

# Examining the Claims about the Relationship Between the Holocaust, and the Armenian Deportation

## Holokost ile Ermeni Tehciri Arasındaki İlişki Hakkında İddialarının İncelenmesi

Murat KÖYLÜ



Vocational School of Çağ University Mersin,  
Türkiye



Geliş Tarihi/Received 25.08.2024  
Kabul Tarihi/Accepted 19.11.2024  
Yayın Tarihi/Publication 05.12.2024

Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding author:  
Murat KÖYLÜ  
muratkoylu@cag.edu.tr

Cite this article: Köylü, M. (2024). Examining the Claims about the Relationship Between the Holocaust, and the Armenian Deportation. *Journal of Atatürk*, 13(2), 48-60.

Atif: Köylü, M. (2024). Holokost ile Ermeni Tehciri Arasındaki İlişki Hakkında İddialarının İncelenmesi. *Atatürk Dergisi*, 13(2), 48-60.

### ABSTRACT

It has been debated whether Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was taken as a role model in the reconstruction process of Germany under the leadership of Adolf Hitler, which lost the First World War and tried to be destroyed by the heavy economic sanctions of the Treaty of Versailles. Immediately after Stefan Ihrig, who is at the center of these debates and who received his Ph.D. degree in 2014 for his doctoral dissertation "Nazi Perceptions of the New Turkey, 1919-1945", published his dissertation as a book titled "Atatürk in the Nazi Imagination" by Harvard University Press, columnists of some newspapers published in Turkey, criticized Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who was founded in the 1920s and came to power from 1933 until the end of World War II. The book began to focus on how Atatürk and the newly established Turkish Republic were portrayed in the newspapers and speeches of politicians close to the Nazi Party, which was founded in the 1920s and remained in power from 1933 until the end of World War II. In particular, the book attempted to establish a similarity between the Armenian deportation and the Holocaust, and in order to strengthen the "so-called Armenian Genocide" allegations, some media outlets supporting the Armenian allegations began to support the book. The aim of this study is to discuss the claims of Stefan Ihrig, who tries to establish similarities between the "so-called Armenian Genocide" and the "holocaust", between Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who fought the holiest struggle in world history for the construction of a modern nation together with the Turkish Nation, and Hitler and the Nazis, who committed the greatest genocide in world history.

**Keyword:** Holokost, Atatürk, Hitler, Ermeni Tehciri

### Öz

Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nı kaybeden ve Versay Antlaşması'nın ağır ekonomik yaptırımlarıyla yok edilmeye çalışılan Almanya'nın, Adolf Hitler liderliğindeki yeniden inşa sürecinde Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün rol model olarak alınıp alınmadığı tartışılmaktadır. Bu tartışmaların odağında olan ve 2014 yılında "Nazi Perceptions of the New Turkey, 1919-1945" adlı doktora teziyle Ph.D. unvanı alan Stefan Ihrig'in tezi, "Atatürk in the Nazi Imagination" adıyla Kitap olarak Harvard University Press tarafından yayımlandıktan hemen sonra Türkiye'de yayınlanan bazı gazetelerin köşe yazarları, 1920'lerde kurulan ve 1933'ten başlayarak II. Dünya Savaşı'nın sonuna kadar iktidarda kalan Nazi Partisi'ne yakın gazetelerinde ve partideki siyasetçilerin konuşmalarında, Atatürk'ün ve yeni kurulan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin nasıl resmedildiğine odaklandığı anlatılmaya başlandı. Özellikle Ermeni tehciri ile Holokost arasında benzerlik kurulmaya çalışılan kitap, "Sözde Ermeni Soykırımı" iddialarını güçlendirmek için Ermeni iddialarını destekleyen bazı basın yayın organlarını da sahiplenerek desteklenmeye başlanmıştır. Çalışmanın amacı, dünya tarihine modern bir ulus inşası için tarihin gördüğü en kutsal mücadeleyi Türk Milleti ile birlikte veren Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk ile yine dünya tarihinin en büyük soykırımını gerçekleştiren Hitler ve Nazileri, "Sözde Ermeni Soykırımı" ile "Holokost" arasında benzerlikler kurmaya çalışan Stefan Ihrig'in iddialarını tartışmaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Holokost, Atatürk, Hitler, Ermeni Tehciri



Content of this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

## Introduction

The First World War was one of the greatest disasters the world had ever seen, characterized not by its causes but by its consequences. The victors usurped the sovereignty, future, and territorial integrity of the vanquished through colonialist and economic agreements signed at the end of the war, signaling a new struggle for the vanquished. The Mudros Armistice signed by the rulers of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the First World War showed that the future of the Turkish Nation, which was left at the mercy of the victorious states, was dragged into great poverty, and uncertainty.

On the other hand, the Treaty of Versailles, signed by Germany at the end of the war and described by Adolf Hitler as “an instrument of immeasurable cruelty, oppression and shameful infamy (Hitler, 2017, p. 645)”; “... in the hands of a wise government that wanted to take advantage of it, it could serve as a whip to arouse the reactions of the nation... (Hitler, 2017, p. 645)” he sees it as a triggering tool to mobilize the German people.

In his book *Mein Kampf*, written in 1923, Hitler mentions three dangers and areas of struggle that threaten the future of the German people. The first of these is the Treaty of Versailles. The Treaty states that with the destruction of the German Army, the security of the German people has disappeared. He states that in order for Germany to regain its former power, it must fight with a strong military presence. The second is the “German Jews”, which he defines as the internal enemy that he thinks is destroying the German economy, and finally the destruction caused by Bolshevism. He expressed his thoughts on this issue as follows:

*“At Versailles, the vile desires and anger of the international thieves were directed primarily against the old German army. Technically, we cannot make any preparations and we cannot get stronger until the Jewish group has been purged. Millions of people will come to us as if they had not been defeated until they have been fought, and the Marxist idea, which creates enmity in their hearts and minds, has been uprooted (Hitler, 2017, p. 645).”*

Atatürk believed that the future and independence of the homeland would be fully ensured not only by ending the occupations, but also by the establishment of a new Turkish state ‘based on national sovereignty, unconditional and independent’ (Atatürk, 2007, p. 33). This could only be possible by following a peaceful policy both at home and in the world by reaching the civilization reached by the victorious states through revolutions and even beyond, and by ensuring full independence.

Hitler would pursue a policy built on a “sense of revenge”. He believed that victory could be achieved through a rule similar to the “blood and iron” policy of Otto von Bismark, the founding chancellor of German unity. In order to achieve this, he believed that he could achieve a solution by first settling accounts with a disciplined, strong military organization that could represent the German race, first with internal enemies (communists and Jews) and then with other European states, especially France, which had left Germany to poverty with the Versailles Treaty. In order to achieve his goal, he thought that it could be achieved through an autocratic understanding of government that required strict discipline, and obedience, which was established by Benitto Mussolini (Ortaylı, 2019, p. 5-6), who came to power in Italy in the early 1920s and called it “fascism”.

However, the idea that the two historical leaders applied different methods in solving similar problems for their countries has evolved in a different direction with a doctoral dissertation published in 2011. A Ph.D. student named Stefan Ihrig, who taught as a lecturer at the Department of Turcology at the University of Berlin between 2005 and 2007, received his Ph.D. degree from the Department of History at Cambridge University with his doctoral thesis titled “Nazi Perceptions of the New Turkey, 1919-1945” and published his thesis as a book titled “Atatürk in The Nazi Imagination” in 2014. With the publication of the book, a public debate began on whether the political movement initiated by Hitler, and the Nazi party in Germany was modeled on the National Struggle led by Atatürk. In his book, Ihrig drew attention to the similarities between Atatürk and Hitler, and analyzed the comparisons and interactions between the Turkish revolution, and the Nazi movement in terms of individuals, institutions, ideologies and actions (Özar, 2015, p. 1).

In this context, in the book written by Ihrig, Hitler is quoted as saying; “Atatürk was the first person to show that it is possible to mobilize, and revitalize a country's lost resources. In this respect, Atatürk was a teacher; Mussolini was his first student, I was his second... (Ihrig, 2015, p. 162)”. In particular, the book, which tries to establish a similarity between the Armenian deportation, and the Holocaust, has started to be supported by some media organs that support the Armenian claims in order to strengthen the “so-called Armenian Genocide” claims. The aim of this study is to discuss the claims of Stefan Ihrig, who tries to establish similarities between the “so-called Armenian Genocide”, and the “holocaust”, between Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who together with the Turkish Nation fought the most sacred struggle in the history of the world for the construction of a modern nation, and Hitler and the Nazis, who committed the greatest

genocide in the history of the world.

### **Relations with Armenians Before, and after the National Struggle**

Justin Mc Carthy in his book "Death and Exile" makes the following observation:

*"Much of what passes for the history of the Caucasus and Eastern Anatolia in the 19th and early 20th centuries is, in fact, nothing more than the propaganda of ethnic communities vying for dominance in the region. More than eager to exaggerate the losses suffered by their own communities, the authors of such histories do not seem to know that they have hostile societies. This attitude has led to a tendency to characterize conflicts as massacres and wars as genocides. A different attitude would be to recognize that both sides fired back and that there were casualties on both sides (McCarthy, 1995, p. 21)."*

This issue, which has been politically motivated in every aspect and has been trying to defame the Turkish Nation for more than a century with dirty propaganda, has been the subject of hundreds of theses, articles and books as claims and counter-claims. In the last quarter of the 19th century, taking advantage of the weakening of the Ottoman Empire, especially with the support of Russia, the events that took place as a result of the rebellions started in many parts of Eastern Anatolia through the terrorist organizations established by the Armenian Nationalists, who took the example of the Balkan States that tried to gain independence by revolting with the support of Russia, turned into "the propaganda of ethnic communities competing with each other for sovereignty" in the words of McCarthy.

Armed by the Hunchak and Dashnaksutyun Armenian terrorist organizations in order to turn the population advantage in the regions they lived in in their favor, Armenian nationalists did not hesitate to massacre tens of thousands of Turks and Muslims with the motto "if you want to survive, first kill your neighbor (TBMM, 2001)".

The First World War created an important opportunity for Armenian terrorist organizations to achieve their goals. The fact that the Ottoman army fought on seven fronts, that even the gendarmerie organization, which was tasked with ensuring security within the country, was assigned to these fronts due to the lack of soldiers (Köylü, 2018, p. 46-47), and that tens of thousands of Ottoman soldiers lost their lives in the unsuccessful Sarıkamış operation against the Russians in the Caucasus, mobilized the Armenian volunteer regiments, which were organized especially

within the Russian army, from the east, and with the support of the sympathetic elements within the country, they started massacres against the Turkish and Muslim people in Eastern Anatolia. Hovannes Katchaznoui, a member of the Dashnak Party, and the first Prime Minister of Armenia, described this situation in a conference held in Bucharest in April 1923 as follows:

*"I am afraid that my final conclusion - and it is very difficult to pronounce it, but I will say it only in the voice of my conscience - will draw the total reaction, perhaps even anger, of the participants of the conference. In the fall of 1914, when Turkey had not yet joined one of the belligerents, but was preparing for war, Armenian volunteer units began to be formed noisily and energetically in the South Caucasus. The Armenian Revolutionary Dashnaksutyun (Dashnak) Party actively participated both in the formation of these units and in their military operations against Turkey, despite the negative decision on volunteer units taken only a few weeks earlier at the congress in Erzurum. The winter of 1914 and the first months of 1915 were a period of excitement and hope for the Armenians of Russia, including the Dashnak Party (Katchaznoui, 2005)."*

According to Katchaznoui, the creation of Armenian volunteer units before the First World War was a mistake. However, it was impossible to prevent this mistake from being made. They were unconditionally and unconditionally tied to Russia. They did not take into account the balance of power in favor of the Turks. Turkey, acting with a defense instinct, had taken the decision of forced migration (deportation). However, as a result of this deportation, the Armenian population of Turkey was severely reduced. According to Katchaznoui, this was a fatal blow to the Armenian issue (Başbuğ, 2015, p. 15-16).

The Armenian deportation, which is now being propagandized as a "genocide" by exaggerating the casualties, also paved the way for the British to use it as a tool of black propaganda. The British were planning to gain an advantage in the war with this propaganda targeting the German army and public opinion consisting of sincere Christians allied with the Ottoman Empire, which they saw as a continuation of the smear campaign launched with the propaganda "Muslims are slaughtering Christians!" for those who died in the Armenian uprisings during the reign of Sultan Abdülhamit (1876-1909). The British propaganda bureau of the period, "Wellington House", headed by Mr. Masterman, defined its field of

work as follows:

*To spread the cause of the Allies, the efforts of the British, the economic and military capabilities of the Empire, the causes and efforts of the war, the crimes and atrocities of Germany's allies. The means used were books, brochures, magazines, maps, posters, postcards, pictures and exhibitions (Gürün, 2012, p. 67)."*

One of these is the book "Atrocities against Armenians, the Slaughter of a Nation", known as the "Blue Book", which is one of the three books prepared by the bureau for Arnold J. Toynbee, a British historian. All references in the book belong to the "Armenian Atrocities Committee" in America (Gürün, 2012, p. 71). From February 1916, Toynbee requested information against Turkey from various countries and individuals, as well as Armenian committees, and included this information in the book without verifying it (Başbuğ, 2015, p. 118). Years later, in 1966, Toynbee admitted in a letter to Mrs. Lillian Ekmekjian that the book was in fact a propaganda tool: "I received your letter of March 1. It is true that the British government's reason for asking Lord Bryce to compile an official report (The Blue Book) was propaganda (Başbuğ, 2015, p. 119)."

With the Armistice of Mudros signed at the end of the First World War, the first step was taken to realize the dreams of Armenian nationalists. Article 24 of the Armistice paved the way for an Armenian State in Eastern Anatolia: 'In case of any disturbance in the so-called six provinces (vilayeti sitte), the Entente states will be able to occupy any of these provinces. After the Armistice, the minorities took action and started to spread persecution and fear in Anatolia with the associations and terrorist organizations they established to realize their ideals.

When Mustafa Kemal Pasha set foot in Samsun on May 19, 1919 to launch the National Struggle, while describing the situation in the country, he described the Mavri Mira committee, one of the associations established by the Greeks, as follows:

*"The Mavri Mira Committee, which was established in the Greek Patriarchate of Istanbul, was busy in establishing and managing gangs in the provinces, organizing rallies and propaganda, which was well proven by reliable information and documents obtained later... Armenian Patriarch Zaven Efendi was working for the same purpose as the Mavri Mira Committee (Atatürk, 2007, p. 7)."*

On the other hand, the twelfth of US President Wilson's fourteen principles, which included suggestions on what should be done after the war in Europe, was seen as a step

towards the realization of Armenian ideals: "Ensuring the independence of the areas of the Ottoman Empire in which the Turks are the majority and in which they are the inhabitants, and providing the other elements under Turkish sovereignty with a full and unhindered opportunity for autonomous development..." The report prepared by the military delegation headed by General Harbord, which was sent to Turkey to oversee the provision of an "American Mandate" to an Armenian State planned to be established in Eastern Anatolia in line with Armenian claims, caused great disappointment among Armenians. The report concluded: "... during the research trip, it was concluded that the principles based on these Armenian claims were inadequate and incorrect...(Akar, 2019, p. 102)".

The report titled "Situation in the Near East" prepared by the delegation was presented to the American President Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference on October 16, 1919, and rejected by the American Senate on April 24, 1920 with 52 votes against 23, and the issue of "Mandate for Armenia" was closed by the United States (Özçelik, 2011).

In addition, it is noteworthy that in this report, there is no event or phenomenon under the name of genocide, deportation, forced emigration, expulsion during the National Struggle, and that this issue was not on the agenda in any way in Lausanne, and that such a situation was not included in any report in a country that was under occupation and where the Allied commissars were present.

Despite all the negative propaganda and approaches during the National Struggle, Mustafa Kemal Pasha did not make any direct or indirect revengeful statements about minorities (Greeks and Armenians), and he equated their fundamental rights and freedoms with those of Turkish citizens. The decisions taken in Erzurum and then in the Sivas Congress, which was convened to discuss Article 24 of the Armistice of Mudros, and which was the most intensely exposed to Armenian atrocities, strongly opposed the separatist claims of Greeks and Armenians: "Christian elements cannot be granted privileges that would disrupt our political dominance and social balance (Erzurum Congress, Art.4) (Atatürk, 2007, p. 50)." "The principle of total defense and resistance was accepted in the rejection of all kinds of occupation and intervention, especially activities aimed at establishing a Greek and Armenian state (Atatürk, 2007, p. 66)."

Furthermore, in the Misak-ı Milli decisions agreed upon by Atatürk with the Istanbul Government during the Amasya negotiations and adopted by the Istanbul Parliament, and the Istanbul Assembly on 28 January



1920, it was stated that ‘the rights of minorities living within the national borders will be adopted and secured by the Turkish nation in the hope that the Muslim peoples in neighbouring countries will also benefit from the same rights’.

As a result, the “Armenian Question” for Turkey was resolved with the Treaty of Kars signed on October 13, 1921 with the participation of Turkish, Russian and Armenian delegations. As the Turkish Nation, we have always considered and accepted every nation, regardless of their race, religion and origin, as a true, and respected citizen of these lands. With the constitutional movements that were renewed with the establishment of the Republic, regardless of religion, and race, they became noble citizens of the Republic of Turkey.

### **Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Approach to the Jews**

For the losers of the First World War, the aftermath of the war contained more severe conditions than the destruction caused by the war. The 440-article Treaty of Versailles signed by Germany changed the political map of Europe and posed a great threat to the existence of the German nation (Çetinkaya, 2019, p. 89).

The psychology created by the days of poverty for the German people, who had lost all their gains, lands, colonies and resources since 1871, when the German Union was established, and whose army was disbanded, had begun to turn into a sense of revenge among German nationalists. The anger caused by the defeat and the degrading conditions imposed by the Treaty of Versailles, especially for those who did not refrain from all kinds of sacrifices for their country during the war period, paved the way for the organization of war veterans, nationalists and patriots, and the foundations of the Nazi Party (Dokuyan, 2009, p. 26) were laid in 1919. Hitler explained the necessity of the establishment of the Nazi Party as follows:

*The Jewish trash who entered the Government in 1918, thanks to the politicians of the Right, stole the weapons of the German nation. It is as a result of their baseness that we have become a defenseless nation. Under these circumstances, the restoration of Germany's independence abroad depends primarily on the restoration of the spirit of determination and will in our nation (Hitler, 2017, p. 328-330).*

The German Nationalists, who shared Hitler's thoughts, were officially founded in 1920 as a right-wing movement under the name of the National-Socialist German Workers'

Party (Nazi) (Armaoğlu, 2009, p. 295). Hitler, who was a good demagogue, influenced party members with his fiery and nationalist speeches at party meetings and soon rose to the leadership of the party. Although he was a corporal in the German army, even the officers who joined the party accepted his leadership and embraced his rhetoric.

Hitler builds the foundation of the party on three principles. The first of these is sacrifice. Every German citizen must spare no sacrifice for his country. The second is the purity of the German race. According to Hitler, Germany will only succeed in its struggle with the purity of the race. Foreigners, especially Jews, accelerated Germany's economic collapse after 1918 and were the cause of all its problems. The third is the establishment of absolute authority. The unconditional obedience and discipline of the German race gathered under the rule of a leader (chief) rather than the rule of the people is necessary. Therefore, in the newly established Nazi Party, Hitler had laid the foundations of a government based on the “fascism” that had begun in Italy, where the military power was gathered around a single leader and absolute obedience was adopted.

The Nazi Party, which did not attract the necessary attention in its early years, later gained popularity especially among unemployed Germans. The party, which also had a uniformed militia force, fueled the enmity between unemployed Germans and Jews, claiming that Jews were the cause of their unemployment and poverty, and promising that everyone would have a job once they were expelled from the country (Uyar, 2012, p. 29). Thus, with the effect of the difficult economic conditions in 1925, he attracted many intellectuals who believed in the superiority of the German race to the Nazi Party. In addition, unemployed university graduates, lawyers, doctors, bankers, and traders who were uncomfortable with Jews began to support the party.

Hitler's relationship with Jews goes back to his childhood. He even says that the word “Jew” was never pronounced at home because his father forbade it. He could not understand why his father and others in society were against the Jews and hated a people of a different religion:

Over time, his thoughts about Jews began to change, in his own words, “agonizingly”. The seeds of “Jew-Hatred” began to be sown in the political climate he would establish in the future when he began to read anti-Semitic articles and pamphlets, no longer conflicted between reason and emotion.

For Hitler, who devoted a large part of his book “Mein Kampf”, in which he discussed his ideas, to Jew hatred, he made his decision about the Jews, whom he held

responsible for the harsh conditions of the Treaty of Versailles, long before he took power, and built all the political arguments of the Nazi Party on this hatred. The Jews had to be exterminated, not only for the sake of the German people and their future, but also for the sake of all humanity.

The Second World War and the “Holocaust”, one of the most tragic events in the history of humanity, were founded on this politics of hatred, and the word “genocide” was written in history. First, with the “Nuremberg Laws” in 1935, the Jews were stripped of all their legal rights, and the way was paved for them to work like slaves until death with the construction of concentration camps. On the night of November 10, 1938, the German Army launched an attack on Jewish settlements in which thousands of Jews were massacred. This night, known as “Crystal Night”, was the beginning of the future massacre of Jews.

In the countries they occupied after the war, they built “Jewish Ghettos” and sent the Jews they had isolated to death camps by transport trains.

**Table 1:** Number of people who died in each extermination camp (www.yadvashem.org)

Camp name	Death toll
Auschwitz II	1.000.000
Belzec	600,000
Chełmno	320,000
Jasenovac	58–97,000
Majdanek	360,000
Maly Trostinets	65,000
Sobibor	250,000
Treblinka	870,000
TOTAL	3.562.000 <sup>1</sup>

### **Stefan Ihrig's Claims on the Relationship between Atatürk, Hitler and the Nazis, the Holocaust, and the Armenian Deportation**

A PhD student, Stefan Ihrig, who taught as a lecturer in the Department of Turcology at the University of Berlin between 2005 and 2007, in his PhD thesis “Nazi Perceptions of the New Turkey, 1919-1945” in the Department of History at Cambridge University, claimed that Hitler was inspired by Atatürk to found the Nazi Party, to carry out the Holocaust and to invade Europe. Although Hitler was one of the darkest dictators in the history of

mankind, this claim attempts to blame Atatürk for Hitler's crimes by citing Atatürk's just and holy struggle for the independence of the Turkish nation as an example.

Ihrig's thesis was published as a book in 2014 under the title “Atatürk In The Nazi Imagination” and later translated into Turkish in 2015 by Alfa Tarih Publications under the title “Nazis and Atatürk”. It started to be cited as a source by Atatürk's opponents. Hilal Kaplan, a columnist for Yeni Şafak newspaper, took Ihrig's thesis one step further: “There were four areas where he drew inspiration from Atatürk, and the Kemalist regime: The idea of a Führer to whom people would unquestioningly obey, the need for a one-party regime, the phenomenon of 'national sacrifice', and the strategy of closing in on opponents to show that they were a single front against enemies (www.ermenihaber.am).”

Yıldırım Oğur, a columnist for Türkiye Newspaper, tries to prove that Hitler took Atatürk as a role model by giving two examples from Ihrig's book. The first of these; “Heinrich Hoffmann recounts in his memoirs: 'Despite Mussolini, whom he loved very much but lost all respect for when he saw a photo of him in shorts looking like a Balkan bandit, he admired Atatürk and the bust of Atatürk made by Thorak was one of the few things he cherished' (Öğür, 2014).”

In the first pages of his book, Ihrig had correctly stated a historical fact, the political aims of the minorities (Greeks and Armenians). This observation, which he made as if denying the main idea of the book, clearly reveals the justification for the National Struggle:

*Christian minorities waved the flags of their nations and dreamed of creating their own state on the territory of the Ottoman Empire. There were plans to create an independent Armenia, to cede large parts of Western Anatolia to Greece, and even to create a second Greek or Greek-Armenian Pontic state on the Black Sea coast. There was intense lobbying in the United States to rid Europe of the Turks and expel them completely, including Istanbul. The great Greek nationalist dream - perhaps the Megali Idea of reviving the Byzantine Empire with Constantinople as its capital - looked like it could be realized when the Greek army occupied Smyrna and its hinterland in 1919. The invasion was carried out at the request of the Entente and before a final peace treaty, while the world was still “meeting in Paris”. Allied warships turned their guns on the centuries-old palaces of the Ottomans; the sultan and his government consistently bowed to Allied demands in the years after the war. But then everything turned around.*

<sup>1</sup> This figure refers only to Jews killed in the camps. With mass executions in ghettos and occupied territories, it is estimated to reach up to 6.5 million).

*In May 1919, Mustafa Kemal Pasha landed in Eastern Anatolia and the Turkish War of Independence began. Originally sent to reorganize Ottoman troops in the region, Mustafa Kemal began organizing a national resistance movement against the disintegration of Anatolia's Turkish hinterland. Motivated by fears of Greek expansionism and Armenian reprisals, and seeking to liberate Istanbul and the office of the sultan-caliph, the movement quickly gained strength. The resistance movement not only had to fight the Armenians and the Greek army, it was de facto at war with all the Entente States and fought the Ottoman army for short periods. Nevertheless, it was successful. After four years of struggle, from mid-1919 to mid-1923, the Turkish nationalists secured their homeland with the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), thus amending a Paris peace treaty, the Treaty of Sèvres (1920) (Ihrig, 2015, pp. 24-25).*

The table below lists page by page the German sources Ihrig cites for almost all of his views and claims on Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Hitler, the Nazis, and the relationship between the genocide allegations and the holocaust, and in particular his quotations from the "Kreuzzeitung Newspaper".

**Table 2:** Ihrig's thesis in the book "Atatürk In The Nazi Imagination" in 2014

Page No.	Ihrig's thesis in his 2014 book "Atatürk In The Nazi Imagination"
86-87	Mustafa Kemal, Hussong wrote in the Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, had a creative "Führer personality" - the man who transformed a helpless and confused mass into a nation, into an army; the man who gave the masses a purpose: "Mustafa Kemal the man stands up and transforms a seemingly helpless and unstable, confused and staggering mass into a united nation. For Hussong, Atatürk was a "man of steel", a man who could do anything, a man with a "steel" will, a man "energized like a battery". It shows that the debate on Atatürk was not limited to Hussong, but was more widespread. He attacked those who focused on Atatürk's alleged flaws (such as "Arab horses, Armenian women and Greek boys") and considered them irrelevant to his role as Führer.
97	German anti-Semites had the opportunity

	to make up their own minds about the Jews of Central Europe and the myth of treachery, where, in the case of Turkey, the Jews were replaced by Armenians.
120	Hauptmann Tröbst: National purification must go hand in hand with the establishment of a united front. In this respect the conditions in Asia Minor were the same as here. The bloodsuckers and parasites in the Turkish national structure were Greeks and Armenians. They had to be uprooted [this is in bold] and rendered harmless; otherwise the whole struggle for freedom would be jeopardized. The Armenians and Greeks were multiplying faster than the Turks, they alone had trade and development, and they knew the most insidious ways of depleting (die Auspowerung) the weak [Turkish] population, which was completely at their mercy." He then again emphasized the treachery of the minorities who enjoyed the "hospitality" of the Turks and shamelessly exploited the working population, the Turks. The term "treacherous" was used, as in other newspapers of the time, for things allegedly done by Christian minorities.
144	The German Ottomans were the future foreign minister Konstantin von Neurath and General Bronsart von Schellendorf. Schellendorf was the president of the völkisch Tannenbergbund, founded in 1925. Otta von Feldmann, formerly an officer in the Ottoman High Command and an active participant in the Armenian genocide, would become a leading politician in the DNVP and the All-Deutscher Verband and, perhaps more importantly, Hindenburg's political advisor during the election campaign and later his personal chief of staff. Scheubner-Richter had served as German vice-consul in Eastern Anatolia and had witnessed the Armenian genocide there. It is often assumed that Hitler learned much about the Armenian genocide and Turkey from his political advisor.
219-220	For example, one biographer wrote: "With such eyes, man is born for something great . . . He was a born master." Some have

	<p>argued that even at a young age Atatürk could feel the spirit of the “bozkurt” (the national/mystical animal of the Turks), the spirit of eternal Turkishness, the spirit of the blood awakening in him. Atatürk was “inspired” by the “blood difference” he could feel in the face of the “inferior races” (referring to Greeks, Armenians and Levantines) that controlled the Ottoman Empire. Some were “Anatolian by blood. That is, Turkish to the core” (Kerntürke). The fact that Ataturk was a boy with blue eyes and blond hair meant a lot to all the writers: He must really have been an Aryan - and clearly so was Hitler.</p>
253	<p>“Turkishness was dying a slow death, but it was dying from the poison discharged by the subjugated racial trash peoples, from the famous spittle of the peoples of the Mediterranean coast, the Levantines, the Greeks, the Armenians, and the Jews, who like resistant weeds covered the ground”. By the time the Third Reich began, the “minority problem” in Turkey was essentially “solved”. The vast majority of Anatolian Armenians had either perished in the Armenian Genocide or had subsequently fled the country. The Greeks had fled the country after the Greek army retreated in the Turkish War of Independence; those who remained behind had been “exchanged” with Greece after the Treaty of Lausanne.</p>
254-255	<p>In order to complete the reconstruction of the Nazi view of modern Turkey, it is necessary to look briefly at the debate on Armenians. There is an ongoing debate about the Armenian Genocide, and Hitler's exclamation “Who today speaks of the extermination of the Armenians?”. There is no point in discussing here whether or not an Armenian Genocide actually took place, but it is interesting to note that the Hitler quote is used in this context to both confirm and deny the genocide. There is another Hitler quote that refers to the “extermination of the Armenians”, but both Hitler quotes come from highly disputed sources. But in any case, neither quote is needed to show that the Nazis were influenced by the Armenian Genocide. Because the Nazis grew up with</p>

	<p>the Armenian Genocide as much as they grew up with Turkey and the Turkish War of Independence.</p>
256-257	<p>During World War I, the German public knew very little about what was happening in Anatolia, but in the years after the end of the war, the Armenian Genocide became the main topic of the German media. To cover up Germany's guilt in connection with this “Armenian Horror”, the German Foreign Office published diplomatic documents that it claimed would show that Germany had done everything in its power to help the Armenians. This went on intermittently until March 1921, when Talat Pasha, the former Ottoman grand vizier and interior minister, was assassinated by an Armenian in Berlin. The ensuing trials and newspaper debates focused less on the assassination and more on the Armenian Genocide. The right to the extreme right justified the “Armenian Horror” by arguing that Armenians had “stabbed the Turks in the back” during the war, and that Armenians were a very sneaky, parasitic and worthless people. These post-war debates were sown in the fertile soil of late 19th century German anti-Armenianism, which shared the same roots as modern anti-Semitism. In fact, German anti-Armenianism presented Armenians as the (real) “Jews of the East”.</p>
259	<p>The perceived parallel between Central European Jews and Ottoman Armenians further reinforced far-right and Nazi interest in the Armenian Genocide. In a six-part series of articles in Heimatland in 1923, Hans Tröbst formulated a series of lessons from Kemalist success, as discussed in Chapter 3. One of these fundamental lessons was the “ethnic cleansing” of the country. In an article published on the front page of the Völkischer Kurier, the main Nazi newspaper at the time, during the Hitler Trial (1924), Tröbst made it clear that what happened to the Armenians could happen to the Jews in a future Germany.</p>
265	<p>A prerequisite for Ataturk's success, as defined by Nazi and Third Reich texts, was the “extermination of the Armenians”-“a compelling necessity,” in the words of</p>



	Mikusch in his biography of Atatürk. Perceiving Armenians as an “unassimilable foreign body”, Mikusch concluded: “Leaving aside the humanitarian aspect, the expulsion of the Armenians from their state for the New Turkey was as compelling a necessity as the extermination of the Indians for the Whites in America
304	The post-World War 1 debates about the Armenian Genocide in Germany, the established and confirmed German tradition of anti-Armenianism parallel to anti-Semitism, the connection between a rejuvenated nation and national purity through the Turkish example - all of these merit a reassessment of the role of the Armenian Genocide in the origins of the Holocaust.
305	The Armenian Genocide was not far from Germany in the interwar period, geographically or temporally. It was there from 1919-9 when the Turkish War of Independence began to attract attention, and it continued to be there when the Third Reich admired Atatürk and his New Turkey. The Armenian Genocide, as perceived by the Third Reich, must indeed have been a seductive precedent: Moreover, assessments of the Armenian Genocide in the 1920s used the established parallel between anti-Semitism and anti-Armenianism, and promoted the myth of the Anatolian backstabber as the logical explanation for the genocidal “justifications”.
329	The Armenian Genocide was not forgotten in the 1930s, as Hitler's controversial statement “Who today speaks of the extermination of the Armenians?” shows. The Armenian Genocide, and the expulsion of the Greeks were an integral part of Third Reich discourses on New Turkey; they were seen as crucial preconditions for the völkisch success story that was New Turkey. The Nazis had “grown up” with both the rise of New Turkey and the Armenian Genocide, and had not forgotten either.

In an interview with the author Stefan Ihrig immediately after the publication of the book “Atatürk in

*Journal of Atatürk*

the Nazi Imagination”, Agos columnist Emre Can Dağlıoğlu tries to establish a connection between Atatürk and the “Armenian deportation” and associates the deportation with Atatürk as “genocide”. To Dağlıoğlu's question, “Does the relationship between the Nazis and Turkey include the modeling of ethnic cleansing in the Ottoman period?”, Ihrig responded as follows:

*“Yes, according to the Nazis' perception of the “New Turkey”, if Turkey had not “gotten rid of” its minorities, it would not have achieved all this. In this sense, the Nazis and other German nationalists saw New Turkey as a precedent for the establishment of a country on an ethno-racial basis (Dağlıoğlu, 2014).”*

In his 340-page book, Ihrig devotes about 75 pages (Ihrig, 2015) to this topic in order to reinforce the view that Armenians and Jews shared a similar fate and that Hitler and the Nazis were inspired by the “so-called Armenian Genocide” to come up with the idea of the Holocaust.

#### **Purpose:**

The historical idea that Atatürk and Hitler applied different methods to solve similar problems for their countries has evolved in a different direction with a doctoral dissertation published in 2011. A Ph.D. student named Stefan Ihrig, who taught as a lecturer at the Department of Turcology at the University of Berlin between 2005 and 2007, received his Ph.D. degree from the Department of History at Cambridge University with his doctoral thesis titled “Nazi Perceptions of the New Turkey, 1919-1945” and published his thesis as a book titled “Atatürk In The Nazi Imagination” in 2014. With the publication of the book, a public debate began on whether the political movement initiated by Hitler and the Nazi party in Germany was modeled on the National Struggle led by Atatürk. In his book, Ihrig draws attention to the similarities between Atatürk and Hitler, compares the Turkish revolution and the Nazi movement in terms of individuals, institutions, ideologies and actions, and analyzes their interactions. In this context, in the book written by Ihrig, Hitler is quoted as saying; “Atatürk was the first person to show that it is possible to mobilize and revitalize a country's lost resources. In this respect, Atatürk was a teacher; Mussolini was his first student and I was his second...” The claim that Hitler took Atatürk as a role model has come to the fore. In particular, the book, which tries to establish a similarity between the Armenian deportation and the Holocaust, has started to be supported by some media organs that support the Armenian claims in order to strengthen the

"so-called Armenian Genocide" claims. The aim of this study is to discuss the claims of Stefan Ihrig, who tries to establish similarities between the "so-called Armenian Genocide" and the "holocaust", between Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who fought the holiest struggle in world history for the construction of a modern nation together with the Turkish Nation, and Hitler and the Nazis, who committed the greatest genocide in world history.

### Method

The method of the study is based on a literature review. In particular, Ihrig's claims are compared with Hitler's own book "Mein Kampf" and refuted with historical documents.

### Discussion and Conclusion

Taking a role model is defined as "imitating someone else's behavior in the face of events, becoming like him/her". According to this definition, it would not be very meaningful to say that a megalomaniacal and powerful character like Adolf Hitler, who was an example and leader of Nazi Germany of the period, took another leader as a "role model". It is quite natural for Hitler to be influenced and inspired by leaders such as Otto von Bismark, Mussolini and Atatürk in their struggle, management and strategies. Because every strong leader, while forming his intelligence, wisdom and understanding of management, is not only contented with his own natural abilities, but also feeds himself with the behaviors and ideas of different strong characters, thinkers and leaders of history, and creates a unique leader profile. Therefore, Hitler was never in a character to take Atatürk or any other leader as a role model. Otherwise, Hitler could have cited dozens of examples about Atatürk, whom he allegedly saw as a role model, in his book "Mein Kampf", which he wrote through his friend Rudolf Hess during his imprisonment in Landsberg Prison in 1924 and which formed the philosophical infrastructure of the Nazi Party. However, in this book, which consists of 728 pages and hundreds of thousands of words in Turkish, there is not a single word about "Turk", "Mustafa", "Kemal", "Atatürk". Moreover, when the same book is scanned, there is not a single word about "Armenians" and there is not a single example given by Hitler.

### Results

In conclusion, I would like to congratulate Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, whose great and honorable struggle against imperialism to build a modern nation earned him the rightful praise and admiration of every nation, not only in Turkey but also around the world, and who led the world to a great catastrophe, in which more than seventy million

people died and more than seven million Jews and foreigners were subjected to genocide, The book "Ataturk in the Nazi Imagination" written by Stefan Ihrig, who compares Ataturk to Adolf Hitler, whose name has been removed from dictionaries and whose mention is banned even in his own country, and who even claims to be a role model, will remain a work that is not academic and scientific, but contains hypothetical and emotional elements, aims to arouse "hatred of Turks", and is nothing more than a lie for Atatürk's opponents and Armenian Nationalists to cling to.

### Conclusion and Recommendations

It is natural that the reaction of the two nations, which were allies in the First World War, to the agreements containing harsh conditions at the end of the war should be similar. In order to get rid of the harsh military and economic conditions imposed by the victorious states with the peace treaties as soon as possible, it is necessary to understand the reason behind the search for a solution by gathering around leaders who could lead the social reaction. However, for both nations, the path to be followed, the methods to be applied and the goals to be achieved in the struggle for full independence, and liberation have never been the same. For this reason, Atatürk's mobilization for the Turkish nation to gain independence and build a new nation is unique and in line with the character, culture and spirit of struggle of the Turkish nation. It is also natural that nations oppressed under similar circumstances would see the "Turkish National Struggle" as an example for starting their own wars. For this reason, it will be possible to understand whether Adolf Hitler and the Nazis took Mustafa Kemal Atatürk as a role model by comparing the struggle strategies, and methods of both leaders and revealing their similarities and differences.

In his thesis and book, Ihrig tried to prove the dirty slander against the Turkish Nation by associating the 1915 Armenian Deportation, in which the Nazis and Hitler emphasized Atatürk's role, with Atatürk's Turkishness and nationalism. Ihrig, in summary, quoting from some German writers of the period, tried to show that Atatürk, as a "Turkish Nationalist", claimed to be a superior race and considered the Greeks and Armenians in Anatolia as an inferior race, that the events and actions of 1915 (the exchange issue in the Treaty of Lausanne) inspired Hitler's superior race theory, and that Atatürk's attitude towards Armenians and Greeks was similar to Hitler's hostility towards Jews.

*Atatürk was the "Führer" long before he was anyone to lead; fate, kismet, even God/Gods had*

chosen him: a leader by birth and birthright. One biographer, for example, wrote the following: "With eyes like these, one is born for something great..." He was a born master." Some have claimed that even at a young age Atatürk could feel the spirit of the "bozkurt" (the national/mystical animal of the Turks), the spirit of eternal Turkishness, the spirit of the blood awakening within him. Atatürk was "inspired" by the "blood difference" he could sense in the "inferior races" (referring to Greeks, Armenians and Levantines) that controlled the Ottoman Empire. Some of them are Anatolian by "blood. In other words, Turkish to the core" (Kerntürke). The fact that Atatürk was a boy with blue eyes and blond hair meant a lot to all the writers: He must really be an Aryan - and clearly so was Hitler. These so-called Aryan roots, in the typical circular reasoning of the time, were reflected in his actions and made those actions possible. By the time the Third Reich began, the "minority problem" in Turkey had essentially been "solved". The vast majority of Anatolian Armenians had either perished in the Armenian Genocide or had subsequently fled the country. The Greeks had fled the country after the Greek army retreated in the Turkish War of Independence; those who remained behind had been "exchanged" with Greece after the Treaty of Lausanne. Some non-Muslim minorities (Greeks, Armenians, Jews and others) remained, especially in Istanbul, but they were not of much importance in the Nazis' vision of the New Turkey: For the Nazis, the New Turkey was a "racially" homogeneous state (Ihrig, 2015, pp. 220-254).

Ihrig did not neglect to embellish his claims in his book with "ugly" statements against Atatürk. It is noteworthy that after Hussong's laudatory statements about Atatürk in the Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, he tried to defile him with the comment "Armenian women and Greek boys attacked those who focused on him and considered them irrelevant to his role as Führer".

Sezen Kılıç analyzes the positive comments about Atatürk by columnists of the pro-Nazi German newspaper Völkischer Beobachter between 1935, and 1938;

*Kılıç underlines the positive atmosphere in Turkish-German relations; "In addition to this, the Turkish-German relations, which were interrupted after World War I. "In addition, the resumption of Turkish-German relations after the Treaty of Lausanne, which had been interrupted after World*

*War I, the fact that Turkey provided the economic and technical equipment, qualified personnel and trade that it needed for its development from Germany, the development of the trade between the two countries to reach very high amounts during the Nazi period, the fact that Germany supplied a large proportion of the chromium needed for Germany's armament from Turkey, and the fact that Germany was a good arms dealer for Turkey played a major role" (Kılıç, 2013, p. 476).*

On the other hand, it would not make much sense to say that a megalomaniacal and powerful character like Adolf Hitler, who was an example and leader of Nazi Germany of the period, took another leader as a "role model". It is quite natural for Hitler to be influenced and inspired by leaders such as Otto von Bismark, Mussolini and Atatürk in their struggle, management, and strategies. Because every strong leader, while forming his intelligence, wisdom and understanding of management, is not only contented with his own natural abilities, but also feeds himself with the behaviors and ideas of different strong characters, thinkers and leaders of history, and creates a unique leader profile. Therefore, Hitler was never in a character to take Atatürk or any other leader as a role model. Otherwise, Hitler could have cited dozens of examples about Atatürk, whom he allegedly saw as a role model, in his book "Mein Kampf", which he wrote through his friend Rudolf Hess during his imprisonment in Landsberg Prison in 1924 and which formed the philosophical infrastructure of the Nazi Party. However, in this book, which consists of 728 pages and hundreds of thousands of words in Turkish, not a single one of the words "Turk", "Mustafa", "Kemal" or "Atatürk" can be found. Moreover, when the same book is scanned, there is not a single word about "Armenians" and there are no examples given by Hitler.

When the sources and citations used by Ihrig in his thesis and book are analyzed, it is seen that he uses one-way citation. First of all, he included works by authors of German (Nazi) origin who praised Atatürk, praised him for legitimizing the holocaust in terms of racism, nationalism and ethnic cleansing, and showed that his actions were taken as an example by Hitler and the Nazis. This situation clearly shows that a scientific study is not conducted on the thesis-antithesis plane, making the scientificity of the study questionable:

*The scarcity of sources and Nazi publications from the early 1920s and the logic of the discourse explored in these sources necessitated a broader focus on the right-wing and far-right print media of*

the early Weimar Republic. Not only, but especially, the *Neue Preussische (Kreuz) Zeitung* was used here. I analyzed this newspaper from 1919 to 1923, the Nazi newspapers *Heimatland* from 1920 to 1923 - during its continued existence, *Völkischer Beobachter* during the Turkish War of Independence - 1919-1923 - and for most of the Third Reich. I was also able to make use of the Reichslandbund collection of newspaper clippings (in the Bundesarchiv) and articles and published collections collected in the Political Archive of the German Foreign Office and in the relevant folders in the Bundesarchiv (Ihrig, 2015, p. 338).

As can be seen from these statements, rather than being an original and unbiased scientific work, Ihrig's book gives the impression of being similar to Arnold J. Toynbee's propaganda book "The Blue Book".

In the table above, Ihrig built the focus of his thesis on two main ideas. The first is that Hitler and the Nazis took Atatürk and the spirit of the National Struggle as an example in their struggle, and that the following statement about Atatürk, which he says belongs to Hitler: "Atatürk was the first person to show that it is possible to mobilize and revitalize a country's lost resources. In this respect, Atatürk was a teacher; Mussolini was his first pupil and I was his second... (Ihrig, 2015, p. 162)", which Hitler used for Atatürk during the Third Reich period.

The second is Hitler's statement "Who today speaks of the extermination of Armenians?", citing the "(so-called) Armenian Genocide" as an example to legitimize the Holocaust. The source of this quote, which is not certain whether it belongs to Hitler or not, is the famous speech attributed to Hitler in the Holocaust Museum in Washington. However, this speech is not directly attributed to Hitler. "Associated Press Bureau Chief in Berlin Louis Lochner" was used as the source. When the truth of the matter was investigated, it was seen that an American of Armenian origin named Seft Mumcuyan, the representative of the then US President Jimmy Carter sent to the Human Rights Commission, donated one million dollars for this statement to be included in the museum (Berk, 2016).

In conclusion, I would like to congratulate Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, whose great, and honorable struggle against imperialism to build a modern nation earned him the rightful praise and admiration of every nation, not only in Turkey but also around the world, and who led the world to a great catastrophe, in which more than seventy million people died and more than seven million Jews and foreigners were subjected to genocide, The book "Ataturk in the Nazi Imagination" written by Stefan Ihrig, who

compares Ataturk to Adolf Hitler, whose name has been removed from dictionaries and whose mention is banned even in his own country, and who even claims to be a role model, will remain a work that is not academic and scientific, but contains hypothetical and emotional elements, aims to arouse "hatred of Turks", and is nothing more than a lie for Atatürk's opponents and Armenian Nationalists to cling to. It is understood that the book has no scientific value due to its content and was written for propaganda purposes.

**Hakem Değerlendirmesi:** Dış bağımsız.

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Yazar çıkar çatışması olmadığını beyan etmiştir.

**Finansal Destek:** Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** The author have no conflicts of interest to declare.

**Financial Disclosure:** The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

## References

- Akar, H. (2019). *Harboard Askeri heyeti Raporu*. Ankara: ATASE Bşk. Yayınları.
- Armaoğlu, F. (2009). *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi*. İstanbul: Alkim Yayınevi.
- Atatürk, G. M. (2007). *Nutuk*. Ankara: Yakamoz Yayıncılık.
- Başbuğ, İ. (2015). *Ermeni Suçlamaları ve Gerçekler*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.
- Berk, M. (2016). *YouTube*. Ermeni Belgeleriyle 1915 Belgeseli: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CGE7BKMn9dc&t=94> sç adresinden alınmıştır
- Çetinkaya, G. (2019). İkinci Dünya Savaşı Öncesinde Nazilerin İktidara Gelişi ve Türk-Alman İlişkileri. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler ve Eğitim Dergisi*, 87-97.
- Dağlıoğlu, E. C. (2014, Aralık 19). Nazilere göre Atatürk'ün başarısının en önemli nedeni Ermenilerin yok edilmesi idi. *Agos Gazetesi*, s. 3-5.
- Dokuyan, S. (2009). *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Sırasında Türk-Alman İlişkileri ve Bu Sürece Milliyetçi-Turancı Görüşlerin Etkisi*. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi/ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Gürün, K. (2012). *Ermeni Dosyası*. İstanbul: Rüstem Yayınevi.
- Hitler, A. (2017). *Kavgam (Mein Kampf)*. Ankara: Parga Yayınları.
- Ihrig, S. (2015). *Naziler ve Atatürk*. İstanbul: Alfa Tarih Yayınları.
- Katchaznouni, H. (2005). *Taşnak Partisi'nin Yapacağı Bir Şey Yok*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.



Kılıç, S. (2013). Nazi Basını ve Völkischer Beobachter Atatürk 1935-1938. *Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), 469-478.

Köylü, M. (2018). Mondros Mütarekesi Sonrası ve Milli Mücadele Döneminde Jandarma Teşkilatı. A. Ö. Ed.: İsmail Hakkı Demircioğlu içinde, *Miras ve Değişim Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Jandarma* (s. 45-66). Ankara: Berikan Yayınevi.

McCarthy, J. (1995). *Ölüm ve Sürgün*. İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınları.

Ortaylı, İ. (2019). *Siyasi Tarih II*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayınları.

Öğür, Y. (2014, Kasım 30). *Karanlıkta Parlayan Yıldız*. Aralık 23, 2023 tarihinde <https://www.turkiyegazetesi.com.tr/kose-yazilari/yildiray-ogur/karanlikta-parildayan-yildiz-583563> adresinden alındı

Özar, Ö. (2015). *Stephan İhrig'in "Atatürk in The NAZI Imagination" Kitabı Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler*. Ankara: AVİM Yayınları.

Özçelik, M. (2011). *Millî Mücadele'de Amerikan Mandası Meselesi ve General Harboard Heyet*. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi SBE.

TBMM. (2001, Ocak 09). Genel Kurul Tutanağı. 21. Dönem 3. Yasama Yılı 41. Birleşim. Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Yayınları.

Uyar, H. (2012). *Tek Parti Dönemi ve Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*. İstanbul : Boyut Yayınevi.