

EDITOR'S NOTE

The year 1993 also marks the 70th anniversary of the Lausanne Peace Treaty, which certified the victory won by the Turks in their War of National Liberation (1919-1922). It is also the basic international document which stands as the foundation of our Republican foreign policy. Consequently, much of this issue is devoted to this momentous event, in the form of a collection of articles sent from abroad for this purpose.

Signed some seven decades ago, on July 24, 1923, the Lausanne Peace Treaty is the only post-First World War agreement ending the armed hostilities, and proving to be durable. It is still in force. It is the only post-war peace treaty that reversed the notorious Sèvres settlement (1920). All others, i. e., the treaties of Versailles (with Germany), St. Germain (Austria), Neuilly (Bulgaria), and Trianon (Hungary), were imposed on the defeated parties by the victors. Turkey was the only country to replace a humiliating treaty with a favourable one.

The Turks proved at Lausanne that they were the new victors. They were the first of the formerly defeated Central Powers to be in a position to re-negotiate a new peace and overturn the Sèvres settlement. The Turkish victory brought down Lloyd George in Britain. Lord Curzon was out to restore the lost prestige of his country. İsmet Pasha (later İnönü), selected to lead the Turkish delegation to Lausanne on the basis of his competence at the previous Mudanya Conference, exasperated Curzon and the so-called "united front" between Britain, France and Italy with his "war of attrition". While some of his adversaries criticized him for his "obstinacy", some other contemporary analysts describe him as the best negotiator in the history of diplomacy.

In the final analysis, there were only two parties at Lausanne: the Turks and the rest. What İsmet Pasha uttered on the first day he repeated throughout, and stated the same at the every end: "full independence". This formulation in itself was a revolution of the day. The whole of Africa, except Ethiopia, and almost the whole of the Orient, including India, were in chains. But Lord Curzon, who poured his eloquent rhetoric on İsmet Pasha, saw him totally unmoved. What the Turks expected from the conference on matters such as Turkish finances, justice, capitulations, minorities and the like was nothing more than the confirmation of what they had already gained. As the great Mustafa Kemâl later noted, centuries-old accounts were being settled in Lausanne. This was not a simple task. The Turks had attained their full sovereignty, which was in the hands of the nation. The debates at the Turkish Grand National Assembly were proof of parliamentary supremacy, even above the able, popular and charismatic Mustafa Kemâl.

The Lausanne Conference recessed after months of stalemate. When İsmet returned to Lausanne, Curzon had disappeared, replaced by the moderate Rumbold. Imperialism had to cope with the loss of the old Ottoman market. The treaty was signed at the end of the second part of the meetings. The territorial integrity of new Turkey was confirmed, with the exception of Mosul. It was still under British occupation mainly on account of its oil deposits. The Turkish Straits were demilitarized, the Ankara government gaining full control in 1936, in a peaceful manner, following the Montreux Convention.

The Lausanne Peace Treaty also regulated Turkish-Greek relations. The rejection of the rights of the Muslim Turkish minority in Western Thrace, the militarization of the Greek islands very close to the Turkish coast, or the various former attempts to unite Cyprus with Greece threaten to disturb the delicate equilibrium set up in Lausanne. Depriving the Turkish minority in Western Thrace of its rights violates the treaty in question. The same treaty restricts even the number of the gendarmerie and the civilian militia on the Greek islands near the Turkish coast. The Turkish intervention in northern Cyprus, on the basis of the existing agreements between Britain, Greece and Turkey, occurred because the desire to unite the whole of the island with mainland Greece after the notorious Sampson coup upset the Lausanne balance.

Among the articles on the Lausanne convention, Michael Dockrill writes in this issue of the *Yearbook* on the role of Britain, the only ex-enemy state to be treated as an equal in any of the peace negotiations. Bruce R. Kuniholm presents observations comparing the problems in the international arena unresolved after the First World War and the post-Cold War settlement that much of the world is still trying to sort out. John M. Vander Lippe examines the fate of the "other" Treaty of Lausanne, meant to establish diplomatic and commercial relations between the United States and the new Turkish Government in Ankara. The treaty, causing official and public controversy delaying its ratification, resulted in its rejection in 1927, but the U.S. Senate accepted another, virtually identical treaty in 1930. Dealing with Italy's role in Lausanne, Maria Antonia di Casola records, on the basis of mainly Italian diplomatic documents, the benevolent Turkish attitude towards Italy as much as Rome's interest in the status of the Dodecanese. Keith Jeffrey and Alan Sharp bring to the attention of the readers the British ability to intercept and read some of the Turkish military and diplomatic signals traffic, the fruits of the modern British intelligence establishment created during the war. With some remarks on the part intelligence activities play in the policy-making process, Bülent Gökay focusses on a certain Colonel Alfred Rawlinson, described by some contemporaries as a "gentleman adventurer", who first came to the Caucasus and then passed on to Erzurum, and finally imprisoned there to be released in late 1921. Mahmut Bali Aykan, who offers us a topic different from the mainstream, analyzes the intensification of Turkey's relations with the Organization of Islamic Conference.

This issue of the **Yearbook** starts a new section entitled "Chronicle", in which I present summaries of two international conferences, one held in Geneva on the occasion of the approaching 50th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, and the other taking place in New Delhi to assess the consequences of the growth of terrorism, the scourge of our century. The former, critical of the so-called "New World Order" as enunciated by President George Bush, makes various structural and other suggestions to help create an international democracy. The latter underlines the significance of rising terrorist activities, especially on the part of armed groups presumably acting on behalf of certain minorities, and reminds that solutions should be sought within the frontiers of the existing states.

This **Yearbook** also prints four resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, taken in the year 1993 all of which note with alarm the invasions of Azerbaijani territory by Armenian forces, condemn such aggressions and demand immediate Armenian withdrawal from all occupied Azerbaijani lands. Resolution 822 (1993) specifically refers to the invasion of the Kelbadjar district, Resolution 853 (1993) does the same for the seizure of Agdam, and Resolution 884 (1993) mentions the occupation of the Zangelan district and the city of Goradiz. Resolution 874 (1993), like all the three other resolutions, reaffirms the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the Azerbaijani Republic, expresses grave concern at the displacement of large numbers of civilians in the Republic of Azerbaijan, and maintains the conviction that the question should be settled through peaceful negotiations. All four resolutions call for the withdrawal of forces from occupied territories and announce that the U.N. Security Council remains actively seized of the matter. Although these recurring resolutions within one year put the fact of Armenian aggression and occupation beyond any doubt, both acts, contrary to international law, continue.

The Book Reviews section presents twelve books, eleven evaluations made by me, and one by Viktor Çikaidze. The latter is a Georgian Turcologist who chose to write in Turkish. The **Yearbook** ends with a Chronology and a Bibliography for the year 1993.

T.A.