

## 1936 THE MONTREUX CONVENTION

*Yusuf Efe Gürbüz*

Despite numerous vital events in the diplomatic history of both the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, the understanding of diplomacy, which was developed during the signing of the Montreux Straits Convention and continued with devotion afterwards, is more critical than ever. The Treaty of Lausanne, which was signed in 1923 and which includes the issues related to the straits, has become inapplicable with the changing structure of the international system, especially after the First World War, and as a result, young but dynamic Turkey has successfully analyzed the current situation and sought to remedy the situation.

This change in the international system after the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne was most clearly seen in Europe, the balances changed, and various ideologies on the continent offered solutions on almost every issue, and especially the suggestions presented in parallel with the understandings supported by the victorious states of the First World War were tried to be implemented.

As a result of these studies, the League of Nations was established in 1920 as a universal organization by the states in the region in order to prevent the formation of new conflicts, to resolve international conflicts through peaceful means, to take measures to protect peace and security, taking into account the painful experiences of the war. However, as a result of the interventions and behaviours carried out unfairly, such as the placement of soldiers in the Rhine region without any agreement in 1936, the occupation of Abyssinia, as well as the ignorance of both international legal norms and the principles of the League of Nations by revisionist leaders such as Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini over time, the organization has lost much of its importance.

After considering the international conjuncture, when we return to Montreux, with the Treaty of Lausanne signed in 1923, Turkey started to lead the commission that manages the straits but did not have full armament and control rights, ensured that Turkey gained absolute sovereignty over the straits. Articles regarding the abolition of the Straits Commission and the rearmament of the region by Turkey, included in the Montreux agreement, which is an agreement that contains much clearer provisions and focuses directly on the solution of problems, compared to Lausanne, which Cicerin did not want to sign in 1923, saying it was "a pile of blank papers" and In addition to the positive effect, these articles have brought with them for Turkey, how they solve the problems they solve is very important in terms of both the history of Turkish diplomacy and the history of international diplomacy. Turkey did not take advantage of the ramblings that dominated the international system just before the Second World War and did not place its military units in the straits; on the contrary, it chose a different way to resolve the issue and aimed to establish diplomatic relations through international conferences and agreements, and this was clearly stated in the newspapers of the period. As it can be understood, Turkey has not only solved an important security problem but also once again revealed to the international public on which values its understanding of diplomacy is based by advancing as peacefully as possible in an extremely complex European order. In this sense, while the "Times", "Proia" and British newspapers were talking about Montreux, "Atatürk won the thankfulness and gratitude of Europe, that Turkey set an example to the world with its honest international behaviour, and that it was the answer to why peace should be sought through negotiations". They wrote and praised, and these accolades did not come only from the domestic and foreign press. The French chief delegate Pol Bonkur, who attended the conference, said in their speeches that Turkey acted as an example to the whole world regarding the Straits; They congratulated the Turkish government in the person of Tefvik Rüştü Alas for their understanding of diplomacy.

So much so that although the determined period of the agreement is 20 years, it is still in effect even today since none of the signatory states has initiated the annulment process. From this point of view, it can be said: Atatürk's young Turkey succeeded in reflecting the reforms of its chief in terms of internal affairs in its foreign relations, and as a result of this success, it left France with a political victory, as the Greek newspaper Proia put it. However, this "victory" mentioned above is not only a victory for Turkey but also for all states that are really willing to participate in international law and structures aiming to establish and maintain peace. For, as he boldly stated in the Paris newspaper L'intransigeant: "Had the Montreux not been successfully accepted, Hitler would see this as a tremendous reason for his own propaganda and would claim that the amendments could only be made by force and force, and he would go to the Rhineland on March 7th. He would vehemently defend his intervention."

This new breath that Turkish diplomacy wanted to bring to the international system was not adopted by the system in the first place as a result of the insistence of names such as Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito to continue their revisionist efforts. However, in the process of this event in the history of Turkish diplomacy, the obvious gains and this attitude, which Turkey continued in a diplomatic sense, protected young Turkey from destruction during the Second World War, which brought destruction all over Europe and brought chaos to the world, and kept it neutral for a long time by rejecting the war. This neutrality was not a kind of silence; on the contrary, Turkey showed its stance both during the war and in the post-war period; as a result, it fully participated in the structures that attached importance to international law and preserved the new understanding of diplomacy that developed with Atatürk. After the war, in parallel with the principles that Turkey had adopted long before, other actors in the international system tried to ensure that the issues were amended very quickly and precisely through agreements, the mistakes were noticed, and the United Nations was established instead of the League of Nations and At this point, the United Nations, taking into account the realities experienced by the League of Nations at the time, has specified the main methods to be followed in the resolution of interstate disputes and has clearly determined the scope of the prohibition of using force and making war.