was Turks and the Aryans who emigrated to Europe were composed of Turks. This argument, as expected, caused some objections to raise. Köprülü also approached to the thesis very critically. His criticisms concentrated rather on the historical sources which were referred to in the formulation of the thesis. According to Köprülü, the existing studies on the Turkish history and the Central Asia made in the West were in introductory level because pre-historical, archaeological and anthropological studies on the region had recently begun and thus, the subject still required further researches.

In his assessment, Köprülü emphasized on some ambiguities in the field. For example, he said that the argument that Turkish was a member of Ural-Altaic linguistic stock was, in fact, still being disputed by the scholarly circles. Thus, this particular subject was not scientifically settled, and many more researches especially on the Altaic languages were required before making a final judgment.

Köprülü’s rather critical comments received some immediate reactions from the participants of the congress. But, in his responses to these reactions, Köprülü seems to have re-accorded his stand rather than to maintain his critical views towards the new thesis. He declared that his comments were misunderstood and he in fact supported the thesis.

Active Political Life: Transition to Multiparty System and Democrat Party

Soon after the Congress, Köprülü was appointed as MP of Kars province in 1935 by the encouragement of Atatürk. As such, according to his son, Orhan Köprülü, his political life from his entrance to the Parliament to the years of transition to democratic multi-party system was just in a formality. Entering politics relatively late has enabled him a good stand in the affairs and disputes which took place between RPP and DP. For instance, İnönü, the head of RPP after Atatürk, has contacted the leaders of DP either directly or -as seen in many cases- via Köprülü and it is obvious that İnönü’s this choice has something to do with his political background. The post-war conditions have led Turkey to adopt a policy as to take side with pro-democracy winners of the war. Accordingly, İnönü’s comments in the opening remarks to the Parliament on 1945 have given a huge encouragement to the movement of opposition which has just started to show off in
the parliament. On the other hand, the relations with the Soviets Union have been worsening as the northern neighbour of Turkey had refused to renew the 1925 Friendship Treaty in 1945. Furthermore, the collapse of one-party regimes in Italy and Germany, yet Turkey’s getting closer with the west after joining the United Nations have begun to shake the foundations of one-party regime within the country. For such reasons, one can argue, the future projection of the ruling political mind in Turkey has been shaped according to the policy of siding with the democracy front which has won the war.

Given the circumstances, the first opposition movement in the parliament has shown itself during the talks about the Law of Landing the Farmers and subsequently the budget debates. Five votes given against the government at the end of the hot debates on the budget of the Ministry of Commerce in May 1945 have been noted as the first signs of emerging opposition and one of those who voted against was Fuat Köprülü. His name was also mentioned among the seven votes casted against the government in the vote of confidence following the budget debates. In June of the same year, a memorandum, known in the history as “The Memorandum of the Four” (Dörtlü Takdir), was presented to the party’s parliamentary group to demand the full implementation of the constitutional principal of “national sovereignty” and the party affairs to be run according to the democratic principles. Those proposed this memorandum were not among the culprits Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes, Fuat Köprülü and Refik Koraltan, who would found the Democrat Party in the future. The idea of giving the said memorandum to the parliamentary group had come from Fuat Köprülü along with Adnan Menderes. Following this incident, Köprülü began with his discourse of opposition especially in daily Vatan, owned by Ahmet Emin Yalman. His first article was penned down in response to a review of Falih Rifki Atay published in daily Ulus. A few months later after “The Memorandum of the Four” (Dörtlü Takdir) was refused in 12 June 1945, Fuat Köprülü and Adnan Menderes were expelled from the party following the negotiations in the RPP’s parliamentary group, because their oppositional discourse they carried out in the newspaper articles were regarded vitiating the party discipline. Upon this decision, Bayar decided to resign from his parliamentary position. After a while, Refik Koraltan has also been ousted from the party. In September, these memorandum-giving four have gathered to start off a work to prepare a new party constitution. At the beginning, another ousted member of RPP, Ahmet Hamdli Bayar has taken part in the preparations of the constitution, however the said person has later been estranged from this work as Adnan Menderes and especially Fuat Köprülü could not accord with him.

After the completion of the program and the constitution, Democrat Party was formed on 7 January 1946 by the initiatives of the four founders. Thereafter, Köprülü as the founder has started his struggle for democracy. Considering that he was a professor who has acquired a well-recognition among the Western Turkologists in his young ages and who has earned honorary doctorates from many repudiated foreign universities, it is clear that his support to DP would bring a noticeable public attention. Another characteristic of Köprülü as a scholar which made him a unique figure in the Turkish politics at the time was his emphasis on social and cultural traditions of Turkish society. For example, it was Fuat Köprülü who first expressed the idea of returning the Emon (the Islamic call to prayer) to its original Arabic form just before the 1946 elections. This certainly provided a good opportunity for DP to develop a warm touch so as to communicate with the masses because disinterest of one-party elites in religious issues had caused a visible opposition to RPP in the society. In those years, the first complaints the RPP deputies have been facing in their visits to their constituencies were usually of the religious concerns. It is therefore not wrong to suggest that Köprülü has extended the methodology he followed in his academic path to the sphere of politics. Furthermore, Köprülü became the ideologue/theorician of DP because the party needed an intellectual support in the country and abroad and Köprülü was the person who would form and defend the ideological frame of the party before the public. Owing to his international reputation, he would also acquire respect to the party in its cause of democracy.

Köprülü has also held some administrative positions within the party. He has served both as a member of General Executive Committee (GEC) and the head of the DP Parliamentary Group (PG). This situation would bring about serious problems later in internal party relations. An opposition group to emerge within the party on the way to the power would attempt to speak up his concerns against GEC through Köprülü.

Inner-party Struggle: the New and the Old

The Freedom Pact (Hürriyat Mısch), agreed on in the first Great Congress of DP held in early 1947, has fuelled the tension both in inner-party struggle and the national politics. The contest among the candidates for GEC in the first year of the party has signalled the future in-party conflicts on the party’s journey towards the power. One the one hand, Menderes and Köprülü were in favour of a 9-member committee, whereas the rivals were pressing for a more sizeable committee with more members, in the hope that it would diminish the influence of the Menderes-Köprülü duo among the founders. The Freedom Pact, approved by the Commission of the Principal Issues (Atas Davalar Komisyonu) in the Congress, has opened door for new and rethinking conflicts, as it led the relations of DP with RPP to a new direction. The Freedom Pact was granting a authority to GEC to decide about resigning fully from the parliament. With this covenant, the struggle between the two parties has become hardened. After a while, an official visit of a parliamentary delegation consisting of both party members has given a kick to the opposition within party. A delegation from the parliament including Enis Akaygen and Fuat Köprülü alongside some Republican MPs has made a visit to England. During this visit, a ground for dialogue based on mutual good-intention was
established between Köprülü and Nihat Erim. They have exchanged their views on democracy and agreed on a common point in terms of relations between the two parties. According to a narrative, during this visit, Köprülü told Erim that “no one can be the president as long as Ismet Pasha was alive”. Upon their return, Erim arranged a private meeting between Köprülü and İnönü. In fact, İnönü was very successfully leading all the manoeuvres required in order to manipulate all the cliques both within DP and RPP in line with his expectations. He has especially contacted with the Menderes-Köprülü group among the founders through Nihat Erim after the London visit. On the other hand, in various occasions, Köprülü has continued conveying the same message onto the leading figures of RPP about the presidency of İnönü which he had mentioned to Erim during London visit.

During the period when DP was in opposition, İnönü seemed to observe a policy to hold with the cliques composed of the young RPP and DP, and the young group in DP was led by Köprülü-Menderes. He has supported such initiatives in order to secure the relationships taking place between these two groups in highest levels. It was therefore hoped that the new multi-party regime could only be risen up on strong pillars that way. In the pursuit of this policy, it is also possible to see how a veteran hardboiled politician was foreseeing, reconstructing and manifesting the political setting in his mind. For example, İnönü was closely following the interest of his old political associates in the new opposition party. The role and place that Ali Fuat Cebesoy and Rauf Orbay sought to hold in the new party and particularly that of Maresal Fevzi Çakmak were one of the primary issues that İnönü was very carefully watching. He was protecting himself from possible political coups against himself by holding with the young groups within both parties. İnönü’s another immediate awareness was the public reaction toward the new political situation after the foundation of DP. Even as early as 1947, both Erim and İnönü believed that it was nearly impossible for RPP to win the next elections. Therefore, the rivalry between the old and the new in DP holds significance in that regard. Any internal opposition to appear in DP would also mean weakening of the opposition party that was rapidly getting more power against the ruling party. Therefore, the relationship that İnönü was trying to establish with the young wing of DP through Köprülü might be seen as an attempt to survive and secure his own power as the president.

Such rumours about Köprülü’s touch with İnönü and Erim have caused a stir in the party and resulted in the rise of the opposition’s voice, led by Kenan Öner, the head of DP’s Istanbul branch. In fact, Bayar was also uneasy about Köprülü’s contact with Erim. Kenan Öner has accused Köprülü of collusion with RPP especially after the Twelfth of July Declaration (12 Temmuz Beyannamesi). In fact, Kenan Öner had never got along with Köprülü since the foundation of the party because he was not pleased at all by Köprülü’s attempt and challenge to control the Istanbul office of the party. Öner was perceiving Köprülü’s efforts to place his men in the party as a plot against himself. This rivalry has resulted in the resignation of Öner at the end. However, in-party opposition was just to re-emerge in another way, again as a reaction to Köprülü’s activities.

A group composed of some members of GEC as well as some MPs invited Bayar to the house of Ahmet Tahtacıoğlu in order to talk about their demand for Köprülü’s resignation because they were disappointed by his poor performance as the head of Democrat PG and the recent developments in which Köprülü was directly involved. In the meeting, they openly expressed their apprehensions over the contact of some founders of DP, particularly Köprülü, with İsmet İnönü and Nihat Erim as this endangered the position of DP in public opinion. They also mentioned Köprülü’s role in Kenan Öner case. After long negotiations with Bayar, Köprülü’s resignation came out as the best solution. However, there were also some members of GEC such as Refik İnce and Fevzi Gülbahar Karaosmanoğlu who sided with Köprülü because they believed that the anti-Köprülü wing aimed ultimately to control the whole party through a campaign against Köprülü. They shared their thought on Köprülü’s case with Bayar so as to convince him on a conspiracy set up by the anti-Köprülü group. But Bayar appeared to be determined on the idea of Köprülü’s resign since he was also much disturbed by Köprülü’s contact with the Republicans. This meant that Bayar did not support the founders, but the opposition.

The demand for Köprülü’s resignation by the oppositional group triggered many hidden controversies within DP including the one among the members of GEC. A group of GEC members composed of Köprülü, Menderes, Koraltan, Karaosmanoğlu, Samet Ağaoglu and Refik İnce prepared an ultimatum to give Bayar, demanding him to make a choice between them and the oppositional group.

Menderes and Köprülü in solidarity warned off the threat towards Köprülü’s position in DP, crushing the opposition and Bayar who was also allied with the oppositional wing. For example, as a result of Menderes-Köprülü’s manoeuvre, Bayar have to resign from his administrative post in the Democrat PG that he came to by the support of the oppositional group. However, an annoying news from Istanbul made the whole situation more complicated: Kenan Öner, the former head of Istanbul branch of DP, was trying to establish a new party.

In the meantime, Tahtacıoğlu, Ahmet Oğuz and Hasan Dincer who were all from the oppositional wing offered Bayar to return his former post. Bayar appeared to approach to this offer positively. After a while, Bayar became the head of the Democrat PG. But this development obviously ruled out the earlier success of Menderes-Köprülü and caused the Menderes-Köprülü wing to move more severely. Due to seriousness of the situation, pro-Menderes-Köprülü members of GEC came together in the house of Köprülü and adopted a new strategy to follow against Bayar. They decided to bring to an end and discuss in GEC all allegations directed to them in PG. Therefore, they would have a chance to answer the questions. They also wanted to bring into discussion everything on which nothing had been talked
before. To put the opposition on the spot, Koptulu also decided officially to apply to GEC in order to force the oppositional members of GEC to declare whether they were supporting the fundamental party policies, or not. The application of Koptulu was formally accepted by GEC and consequently opponent MPs began to be sacked from the party one by one. Displeased by this incident, six opponent members of GEC resigned. The remaining members of GEC took further steps after the resignations by transferring the resigners to the disciplinary commission of the party for their dismissal. The all resigners was discharged from the party. These latest incidents politically agitated the party. At the end of the day, almost a half of the Democrat MPs were ousted during this crisis.

It is noteworthy in this crisis that Celal Bayar made efforts to mediate between the two rival groups in order to avoid possible harms to the party. He tried hard to bring the party to the 1950 elections without a crisis of confidence in public opinion on the party. To this effect, he seems to have risked Koptulu in his conflict with PG. Even in the mind of Bayar, Koptulu was not right in his quarrel with Kenan Oner. Bayar thought that Koptulu's contact with RPP caused an idea of collusion between the two parties to rise in public opinion. In his opinion, if such an idea affected the provincial branches of the party it would be extremely harmful. In the meantime, to avoid the rise of such an idea, the party administration immediately took some measures to increase rivalry between the two parties. One of the measures was to urge Democrat MPs to make speeches against RPP particularly in the parliament and to travel provincial areas so as to talk about the faults and failures of RPP. In such travels, Bayar never allowed Koptulu to accompany himself because Bayar was afraid of spreading the idea of collusion through Koptulu's existence in public occasions. Additionally, Bayar also tried to place his men in the administrative posts of the Istanbul branch after the resignation of Kenan Oner. By doing so, he aimed to balance the power of Koptulu in Istanbul, who also struggled to keep the Istanbul branch under his control.

In every occasion in which Koptulu was involved, Bayar found Menderes standing against himself. The duo of Menderes and Koptulu as the party founders always acted together to balance the power of Bayar in the party. In the domestic power struggles, it was always Menderes who backed Koptulu and protected him from Bayar's attacks. However, there were also other factors that avoided Bayar from taking harsh steps in his struggle against Koptulu such as his intellectual capacity with which he masterfully defended the party policies in front of public through his articles that appeared in the press.

This crisis eventually built up a new power balance within DP. In this new phase, while Bayar constituted one wing alone, the other wing was composed of the alliance of Menderes and Koptulu. The other members of GEC selected their side according to their personal priorities. Interestingly, Inonu also made his own calculations on this power balance among the founders of DP. He tried to find out the ways in order to support the anti-Bayar wing through some names.

The impact of the struggle between the two sides was first seen during the elections in Istanbul branch of the party. From the beginning, Fuat Koptulu had personally dealt with the establishment of the Istanbul branch. It might be thought that his career background in Istanbul and his contacts with the elite in the city played a role in forcing him actively to get involved with the branch. He was always determined to place his men in the administration of the branch. But there was a hard struggle on controlling the branch between the wings. For example, a group of people predominantly from Black Sea region (Karadenizli) was supported by Koptulu and they became highly efficient in the administration of the branch. This inevitably generated some reactions towards the Koptulu-Menderes alliance. Kenan Oner, for instance, was disturbed by the increasing influence of Koptulu in Istanbul through this Karadenizli group.

In the regional congress of the Istanbul branch in 1948, Menderes and Koptulu supported Muharrem Sarol, a person whom Kenan Oner never liked and even considered him as the secret agent of Menderes and Koptulu. Nevertheless, Koptulu and Sarol were to fall apart during the years when DP was in power. It is even reported that Sarol threatened to shoot Koptulu. The fight between these two continued further and Koptulu made a plan against Sarol in the disciplinary committee of DP after the foundation of the fourth Menderes government.

After this domestic crisis of DP, Bayar realized that he should have taken the control of the regional branches of the party. While the Second Great Congress of DP was approaching, Bayar had already begun to work to this aim. For instance, in Istanbul he openly opposed to Sarol even though the latter was backed by Menderes and Koptulu. The struggle among the founders on the control of the regional branches resulted in the victory of Bayar over the alliance of Menderes-Koptulu.

The Reign of Democrat Party: The Beginning of the End
When Democrat Party came to power, Koptulu was appointed as Foreign Minister. It is to be pointed out that, from the beginning, he was expecting to be prime minister. He was disappointed when Menderes was chosen as the Prime Minister by Celal Bayar. Due to this unexpected development, Koptulu was always angry with Bayar on his preference. Koptulu is quoted, saying to Ahmet Emin Yalman, a popular journalist at the time, that: "I am a scholar. I don't have an ambition to be appointed to any post; however, it would have been the best if I had been appointed as Prime Minister for a while. This would give me a chance to prepare Menderes for this post after me. In as much as they only gave me the post of foreign ministry, they should also have made me the leader of the party."
The point considered by Köprülü as zenith was, in fact, the beginning of the end. The solidarity and mutual support among the founders of the party were soon replaced by conflict of opinion. In any occasion, Menderes was the constant supporter of Köprülü. They reacted together against the internal opposition in the party. Even the conflict of opinion occurred among the founders of the party, as it was the case in the incident of Kemal Öner, could not end the unity between the two. In one occasion, Agaoglu is quoted describing Menderes as a man appreciating the qualities of Köprülü and constantly supporting him. Menderes saw Köprülü as his best ally. Furthermore, the latter’s profound knowledge of history as well as his international fame were the other reasons of Menderes’ support. Menderes used, in a way, Köprülü as a means in the elimination of his ambitious rivals.  

Shortly after DP came to power, the nature of relationship between the party founders considerably changed, and consequently a new balance of power occurred within DP. Menderes was no longer constant supporter of Köprülü. For example, Menderes thought that the Foreign Ministry was not undertaking its duty properly. In 1953, when Egypt demanded British to leave the Suez Canal, the policy pursued by Köprülü was criticized both by Menderes and the President Bayar; especially Menderes accused the Foreign Ministry of not formulating an effective policy on the issue. In his view, the Ministry was mistaken and inadequate in its conduct of the affair. Furthermore, according to Menderes and Bayar, it was Köprülü who was solely responsible for this situation.  

A similar incident happened in President Bayar’s visit to America. The text of the speech to be made by Bayar in America was not well prepared, and read in front of the cabinet before reaching the President. Although the accused was the Foreign Ministry, the criticisms were also openly levelled against Köprülü. President Bayar was also unhappy with the activities of the Foreign Ministry. After the overthrow of the king in Egypt in 1954, the existing Turkish ambassador to Cairo was still kept in office. For Bayar, the problem was the lack of foresight in the Turkish Foreign Ministry. Bayar himself particularly requested the Ministry to replace immediately the existing ambassador. However, the Egyptian government deported the Turkish ambassador before the Turkish Foreign Ministry acted. This again caused harsh criticisms to level against Köprülü. Fevzi Lütfi Karaosmanoğlu, a Democrat MP, even wanted Köprülü to resign for his failure.  

These and similar incidents were considered as evidence of the fact that there were some undeniable conflict of opinion among the founders of the party. Complaints about Köprülü increased especially after the formation of the fourth cabinet because he openly criticised some activities of the Democrat government where he also took part. This made the people around him including Prime Minister Menderes to treat Köprülü harshly.  

Fuat Köprülü was appointed as the state secretary in April 1955 and the deputy prime minister in July 1955. But he was returned to the post of foreign secretary at the end of the same year. These changes were an open sign of controversies among the founders and the controversies noticeably increased in 1956. The Prime Minister made some changes in economic and financial policies of the government and revealed them through Anadolu Agency, the official press agency. However, some newspapers such as Cumhuriyet and Dündar wrote a news implying that these changes were dicussed on the prime minister by Köprülü and Nedim Ökmen, and this news was disclaimed neither by Köprülü nor Ökmen. In the same year, another crisis went off in Istanbul branch. Sarol had to rival against Orhan Köprülü, the son of Fuat Köprülü, for the presidency of the branch. But the junior Köprülü eventually stepped back from the rivalry. After a while, this was followed by another relinquishment: Fuat Köprülü resigned from the foreign ministry. The case of Köprülü ended up with his full resignation from DP after almost a year.  

In the 1957 general elections, Köprülü did not support DP, but the oppositional Freedom Party (Hürriyet Partisi). He also returned to his academic studies. He went to Harvard University as a visiting scholar in 1958 and stayed there until the mid 1959. He was arrested by the military regime after the 1960 coup d’etat over his alleged connection to the 6-7 September incidents. However, he was acquitted after a four-month trial. During his trial, a group of American academicians wrote to the National Unity Committee (Millî Birlik Komitesi), the top military authority then, stating the eminence of Köprülü as a scholar and his personal role to integrate Turkey to NATO, and demanded a fair trial.  

After the military rule ended, Köprülü remained in active politics for a limited period. He founded Free Democrat Party (Hür Demokrat Partisi) in 1961. He tried to present this party as the continuation of DP which had been closed down by the military rule, and expected to appeal huge public support. But he apparently failed. In the meantime, he was always disturbed by the politic extensions of the military rule because of the word “Democrat” in the name of his new party. Furthermore, the Chief Prosecutor attempted to make a case so as to outlaw his party in 1962. But Köprülü soon realized that it was not possible to carry on under the current circumstances and closed down his party. He also allowed Justice Party (Adilet Partisi), which was to be a main actor in the Turkish politics until another coup d’etat in 1980, to borrow the symbol of his party, the gray horse.  

Köprülü had a traffic accident in Ankara and could never recover from the heavy injuries. After a long period of illness, he passed away on 28 June 1966 in Istanbul.  

Conclusion  
Köprülü usually got involved in politics rather as a scholar since the Second Constitutional period until 1935 when he became MP first time whereas his earlier attempt to be elected as MP failed during the CPU governments.
Köprülü became MP from Karşı in 1935 upon the invitation of Atatürk. But the first decade of his political life was a silent period. Within the new circumstances of the post-WW II period, Köprülü emerged a new and active political figure in the Turkish politics. The oppositional group in RPP came to surface in 1945 and then DP was founded by the same group in 1946. In this new oppositional party, Köprülü was a member of the leading group.

From very early of his career, Köprülü appears to have had political expectations. But he could not get a chance to meet his political expectations until the establishment of Democrat Party in 1946. Although Köprülü became a highly reputed scholar and intellectual, he never appears to have had satisfaction in political realm. During the early Republican period, he developed a complex attitude towards the new regime. Köprülü never indicated a direct opposition to ideological foundations, policies and applications of the Republican rule, but also never supported all of them enthusiastically. He seems to have adopted a balanced and cautious position. The project of DP apparently provided him the opportunity, which he had been looking forward, so as to acquire his political expectations.

As a founder of DP, Köprülü played a crucial role in transmission to the multiparty system in the mid-twentieth century. His intellectual identity proved very beneficial for DP because his writings during his Democrat years made fundamental contribution to the formulation of the ideological basis of DP.

Köprülü's happy years in DP did not last long. He developed good relations with Menderes and also made alliance with him against Bayraktar in the domestic power struggle in the party during the opposition years. However, after DP came to power, Köprülü kept in the background of Menderes and Bayraktar. He and Menderes were not best friends anymore. But he did not fight Menderes and left DP. He remained politically passive for a while and returned to his academic studies. However, all these did not mean he gave up all of his political expectations as seen soon after the 1960 coup d’état. Köprülü made a last attempt to excite the masses, but failed eventually.

Köprülü's personality and political activities were of a fundamental importance in terms of the rise of multi-party system in modern Turkey in spite of the failure in achieving his personal political expectations. He passed away in 1966 as a "lonely man".
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Book Review


Hilmi Yavuz has appeared before the readers with a brand new work soon after his previous book titled as The History of Islam's Mind: The History of Turkey's Mind - An Embracing Discourse on Turkish Culture.

In his work The History of Islam's Mind, Yavuz puts his views forward boldly on various issues such as philosophy, Islamic theology, politics and society which have been debated for centuries and even today while at the same time he offers not only challenging but also quite unfamiliar proposals on several matters concerning the whole Islamic world and Muslim society. Hilmi Yavuz comes to the conclusion that current events have no daily activity plans and on the contrary they take their places in our minds as the outcomes of an ancient process and that so long as the arguments against their claims are reasonable and logical, only then can these issues be reopened to discussion. As a matter of fact, this assertion can be taken as an open-ended challenge as well.

Soon after the release of The History of Islam's Mind, Hilmi Yavuz published The History of Turkey's Mind. Within the canon of this first work with a larger framework compromising the context of a structure, in the second work the topics that are once again related to the mental history of Turkey are built upon private therefore in-depth foundations to enable a discussion atmosphere. At this point the privacy we have mentioned does not mean a restriction on the author's world of idea. What we try to mean is that the Ottoman which is an indispensable part of the wide pan he exhibited in his previous work and the cultural structure it shaped have been discussed in this work. That is because if there really exists an Islamic world and a Muslim community, it is impossible to keep Ottomans apart from any events to take place in this atmosphere.

The History of Turkey's Mind consists of three parts; "The History of Ottomans' Mind", "Cultural Identity" and "Democracy". The first part "The History of Ottomans' Mind" deals with issues many modern intellectuals insist on denying even today and even more impose their own unjust perception world and therefore turn them into a jigsaw puzzle and this work presents a collection of