POLITICAL CRIME AND DENUNCIATION IN THE 1950s
CASES FOR MAKING COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

SEVAL GÜLEN

Boğaziçi University

2010

POLITICAL CRIME AND DENUNCIATION IN THE 1950s
CASES FOR MAKING COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Thesis submitted to the

Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by

Seval Gülen

Boğaziçi University

2010

"Political Crime and Denunciation in the 1950s- Cases for Making Communist Propaganda" a thesis prepared by Seval Gülen in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree at the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University."

This paper has been approved by

Assoc. Prof. Cengiz Kırlı (Advisor) _____

Prof. Dr. Zafer Toprak _____

Assoc. Prof. Nadir Özbek _____

December 2010

An abstract of the Thesis of Seval Gülen, for the degree of Master of Arts from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History of Boğaziçi University to be taken in December 2010

Title: Political Crime and Denunciation in the 1950s- Cases for Making Communist Propaganda

This thesis is based on the relationship between political crime and denunciation in the 1950s in Turkey. It analyzes the issue of whether there was an atmosphere of ordinary people denouncing each other in that era or not. The paper examines Republican authorities' view of the 'other'- the communists. I have tried to make a detailed analysis of cases- reasons of notice, relationship status of denouncer, authorities' approach to cases or legal results- so as to interpret that our beliefs on the approach of Republican authorities to the communists or any other groups is how authentic in daily life of ordinary people. The cases provided me to see the threats of political system in the eyes of ordinary people and the issues they need to denounce a person as insulting this system. In this respect, I use the case files with political crimes in the 1950s which are tried by Istanbul 1st High Penal Court in Sultanahmet Courthouse. In my thesis study, I make a detailed analysis of these case files, especially ethnic and religious identity of the accused, relationship status of the denouncer and his/her reason for denouncing, defense of the accused, perspective of the members of the court, and final decision of the court. Such a comprehensive analysis of those case files provide for me to understand, in first phase, social and political climate of the 1950s of Turkey and secondly, the experience of this climate among ordinary people of the society.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Seval Gülen tarafından Aralık 2010'da teslim edilen tezin özeti

Başlık: 1950'lerde Siyasi Suç ve İhbar- Komünizm Propagandası Davaları

Bu tez, 1950'lerin Türkiye'sindeki siyasi suçlarla ihbar kavramı arasındaki ilişkiye dayanmaktadır. Bu dönemde sıradan insanların birbirini ihbar etmelerine neden olacak bir atmosferin olup olmadığını analiz etmektedir. Bu inceleme Cumhuriyet kadrolarının "öteki"lere -komünistler- bakışını araştırmaktadır. Cumhuriyet kadrolarının komünistlere ya da herhangi bir gruba karşı yaklaşımlarının sıradan insanların günlük yaşamlarında ne kadar geçerli olduğunu anlayabilmek için, ihbarın nedeni, muhbirin yakınlık derecesi, yetkililerin davalara ya da hukuki sonuçlarına yaklaşımı gibi açılardan tezimde davaların ayrıntılı bir tartışmasını yapmayı denedim. Davalar, sıradan insanların gözünde siyasi düzenin nasıl tehdit olarak algılandığını ve hangi durumlarda bir insanı rejime hakaret ettiği gerekçesiyle ihbar etme ihtiyacı hissettiğini anlamamı sağladı. Bu amaçla, İstanbul Sultanahmet 1. Ağır Ceza Mahkemesi'nin 1950'lerdeki siyasi suçları içeren dava dosyalarını kullandım. Tezimde, özellikle sanıkların etnik ve dini kimliklerini, muhbirin yakınlık derecesi ihbar etme sebebi, sanığın savunması, mahkeme heyetinin olaya bakış açıları ve mahkemenin nihai kararı açısından bu dava dosyalarının ayrıntılı bir analizini yaptım. Dosyaların bu denli kapsamlı bir incelemesi, öncelikle Türkiye'nin 1950'lerdeki sosyal ve siyasi iklimini ve ikinci olarak da toplumun sıradan insanları arasında bu iklimin nasıl tecrübe edildiğini anlamamı sağladı.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I want to thank my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Cengiz Kırlı for his guidance and motivation during all stages of the thesis process. I was very much inspired by his great course on Cultural History and his encouragements for using archival resources when searching for a thesis subject. I also thank to the other members of my jury, Prof. Dr. Zafer Toprak and Assoc. Prof. Nadir Özbek for their remarks and warnings.

I am also grateful to Tracy Lord for her guidance through one year of my thesis. She was always very interested in my thesis process and took care of my questions and gave advices always in the right time. Kathryn Kranzler is another person who deserves a special thank. She edited this thesis in details very carefully.

My thesis cannot be possible if Mehmet Özcan, the bailiff of Sultanahmet First High Penal Court, has not kept the archive of this court regardfully in a special room. And of course, I also thank to the judge of same court for his permission to study in the archive.

During the archive process, Zöhre Benli, Çiğdem Oğuz and Barış Zeren gave a special support by coming with me to the court and taking the pictures of the documents page by page. I am grateful all of them not only for their support but also their warm friendship.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Bahattin Akşit, Prof. Dr. Belma Akşit and Prof. Dr. Sabahattin Güllülü from Sociology Department in Maltepe University for their contribution to my hard times in thesis and arrange my workload according to thesis process. I am also indebted to my workmates from Maltepe University, Burcu Yılmaz, Sinan Alçın, Kurtul Gülenç, Barış Özdemir, Dilek Arlı Çil, Aziz Güzel and Can Cengiz for their permanent support and invaluable friendship.

I should also acknowledge Nivart Taşçı and Deniz İlhan with whom I share a common fate of thesis schedule. They were always with me in all stages of thesis related to ATA and gave a kind support and invaluable friendship.

My dearest family, my mother, my father, my sister and my uncle in law, my brother and my aunt in law, deserves a special thank for their permanent support through all my life, especially in this thesis process. I owe much to them.

This last thank is the most difficult one for me because whatever I say, it will not be enough for his vital role in this thesis study. Erkan Irmak took part in each line of the thesis and did not deny all his knowledge and wisdom to it. Without his passionate love and support in the past two years, this thesis could not be possible.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER II: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 9

Denunciation and History 9
Denunciation and Everyday People 17

CHAPTER III: ANTI-COMMUNISM IN THE 1950s 24

Post-World War II Era 24
Turkey in the 1950s 39

CHAPTER IV: THE CRIME OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA 49

Cases Involving Turkish and Muslim People 50

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION 95

BIBLIOGRAPHY 100

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

My thesis study is based on the relationship between political crime and denunciation in the 1950s in Turkey. It analyzes the issue of whether there was an atmosphere of ordinary people denouncing each other in that era. However, this is not to say that I expected to reach a general conclusion on the atmosphere of that time which could be considered to have been valid in all parts of Turkey. Of course, such an expectation would be very optimistic for a master thesis. In addition, my archive study was limited to a certain region of Turkey, even to Istanbul. Therefore, there will be no big answers in my thesis. Instead, new and interesting stories related to everyday life in the 1950s of Turkey will be presented. The cases on political crime of the period will provide for me to have some conclusions about the history and culture of other parts of the discipline of the society.

This thesis is in the framework of cultural history. Cultural history studies rise against official history which is written only about heroes, significant people, powerful parties or events. Instead, cultural history supports the view that history should be written about the stories and actions of ordinary people. The history of Turkey is very much like that; especially Republican history puts special emphasis on political parties and prime ministers. Therefore, we have very little information on the lives of ordinary people, who constitute a big proportion of society in that period. As a consequence, this thesis is inspired by the same interest on the history of

everyday life. And then comes the issues of political crimes and denunciations as an instrument to examine this.

This paper examines the issue of whether denunciatory activities were commonly used among the ordinary people in the 1950s or not. This hypothesis was supported by the cases with political crimes in the same years. This question is significant and even interesting for me especially to understand the Republican authorities' view of the 'other'- the communists. That is to say, this question will test the general view on that period which sees it as a first step to democracy owing to the transition to the multi-party system. This issue has been very much debated among scholars; however, here a detailed analysis of cases- reasons of notice, relationship of denouncer, authorities' approach to cases or legal result of them- will be made so as to interpret that our beliefs on the approach of the Republican authorities to non-Muslims or any other groups was as it was in the daily lives of the ordinary people. The cases provide a view of the threads of political system from the eyes of the ordinary people and the issues they felt required denunciation for insulting this system.

The most common political crimes of those days were insulting Turkishness, state institutions or the president and making communist or religious propaganda. In the political and social atmosphere of the 1950s, charges were brought in many cases for those crimes, and a significant rate involved non-Muslim citizens. Moreover, nearly all of these cases were caused by a denunciation from a neighbor, sometimes a member of the family, or a friend from a coffeehouse, that is to say, an ordinary person, not an official. Thereby, this thesis study examines the issue of the effect of denunciatory activities in everyday life in the 1950s in Turkey.

A significant source of the history of ordinary people is the cases tried in the courts. These cases are the most accessible sources of information related to the experience of ordinary citizens of crucial events and discussions of the period, their thoughts and commitments, and their stories on the same issues. In this respect, I used the case files involving political crimes in the 1950s tried by the Istanbul 1st High Penal Court at the Sultanahmet Courthouse. The archive of the 1st High Penal Court is completed now and an important part of the cases is about political crimes.

Communist propaganda was the most prevalent political crime according to those files owing to the atmosphere of the period. Then come the libel suits related to insulting Turkishness, the president, and any other state institutions. Finally, there are cases about making religious propaganda in, but such cases are much less frequent than other types of political crime. These case files are in fact the record of final trial, and therefore they include all of the information related to the lawsuit process. They are generally between 2-16 pages. In this study, I made a detailed analysis of these case files, especially on the ethnic and religious identity of the accused, degree of the denouncer and his/her reason for denouncing, defense of the accused, perspective of the members of the court, and the final decision of the court. Such a comprehensive analysis of those case files gave insight into the social and political climate of the 1950s of Turkey and secondly, the experience of this climate among the ordinary people.

The research methods discussed above constitute the methodology part of the thesis. It can be seen as a descriptive method; but I do not want to make only a description of the atmosphere of the 1950s of Turkey in my thesis. On the contrary, I want to criticize the common belief about the role of the state and its organizations on discrimination against the “other” throughout the republican history of Turkey. I

want to find the soul of this view of the other in the daily lives of ordinary people. In this way, I want to discuss the relation between political crimes and denunciation in a society in my thesis using the concepts of surveillance, panopticism, the modern way of political systems, authority and police state, the motivations of the denouncers, the theory of law, and the relation between the systems and denunciation. Therefore, my thesis is a hypothesis-testing, problematical and comparative study.

The cases in the thesis are the oldest trial records in the Sultanahmet High Penal Court which involve cases on political crime between 1950 and 1959. There are decision boards of approximately 100 cases in this archive. Decision boards are the records of the final trial of a case and only these records are archived in the courts. The remaining documents were sent to a paper mill after 10 years had passed. As stated before, the most frequently appearing cases in the archive were related to the crime of making communist propaganda, insulting Turkishness, the president, parliamentary, the armed forces and any other state institutions and finally making religious propaganda.

Of course, this distribution was a consequence of the political picture of the 1950s. The high rates of the crime of communist propaganda are not surprising in a period in which anti-communism was a government policy. The following high numbers of the offense of insulting are a continuation of the tradition of being a sacred cow of the governments, also a legacy of the single-party regime. The Democrat Party often showed its sensibility on this issue, too.

Approximately 80% of these cases are related to the daily events of ordinary people. Only 19 of 105 cases tried were related to popular or politically active people, parties or associations, columns in newspapers, published books or poems. That is to say, the remaining part of the archive is a consequence of denunciations

related with daily events. Some of them are against the government during a neighborhood conflict, or insulting of the laws, or cursing the government due to raises when reading a newspaper, or criticizing the Menderes government during a dinner with some friends, or blaming the government and police for unemployment when begging for help in a mosque, or making communist propaganda by drawing a form that looked like a hammer and sickle on a newspaper, or writing praise about communism on the bottom of a piano, or shouting "Yippee! The Red Army is coming!" during a football match, or complaining about unemployment rates in Turkey, or wearing Bulgarian sucks when playing football with his workmates, or insulting Turkishness owing to her/his criticism of Turkey about the Cyprus events, or insulting Turkishness due to her/his objections to civil servants who wanted to search the house.

The most conspicuous point in the cases is the marks of the political atmosphere of the 1950s in Turkey- opposition to communism, that is to say, Russia, the uncriticizable character of Menderes in power despite a multi-party system, specifically reminding of Turkish identity to non-Muslims, and an emphasis on secularism against Islamic propaganda. The cases show the fact that such kind of concerns and emphases of political powers have also an extensive coverage in the life of everyday people.

First of all, the awareness and bias against the sympathizers of communists or Russia is in the files. People who talked about favorable aspects of Russia in a debate in a coffee house were denounced to the police by their friends in the coffee house. Even a Bulgarian who missed her/his own country was denounced for owing to the crime of making communist propaganda. Or there were people who were denounced for insulting words about Turkey adding the claim that there are no such problems in

Russia. Moreover, there are some accused people who only listened to Bulgarian radio or wore a Bulgarian socks, that were accused by the crime of making communist propaganda.

In addition to such cases, there were denouncers who felt the need to state the fact that the accused person had already been a communist-minded although this explanation had no relation to respective crime. For instance, a mother-in-law in front of a court, who was in a conflict with her daughter's husband owing to his annulment of marriage, added her defense the words spoken by him praising the Russia during a big row. In another case, a complainant about the noise of one of his neighbors defended himself by calling attention to the Armenian identity of the accused and some Armenian words spoken by him during the fight to the court members. Or after a fight of drunks in a bar which ends in a police station, one of the men stated that other had already been communist-minded in order to prove his right.

In other words, ever though in everyday cases which went to court in the 1950s, people know very well the fact that if an individual was a communist, non-Muslim, immigrant or non-Turkish speaker, these features could be used as aggravating circumstances or as signs of high potential to commit crimes. Ordinary people were not loath to voice such identities even irrelevant issues or in cases. They also made a special emphasis on such features.

Finally, the order of the thesis is as: In the second chapter, the theoretical framework of the thesis which is based on the denunciation literature within the scope of the cultural history discipline will be discussed. I will deal with its relation both to history and to the everyday people. Denunciation literature makes a special emphasis on the role of denunciatory activities in modern political systems and how they are used as a controlling and surveillance instrument of the citizens by modern

states. In this chapter, I will begin by explaining the emergence of this literature in historical analysis and continue with sample regimes from world history in which denunciatory acts have had a basic role in social discipline. The possible participants of this action like the state, government, police secret services or ordinary people are given a special interest in this analysis. Moreover, extensive coverage will be made of to the motives of the denouncers and common methods of this action so as to observe the efficiency of the program of the regime over its citizens and also the notions of the people for participating in such acts.

In the third chapter, the political, social and economic atmosphere of the 1950s in the world, together with a primary emphasis to the developments in Turkey, will be analyzed. The 1950s basically were shaped by the circumstances of the post-World War II era, which was organized by the interests of the United States of America. Through the new worldwide foreign policy of America, some crucial events were introduced the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Korean War and McCarthyism or public support for all these interferences. All of these attempts were justified by a danger of communist expansion throughout the world which was laid on thick by the American government. Not only American citizens, but also the world population was saturated by an anti-communist paranoia with the support of various kinds of propaganda and police activities. The Democrat Party government in Turkey also became a loyal promoter of this new order owing its economic and political troubles. In the third chapter, I will analyze in detail this post-World War II era, but emphasizing the new anti-communist ideology by different governments in the world, particularly the American and the Turkish governments.

In the fourth chapter, I will focus on cases brought before the counts on accusations of making communist propaganda. Firstly, I will discuss the role of the practice of the crime of communist propaganda in the 1950s. Then, I will make an extensive evaluation of the cases related to this crime in the archive of the Istanbul 1st High Penal Court according to the regions, ethnic groups, political views, gender or ages of the accused. The social, political and economic profiles of both the denouncers and accused people will be examined in detail in this part. Not only the cases with ordinary people but also with well-known political actors will be included in the analysis to have the chance of making comparison between two.

Finally, in the fifth chapter, I will give the significant concluding remarks of my thesis. I will make some generalizations about the common social life of ordinary people in 1950s in Turkey with regard to the cases with the popular crime of the period- making communist propaganda.

CHAPTER 2

A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Denunciation and History

Denunciation literature -a sub-discipline of cultural history- is inspired by a general interest on the issue of the role given by the authorities to the citizens in a society. This interest in the social sciences has mainly been developed with the works of Michel Foucault, which are symbolized mostly by the concept of "panopticism". Foucault uses this concept for societies in which everyone feels herself/himself to be being spied by someone else or by the authorities/state. Modern societies can be called now surveillance societies as various kinds of policing activities are undertaken place not only by the authorities, but also by the citizens of the country.

In this respect, it can be claimed that denunciation literature has been established by social historians in order to make a more detailed analysis of the denunciation aspect/act as a kind of informing the police or other authorities in modern political systems.[1] They try to reveal a social history of denunciation which means:

> Addressing in turn the types of authors, their motivations for writing, the peculiarities of their style and rhetoric, the means of registering

[1] Robert Gellately, "Denunciations in Twentieth-Century Germany: Aspects of Self-Policing in the Third Reich and the German Democratic Republic," *The Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 931.

> their complaints, the procedural controls and investigative routines, the bureaucracy's self-defense mechanisms, the efficacy of denunciation, and the subsequent fates of both denouncers and denounced.[2]

More generally, denunciation literature provides a lively discussion environment on the notions of citizen and civil acts -targeting the individual as criminal- the limits of public and private sphere, the dilemma between the promise of freedom and at the same time taking severe measures to protect this freedom and the role of denunciatory acts in struggling with the threats towards existing political systems.[3] All these controversial issues are in reality caused by the fact that denunciation is always justified by a forthcoming danger against the regime.[4] And this continuous danger creates a conflict between the role of the citizens and the limit of the governments in social systems.

The literature is basically based on the political systems –specifically dictatorships- of two countries, namely Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. This is mostly due to the fact that in these specific periods these countries were characterized by a complete dedication of all citizens to the existing system and her/his informing acts to the authorities in the case of a disloyalty. As Hannah Arendt states it in her book, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, these regimes develop "a system of ubiquitous spying where everybody may be a police agent" and where "each individual feels himself under constant surveillance."[5] At this point, scholars

---

[2] Vladimir A. Kozlov, "Denunciations and Its Functions in Soviet Governance: A Study of Denunciations and Their Bureaucratic Handling from Soviet Police Archives, 1944-1953," *The Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 872.

[3] Colin Lucas, "The Theory of Denunciation in the French Revolution," *The Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 768.

[4] Lucas, p. 769.

research the frequency, effects and importance of this informing act in such despotic systems.

Vladimir A. Kozlov is one of these scholars. He makes a special contribution to the role of denunciation act in the Soviet Union. He establishes the relationship between the extensity of the denunciation and the political culture in the USSR and finally reaches the conclusion that the political culture of the period engendered such a big role to denunciations. In his own words:

> The political culture of the USSR- the almost complete absence of a tradition of legal resolution of conflicts between political institutions and the individual, between the rulers and the ruled; the extremely limited legal rights of the population to organize autonomously; the anxiety generated in the individual by the feeling of a direct psychological connection to the central power- made denunciation more than anything else an essential element in Russia's traditional system of bureaucratic governance.[6]

This passage also shows that the popularity of denunciation act was a consequence of a culture of governance which gave way to ineffective legal institutions, restricted the rights of the citizens to join in political organizations or a compelling ideological constraint on individuals. Such kind of governments can exist in every corner of the world. In the end, all aspects of this political culture lead to the increasing popularity of denunciations against officials by the citizens.[7] And this mechanism was represented as a form of democratic political participation of

---

[5] Sheila Fitzpatrick and Robert Gellately, "Introduction to the Practices of Denunciation in Modern European History," *The Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 756.

[6] Kozlov, p. 867.

[7] Sheila Fitzpatrick, "Signals from Below: Soviet Letters of Denunciation of the 1930s," *The Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 833.

individuals in the system. Some scholars define such kind of denunciations as "subaltern denunciations" owing to the use of seeking of justice by ordinary people.[8]

Of course, this kind of denunciations should be distinguished from a regular informing of a citizen about a real criminal or suspected person to the police, that is to say, the difference between denouncing and informing. This dilemma is a consequence of the tension of preventing "the defense of liberty from assassinating liberty" which I mentioned above.[9] However, in societies which are governed by authoritarian policies, these two types of activities meld together and their definitions and the difference of them becomes ambiguous.[10]

Historians' curios about the role of denunciation in totalitarian social regimes have made critical investigations especially into the secret services such as Gestapo in Nazi Germany, Cheka in the Soviet Union and the Stasi in East Germany. The common view is that "denunciation was too ordinary a practice in these societies to have the exalted quality, the flavor of spiritual dedication, implied in the totalitarian literature".[11] Furthermore, one of these historians, Robert Gellately, explains the role of these secret service files as follows: "These remaining files are invaluable sources for understanding all aspects of everyday terror, broadly defined, and denunciations in particular."[12]

As stated earlier, denunciation literature has a strong connection with research on totalitarianism and totalitarian regimes. Scholars establish their research on the

---

[8] Fitzpatrick, p. 864.

[9] Lucas, p. 772.

[10] Gellately, p. 932.

[11] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, p. 756.

[12] Gellately, p. 934.

base of the symbols of totalitarian regimes like Nazi Germany, Stalin's Soviet Union or the East German Democratic Republic. They assert that denunciation actions prevailed mostly in these kinds of societies and encouragement mechanisms of this practice among the people was similar to that of the states'. However, some scholars criticize this view of the denunciation act in totalitarian regimes and claim that there were significant differences in the applications related with denunciations in them.[13] Owing to this fact, they separate the link between the motivation for denunciation acts and totalitarian regimes which are claimed in previous works. Besides, they also do not consider denunciation a totalitarian phenomenon or a separate characteristic of totalitarian regimes. On the contrary, according to them, denunciation is a prevalent practice that can be observed in all kinds of societies, but its degree varies according to the political and cultural features of a country or the level of the motivation of a state. These features cause a denunciation mechanism with a great variation in type, visibility and incidence.[14] For instance, in war periods, during the World War I and II, the degree of encouragement and application of denunciations increased dramatically. This is mostly due to the fact that "in wartime all states insist that patriotism- a citizen's allegiance to the nation-state- override all other loyalties" and both state and public of the country find denunciation act justified.[15]

In addition, there were already various kinds of denunciation mechanisms before the World Wars. This mechanism of social control goes beyond the limits of modernist political organizations, urban centers and political crimes. The application in second half of the twentieth century in rural Russia is a conspicuous example of

---

[13] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, p. 759.

[14] Fitzpatrick, p. 832.

[15] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, p. 762.

this limitless phenomenon. The denouncement function had been given to the priests in these villages in order to inform the Church or even the police of anyone who posed a threat existing social order in the village.[16] These people generally were labor migrants or people who were not actively participate in religious duties or rituals or who made noncanonical marriages.[17] This role of the village priests as messenger between higher authorities and villagers was not very different from the cases in modern states. As stated by Jeffrey Burds, "it is quite clear that many of these denunciations were not motivated by religious issues alone: the language of the confrontations suggests that the denunciations were often a kind of popular theater that overlay tensions that were far more profound."[18] They were used as a tool for humiliating the status of the accused and damaging social regulations and the hierarchies in the village.

In reality, in all religious systems and communities, denunciation acts are regarded as a responsibility for all citizens. The encouragement of denunciation by the Christian Church with its laws inspired by the increase of "institutionalized inquisitorial practices" in the Middle Ages is an apparent case of this reality.[19] However, all examples of such cases deal with a large scale of issues other than religious principles. This extensive usage of denunciation is caused by the fact that people see them as a necessity for survival and growth in such kind of societies.[20]

---

[16] Jeffrey Burds, "A Culture of Denunciation: Peasant Labor Migration and Religious Anathematization in Rural Russia, 1860-1905," *Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 791.

[17] Burds, p. 788.

[18] Burds, p. 811.

[19] Gary Lease, "Denunciation as a Tool of Ecclesiastical Control: The Case of Roman Catholic Modernism," *The Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 820.

[20] Burds, p. 830.

The concept of "political criminality" is also a crucial subject in denunciation literature because it seems that this concept gains a broader meaning in authoritarian regimes.[21] In these regimes, criminality becomes a central issue in daily life and its scope is extended towards any suspected action of a citizen. As a result of this perception, the scope of the laws is also extended and diversified. The citizens are encouraged to take part in solving crimes and denouncing criminals to the authorities. As Colin Lucas comments on the period of the French Revolution, "denunciation was the civic duty of the citizen, expressive of his vigilance in caring for public affairs, one of his individual actions to defend and promote the Revolution and to secure its successful transition from tyranny to liberty and equality."[22] This kind of an observation also can be found in the modifications during the 1950s in Turkey to Article 141 and 142 in the Turkish Penal Code -as I mentioned in the previous chapter- which were related to the crime of making communist propaganda. The Democrat Party government made many changes in laws related to different kinds of political crimes and expanded their scope during their power.

Moreover, the state and governing party's role in encouraging denunciations and regulating laws related to political crimes are analyzed in detail in studies. The main question in this issue is whether the state or as Gellately writes "the party tolerated, directed, and even sponsored all kinds of actions" against some groups in the society -sometimes this group becomes communists or non-Muslims, Islamists, Jews or many other- or not.[23] Such an analysis of other groups in society provides us the possibility of understanding what happens in other social settings. Furthermore,

---

[21] Gellately, p. 933.

[22] Lucas, pp. 774-775.

[23] Gellately, p. 934.

there is a directly proportional relationship between the lifetime of a system and the dose of encouragement of the citizens' participation in denunciation activities. Any extension in the duration of a regime causes more motivation for the systematical denunciation activities of the citizens. In addition, as Gellately writes, secret services and

> other parts of domination (party and state) had more time to sink deeper roots and to spread through society in numerous ways, playing a role not only as repressor and persecutor but also as mediator of conflicts and as "paternalistic sponsor and dispenser of privileges, even a substitute for usual channels of interest articulation, which were closed in that patronized society.[24]

In addition, the role of the police and secret services in encouraging denunciations of some "suspected" others are significant in the related literature. As Fitzpatrick and Gellately state, "There is clearly a relationship between the practice of denunciation and the existence of police whose charge includes reporting on dangerous moods and opinions among population."[25] However, the research in denunciation literature is generally based on the files of secret services more than on archives related with police activities. This is mostly due to the fact that this literature is more generally based on countries which had effective secret services in their most authoritarian periods. During these years, the secret services were more active than the police in crime prevention.[26] In the case of Turkey, however, the cases which were tried in the Sultanahmet High Penal Court in the 1950s were generally a consequence of a denunciation of a suspect to the police. That is to say, the police were the first option which came to the mind of a denouncer in that period,

---

[24] Lucas, p. 963.

[25] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, p. 760.

[26] Gellately, p. 942.

because the secret service very effective in those years, especially in solving conflicts among or related to everyday people.

Denunciation and Everyday People

Of course, especially cases with ordinary people were more difficult to evaluate and control by the authorities. First, a political crime committed by an ordinary person in society is more challenging to judge than that of a real criminal. Second, organization of the denunciation acts among ordinary citizens is harder to realize. Therefore, the attitudes of both the police and the members of the court towards the cases related with ordinary people are critical to analyze. This concern is in connection with another notable question: Were ethnic, religious or any other differences influential in political crimes, and if they were, to what extent? Did being denounced to the authorities result in a feeling of "warning" or "reprimand" for an individual?[27] As John Connelly proposes, "Petitioning was a zero-sum game. To take advantage of a resource, one had to show why someone else should be excluded" and therefore "regardless of intent, they had a political effect."[28] In other words, even though many of these cases are not started owing to a political conflict, the denunciatory aspect and their role in establishing a hierarchy between citizens make them political denunciations.

Colin Lucas's generalizations on denunciation act provide the distinctive features of this matter. As he asserts, denunciation is a collective act, although it is

---

[27] John Connelly, "The Uses of Volksgemeinschaft: Letters to the NSDAP Kreisleitung Eisenach, 1930-1940," *The Journal of Modern History* 68/4 (1996): p. 930.

[28] Connelly, p. 905.

carried out by an individual; in other words, it has a publicity character. Moreover, the denouncer does not have the responsibility of her/his act; it can easily obtain an anonymous character. Finally and most significantly, the denunciation act has a disciplinary and educative character, which means that it is a duty of being citizen to inform on those who do not act as integral members of the collectivity.[29]

However, there must be more motives than these to convince a citizen to denounce someone. First of all, so as to have a general idea about the motives of a denouncer, her/his social profile provides a crucial clue. The connection between her/his social environment and the suspected person is an essential determinant in denunciation act. Are they from same class status or a lower or a higher one? For instance, do they denounce their bosses or any other bureaucrats in order to take their revenge on those who constantly abused and insult them as was the case in Soviet Russia?[30] Generally what are their genders are the denunciation acts are mostly used by men or women?[31]

The motive of the denouncers is also significant for understanding the efficiency of the program or ideology of the state or party on the citizens. Of course, every denunciation includes ideological beliefs and moral judgments to a certain extent; that is to say, denouncers use classic ideological frames or popular themes of the existing regime in order to justify their act.[32] As Kozlov writes, "The use of applicable ideological codes was supposed to set up a special almost intimate connection between the informer or denouncer and the regime and to indicate that the

---

[29] Lucas, p. 777.

[30] Kozlov, p. 871.

[31] Gellately, p. 961.

[32] Kozlov, p. 882.

author was deserving of special trust."[33] This usage is also related to the fact that denunciation is an interpretation more than a statement of suspicion and it is a "process of giving meaning to behavior, gestures, and appearances."[34]

However, there is more than one motive for a person to denounce someone to the authorities and these motives change depending on the circumstances of the period, the attitude of the rulers on the issue, and the character and interests of the denouncer. First of all, these denunciations can be seen "as a measure of popular consensus or a sign of general agreement with the regime."[35] However, Robert Gellately finds such an interpretation of these actions too simple. And he develops two kinds of motives of denouncers, namely affective and instrumental. By affective motives, he means basically the political motives of a person to denounce someone to the authorities owing to her/his any kind of disloyalty to the regime or to the dominant ideology. This kind of denunciation can be against "demonized enemies of the people-alleged witches, heretics, Communists, counterrevolutionaries, child abusers, or terrorists" or against the groups defined as "outsiders and pariahs […] such as Jews, gypsies, homosexuals, religious dissenters, foreigners, or members of stigmatized social groups."[36] Another example of such kind of denunciation is the one against local officials or bureaucrats made by the citizens in order to exert the central state's influence over this conflict between the officials and people and secure justice.[37]

---

[33] Kozlov, p. 883.

[34] Lucas, p. 781.

[35] Gellately, p. 943.

[36] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, pp. 762-763.

[37] Kozlov, p. 891.

Instrumental motives are related to personal the interests of the denouncer in doing much a thing. Gellately adds the fact that generally these two kinds of motives become influential together in a denouncing act. Despite this fact, self-interests in a denouncement generally far overweigh compared to the affective motives. This self-interest becomes effective in conflicts that appear in social classes, neighborhoods, houses, and even in families.[38] Even it has been proved that "a very large number of denunciations in most societies are against ordinary people- neighbors, fellow villagers, work colleagues- against whom the denouncer has an everyday grievance."[39] In addition, such kinds of instrumental motives are closely related to the attitude of the state during the period as Gellately explains: "The widespread use of denunciations has to be seen in the cultural and social context of an interventionist system that fostered instrumental relations between citizens and regime."[40]

A similar distinction between the types of denunciations is made by Kozlov as "disinterested" and "interested" denunciations. Whereas disinterested denunciations are not caused by any personal interest of the denouncer, interested motives are direct consequences of a private motive of the denouncer. In other words, disinterested denunciations are introduced by affective motives; whereas interested denunciations are the outcomes of instrumental motives. Disinterested denunciations are made through a belief on the fairness of the central state and legal institutions and their efforts to administer justice. However, interested denunciations are not made for a strong wish to achieve justice; their target can be self-defense or a

[38] Gellately, p. 945.

[39] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, p. 763.

[40] Gellately, p. 949.

desire to take secret revenge on someone.[41] Nonetheless, as stated above, these two kinds cannot be separated from each other; an interested denunciation also can include an affective motive itself, in order to make it more legitimate and rightful.

Sheila Fitzpatrick is another scholar who makes a categorization between the denunciations, this time based on their genre. She distinguishes them as the ones which concern loyalty, social class, "abuse of power", made by family members or focusing on moral values, manipulative uses of denunciation, anonymous denunciations and finally according to the outcomes of the denouncement act.[42] Whereas loyalty denunciations have the target of public service, class conflicts are caused by the rifts between different social classes. Abuse denunciations are generally made by people who are at the low levels of social hierarchies, especially against unrestricted power posed upon them by anyone or any institution. There are also denunciations of family members who denunciate each other over matters of moral corruption, like sexual harassment. Fitzpatrick gives the example of "apartment" denunciation to manipulative uses of this act, meaning that the denunciation of one neighbor by another neighbor who were sharing the same living space. All in all, the heavy outcomes of being denounced such as dismissal from jobs, expulsion from the party in power, prison sentence or other criminal charges make them critical for every citizen.

The type of the denunciation is another emphasis of these studies in denunciation history. Which method generally is used by a denouncer, letters, either signed or anonymous, tips or personally visiting the offices?[43] Or does she/he use the

---

[41] Kozlov, pp. 872-882.

[42] Fitzpatrick, p. 837.

newspapers, a common type in the twentieth century, accusations which are "written by people who perceive themselves to be victims of bureaucratic injustice or persecution or who wish to disclose wrongdoing by big corporations and government agencies"?[44] In that period, sending a denouncing letter to a newspaper was the same as sending it to the government agencies.[45] Among all these different kinds of denunciation acts, approximately all of the cases in my thesis which started as a result of a denunciation, involved one or more people personally going to the police station. Other methods of denunciation were not widely-used by Turkish people in the era under study.

As a result of these denunciations, the state or governing party both gain information and have a control over the private spheres of social life. This extends their scope of domination from the public space to the private area. In addition, denunciations enable the state and the party to keep their fingers on the pulse of society. As Fitzpatrick asserts, "The surveillance function of denunciation has to do with the disciplining of citizens- the exertion of state and collective power to enforce conformity to certain socially accepted norms."[46] Additionally, these denouncing systems are in use for various kinds of activities against "other" groups in society like communists, non-Muslims, different ethnic groups or sometimes women. All in all, as Fitzpatrick and Gellately point out:

> Police, revolutionary, and theocratic states and communities- as well as twentieth-century totalitarian states- have been particularly likely to encourage their citizens or members to write denunciations against

---

[43] Gellately, p. 943.

[44] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, pp. 760-761.

[45] Fitzpatrick, p. 835.

[46] Fitzpatrick, p. 863.

> each other for purposes of maintaining social control, ideological purity, virtue, and so on.[47]

Furthermore, the denunciation act creates a two-sided distinction between the citizens of a country as denouncers and the people who are denounced. That is to say, it creates a "line dividing those who find themselves in tension with the state and those who see some of their own identity in the state; it marks the division between a state that is 'externalized' and one that is 'internalized' by the citizens."[48] However, it is an obvious fact that the state plays an active role in this externalization and internalization process of its citizens.

[47] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, p. 761.

[48] Fitzpatrick and Gellately, p. 763.

CHAPTER 3

ANTI-COMMUNISM IN THE 1950s

The Post-World War II Era

In the post-World War II era, the USA was governed by the dream of a new international order which basically would be regulated according to the interests of it. Before the war, there had been two big powers on the world stage, the USSR and Great Britain, which had been in conflict because of their interests. In such a world, the US would have a mediating role between these two, as the organizer of the world's politics. According to this new world order, the US would take on the leading role of Britain in the Mediterranean region[49], which was in related with Turkey and Greece mostly.[50] Such a recovery in world system should only be provided by what Freeland calls "economic reconstruction of the major trading nations."[51] Between 1945 and 1946, the United States succeeded in receiving

[49] Mustafa Bilgin, *Britain and Turkey in The Middle East: Politics and Influence in the Early Cold War Era* (London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies; New York: In the United States and Canada distributed by Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 42.

[50] Robert E. Osgood, "Introduction: Reappraisal of American Policy," in *America & the World: From the Truman Doctrine to Vietnam* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), p. 5.

[51] Richard M. Freeland, *The Truman Doctrine and the Origins of McCarthyism* (New York and London: New York University Press, 1985), p. 22.

approval from its people to give financial aid to Britain and the Western European countries "for cooperation with American commercial policy."[52]

Actually, before the end of the World War II, United States had been in the belief that the Soviet Union could be persuaded to approve and adapt itself to the new American new postwar foreign policy. At that time, the essential point of the conflict was the distribution of Eastern and Western European countries between the USA and the USSR. America's new policy -bringing "democracy" and "peace" to the world- for these countries in fact posed a threat the existing policy of the Soviet Union in the region. Despite this situation, during the first years of the post-World War II era, the US government tried to reach an agreement with Joseph Stalin on this matter. In a similar vein, the Soviet government was also following a reconciliatory policy towards the United States; however, in addition to this policy, Stalin was demanding as much as possible from this new sharing of the world.[53]

This positive attitude of the president Truman towards the Russian government was not supported fully by the American citizens, because, through the World War II, they had been convinced by the same government that the real enemy of their country was the Soviet Union.[54] At the same time, the US administration had always a fear of persuading the American public opinion to change in their foreign policy from isolationism to interventionism in the post-World War II era.[55] Furthermore, in order to provide a consensus on this new interventionist foreign policy of the United States, all opposed groups in the society should be united

[52] Freeland, p. 47.

[53] Freeland, p. 21.

[54] Freeland, pp. 21-22.

[55] Freeland, p. 24.

"behind a military program made necessary by enemy attack."[56] And of course, this enemy would be the Soviet Union.

In addition to this, the new government in the US had realized that the policies of the two superpowers in Eastern and Western European countries were in essence in conflict with each other. As a consequence, America's attitude towards the Soviet Union changed in the sense that it abandoned to negotiating approach, but instead, took on a constant opposing position in the strongest possible method against any extravagation of the Soviet Union.[57]

In this respect, the US tried to establish a non-communist Western Europe which would be reconstructed according to its new social and economic policy , towards to the end of 1946. In essence,

> "American efforts to assist European construction were increasingly seen not only as means to eliminate the depressed economic conditions that tended to serve the interests of the communists, but also as political tools to undermine the influence of the Communist Party and move western European governments toward strong pro-American and anti-Soviet positions."[58]

There was a great fear of Europe's taking the part of Soviet Union in those years if it would not recover political instability. Moreover, this fear was actually built by advocates of Cold War.[59]

On the other side, some reports on the economic situation of Western European countries revealed the fact that all countries except Sweden were in decline

---

[56] Freeland, p. 25.

[57] Freeland, p. 53.

[58] Freeland, p. 54.

[59] Cüneyt Akalın, *Soğuk Savaş, ABD ve Türkiye: Olaylar-Belgeler (1945-1952)* (Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2003), p. 231.

in the rates of industrial production compared to pre-war conditions.[60] For this reason, the US administration had a strong fear of the future that such circumstances of Western European countries would cause the Communist Parties to come to power through elections or a forcible coup. As a consequence of this fear, it interfered in the internal affairs of these countries, especially France, Italy, Germany, Poland, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece and Turkey. Generally, the Truman administration demanded that these countries eliminate the communists -and hence the communist parties- from the political sphere, in return for economic assistance.

Another part of this plan was accomplished by the Greek-Turkish Aid Program, which was developed in conjunction with the Truman Doctrine, declaring that "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."[61] This idea led to many interferences by America throughout a great deal of the world, namely from Asia to the Far East. Some scholars assert that the real purpose of the Greek-Turkish Aid Program was to prevent any possible influence of the Soviet Union on these countries. Such a Soviet influence, Freeland writes, "would endanger western European access to the oil resources of the Middle East, upon which American planners were depending for programs of European recovery."[62]

Most of the theorists agree with Osgood's view of that "American vital interests that goes far beyond the physical security of American territory and identifies American security with balances of power and a modicum of international

[60] Freeland, p. 71.

[61] Osgood, p. 5.

[62] Freeland, p. 75.

order against communist expansion in other continents."[63] Especially in the post-World War II era, the US had the belief that there was a continuous threat against its interests caused by the Soviet Union and China which pursued expansionist policies all around the world. Any kind of their success over other communist or non-communist countries would pose a major threat to US security. As Osgood explains, after the Korean War and a bipolar world starting with the late 1950s, "the Cold War was essentially a zero-sum contest between the two super powers and that an aggression by any small communist state would shift the world balance of power toward the communist bloc."[64]

Indeed, such possibility of aggression had already spread to a wide region reaching from Europe to Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Caribbean. However, each country in these regions already had divergent problems and in parallel with these, each of them had different and sometimes conflicting targets. In such a world system, the US battled for its hegemony over these countries by focusing on local conflicts which were indeed ineffective on the balance between these two big powers –the US and the Soviet Union. However, interferences into any country caused new conflicting issues to emerge between the USA and the USSR. During any of such interference, the superpowers tried to display their limit of military capacity and governmental power over solving any kind of conflicting interest in any part of the world.[65] However, the interests of these three sided post-World War II era were not always the same. Furthermore, communist China, which was proclaimed after the end of the Chinese Civil War in 1949, was supervened upon this new polarized world

[63] Osgood, p. 7.

[64] Osgood, p. 8.

[65] Osgood, p. 13.

climate taking a stand near the Soviet Union. This newly identified dichotomy in the world order was continued with new alliances for both of the sides with several countries in every corner of the world. Of course, this dichotomy basically was defined in terms of pursuing an expansionist policy in order to establish a communist world order and head this expansionism off by provoking an anti-communist reaction.

In these expansionist policies of two superpowers during the Cold War era, Asian countries were at the forefront of the major struggle together with African countries. According to the Osgood's interpretation,

> "The Soviet and Chinese switch from reviling nonaligned states not in the communist camp to embracing them as collaborators against the remnants of imperialism (like the United States' earlier program of economic aid and its later endorsement of neutralism) seemed to portend some sort of climactic competition- a competition not only between states but between systems of government and ways of organizing world order."[66]

Of course, that kind of an interpretation reflected mainly the American point of view; however, it is valid when we think in the way that both of the sides legitimized their competitive practices by this discourse.

Some theorists in America criticized the long-standing American foreign policy of

> "not for trying to check communist expansion, cultivate balances of power, and foster a congenial international environment, but only for pursuing these ends with excessive anti-aggression and anti-communist fervor, for lack of discrimination between vital and not-so-vital interests, and for an imprudent commitment of American power to goals that exceed the nation's true interests as well as its effective power and will to use it."[67]

---

[66] Osgood, p. 16.

[67] Osgood, pp. 3-4.

In other words, they were criticizing America's understanding of communism, and interpreting that completely as a threat to their national security.[68] However, such voices were drowned out by the massive and wide propaganda for anti-communism by the Truman administration.

Truman Doctrine

In 1947, American president Truman proclaimed the objectives of the doctrine as follows:

> "To help free people to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes […] is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed upon on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States."[69]

In reality, these statements clarified the primary goal of the United States for implementing the Truman Doctrine in several countries. That is to say, in this declaration, "free people" refered to all people from Asia to Africa; "aggressive movements" was used in the name of communist countries –the Soviet Union and China; "totalitarian regimes" meant communist governments; "international peace" was in fact the world that would be organized by the US, and furthermore, the role of USA in such a conflict is "to help" this "free people" not only for the sake of establishing the "international peace" but also for the security of United States. The remaining part of Truman's speech makes a special emphasis on the special character

[68] Osgood, p. 7.

[69] Robert W. Tucker, "The American Outlook," in *America & the World: From the Truman Doctrine to Vietnam* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), p. 34.

of these aid programs as a global commitment to fighting communism. As Senator J. William Fulbright declared, "More by far than any other factor the anti-communism of the Truman Doctrine has been the guiding spirit of American foreign policy since World War II."[70]

It seems that according to Truman, Turkey and Greece were the leading countries in need of such help. In a draft version of a report on communist expansion prepared by the State Department in 1947, this priority was explained with the idea that if Turkey and Greece were brought under the control of the Soviet Union, this would cost much more than the proposed economic assistance.[71] However, this doctrine was restricted not only to these two countries. The Eastern part of Germany also was considered as being in need of America's "help." In reality, the American government tried to isolate East Germany, which was in the control of the Soviet Union during those days. In addition, it was asserted that America had made a list of socialists and communists in Germany who could be punished in case of the loss of control over other regions of Germany.[72] Additionally, similar efforts by the US could be seen in France and Italy, where communist parties had become more influential over public opinion after World War II. These two countries were obliged to suspend all communist representatives from the parliament, because of pressure from the US. Moreover, similar pressures on the representatives who had the communist ideology were applied by Belgium and Luxemburg owing to the objectives of President Truman's administration.

---

[70] Walter LaFeber, *America, Russia, and The Cold War, 1945-1990* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991), p. 49.

[71] Burcu Birinci, "The Marshall Plan in Turkey: A Critical Evaluation of United States' Interests in the Plan and its Effects on the Republic" (MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2007), p. 41.

[72] Derya Çağlar, *Hayali Komünizm – Soğuk Savaş'ın Türkiye Söylemleri* (Istanbul: Berfin Yayınları, 2008), p. 41.

The Marshall Plan

The Marshall Plan was implemented for the general security policy of the United States, which was intended to prevent any relation or dependency of Western European countries' with communist regimes, namely the Soviet Union. It was approved by Congress in 1948 so as to bring "democracy" to Western Europe. In reality, the US aspired to establish an anti-Soviet bloc in Western Europe especially against the communist parties, labor movements in these countries and their effect on some other European countries which were in the reconstruction process after the war.[73] As Cromwell puts it, the Marshall Plan also was critical owing to its role in crystallizing the East-West conflict in Europe, as the continuation of the Truman Doctrine and establishing a political and economic Western bloc against Soviet expansion.[74]

At first, according to the US administration, Turkey was not suitable for taking place among the countries which were in need of such economic assistance because, Turkey had not taken part in the World War II and therefore the economic, political or sociological structure of the country had not been damaged as much as those of European countries. In addition, Turkey had received some financial and military assistance during the war and consequently it had enough foreign exchange reserve to recover its economy.[75] Despite all of these counter arguments, the US

---

[73] Freeland, p. 167.

[74] Birinci, p. 48.

[75] Birinci, p. 50.

added Turkey to the list of the Marshall Plan. This was most probably related to American's new foreign policy of interventionism through all parts of the world and the ascribed role of Turkey in this new world order. Turkey was actually significant for its being a model for other Middle Eastern countries.[76]

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization

When the dream of the Marshall Plan to establish a Western bloc which was controlled by the US commercial system failed in the early 1950, and the US changed its foreign policy to an "integrated, "Atlantic" military organization, NATO, for the basis of Western political cohesion."[77] In other words, efforts had been made to pursue the US's long term foreign policy of instituting an American-oriented Western bloc various kinds of economic aid until the beginnings of 1950. However, after that year, martial methods started to be used in respect of the same foreign policy. The main sign of this new politics was the constant effort of the United States in the establishment of NATO.

The Korean War

The interferences of the US in the internal affairs of Korea were in fact in parallel with its ideology stated in the Truman Doctrine. Along the same line, it legitimized the intervention by its will "to help free people […] against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes […] [which]

[76] George Crews McGhee, *ABD-Türkiye-NATO-Ortadoğu* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1992), pp. 56-57.

[77] Freeland, p. 319.

undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States."[78] Nonetheless, some scholars assert that the Asian policy of the United States throughout the Cold War era basically was determined also during the Korean War.[79] The distinctive part of this policy, which was first expressed in the Truman Doctrine, was its offering of a new perspective for Asian countries that Asians were different from Europeans in terms of their historical background and ideological inheritance. Tucker writes, "In Asia, the Korean War […] prompted the conclusion of a series of bilateral and multilateral alliances that continue today [through the Cold War] roughly to define the extent of the American commitment in that area."[80]

Moreover, the Korean War came hard on the heels of some other unexpected developments in different regions of the world for the sake of communist world, the coup in Czechoslovakia, the attack against Berlin, the usage of an atomic device by the Soviet Union for the first time, the new communist government in China. All of these events led to an excessive exaggeration of the communist threat in every corner of the world by the US.

McCarthyism or Public Support

These new policies of the US over the world also were supported by a big portion of people living in the USA. People were made believe that their country had been fighting not only against the Soviet Union, but also against a communist

[78] Freeland, p. 319.

[79] Tucker, p. 36.

[80] Tucker, p. 44.

expansion that would in the end endanger the security of the United States. In *The American People and Foreign Policy*, which was written at the beginnings of the 1950s, Gabriel Almond states the fact that "Every group of any significance in the United States feels itself to be threatened by this movement. […] The believing Christian, the trade unionist, the democratic Socialist, the liberal, the conservative - all save a small sector of the population- experience Russian and communist pressure as a grave threat to fundamental values."[81]

Nonetheless, the government continued to try to gain public support using a great variety of strategies during the implementation of their policies after World War II. As an example, it organized the establishment of a citizens' committee in order to generate public support for the Marshall Plan in 1947. As Rourke puts it, "When involved in this way in the organization of what might be called government front groups, administrations have adroitly combined the arts of manipulation with the norms of democracy by helping to create the public opinion they are assumed to be reflecting."[82]

McCarthyism can be conceived of as one of these strategies applied in the 1950s in the United States that spreads to the rest of the world. The creator of this movement, Joseph McCarthy, was a Republican Senator. He accused the current government of the Democratic Party of defending the communists in the country. Such an exaggerative interpretation was accepted by the American citizens in the circumstances of the 1950s. Therefore, McCarthy and other Republicans tried to have the administration of President Truman over a barrel by criticizing their effort

---

[81] Francis E. Rourke, "The Domestic Scene," in *America & the World: From the Truman Doctrine to Vietnam* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), p. 155.

[82] Rourke, pp. 157-158.

on fighting against communists or communist sympathizers not also in Europe, Asia or Africa but also within the boundaries of their own country. On the other side, although President Truman realized the possible impact of these accusations and tried to reduce the dose of anti-communist propaganda. Other events in the world did not give a chance for such trials.

Freeland connects the rise of McCarthyism with the actions of Truman, especially between 1946 and 1948 in his book *The Truman Doctrine and The Origins of McCarthyism*. He analyzes the role of Truman administration in postwar anti-communism policies in detail and reaches the conclusions that Truman encouraged and legitimized the expansion of McCarthyism by his actions in domestic affairs between 1946 and 1948. First of all, the main intention of President Truman was to gain support for his foreign policies, especially for the Marshall Plan, on the grounds of anti-communist paranoia in the country and some regions of the world. His basic foreign policy was based on presenting "distorted versions of both American and Soviet foreign policies, and arouse fears about the Soviet Union unwarranted by the administration's own assessment of the facts."[83] And finally, especially so as to get support for the Marshall Plan, Truman established American foreign policy on the grounds of anti-communism "that eventually it was forced into international commitments inconsistent with its own perceptions of the national interest."[84] These actions gave way to the dissemination and legitimization of McCarthy's arguments among the American people.

Furthermore, as Richard M. Freeland states, the attempts of the Truman government to accomplish the above mentioned objectives can be categorized in two

[83] Freeland, Preface.

[84] Freeland, Preface.

basic forms: propaganda activities and police activities.[85] By propaganda activities, the author implies a frequent number of public statements made by governors, encouraging news or columns in press organs, leaking formal diplomatic documents to the press which reveals the traitorous cooperation of communist countries against the US, a defaming campaign against communist actors in the country and finally a political campaign for encouraging patriotism.[86] The common point of all of these methods is being an attempt to promulgate among the American people that all unpleasant events that they were faced with after World War II were caused by "Soviet betrayal and aggression."[87] In order to ensure the safety of European countries, and of course of America, the aid programs needed to be implemented as soon as possible.

The second type of activities of the Truman administration was fulfilled by police officers, as Freeland continues.[88] This activity was based on the belief that all people who criticized or did not think in the same way as the government about the foreign policy of the US were labeled traitors or communists. These people could be federal employees, bureaucrats or everyday people. Moreover, such an exaggerative expectation of loyalty to the policies of the government led also to "public denunciation of dissenters as disloyal."[89] The problem of employee loyalty was another area of police activities of Truman administration. There were divergent ways of controlling employee loyalty to the US administration: the Civil Service

[85] Freeland, p. 9.

[86] Freeland, p. 10.

[87] Freeland, p. 9.

[88] Freeland, p. 10.

[89] Freeland, p. 11.

Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the method of summary dismissal.[90]

In addition, disobedient organizations were listed by the government in terms of their relation with communist ideology, such as the Attorney General's list kept in 1947. In addition, there were many cases of arresting opponents of the foreign policy of their country. Newsmen and reporters who did not weigh in with these policies were punished by bans on leaving the country. Any kind of public activities of foreign visitors in the country was subjected to the permission of government authorities. Nevertheless, there were divergent institutions in the American administration so as to organize public campaigns for Truman's new foreign policy, which was based on anti-communism. The central one of them was the House of Un-American Activities Committee. The main mission of this institution was "to draw the attention of the American people to the problem of communist influences in many areas of American life and to launch a program of public education against communist propaganda."[91] These areas basically included the federal government first, then the unions and other type of non-governmental organizations, the cinema industry, and public education against the propaganda of communist ideology.[92]

In reality, towards early 1948, the Truman administration had started to soften the effect of anti-communism among Americans, because this kind of propaganda caused a decrease in the support for other parts of foreign aid program which were basically commercial.[93] However, other crucial developments around the

[90] Freeland, pp. 123-124.

[91] Freeland, p. 135.

[92] Freeland, pp. 132-133.

[93] Freeland, p. 334.

world did not give way to this attempt -events such as the atomic explosion in the Soviet Union, the new communist government in China, the denunciation of Alger Hiss as a Soviet spy and the outbreak of Korean War etc. According to Freeland, these events showed Americans how their government had been right in its fight against internal and external communist movements and "Truman now watched helplessly as his political opponents took charge of the anti-communist issue and initiated the period of McCarthyism."[94]

Turkey in the 1950s

Turkey and the Soviet Union had intimate relations before World War II. Since the Turkish War of Independence and before the foundation of the Soviet Union, Russia had been an intimate friend of Turkey. Although they did not favor the communism or nationalism of each other, they had concluded some agreements of friendship and cooperation.[95] It is possible to see a great deal of news about these relations between Turkey and Soviet Union in the daily newspapers of the period.[96] Especially, the days when the committee of the Soviet Union came to a meeting to Turkey caused breaking news on daily newspapers. However, at the end of World War II, these ties between two countries were destroyed because of the claims that the Soviet Union had demanded the eastern provinces of Kars and Ardahan, partial

---

[94] Freeland, p. 334.

[95] Altan Öymen, *Bir Dönem Bir Çocuk* (Istanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2005), p. 106.

[96] Çağlar, p. 49.

control of Dardanelles and some bases on the straits from Turkey.[97] Hence, the Turkish government had started to construct an effective alliance with the US so as to provide security in the case of a Soviet aggression. This change also was supported by America's new intentions in the region, particularly on Turkey. In the 1950s, under the power of the Democrat Party, Turkey became intensely a part of the world capitalist system not only in the economic sphere, but also in foreign policies and defense mechanisms.[98] The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan initiated this process of integration, and membership in NATO which allowed Turkey to reach peak levels.[99]

In this respect, the news in the Turkish newspapers changed rapidly and started to put emphasis on the threat of communism, that is to say, the requests of the Soviet Union. They used some specific attractive signs and motifs in order to persuade the Turkish people of the seriousness of the communist danger in the country. Derya Çağlar makes a detailed analysis of these newspapers of the 1950s in this respect and reveals the most popular signs of anti-communist propaganda as follows: the motif of the wingy spies, which symbolizes birds that could carry a chip; the secret agents who could be non-Muslims, a young girl, a woman or Soviet and Bulgarian agencies; red herd or red agents or traitors[100]; the motif of Nâzım Hikmet, which put a special focus on his fleeing abroad. Moreover, the newspapers used the signs of The Korean War, which was an indicator of the friendship between the US and Turkey and also the communist threat imposed by China and Korea; Stalin so as

[97] Birinci, p. 36.

[98] Erik Jan Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007), p. 341.

[99] Feroz Ahmad, *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu* (Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2007), p. 131.

[100] Cem Eroğul, *Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1970), pp. 71-72.

to change the prestige of the Red Army and the Soviet Union, which was victor of World War II in the eyes of Turkish people; the motif of the Village Institutes through their relation with communist ideology. Additionally, there were the signs in the newspapers of the 1950s as the collaboration between the followers of sharia and the communists; the hammer and sickle, the Russian flag and red color motif which symbolize the Soviet Union; the bases of NATO, which had been set up in countries where the communists were active; transmitter radio stations which provided for Turkish communists to communicate with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and finally, the comments of the workers, students, writers or poets related with anti-communism.[101]

The motifs and signs which were used in newspapers for anti-communist propaganda are useful for the study at hand, because such kinds of arguments also were used by everyday people to denounce someone for making communist propaganda. The cases indicate that especially the motifs of Nâzım Hikmet, the Korean War, NATO, Stalin and the sign of hammer and sickle were considered by the everyday people as strong evidence of making communist propaganda or being a communist.

Contrary to expectations, in the first years of the Menderes government, some leftist intellectuals supported the Democrat Party. This support sometimes occurred on a party level, exemplified in the case that even the illegal Communist Party actively took place at the Democrat Party's side in the 1950 elections.[102] Ahmet Emin Yalman and his newspaper *Vatan*, Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel and their newspaper *Tan* were leftist publications, but their support changed according to

[101] Çağlar, pp. 68-193.

[102] Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007), p. 153.

developments. Nevertheless, in the first years of their power, the Democrat Party tried to establish a relationship with the writers of *Tan* during their quest for an intellectual alliance. The Sertels and Celal Bayar and his group agreed to publish of a journal together, called *Görüşler* (The Opinions). However, after the publishing of the first issue of this journal, Bayar and his group, including Adnan Menderes and Fuat Köprülü, were criticized harshly by the guardians of the regime. Therefore, they immediately broke up and even denied such a relationship with leftist groups.[103] Indeed, according to Yüksel Taşkın, these initiatives of positive approach towards socialists, a group which was considered to be the permanent enemy of the republican regime, could be comprehended as the attempts to form a political coalition of opponent intellectuals.[104] However, such an extraordinary attempt by a ruling party was confronted by a sharp notice by the Republican elites.

As said above, these mentioned events were extraordinary. The Menderes administration devoted itself to an anti-communist struggle through their remaining years in power. Yüksel Taşkın asserts that in addition to Adnan Menderes, Celal Bayar was a significant figure in the anti-communist struggle, due to his ideas on the priority of the Turkish identity or nationalism on the central right discourse. He had an essential role not only in forming this priority on the central right, but also in spreading it among the elites of the Republic.[105]

In the middle of the 1940s, there were central right journals like *Bozkurt*, *Millet* (The Nation), *Çığır* (The Epoch), *Tanrıdağ* and *Çınaraltı* which had crucial

---

[103] Öymen, *Bir Dönem Bir Çocuk*, p. 494.

[104] Yüksel Taşkın, *Anti-Komünizmden Küreselleşme Karşıtlığına Milliyetçi Muhafazakâr Entelijansiya* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007), p. 103.

[105] Taşkın, p. 92.

roles in the anti-communist struggle of the period. These journals were in the vein of Turkism, which was totally produced in the essence of Nazism's racism. They declared the Turkish race the master race and that two enemies of this race were communists and non-Muslim minorities.[106] These journals made a special emphasis on the danger of communism in Turkey in each issue and also sometimes denounced some people to the government as being communist. Nihal Atsız's list of dangerous people in the country, including Sabahattin Ali, Pertev Naili Boratav and Hasan Ali Yücel, addressed to the prime minister which was published in one of above journals is an example of such kind of denunciation.[107]

At the end of 1945, the newspaper *Tan* was attacked in Istanbul by nearly 100 people and its building and machines were demolished. The striking fact was that not the violators but the owners of the newspapers – the Sertels- were punished by the court. This result was the beginning of the campaign against all kind of leftist groups for the sake of the anti-communist struggle.[108] There were other events of closing leftist organizations, especially two socialist parties, Turkey Socialist Party *(Türkiye Sosyalist Partisi)* and Turkey Socialist Peasant Workers' Party *(Türkiye Sosyalist Emekçi Köylü Partisi)* in 1946 during the Democratic Party's administration. Some members and administrators of these two leftist parties were detained within the scope of "16th December Arrests" *(16 Aralık Tevkifatı)*, and the following year, some professors from Ankara University, Behice Boran, Pertev Naili Boratav, Niyazi Berkes and Muzaffer Şerif, were dismissed from the university. These were evidence of their intention to struggle against communist ideology in every segment of the

[106] Öymen, *Bir Dönem Bir Çocuk*, pp. 284-288.

[107] Öymen, pp. 430-435.

[108] Öymen, pp. 490-498.

society. It is clear that this disbandment of leftist parties could only be possible after a consensus between the Democrat and the Republican People's Party and this consensus continued until the beginnings of the 1960s.[109]

A series of arrests were took place in 1951 which is one of the large scale operation against communists in Turkey.[110] They are known as the "1951 Arrests" in the history of Turkey. Especially in Istanbul and Ankara, more than 150 people were arrested for being members or administrators of the Communist Party of Turkey. There were some very important individuals among them who were writers, academics, doctors of politicians of the day.

Altan Öymen claims that the arrests in 1951 were different from previous ones in terms of their conclusion with heavy penalties. The previous arrests had been short and the accused person had been acquitted after a short imprisonment.[111] He considers this procedure as a method of struggle with communism in the sense that the government treated the accused people who could be chastened more easily in a soft way. On the other hand, the arrests in 1951 were more exhaustive and serious than the former treatments. This was due mostly to the fact that such a communist threat in Turkey would draw the American government's attention and might lead to more economic assistance, as Öymen asserts.[112] At the end of these cases, most of the accused people were punished with heavy penalties or banishments.

The provisions against communism were intensified and the felonies described in the related articles in the Turkish High Penal Law were compounded. Article 141 and 142 were articles related to crimes about communism. Article 141

[109] Ahmad, p. 133.

[110] Eroğul, p. 72.
[111] Altan Öymen, *Öfkeli Yıllar* (Istanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2009), p. 246.

[112] Öymen, p. 256.

described communist activities and their penalties for actual states and Article 142 was a regulation for the propaganda of these actual states.[113] According to the first version of Article 141, people who established or administrated associations for introducing communist ideology would be punished with from 5 to 12 years of penal servitude and people who become a member of these communist associations would be sentenced from one to five years of penal servitude. Over the years, the punishments defined in these articles were increased; however, the most serious change in these articles was made by removing the requirement of violence factor in the crime in 1938. Therefore, non-violent thoughts or actions also could be labeled as a crime related with communism.

In addition to this critical change, Menderes again increased the duration of prison sentence mentioned in Articles 141 and 142, which was in fact decreased with a change in 1949. Furthermore, subjection about the denunciation factor was added to these articles. This meant that if a guilty person denounced her/his friends, her/his sentence would be reduced. In this way, the denouncement act was promoted among public.

In the 1950s, leftist people were exposed to a detailed follow-up by the Turkish police office and many of them mention the feeling of "being followed by someone" in their memoirs. Altan Öymen touches on this issue and says that in those years, each of his leftist friends believed that she/he was being followed by the police.[114] When he went out for dinner with some leftist friends, everybody thought

---

[113] These articles were firstly introduced to Turkish Criminal Law in 1936 in one-party period and they were taken from the Italian Penal Code which was drawn up by Mussolini. However, the punishments of Turkish Penal Code were much heavier than Mussolini's. And the articles 141 and 142 were known as the "Mussolini's Articles" during the 1950s in Turkey. See. Altan Öymen, *Öfkeli Yıllar*, p. 272.

that one or more people sitting at the tables around them were most probably secret police.

Anti-communism also was used as an exclusionary mechanism among the power elites. For instance, in the 1957 elections, the Democrat Party often accused the Republican People's Party of being communist and heathen so as to praise their construction of new mosques and imam hatip high schools- Islamic divinity students' high-school.[115] The experience of Marshall Fevzi Çakmak after his attempt to join Human Rights Organization is another example of this mechanism. After the middle of 1940s, the trial of Çakmak was criticized severely by a minister of the Republican People's Party in terms of his relation with communist groups in the country. In that declaration, this minister of internal affairs also pointed out the ever-growing communist actions in the country -the story of the first congress of the Turkey Communist Party under the leadership of Mustafa Suphi, the journals of *Aydınlık* (The Light), *Kurtuluş* (The Liberty), *Orak Çekiç* (Hammer and Sickle) and *Yoldaş* (The Comrade); Nâzım Hikmet and Doctor Şefik Hüsnü, the journal *Yurt ve Dünya* (Homeland and World), published by Pertev Naili Boratav; the journal of *Adımlar* (The Steps), published by Behice Boran, and the newspaper of *Tan*.[116] Consequently, a conservative known for his loyalty to the regime, Çakmak had to defend himself against accusations of being a communist. This event was one of the strongest pieces of evidence of how anti-communism had become a common way of recrimination between political groups after the single-party regime in Turkey.[117]

---

[114] Öymen, p. 104.

[115] Zürcher, p. 338.

[116] Öymen, *Bir Dönem Bir Çocuk,* pp. 562-571.

[117] Taşkın, pp. 104-105.

In addition to these, anti-communism was used against the negative reaction towards religious demands -such as increasing religious courses in schools, introducing Arabic language courses, special high schools for raising imam hatips etc- by some religious groups and people. In fact, such demands were perceived as Reactionist, especially by the opponents of the Democrat Party and constituted a conflicting issue between these competing political parties in the assembly. Some members of the assembly defended such demands by its function in Turkey's struggle against communism.[118] They asserted the idea that a significant requirement of the anti-communist struggle was attaching more importance to the religion. In other words, the anti-communist discourse in the period was now being used by conservatives so as to legitimize their arguments beside the mark.

Altan Öymen, in his memoirs, mentions that the communists were considered as liable for every kind of social crime in the 1950s.[119] Maybe one of the most obvious exemplary cases of this fact was the events of the September 6 and 7, in 1955. On that day, the news were spread among the people living in Istanbul that bombing had been carried out the house of Mustafa Kemal in Salonika. Then, on the same day, more than 100,000 people poured into Taksim, especially where the non-Muslims resided or worked, and they overran their working places, houses, schools, churches and cemeteries.[120] Many non-Muslim citizens suffered greatly from these events.

---

[118] Öymen, *Öfkeli Yıllar*, p. 194.

[119] Öymen, p. 591.

[120] Dilek Güven, *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Azınlık Politikaları ve Stratejileri Bağlamında 6-7 Eylül Olayları*, trans. Bahar Şahin (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2010), p. 25.

The remarkable thing about the events of September 6 and 7 was that first and foremost the Menderes government accused the communists of these events. In the following day of the events, approximately 50 people who were known as communists were detained for the crime of provocation and destruction.[121] These people stayed in prison for nearly four months and then were acquitted of this crime. However, as Güven states, the number of communists in Turkey in that period was very low. Any actions of the communists or the leftist groups were being followed carefully by the police. That is to say, any role for the communists in the events of September 6-7 was impossible. More than that, the communist ideology does not include any kind of discrimination against non-Muslims or any other groups in society. Despite these facts, the Menderes government pointed to the communists as responsible for the events in September 6 and 7; and this was perfectly acceptable in the circumstances of the 1950s in Turkey.

[121] Güven, p. 73.

CHAPTER 4

THE CRIME OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Cases Regarding Communist Propaganda in the 1950s

Denouncing someone or some group of making communist propaganda was common in the 1950s in Turkey in order to label them politically immoral, unwished and punishable with high penalty. In addition, these people should be denounced to the authorities under no circumstances. A fearful atmosphere created by the authorities appeared in the form of laws, cases, denunciations, acquittals or heavy penalties related to the crime of communist propaganda.

These cases were brought against people from divergent regions, ethnic groups, political views, sexes and ages. The factors had a profound impact on the lawsuit process; however, especially the ethnic identity of the accused was somehow more influential than others during the case. This distinction is basically seemed between Turkish and Muslim people and non-Muslims, minorities, and migrants. Between these two sides, a case could be predestined. Therefore, I used ethnic identity as a determinant when analyzing cases with communist propaganda. First, I split into two groups the cases with Turkish and Muslim people and the lawsuits with "others," as non-Muslims, migrants and minorities. Second, I distinguished between the cases with political people and the accusations about everyday people for each of the former groups. This last distinction was essential so as to comprehend the

changing characteristics of the accusations about everyday people from "real" political cases. Moreover, although this thesis is mostly about the suits involving everyday people, not touching on cases with politically active people is impossible because they made it possible to consider the place of the crime of communist propaganda and sample cases. In this respect, these categorizations allow the analysis the characteristics of these cases in detail together with the variables.

Cases Involving Turkish and Muslim People

Cases Involving Political People

Before starting to analyze the cases of those accused with making communist propaganda among the ordinary people, some cases related to people's political orientation should be mentioned. These "real" cases will provide the grounds to regard communist propaganda as a political crime and also a comparison between the cases of political and ordinary individuals. This comparison is also useful to understand the similarities between the two types of cases on the justifications of the accusations, the styles of argumentation during the trial, and the reasons for imposing punishment or acquittal.

First of all, it should be said that many cases in this category ended with the decision of acquittal. However, this does not make them insignificant, because even starting a criminal prosecution for a person owing to the same reasons was in fact a way of provocation and instigation for other similar causes of action. In this category, the cases were generally public prosecutions, not caused by a denunciation or being caught in the act, which means that the one who proceeded against the accused was an institution of the state. Therefore, although the court returned an

acquittal at the end of the trial, this happy end of a case did not put a real end to such accusations. Actually, simply initiating a criminal case against someone on this issue was enough for new appeals to the courts.

Of course there were some cases that ended up with punishment too; however, their rate was in the minority among all. They were generally about people who really made attempts to establish a communist party and actively participate in the coordination and administration of such organizations. Another frequent reason for being punished by the court was criticizing or insulting the government while making communist propaganda. Thereby, it could be said that if a case had a relation to any kind of crime against the government, the accused was usually sentenced prison.

A significant portion of the cases involving political people were about their intellectual and artistic work, like articles in newspapers or journals, poetry in a book or paintings in an exhibition. For instance, there was a case about a painter who was accused of drawing the figure of the hammer and sickle in one of his paintings in 1955.[122] The painter held an exhibition in the middle of Beyoğlu in the gallery of Istanbul Municipality that is to say in a building of a government agency. However, this was not enough to dispel paranoia of the coming communism "danger" of the period. Law enforcement officials came to the exhibition and associated the figure in the painting with the symbol of the hammer and sickle of Soviet Russia. Finally, they tore down the entire exhibition and took the artist to the police station. In the court, he gave an account of the work in detail and explained its relation to his understanding of art. Additionally, a few experts examined the evidence and accepted the similarity between the symbol and the figure in the painting. However,

[122] Decree no. 1955/100, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, June 2, 1955.

they added that this had only been caused by the artistic preferences of the painter, not the thing else.

At the end of the case, court board be acquitted the accused; however, this final decision did not save him. His exhibition had already been destroyed and he had already been taken under surveillance for several days which meant he had been stigmatized as a criminal and hazardous communist in the community.

Poems were other instruments for accusing someone of being a communist. In the courts of those years, there were many cases involving poems which praised of communism. Three such cases appear in my archive work.

One of them was related to a poem published in a journal and the other two of them were about the poetry books of two popular poets of the time. All of them end with acquittal; but the approach of the members of the court board to the issue is still worthy of note.

The first case is about the poems of Cahit Irgat,[123] a popular socialist realist poet, which were published in his book *Ortalık*.[124] It was said that he dreamed of communist revolution throughout the book. They gave the poem "Water Smelted Iron" *(Su Demiri Eritti)* as an example. According to the accusation, in this poem, the poet tried to create an atmosphere of a forthcoming revolution in Turkey. Another poem in this book, "Death of Horses" *(Atların Ölümü)* was used to accuse Irgat of being a communist. It asserted that the horses in the poem represented the working class as a symbol and therefore, rearing up of the horses meant mobilizing the proletariat against the regime. Another poem cited "The Night as a Sack" *(Gece*

[123] He lives between 1916 and 1971. At first, he was a romantic poet; however, after World War II, he began to write on war damage and the sufferings of the people. *Ortalık*, published in 1952, is one of his works of this period.

[124] Decree no. 1953/290, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 24, 1953.

Çuval Gibi). According to the accusation, the poet used the words "root" and "branch" metaphorically: The root was a symbol of the capitalist system and the branch implied the working class. The metaphor of being shaken off its root and tearing up the ground means that working class would take the place of the capitalist class and then the revolution would come true.

These were all examples of charging a poet with making communist propaganda. Irgat was guilty of using words such as "horse", "root" or "branch" in his poems.

From the records of the final lawsuit, it is understood that earlier books by Cahit Irgat had gone on trial, *You Cannot Return* (Geri Dönemezsin) and *The Children of This City* (Bu Şehrin Çocukları). He was acquitted on both counts. However, this did not change his fate, and another case regarding his new book was brought against him. This is evidence for my statement that an acquittal is not a real end for the accused. Although he is freed from one of them, he is stigmatized as a potential criminal.

The final decision of the court could trigger reasons for new ones. The chief judge explained that, although the books of the poet had some features of supporting the communist regime, they were not powerful and explicit enough. Therefore, he would not be charged with making communist propaganda. However, the poet still had a relationship with communism in a sort of way, according to the decision of the members of the court board.

In the archive of the Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, a case the authors like Şükran Kurdakul,[125] Sabih Şendil,[126] Suat Taşer,[127] and Abidin Özkan[128] appeared

[125] Şükran Kurdakul was a poet and researcher who lived between 1927 and 2004. When he was 19 years old, he was arrested for making communist propaganda and spent 4.5 months in prison.

due to the articles on *Yeryüzü*[129].[130] They were accused of making propaganda of communist ideology by publishing articles in favor of communism. The most significant evidence was the use of a specific number of years, "28 years" in the article "The National Independence Song" *(Milli Kurtuluş Şarkısı)*. According to the accusation, this usage of "28 years" in the verse referred implicitly to the Soviet Revolution and in the following lines the author deliberately lauded the Communist Revolution because of its struggle against imperialism. However, there was great confusion in the consideration of the usage of "28 years", because 28 years ago actually referred to the time of Turkish National Independence War, rather than the Soviet Revolution. Therefore, the court members discuss for a long time whether this date in the verse symbolized Soviet or Turkish history.

In the final part of the verse, some places from Anatolia, especially Maraş, in the period of Sultan Vahdettin, were addressed. Finally the court members considered that these issues had a closer relationship to Turkish history. Some other lines in the work and a drawing of an imaginary person also become matters of the case. However, they still were not strong enough to persuade the court members to

---

Throughout his life, he participated in the organization of many different journals. He was also a member of the Workers' Party (İşçi Partisi).

[126] Sabih Şendil was a poet who lived between 1926 and 2002. He wrote in various journals of the 1950s and 1960s.

[127] Suat Taşer was an actor who wrote poems in some journals. He lived between 1919 and 1982. He is considered among the socialist poets of the 1940s.

[128] Abidin Özkan lived between 1926 and 1993. His socialist life continued with his membership in the Workers Party of Turkey (Türkiye İşçi Partisi) in 1960s.

[129] *Yeryüzü* was a biweekly journal published between 1951 and 1952. After the 11th issue, it is closed. The main authors of the journal were Arif Damar, Şükran Kurdakul, M. Abidin Özkan, and Fethi Naci. It was long debated among the authors of the journal after it was closed whether it was the organ of the Communist Party of Turkey (Türkiye Komünist Partisi) or not.

[130] Decree no. 1952/211, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 11, 1952.

make a decision against the authors. At the end of the case, they are acquitted of making communist propaganda based on both failure of evidence and expert evidence, who are professors from some universities.

A similar case involved İlhan Berk, a leading poet of the 1950s and later periods, due to his book, called *Good Morning Earth* (Günaydın Yeryüzü).[131] The criminal evidence was again some words in the book which had also symbolic meanings related to communist ideology. However, more details about the leading motives of the court are not available for blaming the poet guilty of making communist propaganda because the case withered on the vine owing to an article on the press law. As this article indicated, public prosecution could be opened six months after a work was published. The book in dispute in November 1953 had been published in September 1952. Therefore, this case of İlhan Berk was dismissed.

The discussed no far involved artists and their political orientation. In addition to them, in my archive study, cases involving people who were actively participating in political activity were also found. The general reasons for accusations against such people were establishing a communist party or an association, and organizing/ participating a meeting or a conference for memorializing a familiar communist person and so forth. These cases generally ended with acquittal; but the convincing proof of innocence of the accused person was less than former ones'. Of course, if an individual was accused of establishing a communist party, s/he was sentenced to imprisonment for more than one year. There is also an example of such cases in the archives. Tobacco worker and compositor was charged with the formation, organization, coordination and administration of a secret communist party so as to establish the domination of the proletariat over other

[131] Decree no. 1953/237, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, November 10, 1953.

classes.[132] According to the case files, the accused man, Mehmet Bozışık, was not only a simple worker. He was a graduate student from the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies with the communist party's support. He worked in a tobacco company just to organize the workers and youth on how to achieve communist ideals. The court board associated the story of Mehmet Bozışık with the story of two communist leaders of the period, Reşat Fuat[133] and Şefik Hüsnü.[134] Reşat Fuat had been punished by the Second Court-Martial of Ankara Garrison Command for activities taking place between 1941 and 1944 on communist organization in Turkey. Şefik Hüsnü had also struggled to establish an effective communist organization in different regions of Turkey.

According to the records of the case, while these affairs were happening at the front with the two leaders, Mehmet Bozışık was called back to Istanbul in order to work in new mobilized organization. Subsequently, Bozışık answered the invitation and traveled to Istanbul. Additionally, he ran off copies of secret documents of the communist party on his own printing press. It seems that he hid this printing press throughout his political life in the houses of different friends. More than five of them were known by the court members. Furthermore, the connection between the party leaders, especially Şefik Hüsnü, and the accused man were provided by a frequently changing agent.

---

[132] Decree no. 1950/352, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 14, 1950.

[133] Reşat Fuat was a dominant leader of the Communist Party of Turkey, who lived between 1900 and 1968. Throughout his life, he struggled for the realization of communist ideals. He was also famous for being the son of the aunt of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk.

[134] Şefik Hüsnü was one of the founders of the Workers and Peasants Socialist Party of Turkey (Türkiye İşçi ve Çiftçi Sosyalist Fırkası), who lived between 1887 and 1959. This party was founded in 1919 by some socialist intellectuals who supported the Turkish War of Independence due to its revolutionary character against imperialism.

It should be added that during the final trial, the previous prison sentences of Mehmet Bozışık were continually taken back. These punishments were repeated in the records of the trial and especially the institutions, such as the Ankara Garnison Command or Military Commission which had given the prison sentence, are given a great deal of stress in those documents. That is to say, his earlier activities for making communist propaganda seem to have been more evidential reasoning than the ones for his recent crime.

At the end of the trial, Bozışık was proven guilty although he denied the allegation. He was imprisoned for three years. Then, this sentence was reduced to one year since the time of the matter of the repetition of the previous sentence had passed.

Not only the formation and coordination of a secret communist party but also being a member of such a party or an association was a frequent political accusation in the 1950s which, is generally when prosecuted end in imprisonment. Being a member of an association or a party which aimed to criticize or change any aspect of the economic or social orders of the country was a common reason for someone being brought before justice. As an example, there was an accused man about whom it was asserted that he was a member of Advanced Young Turks Association *(İleri Jön Türkler Derneği)*.[135] He was a student in a law faculty of a university in Paris. He was arrested in 1952 in Istanbul and stayed in prison until 1953. The records are related to the court of appeal of this old case. The court of appeal decided to acquit him of the old rough justice. The reason for the decision of acquittal was the denial of previous statement of both the accused man and other related defendants.

[135] This association was first established in Paris and it had a branch in Istanbul. Sevim Tura, who is a well-known communist of the period, was presidency of that branch.

Furthermore, the court members explained that they could not find any written document related to such an association or its members. That is to say, it seems that the only justification of the arrest of the accused man was a statement by member of the secret association. When she denied her first statement, which resulted in the accusation of the man, he was cleared of blame. However, he had already spent a year in prison.

A similar case in the same year was brought before the Istanbul First High Penal Court. Emin Torunoğlu was accused of making communist propaganda, but this time the reason of his crime was different from previous ones: it was emphasized in the text that he was a communist working to neutralize or weaken national feelings in society.[136] Torunoğlu, however, had been found guilty and sentenced to prison four years earlier for committing the same crime. The previous law suit had been taken place in Ordu, Ünye. According to the record of the trial, the previous crime had started in Istanbul seven years earlier, and continued in Ünye until four years earlier. Then the accused man had come back to Istanbul and it was asserted that he had continued to commit the same crime there. However, the legal provisions of this claim were based only on some witnesses' doubtful reputations and the former crime of the person of interest. In addition, nine material witnesses testified in the present court on behalf of the accused. All of them explained that they had not any kind of information about the activities of the accused man on making communist propaganda in Istanbul. Some of the witnesses were fellow citizen of the accused and they declared that they know him from his communist activities in Ünye. However, they did not have any information about his propagandist movements in Istanbul. Another witness was his old neighbor. She said that she had seen some meetings in

[136] Decree no. 1953/159, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, May 25, 1953.

the house of the defendant, but that she did not know what was discussed at those meetings. Moreover, one of the witnesses was a man, whom the accused had joined in a meeting in his house. He also explained that he had not heard any kind of propagandist words from the person of interest. A witness for the prosecution, additionally, claimed that although he had given such assessment before, it had been very long ago and he did not know anything about the condition of the accused man after that period.

At the end of the trial, Torunoğlu was acquitted owing to lack of evidence. However, it seems that because of his previous sentence on the same crime, it was accepted that he was a potential criminal and in somehow he would continue to commit the same crime. Therefore, while he had committed the former crime in Ünye, after he moved to Istanbul, he was followed by the authorities whether he continued to make communist propaganda or not. That is to say, he was labeled a criminal for the rest of his life.

Furthermore, if a specific affiliation with an association could not be a crime, attending a meeting of that association might be labeled a crime factor. Different reasons could be found to accuse all members of the association of the crime of making communist propaganda. In this way, not the association itself but some of its activities were judged by the authorities. So, it became a cover for restraining any kind of organizations from making political activities that had the potential of being perceived as pertaining to the communists. Additionally, the crime elements in such meetings were coined according to the values that were wanted to be labeled as pieces of communist ideals. The symbols of communism -important actors, secret signs, and key references- were determined in the courts and these created symbols become the grounds for denouncing other people.

Nâzım Hikmet was one of the major figures of communism in the 1950s. He was a well-known socialist poet who stayed in prison for twelve years owing to the crime of his actions of sedition. He got out of prison in 1950 and after one year, he fled abroad in fear for his life.[137] He went to the Soviet Union. This caused campaigns against the socialist poet in Turkey to increase rapidly. In addition, these campaigns resulted in his being stripped of his Turkish citizenship. Any kind of activities related to Nâzım Hikmet started to be perceived as a legislative intention of sentence due to making communist propaganda.

Nâzım Hikmet's image as a hazardous communist who had betrayed his homeland and escaped to the Soviet Union was used to accuse some people or organizations. Reading Nâzım Hikmet or organizing meetings about him was deliberate proof of being a communist and those people or organizations could be accused easily of being communists, although they did not have a direct relationship with communism at all or there was not enough evidence to blame them for making such propaganda.

The case with the High Education Youth Organization *(Yüksek Tahsil Gençliği Derneği)* in 1952 in the Sultanahmet High Penal Court is an example of such cases. The grounds for the law suit was not the organization itself -its aim of establishment, administrative body or any kind of formal declaration- but its meeting organized to celebrating the release of Nâzım Hikmet from prison. Therefore, the members of the Youth Organization who attended this meeting were charged with praising communist ideology, which sought to establish its own social and economic order, according to the statements of the members of the court. The eight accused

[137] İ. E. Irmak, "Kayıp *Destan*'ın İzinde ya da *Manzaralar*'da Yiten: *Kuvâyi Milliye* ve *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*'nda Milliyetçilik, Propaganda ve İdeoloji" (MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2009), 57.

members -all of them are students in or graduate from the top universities in Istanbul in the departments of medical, law or economics faculties- stayed in prison for six months after the first instance. After six months, they went to the court of appeals but their appeal failed. It seems that the members of the Youth Organization were judged by more than seven witnesses' acknowledgements for prosecution and there was no other evidence for their accusation. However, although these witnesses change their statements in the court of appeals, the innocence of the students is not found convincing by the members of the court. In other words, the uncertain statements of a small number of witnesses were enough to accuse someone of making communist propaganda and arresting him/her for a length of time.

The statements of the witnesses which were considered as evidence for the criminality of the members of the organization are interesting. They only assert that some students in the meeting shouted 'Long live communism!' during some speeches. Moreover, some of the witnesses said that at the meeting one of the accused women students talked about Nâzım Hikmet during her speech and said that there was no freedom in this country, the rights and freedom of the citizens were being encroached; however, European countries overwhelmed the citizens with freedom. One of the attendees said that 'Down with communism, go to Europe, go to Moscow' and the speaker answered 'Fascists, you go to Spain' or 'The servants of fascists' or 'Down with fascists, Gestapos.' These last words became the grounds for arresting her from the crime of making communist propaganda. Furthermore, some witnesses asserted that some of the accused had shout "Long live Nâzım Hikmet!" during the meeting and when he said to the shouters "We do not say anything about your thoughts about Nâzım Hikmet but let's say with us 'Down with communism!'" The shouters said nothing, but they continued to shout in favor of Nâzım Hikmet and

communism. In addition, they shouted “Down with Turkish nationalists!” These words were accepted as evidence of the accused having made communist propaganda by the authorities.

Consequently, these four sentences resulted in the students spending the months in prison. Seven other students denounced them as they having said these words during the meeting and these statements were found enough for judging them. Six months later, when the accused students went to the court of appeals and the witnesses gave contradictory statements in this court, they were not acquitted.

The lawyers of the accused students put forward many arguments to prove the innocence of their clients. These reasons are worth analyzing in details to get the legal provisions of the general defense of the political actors of the period themselves against the authorities. First, although the witnesses gave contradictory statements during different stages of the court process about the accused, the members of the court had decided that all of the witnesses had heard the same things and almost everybody in the meeting had joined this group; therefore, all of the accused students had to have been shouters. Moreover, the witnesses knew the accused students because they were from the same university, even from the same department; therefore, the witnesses could not be mistaken about their estimates of people. Although the lawyers of the accused stated that students on the prosecution’s side had given contradictory statements and broadened the scope of accused students in the process of time, the court considered this fact worthless and maintained that the common points of their statements were enough to prove the guilt based on evidence.

Furthermore, the members of the court considered the consensus for defense among the accused people suspicious. They explained that despite the fact that this concurrence of several prisoners was their natural right, this concurrence was related

to their common preference of the idea of a communist regime more than self-defense of the accusations levied at them. So, that similar defenses of the accused students during the court were interpreted by the authorities as they acting in an organized manner and this becomes more evidence proving they had been involved in organized crime.

Of course, memorizing Nâzım Hikmet is hard proof of having communist ideas; however, the members of the court did not express this point explicitly. Instead of this, they touched upon this issue when answering an argument for the defense of the lawyers of the accused people. The lawyers said that Nâzım Hikmet had fled abroad and talked on several radios in Russia against Turkey after the meeting of his clients; therefore, his clients could not be accused of celebrating Nâzım Hikmet's acquittal which had occurred before he had fled. From these words, it is understood that Nâzım Hikmet's image in the country had been grown worse after he had fled abroad and made some statements to the media instruments against his country. Therefore, the lawyers of the accused claimed that the students remembered with respect the memory of a Nâzım Hikmet who had not yet fled abroad.

The members of the court, however, did not accept this as proof of their innocence. They explained in the below words, which were also common ideas about Nâzım Hikmet among the authorities of the period:

> But fleeing abroad from Turkey without any reason or impulsion by a person who is not communist-minded and released from prison under cover of amnesty law is the concrete evidence that he is a communist. In addition, an association which organizes a meeting to memorialize Nâzım Hikmet has to know his political beliefs in addition to his literary personage and it also means that the people who advocate such minded person must have the same beliefs. Therefore, it is not considered undue to mention the escape of Nâzım Hikmet; on the contrary, this matter is the presumptive evidence

> besides all other counter evidence. These accused members of the association who are also students in the universities and high schools should know that the failure of justice could be bettered not by meeting in the halls but only by applying to the courts in the eye of competent authorities and organ. They undoubtedly know that therefore, the meeting should have different aims than saving Nâzım Hikmet from prison.[138]

So, Nâzım Hikmet was a hard evidence of their loyalty to communist ideology, and additionally, the members of the court were bound and determined on the guilt of the students and punished them. Even in the end, all of the accused were punished with several years for making communist propaganda and when they go to the court of appeal, it insisted on the old decision. Only memorializing Nâzım Hikmet in a non-violent meeting had cost those years.

Cases with Everyday People

In the 1950s in Turkey, there were also a significant number of cases involving making communist propaganda regarding everyday people related and daily events. Such cases were generally daily speeches, discussions or events between friends, a family or some neighbors which contained some kind of symbols related to communist ideas. There were the diverse reasons for such cases which are crucial to interpreting the experience of the everyday people related with political crimes and the act of denunciation in the period under discussion.

---

138 *"Ancak komünist ruhlu olmayan ve af kanunundan istifade ederek tahliye edilmiş bulunan bir şahsın hiçbir sebep ve saik yok iken Türkiye'den kaçması, onun evvelden beri aynı kanaatı taşıdığının, komünist fikirli olduğunun açık bir delili olmasına ve Nâzım Hikmet için toplantı yapan bir derneğin edebi şahsiyeti kadar siyasi akidesini de bilmeleri tabii bulunmasına ve bu kanaatı taşıyan bir şahsı müdafaa edenlerin de aynı hissiyatı taşıyacakları izahdan vareste olmasına binaen Nâzım Hikmet'in firarından bahs etmekte yersizlik görülmemiş ve esasen bu husus aleyhde olan diğer delillerin yanında bir karine olarak zikrolunmuştur. Adli hatanın salonlarda içtima yaparak değil, selahiyetli merciler nezdinde kanun dairesinde müracatlarla ıslah edilebileceğinin üniversite ve yüksek mektep talebesi olan bu dernek mensubinin ve sanıkların bilmeleri lazım gelmekte ve bildikleri de şüphesiz bulunmakta olmasına göre toplantının Nâzım Hikmet'i hapisten kurtarmak maksadından ziyade başka sebeplerde aramak lazım gelmektedir."*

To begin with, a common reason for accusing someone of making communist propaganda in the 1950s was his/her complimentary words on a communist country, especially the USSR. As explained in the previous chapter, the USSR was equivalent to communist ideology in the world at that time, also in Turkey. Any kind of bright view of this country could not be approved by the official discourse in Turkey and this opposing view towards the USSR continued to be given support by the everyday people. This support easily could be seen in the cases in the high penal court due to denunciations among everyday people.

For instance, there was a case between a drunk and night watchman.[139] The night watchman wanted to take the drunk to the police station because he was shouting loudly in the streets at 11:00 pm. The drunk resisted going to the police station. He hits his face, so of course this fight ended up in court. The accused man stayed in prison for four months and then came the trial day. This event seems like a judicial case; however, the claims about the accused man make it political. The night watchman asserted that the drunk had shouted "There is no law in this country! If the Russian government takes control of here, everything will be put in order! This country could be governed by Russians!"[140] Therefore, according to the watchman, these words were in favor of communism because he mentioned the advantages of the law and order of a communist country and this was also propaganda of weakening national feelings.

Additionally, two eyewitnesses, a woman and her 13-year old son at, entered the case and stated that the accused had reviled against both the government and the law, specifically to Celal Bayar, saying that the country may be governed by

[139] Decree no. 1953/205, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, October 8, 1953.

[140] *'Bu memlekette kanun yok, Rus hükümeti gelsin bak nasıl işler düzene girer, burasını Ruslar idare edebilir.'*

Russians or Persians and at least the government should follow the civil code of Russia. The boy added Egypt to these countries; that is to say, he heard accused declare that the country could also be governed by Egyptians. That is to say, the statements of denouncers were a bit different from each other; but all of them heard his complaints about the government or the country in general. More importantly, they saw these complaints as enough to accuse him of the crime of making propaganda against the country under the name of communism. In the end, legislative intention of such a judicial case became making communist propaganda.

Another similar case in the archives of the high penal court is a conflict between married couples.[141] There was an incompatibility of temperament in the family and this story ended up in the court. However, the statements of a relative of the woman turned this judicial case into a political one. He indicated about that his brother-in-law made communist propaganda when he read the article of Kasım Gülek, general secretary of Republican People's Party, related with his speech on BBC radio in *Millet* newspaper. According to the witness, when the accused man was reading this article, he said, "More men like Kasım Gülek are necessary for this country, there is no freedom in this country, there is only oppression. If the government of Soviet Russia is implemented in our country, we could gain our freedom. I am working like that but I cannot find dry bread as well. Russia is a big country, you do the work which they give to you and don't think about anything else. They dismissed like a man Nâzım Hikmet from the country because he is a communist."[142]

[141] Decree no. 1952/190, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, November 20, 1952.

[142] *'Kasım Gülek gibi adamlar lazımdır. Bizde hürriyet yoktur, baskı vardır, Sovyet Rusya'nın idaresi memleketimizde tatbik edilirse o zaman hürriyete kavuşuruz. Ben bu kadar çalışıyorum kuru ekmek bulamıyorum. Rusya geniş memlekettir ne iş verirlerse onu yapar başka bir şey düşünmezsin, Nazım Hikmet gibi bir adamı komonisttir diye attılar.'*

The accused person said that contrary to the statements of the witnesses, that is to say, his wife and a close relative of hers, they went home unexpectedly and a fight broke out between them. In the end, this event ended up in the police station and they were reconciled by the police. However, in response to his complaint about his wife and some of her relatives, one of them denounced him as making communist propaganda. He showed above words of the accused man as evidence for this crime. In addition, he showed the wife of the accused and some other relatives as the witnesses to his words. However, in the court, these witnesses did not accept the claim that they had heard such words. Furthermore, the statements of the denouncer relative were found contradictory by the court members and the first complaint of the accused man about the witnesses was confirmed by the records of the police station; therefore, the man was acquitted of this crime.

This acquittal was not significant in this case. The striking fact is that everyday people in the 1950s used the aspersion of communist propaganda as a reason for heavy penalty. They knew the fact that any kind of communist activity or only words were the heaviest crime in their country or a strong reason to increase the punishment even if it was related with a different crime.

As an example, a dispute between two people in a trade relation ended with one denouncing the other of making communist propaganda. A retired major who wanted to publish his book, called as *War of Independence* (İstiklal Harbi), contracted with a publisher.[143] However, the publisher took a long time printing the book and the major exerted pressure on him to accelerate the process. According to the statement of the major, during one of these discussions, the publisher said: "You

[143] Decree no. 1952/41, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, March 20, 1952.

have harassed me all through and you do not praise me anytime. Even a worker like me is not suitable for this country; therefore in order to work easily I should close the shop and go to Russia."[144] After five or six months, the major went to the shop of the publisher; however, he could not find him there. When he asked about him to the other shopkeepers, they say that he had fled after abusing a girl and most probably he had gone to Moscow because he was dishonorable and a communist.

This case is interesting for not arising from a conflict between two people in a trade relationship, but for the fact that the denouncer in the case was not one of the two people. He was a third person who was not directly related with the event. As expected, the denouncer should be the complainant major; however, the real denouncer in this case was a man who worked in the shop of the publisher. This man heard about the event between the major and his employer and denounced his employer to the police. He brought proof of the complaints of the major and disappearance of the publisher from the country. The denouncer added to his statement the comment that the reason for his denunciation was the fulfillment of his "Turkishness duty." He needed to make emphasis on this many times during the court. Probably, the denouncer tried to legitimize his denunciation in this case because he was not directly related with the event. Therefore, his Turkishness identity could have been a sufficient motive to accuse someone of making communist propaganda.

It should be added that contrary to the statements of the denouncer, the accused publisher explained that he had no relation with the idea of communism in any words or actions, but that his employee had cast aspersions upon him because

[144] *'Her vakit beni taciz ediyorsunuz, benim kıymetimi takdir etmiyorsunuz, bu memlekete zaten benim gibi işçi yaramaz, iş yapmak için dükkânı kapayıp Rusya'ya gitmeli.'*

they had a conflict over a woman who worked with them before his denunciation. Additionally, other witnesses, the major and a friend of the denouncer gave statements in favor of the accused man. They asserted that although they heard the words of the accused related with communist ideas that the denouncer maintained, he had said them with anger, they could not have been his real thoughts.

A conspicuous detail from the statements of the witness is that the major also defended himself for not denouncing the accused man although he had heard such communist words from him. He added his statement that he was a citizen who had strong national feelings and he had not denounced the publisher because he thought that the criminal words were not his real words. This extra account shows the fact that the people of the 1950s knew that if they came upon, heard or saw something or someone related with communism, they should denounce it to the authorities. If she/he did not do so, she/he should explain the reason of her/his default of notice successfully.

At the end of the case, the words of the accused man, which were approved by all of the witnesses, were accepted as said due to anger during a conflict between a salesman and a customer by the members of the court and the publisher was acquitted.

According to the authorities, praising the USSR for its administrative management accompanied by complaining about the government or administration of Turkey were crimes. A person who made a complaint about anything in Turkey also had a tendency to commend other countries for their admirable conditions, especially the USSR. There are many examples of such cases in the archives of Sultanahmet High Penal Court. In very different conditions, at lunch in a restaurant with some friends, during a fight between a woman and her husband, reading a

newspaper, shouting at a football match or travelling in a bus could be the place where denouncers could identify someone to the police. Any sentences including the word of "Russia" could be a reason to denounce anyone to the authorities.

Sometimes, although it was a question only, talking about the USSR during a conversation in a coffee house could become the subject of a denunciation. As an example, a man went to a shoemaker and then they went together to a close coffee house.[145] When they arrived there, some men were talking about recent developments in Iran, the acts of Mullah Kasani and the arrest of Dr. Mohammed Mosaddegh. A man asserted that the reason for Mosaddegh's arrest was his advocacy of Russia. Thereupon, the accused man participated in the conversation by saying that he had travelled through the world owing to his duty; however, he had not gone to Russia. Additionally, he continued, saying that his friends who had travelled to Russia generally had positive impressions about the country and most of them claimed that the Russian people had a good attitude towards Turkish people. Also, his friends praised the system of government in Russia, especially the wide realm of freedom. The man asked to the man talking about Iran in the coffee house what he thought about these comments of his friends about Russia.

Another man sitting in the coffee house with them became angry when he heard such words from the accused man and immediately he went to the police station and denounced him for making communist propaganda. It is noteworthy that this denouncer was a soldier. After this denunciation, the man was arrested and kept in prison for three months. When the trial has ended, he was acquitted owing to the statements of the witnesses in favor of him. All of the witnesses and the court stated that the accused man had to say those words to answer a question. However, he had

[145] Decree no. 1954/114, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, June 17, 1954.

already stayed in prison three months and been questioned for his words on Russia. Of course, the accused man, the witnesses and other men in the coffee house who heard about the case must have derived lessons from this case.

Another similar case occurred during a football match between Beşiktaş and Fenerbahçe at Mithatpaşa Stadium on February 8, 1953.[146] Before the match began, the referee wanted to delay due to bad weather conditions. This resulted in an argument between the players and him. And consequently, it was decided to kick off the match and some gendarmeries took the field in order to ensure safety in the stadium. At the same time, a man gets on the stage and according to the statement of the man who denounced him, he shouts later "Yippee! Red Army is coming!" and clapped his hands when the gendarmes took the field. The denouncer and all other witnesses confirmed these sentences of the accused. Unfortunately, the names or relations of the denouncers with the accused were not indicated in the records of the case. This information could have provided us with the motive of the denouncers; however, this is not possible. Whether they knew the accused man and denounced him due to a conflict among themselves or did not know him and denounced him only because of his words about the gendarmes. Although we could not know this matter, it is as clear that the denouncers knew that such words about the Red Army, that is to say the USSR, could be a reason for denouncing someone from making communist propaganda. On the other hand, despite the statements of all of the witnesses for the prosecution, the members of the court believed in the innocence of the accused and he was acquitted from this crime. They asserted that he could not have said those criminal words in order to make propaganda to subvert the economic

[146] Decree no. 1953/88, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, April 13, 1953.

and social order of the country; instead, they have been said owing to his excitement at that moment. But, because of the denunciation he spent two months in prison.

As explained above, the cases with commending the USSR for making communist propaganda generally went along with complaining about the poor conditions in Turkey. In those years, complaining about national issues had the same meaning as having communist ideas in the eyes of the everyday people. According to general opinion, such people also tended to praise the strong and judicious economic and social system of the USSR.

A case related to this general opinion in the records of the High Penal Court illustrates the general acceptances of the communist ideology or people. The case was about a teacher who had been assigned to a village in Istanbul.[147] The accused teacher had been inducted to a village of Istanbul, Değirmençayırı Village in the district of Şile at the beginnings of 1951. Of course, he had graduated from an arts institute and also was not married. The case started with denunciations of many people about him due to his common words about the bad conditions of the country and also praising the system in the USSR. According to the statements of a witness who was teacher in a nearby village, the accused dropped by him when he first went to his new place of duty and he mentioned the social disorders of the country such as the disturbance of the highways and poor transportation. In other words, the accused man only complained about the highway of the village which was a common feature of many villages in Turkey; however, these words were found suspicious by some people and enough to denounce someone from making communist propaganda.

[147] Decree no. 1952/95, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, May 29, 1952.

Another witness, who was the head teacher of the same village, supported these claims about the accused and added that in addition to his presenting complaints about the country, he also mentioned the rich people in Istanbul who went on trips and went out in luxury automobiles as opposed to the people who lived in poor conditions in that village. In addition, the new teacher claimed that the case was not like that in Russia; there was equality there which means that everyone has the same right. It seemed that such negative views about richness of some social groups were considered as derived from the communist ideology and enough to denounce someone to the police from making communist propaganda. Together with the praising of anything related to Russia, the guilt a man that utters such ideas is proved explicitly in the eyes of the everyday people.

Another evidence of the communism of the teacher which was stated later put by the witnesses was his ideas on family. First, it should be kept in mind that he was a single man. According to the statement of the third witness who was also a teacher in same village, the accused man also talked about the incongruity of the notion of family and criticized the possession of a woman by a man. He continued by asserting that all men should marry a woman separately; however, they exchange their wives. These words were also considered as evidence of communism of the new teacher. It seems that the single life of the teacher was a significant factor of his ideas. The claims of the witness and the words they preferred when summarizing the ideas of the teacher seem. Therefore, it becomes more difficult that the accused said such ideas to them.

Consequently, some teachers in the same village decided to denounce the new teacher to the district manager and gendarme commander owing to his above words at different time and places. Thus far, the case seemed indistinguishable from others,

one person talked about ideas related with communism and was denounced to the police instantly someone else. However, the sequence of events started after that time: The gendarme commended them the fact that they should catch the new teacher in act and his words should be recorded by the policemen. Hence, the denouncers arranged a dinner for the new teacher and tried to get him to say the criminal words again. During the dinner, the gendarme commander and sergeant major listened them and witnessed the above words of the teacher. At the end, he was taken to the police station and sentenced to prison for one year.

At the end of one year, the case resulted against the accused and his crime of making communist propaganda was approved by the members of the court depending on Article 142 of the constitution. He was punished with a one-year prison sentence, but as he had already stayed in prison for same time; he was acquitted.

It seems that his words on some poor conditions in the country, the wealth of a minority, and positive features of the regime in the USSR and classic notion of the family were found to be strong evidence of his communist identity and enough to jail him for one year.

In addition to praising Russia as evidence of the crime of making communist propaganda, any words about Joseph Stalin were also used to accuse someone from this crime. There were many denunciations owing to compliments about the government of Stalin in the archive of the High Penal Court and most of them were on daily events about everyday people. As an instance, there is a case about a fisher who was single and lived in a motor boat.[148] The case started in a coffeehouse on the

[148] Decree no. 1952/224, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 29, 1952.

coast of Florya. The man was drinking some alcohol with his friends from the neighborhood. When the time came to pay the account, the grocer demanded more money than the price of a magnum from them. Thereupon, according to the statement of the denouncer, the man said that there was no law in this country, God was Stalin, and there was no God apart from Stalin.[149] This man was arrested and imprisoned for four months owing to the statements of a few denouncers who were at the same time his friends. After four months in prison, the lawsuit arrived at the conclusion that the accused man could not have said those words in order to make communist propaganda because he was drunk; therefore, the accused man was acquitted. However, it should be noted that only one sentence from him about Stalin cost him four months in prison.

There are many cases in the archive of High Penal Court like that. A sentence which included the name of Stalin resulted in denunciation of making communist propaganda. For instance, there was a case about a man who went to the grocer to buy daily newspapers.[150] According to the claim, that man said, 'I pulled Stalin, pull you as well'[151] when he takes one of the newspapers from the shelf. Then, the grocer and one of his relatives who heard this sentence immediately denounced him to the police and he was taken to court.

The accused defended himself by explaining that on the day in question, he really went to the grocer; but he did not buy any newspaper or cigarettes. As a consequence, the grocer became angry with him and denounced him to the police with slander. Contrary to the accusations, he had not said the word Stalin.

---

[149] *'Burada kanun yok, Allah Stalindir, Stalinden başka Allah yoktur.'*

[150] Decree no. 1952/14, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, February 4, 1952.

[151] *'Ben Stalin'i çektim, sen de çek!'*

Although it can never be known whether he said such words about Stalin or not, it can be easily seen that such a regular and daily event, maybe a conflict, could end in a court house and one sentence uttered by one of the sides could become strong evidence of a crime. In other words, such cases show that the everyday people of the 1950s knew very well that the crime of making communist propaganda resulted in higher penalty than a common conflict between two people. Therefore, they used this fact when they defended themselves and accused others in such cases. In the end, such daily events or conflicts become like political conflicts and of course the crime became making communist propaganda which was the most popular political crime of the period.

The above cases show that mentioning Stalin for any reason was seen as strong evidences of following communist ideology. This was mostly due to the fact that the name of Stalin also symbolized many delicate subjects like disbelief in religion, Turkey's engaging in the Korean War along with the US, the new role of China in the world system, the Balkan Pact, and Turkey's efforts to enter NATO. Generally, praising Stalin meant being on a side on these issues and of course this side was different from Turkey's. There was a lawsuit which illustrates explicitly this view of the figure of Stalin by the everyday people. A man was denounced to the police by his boss and workmates due to his complimentary words about Stalin at different times in 1953.[152] According to the records of the trial, the denouncers continued to give evidence of the criminality of the accused man as follows:

> It is claimed that he said that religions are idle things and invented to deceive the public, that there is no God and prophets and the crosses Christians wear are just a piece of iron, that only ignorant people, such as rednecks and fruit sellers go to the mosque, that enlightened

[152] Decree no. 1953/185, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, September 10, 1952.

> persons do not believe in these, and when he saw the news Tito had been assassinated in London he rejoiced and said that our friends did this but they would think that they were British and a war will start. He made communist propaganda, for example, by coming to the coffeehouse upset after the death of Stalin, saying that soldiers had been sent to Korea because of America's pleasure, Stalin was the son of a poor family and he had taken the money of the wealthy and give them to poor people, and by doing so he established equality in his country; besides it is also claimed that he continued to make communist propaganda in a barbershop by coming one day to this barbershop with a badge of Stalin and when he was being shaved he spoke again against religion and he said that by eliminating bosses there would be prosperity and there is such prosperity in Russia. [153]

It seems that all of the above ideas were the evidence of a person's loyalty to communist ideology in the eyes of the everyday people. All of the witnesses agreed on the communist identity of the accused man owing to his above words. And they denounce him to the police. He spent five months in prison.

The comments of the members of the court on the statements of the witnesses are also curious. First of all, they found the atheism of the accused man to be unrelated to making communist propaganda. Similarly, comments of the accused on the assassination attempt to Tito and death of Stalin were also found to be unrelated to having communist ideology. His words on the poorness of Stalin did not constitute a crime. However, when the time came to the words that Stalin gave to poor people the things which he had taken from rich and in this manner he provided equality in society, the members of the court tried to find this evidence speculative and did not accept the statement of a witness enough for this crime. That is to say, they

---

[153] *"Dinlerin boş şey olup halkı kandırmak için icat edilmiş bulunduğunu, Allah ve Peygamber bulunmadığını ve Hristiyanların boyunlarına astığı ıstavrozun bir demir parçası olduğunu, camilere amele ve manav gibi cahil kimselerin gittiğini, münevverlerin bunlara inanmadığını söylediği ve Tito'ya Londra'da suikast yapıldığına dair haberi görünce neşelendiği ve bunu bizimkiler yaptı, İngilizlerden bilecekler harp olacak. Stalin'in ölüm haberi üzerine kahveye müteessir geldiği, Kore'ye Amerika'nın keyfî için asker gönderildiğini söylediği, Stalin'in fakir bir aile çocuğu olduğunu, zenginlerin malını alıp fakirlere verdiği, bu suretle musavat tesis eylediğini bildirerek şu suretlerle komünizm propagandası yaptığı gibi bir gün berber dükkanına yakasına Stalin'in rozetini takarak geldiği ve traş olurken yine din aleyhinde konuştuğu gibi patronların ortadan kaldırılması suretile refahın temin edileceğini ve Rusya'da böyle olduğunu söyleyerek propagandasına bu dükkanda da devam eylediği iddia kılınmaktadır."*

considered respect for Stalin innocent; however, praising his ideas could be labeled as constituting a crime. By the same token, whereas the wearing badge of Stalin of the accused man in the barbershop was not judged by the court members as criminal, his words on eliminating the bosses and providing equality were shown as conclusory. In other words, such words could be supposed as evidences of making communist propaganda.

In the end, the court decided to acquit the accused man owing to the fact that the authenticity of the claims could not be proved reasonably and many of them could not be considered as praise for communism or communist propaganda. However, his five months in prison and the statements of the denouncers having been taken seriously by the court were of course imprinted on the everyday people's minds.

Another denunciation was made between two patients at the Validebağ Sanatorium, Istanbul, in 1951.[154] The accused man was a third year student in the law faculty of Ankara University. He had been referred to this hospital as a patient by the Ministry of National Education. During these days in the hospital, he was denounced to the police by his roommate for making communist propaganda. As evidence the denouncer showed singing the poems of Nazım Hikmet, praising communists who fought in the Korean War for freedom, extolling the virtues of the communist regime in Russia, especially about its scores of proponents. The man who had heard these words from his roommate had denounced him first to the head doctor and then to the municipal police. In addition, his statements were supported by two other patients. They also claimed that they had heard at different times from the accused man words praising communist regimes in different countries.

[154] Decree no. 1952/74, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, May 8, 1952.

Owing to these statements of the witnesses, a suit against the patient was brought. However, during the lawsuit, the denouncer renounced his former allegations about his roommate and explained that he had had to say those words due to his affection. Henceforth, other witnesses mentioned that they also had said their statements under the influence of the denouncer; in fact, they did not hear the words from the accused but the denouncer had heard them only from.

The defense also asserted that he did not say the alleged words at any time; however, the prosecution's witness maligned him because of their other conflicts in the hospital with each other for different reasons.

Therefore, the denouncement lost its validity; but the court still needed to evaluate the possible criminal words of the accused man. The members of the court decided that if the accused man had said these words, they still could be evidence of making communist propaganda, they were not punishable. Yet, the denouncement based on such words of a man had already caused his arrest and stay in prison for three months. Despite the fact that he was acquitted in the end, only the beginning of such a case was an incentive for others in future.

As mentioned before, in the 1950s, hearing someone mention Nazım Hikmet was a strong evidence for denouncing someone for the crime of making communist propaganda. Although his name was seen in above cases which started depending on other reasons, there were also cases related directly to Nazım Hikmet in the archive of the Sultanahmet High Penal Court. For instance, a guest denounced the host to the police owing to his words about Nazım Hikmet's having fled abroad and this event is brought to the courtroom.[155] According to the statement of the denouncer guest, the host man had talked about the awful conditions of his work place and working hours

[155] Decree no. 1953/167, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, July 9, 1953.

and in addition to these circumstances, had said that there wss no freedom in the country. The accused one exemplified the fleeing abroad of Nazım Hikmet for this pressure. His guests found these words sufficient for denouncing him to the authorities for the crime of making communist propaganda.

However, contrary to the expectations of the denouncers, the court members did not hold same opinion and decided that his words about Nazım Hikmet were not be evidence of communist propaganda. The detailed explanation of the court should be stressed here because it provides clues about the view of both Nazım Hikmet and the idea of communism by the authorities in that period as follows:

> Although it is understood that the accused Cemil said that Nâzım Hikmet, who is a communist as everybody accepts, has been sent away from the homeland; and even his words that there is a failure of justice in Nâzım Hikmet's sentence which appears in those day's newspapers; and his statements with the aim of approving comments and criticisms that Nâzım Hikmet's sentence is a violation of freedom of thought and this sentence is unfair and incorrect and there is no freedom of thought cannot be described and accepted as a crime which aims at reducing and weakening the national feelings; even if this person who left his homeland secretly of his own free will, had been sent away by the government as the accused claimed, it is obvious that criticizing this situation cannot constitute the crime of praising communism and virtually, as the crime of making communist propaganda or praising this regime can be existent only whether by praising the mentioned regime by pronouncing directly its name or also by praising one of this regime's principles, for example stating that workers should be protected against bosses, that the necessity of collective ownership and need to be mentioned benefits of these principles […] it cannot be considered that the accused Cemil has committed the crime he is charged with.[156]

[156] *"Her ne kadar maznun Cemil'in herkesçe komünist olduğu malum olan Nazım Hikmet'in memleketten çıkarıldığını söylediği anlaşılmakta ise de; ve Nazım Hikmet'in mahkumiyetinde adli hata olduğu yolunda o tarihte gazetelerde intişar eden ve bu mahkumiyetin fikir hürriyeti prensibini ihlal eden bir karar olduğu merkezde ortaya atılan mütalaa ve tenkitlere iştirak mahiyetinde olmak üzere ve bu mahkumiyetin haksız ve hatalı olduğuna işaret maksadile memlekette fikir hürriyeti bulunmadığına müteallik sözü dahi milli hissiyatı sarsmak ve hafifletmek maksadına müstenit bir cürüm şeklinde tavsif ve kabul edilemeyeceğine, kendiliğinden gizlice vatanını terk eden bu şahsın maznunun dediği gibi hükümet tarafından hudut harici edilmiş olması halinde dahi, bu hususun tenkid edilmesi komünizmi öğmek suçunu teşkil edemeyeceği tabii bulunmasına ve esas itibarile komünizm propagandası yapmak veya bu rejimi öğmek suçunun tekevvünü için ya doğrudan doğruya bu mesleki içtimainin ismini zikrederek öğmek veya bu meslek ideolojilerinden birini ve mesela amelenin patronlara karşı himaye edilmesinin, mülkiyette iştirakın lüzumundan ve bu hususların iyiliğinden*

These court records show that the judges perceived making the propaganda of communist ideology as directly voicing its name or claiming the protection of the working class against the bosses or the necessity of collective ownership. In addition, praising an artist who is known as a communist was not considered as a crime by the court. In this respect, the accused man was acquitted. Thus far, everything was well; however, another fact turned the table. In fact, this trial was a court of appeal which means that this suit had been tried before and the accused man had been acquitted by it; however, owing to same complaints, the case had started over again. At the end of the last trial, the man was again found innocent. But eight months had passed from the first denunciation to the last court of appeal. Most probably, these long months were enough to learn his lesson. That is to say, some groundless denunciations from a close neighbor cost him not only eight months in the prison, but also the information that he should be careful about his words and where and with whom he mentioned them.

In the 1950s, there were also cases with political conversations or discussions among some friends that ended in the courts. Such cases began with various kinds of issues of conversation among more than one person, friends, neighbors, and workmates; in a wide range of places, a dormitory, hospital, workplace, pub, and even military barracks. However, all of these divergent cases had a common feature which is the fact that although they were special conversations among somehow familiar people, they eventuated in a public institution which was the court owing to denunciation of one of them by another. Therefore, these cases give significant clues about the denunciation factor in such everyday events that included the crime of

---

bahs eylemek iktiza edeceği tafsil ve izahdan vareste olmasına bianen […], maznun Cemil'in isnad olunan suçu işlediğinin sübutuna kafi görülmemektedir."

making communist propaganda as it was asserted. Moreover, the risky or annoying issues or ideas of the 1950s can be easily revealed by these cases.

An example of such cases in that period involved a student in the Department of Fine Arts in Istanbul who was accused of making propaganda of communist ideology among the other students in the dormitory.[157] The event started with the treatment process of the accused student in the hospital of the Ministry of National Education. According to the statements of the prosecution's witnesses, one day when some of them were talking in the dormitory about consecutive fires in the buildings of the Ministry of National Education, which most probably had been set by the communists, the accused student went to them and said the following in defense of the communist ideology:

> The only reason for the disasters experienced throughout various places of Turkey is that there is no equality, and equality is only existent in a communist regime. Who was wearing a piece of clothes when we were just born? When the birth nears, the wealthy goes to expensive maternity hospitals with cars, they are clothed in silk; I am, on the other hand, starving. All the wealthy became rich by stealing. Rich and poor should be equal, they should eat the same meal, and they should wear the same clothes. Generals and private soldiers have to eat same meals. However, the wealthy and the generals are eating and drinking separately today. These all should be one and money of the wealthy should be shared among the poor people, and then there can be established equality. For example, can 30 million liras of Saraçoğlu, mansions of İnönü be earned after eight years of parliament membership? Atatürk is a dictator. And his regime is a dictatorship. Now you are all yelling, but the communists will take the control and you will all stop speaking. I do not recognize this Turkish regime, report me wherever you want, sooner or later this regime will collapse, we all will reach then prosperity and then equality will occur. Remember how the ideas of Namık Kemal were disliked and criticized at the beginning, but now they are liked and admired by youth of Kemalism. One day, the communist regime will also be admired just like that.[158]

[157] Decree no. 1950/36, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, February 23, 1950.

[158] *"Türkiyede muhtelif yerlerde vaki olan yangınların hep sebebi müsavatlık olmadığı içindir, müsavatlık ise ancak komünizm rejiminde vardır. Doğuşumuzda hangimizin sırtında bir parça bez vardı? Zenginin çocuğu doğduğu zaman taksilerle lüks doğum evine gidiyor ipeklere büründürülüyor, ben ise acımdan sürünüyorum. Bütün zenginler çalarak zengin olmuştur. Zengin fakir eşit olmalı ayni*

These words were considered by both the students and the court which were said for the purpose of praising the communist system by making special emphasis its equality character with respect to the elimination of the capitalist class by sharing all of their money between the poor people. Therefore, he was punished with a one year prison sentence owing to the crime of making communist propaganda.

The above quotation, which is a part from the claims of the prosecution's witnesses on the words of the accused student, shows the ideas that are considered a crime by the denouncer students. In other words, opposing views on the gap between rich and poor, the wealth of the state bureaucrats, the regime of Mustafa Kemal were seen in the way of appreciating the communist ideology. The court focused on the irrelevancy of these ideas from the first object at issue, which was the fires in some schools in Istanbul, and also his examples of the wealth of Şükrü Saraçoğlu and İsmet İnönü. According to the view of the court, these were evidence of the rationality of the accused student in order to make the propaganda of communism to other students in the dormitory. That is to say, the criminal words were not considered as they had been said in a hurry during a discussion between some students, but in a meaningful and systematical order.

On the other hand, if we take a brief look at the above quotation, it can be seen that it was an exaggerated comment to use such words for the aim of any kind of propaganda.

---

yemeği yimeli aynı üniformayı taşımalıdır. Generaller ve neferler ayni yemekleri yemeğe mecburdurlar. Halbuki şimdi zengin ayrı Generaller ayrı yiyip içiyorlar. Bunların hepsi bir olmalı ve Zenginlerin paraları fakirlerin arasında taksim edilmelidirki o zaman müsavat olur. Mesela Saraçoğlunun 30 milyon lirası İnönü'nün Köşkleri sekiz senelik meb'uslukla elde edilebilirmi? Atatürk bir diktatördür. Rejimi de diktatör rejimidir. Şimdi hepiniz bağırıyorsunuz fakat komünistler başa geçecek hepiniz susacaksınız ben bu Türk rejimini tanımıyorum istediğiniz yere şikayet ediniz, er geç bu rejim yıkılacak hepimiz o zaman refaha kavuşup müsavatlık o zaman olacaktır. Namık Kemalin fikirleri nasıl ilk vakıtlar sevilmeyip hep tenkit ediliyordu, fakat şimdi Kemalizm gençliği tarafından seviliyor ve beğeniliyor. İşte bir gün gelecek ayni şekilde komünizm rejimi de böyle beğenilecektir."

In the 1950s, another reason for denouncing someone for the crime of making communist propaganda was related to some kind of symbols of communist ideology such as drawing the hammer and sickle on a newspaper, wall or another ground, or writing slogans praising communism in various places. There are many of cases owing to this cause in the archive of High Penal Court and approximately all of them starts by a denunciation of a close person to the accused. This means that these cases are much more connected with daily events or issues than the above motives of denunciation.

As an example, there is a case on making communist propaganda by drawing hammer and sickle to a wall of a fifteen year old child.[159] According to the statements of the witnesses, he had drawn the hammer and sickle on a chair in the cabin of the night watchman of the factory where he worked. This act was witnessed by another watchwoman and she denounced him to the police. Moreover, another co-worker mentioned an event that after they had left a cinema, the child had pulled out a paper from his pocket on which there was a symbol of hammer and sickle. The denouncer continued his story by telling that then the accused child had pasted it to a wall. The denouncer had warned him about the criminal feature of that symbol and ripped the paper up; however, the accused pulled a new same paper from his pocket and hung it on a tree.

The comments about the child were continued by a different denouncer who also worked the factory. This witness asserted that the accused had delivered the same sheets to the coffeehouses and showed them to each person in the coffeehouse at different times.

[159] Decree no. 1951/42, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, March 8, 1951.

Because of all these denunciations, a suit was started involving the fifteen year old boy. His workmates in the factory were the prosecution witnesses and their statements were the only evidences of his crime of making the propaganda of communist ideology. Finally, the court decided that the child was guilty with strong evidence by the close witnesses to him. The court interpreted final decision as follows:

> According to Article 142 of the Turkish Penal Code, making propaganda in order to overthrow social orders or subvert political or juridical orders is defined as a crime, and, on the other hand, because the modus operandi of the crime has not explained and enunciated in law and as it is possible to make propaganda even with a picture or a sign; and while the accused was showing others the papers which have the hammer and sickle figures on and hanging on the walls and trees these papers, he stated that he knows that the hammer and sickle are signs of communism, and although drawing these figures on papers can be regarded as a desire to paint, his behavior of distributing these papers separate places explains that he had a different agenda and aimed to make communist propaganda which the hammer and sickle figures indicates […] and as it is obvious that this propaganda was intended to subvert political and juridical orders existent in the homeland […] according to first sub clause of Article 142 which was exchanged with Article 4934 of the Turkish Penal Code, a six month of prison sentence […][160]

In the end, the child did not go to jail because his punishment was cut as much as half it and besides, the remaining time was reduced fully. However, it also should be highlighted that the record of the case in Sultanahmet High Penal Court is a supreme court. That is to say, in the first lawsuit of this case, the accused child was

[160] *"Türk Ceza Kanununun 142. Maddesinde iktisabı, içtimai nizamları devirmek veya siyasi veya hukuki nizamları yıkmak için propaganda yapmak hali cezalandırılmakta olup propagandanın icrası şekli tayin ve tasrih edilmemiş olması hasebile resim veya işaret ile dahi propaganda yapılması mümkün bulunmasına ve sanığın komünizmin remzi olan orak çekiç resmini havi kağıtları başkasına göstermek ve ağaca duvara asmak gibi hareketlerde bulunurken bu işaretin komünistlik işareti olduğunu bildiğini söylemesine ve resim yapmak meyil ve arzusu ile böyle bir işaretin bir kağıda çizilmesi varit görülebilirse de bu işareti kağıtlara çizip ayrı ayrı yerlere talik etmesi böyle bir gay eve maksat dışında hareket ettiğini ve bu işaretin delalet ettiği komünistlik propagandası niyet ve gayesini taşıdığını göstermesine […] ve bu yaptığı propagandanın memleket içinde teşekkül etmiş siyasi ve hukuki nizamı yıkmağa matuf olduğu kendiliğinden zahir bulunmakta olup, […] Türk Ceza Kanunu'nun 4934 numaralı kanunla değiştirilen 142. maddesinin birinci fıkrasına tevfikan altı ay hapis cezasile mahkumiyetine […]"*

acquitted; however, after the prosecution office took an appeal to the final decision, the case was started again and the child was punished with a prison sentence in that one. In other words, approximately two years of the child had been spent with this case in the courts and most probably, he lost not only years but also his work and workmates owing to this event.

It is also worth mentioning that the court interpreted Article 142 in the manner of how the practically the crime in the related article could have been carried out. According to their view, some symbols written on a wall or a tree or some other place could be a method of making the propaganda of communist ideology. Therefore, a person who attempted to do such a thing should be punished on the grounds of Article 142 of the Turkish Penal Code in which in fact the criminal act is not expressed clearly.

In another similar denunciation case, witnesses added evidence of some speeches of the accused in order to justify their denunciation. First of all, this case was related to a man who had drawn a sign which looked like a hammer and sickle on a newspaper.[161] According to the statements of four denouncers, when the accused man sat in a coffeehouse and read the newspaper *Son Telgraf*, he drew the famous sign on news about Korean War. Further, they give the details of the place of his sign as follows:

> At the headline of the newspaper *Son Telgraf* on January 2, 1950; on the small map which illustrated combat area of Korea, Turkish troop was symbolized with the Turkish flag. On the same map, red armies were also drawn as attacking the zone under Turkish flag. It is asserted that the criminal draws a crescent which surrounds Turkish troop from behind by extending arrow marks showing line of march

[161] Decree no. 1952/42, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, March 20, 1952.

> of red armies. These arrow marks symbolize the hummer figure which represents Russian regime […][162]

This statement shows how closely watched the accused had been followed by the denouncers. Even though their words were not right, they were in need to give the details so as to justify their accusation. Furthermore, they continued by mentioning events like that at earlier times, they had seen the accused man when reading the columns of the newspaper in a detailed manner and taking some notes on it. In addition, in order to testify the views of the accused that constituted a crime, they brought up the subject of the Korean War when they were sitting together in the coffeehouse. Of course, similar to their expectations, the man took the side of Russia and China in the war and criticized the attack of America. It seems that such a view about the Korean War is an illegal act according to the witnesses.

More evidence about the guilt of the man was his words about a youth meeting organized to criticize both political reaction and communist movements in Turkey. This small talk took place in a grocer's with three other men. At that moment, according to the witnesses, the accused commented on the nonexistence of freedom of thought in Turkey and exemplified this by being above reproach of Ataturk's principles. Additionally, he praised about the interrogable character of Stalin's regime in Russia as opposed to Turkey's. Thereupon, an interesting dialogue was established- the apprentice boy in the grocer said, "The tongue of anyone who talks against Turkish principles or the Turkish identity is mutilated and if it is necessary, the youth beat such people." Then, the accused man answered this attack by claiming that "Such an attitude can be possible only in fascist regimes; we can

[162] *"2/1/1951 tarihli Son Telgraf gazetesinin ilk sahifesinin baş tarafında Kore harp sahasını gösterir ufak kıt'adaki haritada Türk kıt'asının bulunduğu bölgede tab edilerek gösterilmiş olan Türk bayrağının bulunduğu saha üzerine hücuma geçmiş olan kızıl kuvvetlerin yürüyüş istikametlerini gösterir ok işaretlerini kurşun kalemile uzatarak Türk kıt'asını arkadan çevrilmiş bir hale koyduğu ve bu ok işaretlerini Rus rejiminin timsali olan orak resmine benzettiği […]"*

like Ataturk's regime or not and in a similar way, we can criticize the communist regime or praise it." Moreover, he told them about his travels to Russia and Yugoslavia and made a comparison between these two countries and Turkey on the state of freedom of thought and concluded that both of them were notably in better circumstances than Turkey.

These accusations were considered by the court as strong evidences of making communist propaganda. Despite all of his refusals on a big proportion of the claims, he was given a verdict of guilty and punished with one year in prison. However, he had already been in prison for one year; a year had passed from his first arrest to the day of final lawsuit.

Another striking case was related to a young man who wrote "Long Live" on a newspaper on news related to the arrest of communist teachers in schools.[163] He worked in a coffeehouse. The case started with the denunciation of a customer of this coffeehouse. When he came to the coffeehouse on a just another day, he found a newspaper on a table on which there was the handwritten phrase of "Long Live" right on the left side the phrase "communism". He reported this event to the police. After the inquiry, it was understood that this phrase had been written by a waiter of the coffeehouse. He was charged with making communist propaganda by putting such a newspaper on a table which could be seen by many customers.

The accused waiter defended himself by emphasizing his loyalty to his ethnic identity as follows:

> I bought a pen the day the event had happened, I wrote to test the pen. I did not write such a thing so the communists would live long. I also did not see which word there was, I only wrote the word "long live." It was written coincidently there, I am a Turkish child, even if

[163] Decree no. 1952/103, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, June 9, 1952.

> it kills me I do not want communists to live long, I do not know what I did with the newspaper, I also do not know when I wrote this "long live" words on it, I just learnt that when I was called to the police station. The newspaper belongs to the coffeehouse; I have no intention […][164]

By this passage, it is understood that the waiter thought that emphasizing his Turkish identity and as a consequence of this identity, being an anti-communist from birth, during his defense could be advantageous for his exoneration. In other words, it seems that a young man who lived in the 1950s in Turkey knew that a Turkish child could not be a communist and also did not want the existence of any communists in his country. In addition, the accused man felt that showing his strong belief in such an idea could help prove his innocence.

In the end, somehow the claims were not found adequate in order to judge him of the crime of making communist propaganda and he was acquitted. That is to say, the court members decided that the resulting sentence on the newspaper after the man had written the phrase "Long Live" did not pose a threat to the political system of the country.

More than this, there are cases with writing or drawing some words praising communist ideology on a great variety of surfaces in the archives of the High Penal Court. This surface could be a paper, a newspaper but also a piano, a tree or the wall of a toilet. Someone could be denounced to the police owing to the accusation that she/he had been seen as writing such words on various surfaces for making communist propaganda. For instance, there is a case with a male student at the conservatory because it was asserted that he had written "Long Live Communism

[164] *"Hadise günü bir kalem almışdım onu tecrübe için yazdım. Ben komünistlerin yaşaması için böyle bir şey yazmadım. Orada ne kelime olduğunuda görmedim, yalnız yaşasın kelimesini yazdım. Tesadüf oraya gelmiş, ben Türk çocuğum ölsem de komünistlerin yaşamasını istemem, ben gazeteyi ne yaptığımı bilmiyorum, bu yaşasın kelimesini günün hangi saatinde yazdığımında farkında değilim, ben karakoldan çağırdıkları zaman bunu öğrendim. Gazete kahvenin gazetesidir, bir kastım yoktur […]"*

Russia" on the bottom of a piano in a classroom.[165] The event started with a report by a student who had seen this slogan under the piano to the school director. The school director tried to investigate this issue, but he could found any clue about the criminal. Then, he referred the matter to the police department. After questioning in the school by the police, it was understood that there were other tables and chairs which had handwritten words praising communist ideology. Moreover, there were too many different statements about the people who had written these words on these surfaces in order to make communist propaganda. Some students denounced one of their classmate as one day they had seen her/him sitting alone in the classroom and they had becomes suspicious about this situation. Some students said about some of their classmates that they had already known by their other activities or ideas on making communist propaganda.

However, in the end, nobody was found guilty, because it could not be proved who had written the words on the piano, tables or chairs. Therefore, no conservatory student was arrested for this crime. Moreover, the court decided that because of the fact that the unknown guilty student had written criminal words on surfaces that could be seen with difficulty by other students, these writings could not have had the aim of making communist propaganda. In this way, the court indicated that although they could not find the guilty person, if so the other way around, they would not punish him from the crime of propaganda due to presumptive evidence.

As stated above, there are also cases with the denunciation of someone who had drawn certain signs of communist ideology on the walls and of course generally this figure was the hammer and sickle. However, in such crimes, it was difficult to determine the person who had drawn on the wall and when it had been done. This

[165] Decree no. 1953/102, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, April 30, 1953.

made them being more exposed to denunciation cases because such events could only begin with a witness' statement which had strong evidence about this act of the accused. Two suits in the High Penal Court which were tried in consecutive years show this role of denunciations and the competency of the witnesses in such cases.

A man saw a hammer and sickle figure on the wall of the toilet of a coffeehouse and decided to report this to the police.[166] He added to his statement the fact that he had seen the same hand drawn figure on the wall of the same toilet before, but that it has been deleted. He asserted that the current figure on the wall was drawn by a customer of the coffeehouse who became the accused. He and some other customers followed the accused and went to the toilet after he visited it and saw this new hand drawn figure on the wall. In addition, for several months he had been on the accused man's trail, he had met with a similar sequence of events a few times.

There are some other witnesses who gave the same statements as the above. These were the people who claimed that they followed the accused man for some time and then understood that the person who had drawn the figure of hammer and sickle on the toilet wall was him. Apart from them, there were some witnesses in this case who explained that although they had not seen the accused when committing this crime, they had heard what other witnesses had stated and believed them.

It seems that there were servants of the coffeehouse, some customers and yet more police in the region among the witnesses of this case. That is to say, this event was the result of long-term following and rumors about the accused man, and many people around the coffeehouse acted collectively to catch him in the act. In the end, one of them thought that his evidence was enough to denounce him to the police for the crime making communist propaganda and put this project into effect.

[166] Decree no. 1953/17, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, January 29, 1953.

The members of the court, however, did not find the evidence strong enough to punish the accused for the crime of communist propaganda. They emphasized especially the issue that even if the claims of the witnesses were true, the place of the hammer and sickle on the wall was too small and dark; therefore it was improbable to evaluate such an act as having been aimed to make communist propaganda. This point was repeated by the court a few times throughout the suits. In my opinion, this repetition was caused by the attempt to persuade such a large number of witnesses to share the judgment of the accused man's innocence, because it seems that it was impossible to make them believe in the weakness of their evidence. Therefore, the court preferred to give the emphasis on the weakness of the act of the accused man for the crime of making communist propaganda. Just because of this, they decided to acquit the accused.

In another case with a drawing of the figure of hammer and sickle on a wall of a toilet, it started with a denunciation and ended with the acquittal of the accused man owing to weakness of the action for making communist propaganda. However, this end did not change the fact that drawing a figure on a wall could be a cause of action about someone for the crime of making communist propaganda.

This propaganda wall was located in a toilet of a secondary school in Istanbul.[167] The denouncer in this case was the school director. He had noticed the figure of hammer and sickle which had been drawn by a hard object on a toilet of boys' school. After his denunciation, the police came to the school and made detailed investigations and in the end, they found the guilty student. After the first interrogation, it was understood that the student had made the figure by using a hull

[167] Decree no. 1954/74, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, April 8, 1954.

of a hunting rifle. He accepted all accusations about him; but he claimed that he done it only for fun.

It the last court, the accused student claimed that he had given his first statements under pressure and in fact, he had not drawn the figure. He added that the toilet was not for only school boys, but also, it was possible for any other boys from outside who could use this toilet easily. Other witnesses gave similar statements. Even the school director who had denounced him at first changed his first statement and argued for the presumption of innocence of the accused student.

All of these statements resulted in the acquittal of the accused student from this crime; however, he had already spent a month in prison after the initial denunciation. Similar to the former case, the court made a special emphasis on the weakness of the place of the crime element for making ideological propaganda when they decided the innocence of the male student.

In addition to many cases with communist propaganda, there was also a significant portion of the cases involving degrading Turkishness and different types of state institutions, usually the government, the prime minister, the president, the republican system, the parliament, the court house and the laws, the military and other security forces. While half of the cases in the archive study were related to the crime of communist propaganda, the remaining half of the cases were about the offense of libel against a variety of authorities of the Turkish state.

As well as the cases with communist propaganda, the cases with the offense of libel also were mostly about the daily events of everyday people. Of course, there were law suits with political people and they need to be mentioned in this thesis in order to interpret the character of the lawsuits related with everyday people; however, it should be emphasized that the number of the cases with everyday people

is much greater than that of politically active people. In other words, contrary to the expectations, such political crimes had more connections with everyday people than political people or groups.

Of course, the reasons and final decisions of these cases differed according to the Turkish institution or identity that had been insulted. However, some generalizations can be made. First of all, the cases involving insulting Turkishness were usually about non-Turkish or non-Muslim people, especially the populous minorities of the period such as Greeks, Armenians, and also Bulgarian migrants as being a non-Turkish Muslim group. Moreover, almost all of the suits with this crime in the archive of the High Penal Court are about everyday events related to everyday people such as neighbor fights, a dispute between a homeowner and her/his tenant or between a boss and her/his worker, or daily conversations about popular political events of the period like Cyprus events or September 6-7 Riots. Additionally, most of the cases were the result of a denunciation of some people who claimed that they had seen or heard the event.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Accusing people of the crime of making communist propaganda was a widely used practice in the 1950s in Turkey in order to label some group of people as politically immoral, unwanted and punishable with high penalties. As a common opinion in society, these people were to be denounced to the authorities immediately. A kind of fearful atmosphere created by the authorities of the period appeared in the form of laws, cases, denunciations, acquittals or heavy penalties related to the crime of communist propaganda. These cases were presented to a great variety of people from divergent regions, ethnic groups, political views, sexes or ages. All of these factors had a profound impact on lawsuit process.

As stated in the beginning, this study was based on the relationship between political crime and denunciation in the 1950s in Turkey and it analyzed the issue of whether there was an atmosphere of ordinary people denouncing each other or not. Although my study was limited to a certain region of Turkey, even to Istanbul, it provided significant clues on the general atmosphere of Turkey in that period because the city was a melting pot of distinctive classes, status, ethnic identities, languages, political views, gender and ages. Therefore, the cases in the archive of the Istanbul 1st High Penal Court piece Turkey's differences together.

At the end of my thesis, various kinds of political crime in the climate of the 1950s were explored. Communist propaganda was the most common one among

them. Libel suits related to the president and the government came next. That is to say, the fears of communism or any other kind of criticism in that time resulted in high rates in these two kinds. The numbers can provide more detailed information about the distribution of each crime in the total. For instance, 49 of total 105 cases- that is to say, 49% of all- in the archive are related with the crime of making communist propaganda. 21 one them, or 20% of all, involve insulting Turkishness and, at the same rate, there are cases with the crime of insulting the government and other institutions of the state. The remaining proportion includes offenses with religious propaganda.

Of course, this distribution was a consequence of the political picture of the 1950s. It is not surprising that there were high rates of the crime of communist propaganda in a period which anti-communism was a government policy. As Lucas writes, all these controversial issues are in reality caused by the fact that denunciation is always justified by a forthcoming danger against the regime.[168] This continuous danger creates a conflict between the role of the citizens and the limit of the governments in social systems. Furthermore, the following high numbers of the offense of insulting are the continuation of the tradition of being a sacred cow of the governments- which is also a heritage of the one-party regime. The Democrat Party often showed its sensibility on this issue, too.

In addition, a high portion of the accused people was from "other" ethnic or religious groups in society. Especially in the cases with communist propaganda were migrants from close neighbors who had different ethnic identity or religious views. There were also high rates of denouncing in those case files. Again, the cases with

[168] Colin Lucas, p.769.

communist propaganda had a more denouncing aspect than other kinds of political crime. The fear of communism had ensured to each part of society in the 1950s; therefore, the act of denouncing among ordinary people was more popular. The reason of the denouncer could be ideological, political or only for self-interest or all together. Moreover, the defense of the accused person or perspective of the members of the court in the process of the case was in the borders of the language of the law.

The most important fact was my access to the interest that I mentioned at the beginning which brought me to this archive: approximately 80% of these cases are related to the daily events of ordinary people and only 19 of 105 cases are tried were related to popular or politically active people, parties or associations, columns in newspapers, published books or poems. That is to say, the remaining part of the archive is a consequence of denunciations related to daily events for which I searched.

Additionally, the final decision of the court about a case was not significant for my analysis; but it should be added that many of the cases involving political crimes had probably ended with acquittal. Still, this ending does not change the fact that such cases were used to discourage other people from criticizing any aspects of the system. Moreover, even starting a criminal prosecution for a person owing to the same reasons was in fact a way of provocation and instigation for similar causes of action. Of course there were some cases that ended up with punishment, too; however, the rate of them was in the minority among all. They generally were about people who really made an attempt to establish a communist party and actively participated in the coordination and administration of such organizations. Another frequent reason for being punished by the court was criticizing or insulting the government while making communist propaganda. Thereby, it could be said that, if a

case had a relation with any kind of crime against the government of the period, the sentence was usually prison. In other words, whereas 12% of the people accused of spreading communist propaganda were punished by prison sentences, this rate increased to 33% in insulting trials.

The most conspicuous point in the cases is the marks of the political atmosphere of the 1950s in Turkey opposition to communism, that is to say Russia, the uncriticizable character of Menderes in power, despite a multi-party system; specifically reminding of Turkish identity to non-Muslims; and an emphasis on secularism against Islamic propaganda. The cases show the fact that such kinds of concerns and emphases of political powers also had extensive coverage in the life of the everyday people. It seems that especially the motifs of Nazım Hikmet, the Korean War, NATO, Stalin and the sign of hammer and sickle were considered by everyday people as strong evidence of making communist propaganda or being a communist.

The motive of the denouncers is also significant for understanding the efficiency of the program or ideology of the state or party on the citizens. Of course, every denunciation included ideological beliefs and moral judgments to a certain extent; that is to say, the denouncers used classical ideological frames or the popular themes of the existing regime in order to justify their acts. However, this judgment was not valid for all cases. Both affective and instrumental motives had a role in this process.

In the conclusion of these denunciations, the state or governing party both gained information and had a control over the private spheres of social life. This extended its scope of domination from the public space to the private area. In addition, denunciations enabled the state and the party to keep their fingers on the

pulse of society. Additionally, these denouncing systems were used for various kinds of activities against “other” groups in society like communists, non-Muslims, different ethnic groups or sometimes women. Furthermore, the denunciation act created a two-sided distinction between the citizens of a country as denouncers and the people who are denounced. In other words, even though many of these cases were not started owing to a political conflict, their denunciatory aspect and their role in establishing a hierarchy between citizens made them political denunciations. It should be emphasized that denunciation is a collective act, although it is carried out by an individual; that is to say, it has a public character. However, it is an obvious fact that there is an active role of the state in this externalization and internalization process of its citizens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Documents

Decree no. 1950/352, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 14, 1950.

Decree no. 1950/36, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, February 23, 1950.

Decree no. 1951/42, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, March 8, 1951.

Decree no. 1952/103, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, June 9, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/14, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, February 4, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/190, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, November 20, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/211, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 11, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/224, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 29, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/41, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, March 20, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/42, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, March 20, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/74, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, May 8, 1952.

Decree no. 1952/95, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, May 29, 1952.

Decree no. 1953/102, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, April 30, 1953.

Decree no. 1953/159, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, May 25, 1953.

Decree no. 1953/167, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, July 9, 1953.

Decree no. 1953/17, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, January 29, 1953.

Decree no. 1953/185, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, September 10, 1952.

Decree no. 1953/205, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, October 8, 1953.

Decree no. 1953/237, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, November 10, 1953.

Decree no. 1953/290, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, December 24, 1953.

Decree no. 1953/88, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, April 13, 1953.

Decree no. 1954/114, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, June 17, 1954.

Decree no. 1954/74, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, April 8, 1954.

Decree no. 1955/100, T.C. Istanbul 1st High Penal Court, June 2, 1955.

Books and Articles

Ağaoğlu, Samet. İpin Gölgesindeki Günler: *Arkadaşım Menderes Marmara'da Bir Ada*. Istanbul: Alkım Yayınevi, 2004.

Ahmad, Feroz. *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*. Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2007.

Akalın, Cüneyt. *Soğuk Savaş, ABD ve Türkiye*. Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2003.

Akar, Atilla. *Bir Kuşağın Son Temsilcileri-Eski Tüfek Sosyalistler*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1989.

Aktaş, Melih. *1950-1960 Demokrat Parti Döneminde Türk-Sovyet İlişkilerinde Amerikan Faktörü*. Istanbul: Şema Yayınevi, 2006.

Asal, Talat. *Güneş Batmadı: Müvekkilim Adnan Menderes ve Yassıada*. Istanbul: Selis Kitaplar, 2003.

Arcayürek, Cüneyt. *Yeni İktidar, Yeni Dönem 1951-1954*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1985.

Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya. *Menderes'in Dramı: 1899-1960*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2000.

Bağcı, Hüseyin. *Demokrat Parti Dönemi Dış Politikası*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1990.

Belli, Sevim. *Boşuna mı Çiğnedik?* Istanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1994.

Bilgin, Mustafa. *Britain and Turkey in the Middle East: Politics and Influence in the Early Cold War Era*. London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies; New York: In the United States and Canada distributed by Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Birinci, Burcu. “The Marshall Plan in Turkey: A Critical Evaluation of United States' Interests in the Plan and its Effects on the Republic.” MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2007.

Burds, Jeffrey. “A Culture of Denunciation: Peasant Labor Migration and Religious Anathematization in Rural Russia, 1860-1905.” *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 786-818.

Connelly, John. “The Uses of Volkgemeinschaft: Letters to the NSDAP Kreisleitung Eisenach, 193-1940.” *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 899-930.

Çağlar, Derya. *Hayali Komünizm – Soğuk Savaş’ın Türkiye Söylemleri*. Istanbul: Berfin Yayınları, 2008.

Çelenk, Halit. *141-142 Üzerine*. Ankara: Anka Yayınları, 1976.

Çizmeli, Şevket. *Menderes: Demokrasi Yıldızı?*. Ankara: Arkadaş Kitabevi, 2007.

Eroğul, Cem. *Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1970.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila, and Robert Gellately. “Introduction to the Practices of Denunciation in Modern European History.” *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 747-767.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. “Signals from Below: Soviet Letters of Denunciation of the 1930s.” *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 831-866.

Fleeming, Denna Frank. *The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961.

Freeland, Richard M. *The Truman Doctrine and the Origins of McCarthyism*. New York and London: New York University Press, 1985.

Gellately, Robert. “Denunciations in Twentieth-Century Germany: Aspects of Self-Policing in the Third Reich and the German Democratic Republic.” *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 931-967.

Goldwin, Robert A. *Beyond the Cold War: Essays on American Foreign Policy in a Changing World Environment*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Güven, Dilek. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Azınlık Politikaları ve Stratejileri Bağlamında 6-7 Eylül Olayları*. Trans. Bahar Şahin. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2010.

Irmak, İ. Erkan. “Kayıp *Destan*’ın İzinde ya da *Manzaralar*’da Yiten: *Kuvâyi Milliye* ve *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*’nda Milliyetçilik, Propaganda ve İdeoloji.” MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2009.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Türkiye’de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Koçak, Cemil. "Ayın Karanlık Yüzü: Tek-Parti Döneminde Gayri Müslim azınlıklar hakkında açılan Türklüğü Tahkir Davaları." *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar 1* (2005): 147-208.

Kozlov, Vladimir A. "Denunciation and Its Functions in Soviet Governance: A Study of Denunciations and Their Bureaucratic Handling from Soviet Police Archives, 1944-1953." *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 867-898.

LaFeber, Walter. *America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1990*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991.

Lease, Gary. "Denunciation as a Tool of Ecclesiastical Control: The Case of Roman Catholic Modernism." *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 819-830.

Lucas, Colin. "The Theory and Practice of Denunciation in the French Revolution." *The Journal of Modern History 68* (1996): 768-785.

McGhee, George Crews. *ABD-Türkiye-NATO-Ortadoğu…* Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1992.

Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce 4: Milliyetçilik. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Osgood, Robert E. "Introduction: Reappraisal of American Policy." In *America & the World: From the Truman Doctrine to Vietnam*, 1-24. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970.

Öymen, Altan. *Bir Dönem Bir Çocuk*. Istanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2005.

_____. *Öfkeli Yıllar*. Istanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2009.

Rourke, Francis E. "The Domestic Scene." In *America & the World: From the Truman Doctrine to Vietnam*, 147-188. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970.

Taşkın, Yüksel. *Anti-Komünizmden Küreselleşme Karşıtlığına Milliyetçi Muhafazakâr Entelijansiya*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Tucker, Robert W. "The American Outlook." In *America & the World: From the Truman Doctrine to Vietnam*, 27-78. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970.

Whitfield, Stephen J. *The Culture of the Cold War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi.* Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.