ARŞİV EMEKTARLARINA ARMAĞAN

ARŞİV EMEKTARLARINA ARMAĞAN

Hazırlayanlar

Nizamettin Oğuz İshak Keskin

İstanbul 2013

Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı Yayınları
Yayın Numarası: 165

ARŞİV EMEKTARLARINA ARMAĞAN

T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Sertifika No: 16549

İç Düzen
Nizamettin Oğuz - İshak Keskin

Kapak
Dr. Mehmet Fahri Furat

Baskı - Cilt
Şenyıldız Matbaası

ISBN
978-975-6186-81-7
1. Baskı: 2013

Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı Yayınları
İstanbul - 2013
Tel: 90 (212) 526 16 15
Fax: 90 (212) 217 60 46

İçindekiler

İçindekiler 5
Sunuş 9
Dündar ALİKILIÇ
Türkiye'de Özelleştirilen Kurumlara Yönelik Arşiv Politikaları 13
Doğan ATILGAN
Bilgi Hizmetlerinin Gelişimi ve Ankara Üniversitesi 21
Bilgin AYDIN
XVI. Yüzyıl Divan-ı Hümâyun Ruus Defterleri 29
Yahya BAŞKAN
Türkler, Tarih, Savaş ve Meşrûiyet 41
Gülbün BAYDUR - Şelale KORKUT
Özel Bir Arşiv İçin Thesaurus Denemesi 47
İsmet BİNARK
Devlet Arşivimiz 67
İsmet BİNARK
Bulgaristan'a Okka İle Satılan Arşiv Belgeleri 77
Murat CANDEMİR
Haydarpaşa Liman ve Rıhtımı İnşası İmtiyazının Bürokratik Yolculuğu 89
Niyazi ÇİÇEK
A View of Bureaucratic Relations in the Transition Period from the Ottoman State to the Republic in Light of the Administrative Acts and Writings of the First Years of the Republic 117
Géza DÁVID
Bir Macar Arşiv Emektarı ve Tarihçisi, Zoltán Dávid (1923–1996) 131
Muhammet Ali DEMİR - Ali ÖZTÜRK
Türkiye Üniversitelerinde Görme Engelli Öğrencilere Osmanlı Türkçesi Öğretimi: Karşılaşılan Sorunlar ve Çözümlerine Yönelik Atılmış Adımlar 141
Murat ELMALI
Eski Uygurca Bir Budist Hikâye: Sena Upesena Hikâyesi 169
Berndt FREDRIKSSON / Çev. Mehmet Fahri FURAT
Postmodern(istik) Arşiv Bilimi – Bir Bilimin Metodolojisinin Yeniden Düşünülmesi 179
Mehmet Fahri FURAT - İshak KESKİN
Arşiv Sergileri ve Planlama Süreci Hakkında Kısa Bir Değerlendirme 199
Ceyhan GÜLER
Bilgi Teknolojileri ve İletişim Kurumu ve e-Devlet Uygulamalarına Yönelik Faaliyetleri 213
Süleyman Faruk GÖNCÜOĞLU
İstanbul'un İktisadi ve Sosyal Hayatı İçerisinde Bahçekapı Semti'nin Yeri ve Önemi 229

Mukadder GÜNERİ
Şiblî'nin Sefernâme-i Rûm u Şâm u Mısr Adlı Yapıtına Göre İstanbul
Kütüphanelerinin Dünü ve Bugünü 255

Asiye KAKIRMAN YILDIZ
Kütüphanelerde Bilgi Yönetimi Stratejilerinin Belirlenmesinde
Dijital Melezlerin Etkisi 273

Esra Gökçen KAYGISIZ
Bilgi Merkezlerinin Vizyon-Misyon İfadelerinin İncelenmesi 279

Hasan S. KESEROĞLU
Arşivci Olmak 297

İshak KESKİN
Kutadgu Bilig'de Devlet İşlemlerinin Kayıt Altına Alınması ve Kâtipler 303

Özgür KÜLCÜ
Ontolojik Çalışmalar Kapsamında Elektronik Arşiv Kaynaklarının
Tanımlanması ve Üstveri Alanlarının Geliştirilmesi 319

Talip MERT
Zekaî Dede Efendi 353

Hüseyin ODABAŞ - Kasım BİNİCİ
Öğretim Elemanlarının Açık Erişime Karşı Tutumları:
Atatürk Üniversitesi Örneği 361

Ş. Nihal SOMER
Fotoğrafik Malzeme: Türler, Tahribat ve Fiziksel Koruma 375

Burçak ŞENTÜRK
The Swedish National Archives: From the User Point of View 393

Acar TANLAK
Bir CD Koleksiyoncusunun Arşivcilere ve Arşivciliğe Dair Tavsiyeleri 403

Alptekin TOSUN
Radyoloji Bölümünde Arşiv Yönetimi 409

Bekir TOSUN
Bilgi Toplumunda Ekonomi ve Sanal Organizasyonlar 421

Mustafa Birol ÜLKER
İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi Kütüphanesi Arşiv-Dokümantasyon
Koleksiyonu ve Veri Tabanları 429

Ayşe ÜSTÜN - Işıl İlknur SERT
İskenderiye Kütüphanesi 439

Arnold van GENNEP / Çev. Kenan YILDIZ
Araştırma Konusu veya Bitimsiz Folklor 455

Murat YILMAZ
Arşivciler ve Kütüphaneciler Tüccar mıdır? 461

Türk arşivciliğine emeği geçenlere…

A View of Bureaucratic Relations in the Transition Period from the Ottoman State to the Republic in Light of the Administrative Acts and Writings of the First Years of the Republic

Niyazi ÇİÇEK*

Introduction

Scholars who work with the history of Turkish administration share the view that the Turkish community, which has a well-rooted state tradition, did not experience great difficulties in forming institutions when new states were established. We see one of the best examples of this in the Turkish Republic. Since the new government set up in Anatolia had the luxury of the rich state administration left over from the Ottoman state, it didn't take long for it to form institutions and organizations. The administrative structure from the previous administration was used until a modern framework was realized.

Consequently, even though the administration's form changed, because of the cadre of officials and bureaucrats left over from the Ottoman state the administrative customs of system and process were continued for a time. And although the young Republic turned its direction entirely toward the West and set out on a rapid modernization process, one sees that the administrative tradition continued and that the traces of many processes and procedures of the late-period Ottoman bureaucracy were evident. The great similarity between the documents produced in the first years of the Republic and the administrative processes for letters and records of the previous administration supports such a view.

In this study, we have examined the bureaucratic relationship for the transition period from Ottoman to Republic, in light of the administrative acts and writings of the first years of the Republic. The research was based in large measure on the documents found in the archival files of the Republic Archives. The document examples encountered were examined and compared from the standpoint of the diplomatic characteristics of writings of the two periods. We were encouraged to take up such a subject as this when we found documents in the archives related to the continuation of the administrative functions of organs like Divan-ı Mu-

* Istanbul University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Records and Information Management. E-posta: ncicek@istanbul.edu.tr

hâsebat (Imperial Audit Office), Şûrâ-yı Devlet (Council of State) and Başvekâlet (Prime Minister)'s central organization.

Research was conducted under a few headings. First of all, the traces of Ottoman administrative customs in the Republican bureaucracy, especially during the transition period, were reviewed and evaluated. Next, the document processes and administrative procedures for the documents of the newly established state were examined. Lastly, the form characteristics of the writings in the Republic's first years were scrutinized. In this way, by examining administrative acts and record that reflect a concrete view of administrative procedures, we sought an answer the questions of how long the new administration, which was realized only after a number of revolutions on the way to becoming a modern state, used the old procedures and how it turned these into modern methods.

Traces of the Ottoman Bureaucratic Culture in the Young Republic

It is known that administrative and social movements of change in Turkish society began in the period prior to the establishment of the Turkish Republic. As an example of this, historians note that as of the second half of the 17th century, the Divân-ı Hümâyun (Imperial Chancery of State), which was accepted as the centre for state administration in the Ottoman state, changed from being the place where the state administration's internal and external developments were discussed and decisions made, and began to become an institution that implemented protocol matters such as the distribution of gifts in connection with the sultan's accession and the acceptance of ambassadors. Conversely, it is stated that the functions of the Bâbıâli (Prime Minister's palace), which was headed by the Sadrıâzam (Prime Minister), increased vis-a-vis state administration and these became concentrated around this institution.[1]

The Ottoman administration entered an intense period of rapid westernization and modernization in the political and administrative fields in the first quarter of the 19th century and, taking western institutions as examples, organized the state structure anew. During this period, the years when Mahmut II was on the throne, the interior ministry, called *Umur-ı Mülkiye Nezareti*, the foreign ministry, called *Umur-ı Hariciye Nezareti*, and the finance ministry, *Umur-ı Maliye Nezareti*, were established by means of various hatt-ı hümâyun's (Imperial decrees), and the Çavuşbaşılık (Sultan's Bodyguards), which had handled judicial affairs, handed over its duties to the justice ministry, called *Deavi Nezareti*.[2] Consequ-

---

1 Mehmet İpşirli, "Bâbıâli", *DİA,* c. 4, Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, p. 390.

2 For more extensive information, see Ali Akyıldız, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilatinda Reform (1836-1856),* Istanbul: Eren, 1993, pp. 66-141.

ently, as the result of the renewal activities undertaken in the Ottoman administration, the Dahiliye (Interior) and Hariciye (Foreign) ministries were established in 1836, the Maarif (Education) ministry in 1857, the Adliye (Justice) ministry in 1877, and the Harbiye (Military Affairs) ministry in 1908.[3] In subsequent years a portion of the ministries, even though they were independent, performed duty as a unit tied to the Sadaret (Prime Minister's office). Nevertheless, they then returned to their founding form and performed their duties.

The formation of the central administration, in particular, and the other organs of the Ottoman state was accomplished by taking Western organizations as examples and the main country that was the model for this renewal movement in the civil field was France. Together with the ministries that were set up, organizations like Danıştay (Council of State), Sayıştay (Exchequer and Audit Department), Özel İdare (Special Provincial Administration) and Belediye (Municipality) were established on the French model.[4] For the most part, many of the institutions for enforcement, law courts and laws which were set up as the result of the Tanzimat (Reforms) movement, endured until the dissolution of the Ottoman State.

More modern processes, in comparison to the classic period, for administrative and bureaucratic matters in the Ottoman administration then began in the ministries established. One example of this is the transition in bureaus from the notebook method to the document and file method. Consequently, the Prime Minister's office and the ministries in the Turkish community, as well as the central and rural units tied to them, adopted and implemented, albeit not completely, the Western modern organization model. At the same time, there was within the community a bureaucratic cadre that knew the rules and processes applicable to administrative procedures.

The common view of some researchers who work on Republican history is that the Turkish community, which had deeply-rooted state traditions, did not experience great difficulties in realizing the establishment and organization of a new state. The Republic set up in Anatolia took possession of a cadre of officials, bureaucrats and bureaucratic functions that were the rich bequest left over from the Ottoman state.[5] For this reason, it did not take long to set up and organize institutions. This heritage was used until the realization of a modern structure. However much the

---

3 Necati Gültepe, *Mührün Gücü: İlk Türk-İslam Devletlerinde ve Osmanlılarda Bürokrasi,* Istanbul: Ötüken, 2009, p. 277.

4 Tahsin Bekir Balta, *İdare Hukuku I: Genel Konular*, Ankara: AÜ Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1970, p. 58.

5 Metin Heper, "Bürokrasi", *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, c. 2, Istanbul: İletişim, 1983, p. 296.

administration form changed, the bureaucratic cadre and the traditional methods and processes left over from the Ottoman state continued in place for a period. That is why the administrative procedures of the newly-established Turkish Republic, even though it had a modern administration form in every respect and the organs to run it, was run in its first years with the processes implemented by the hands of bureaucrats from the Ottoman state.

With the newly-established state, Turkey turned its direction completely toward the Western community and entered into a rapid period of modernization. The cultural changes and new administrative processes prompted the new state's organization and complete reformation of its administrative structure and institutions. The new infrastructure activities naturally meant the creation of different functions in many fields, such as health, public works, municipalities and higher education. At the same time, the form of these new functions and the way in which the requisite administrative processes would be implemented were spelled out in a number of organizational instructions contained in new laws, regulations, circulars and notices. Naturally, these new and different functions resulted in documents known to the organs that constituted public administration, but also spawned different document types that were certainly different from one another. However, if one thinks about the continuation of the administrative tradition and the many related processes and methods that were left over from the previous administration, then one sees that the written record customs of the Turkish Republic bear the marks of the bureaucratic culture remaining from the post-Tazminat (Reforms) modernized bureaucracy, and, in particular, from the late-Ottoman period. For this reason, the view that the documents of the Republic period reflect, in a significant way, the written and record tradition of the previous administration's final period from the standpoint of their diplomatic and internal characteristics, is predominant.[6] It is possible to see various examples that support this view in documents produced in the first years of the Republic which show a strong resemblance to Ottoman documents.[7]

The reason for the resemblance in correspondence tradition may be thought of as being related to state bureaucratic culture. In other words, do the factors that caused the formation of the bureaucracy in the new state constitute, at the same time, the basic elements in the continuation

---

6 Oğuz İcimsoy, *The Development Records Services in Turkey*, (Unpublished PhD), University College London, 1993, p. 95.

7 A modest study made of document samples published with regard to the Prime Minister's Office Central Organization by the State Archives General Directorate confirms this view, (*Başbakanlık Merkez Teşkilatı: Tarihçe ve Mevzuat*, Ankara: DAGM, 1995).

of the correspondence tradition? The answers to this question will reveal how the correspondence tradition came to be in the Republican period.

The first matter to be taken up when exposing the bureaucratic culture in the understanding of an administration is without a doubt its administrative and institutional structure. How is the formation of institutions realized together with the newly-established young state. As the functions are accomplished in these institutions what is the method of the administrative implementation employed. In what form are the administrative acts and records, which are the concrete manifestations in form of these administrative processes, done. The answers to these questions will show how the administration of the new Turkish Republic, which was realized only after many revolutions, one after the other, on the way to becoming a modern state, used the old methods and to what extent, and during this period how the previous methods were turned into modern methods.

According to most researchers who work on administrative history, the social appearance of the Empire, as well as its institutions and, to a great degree, its administration, along with its main legal framework, were transferred to the Republic without much change.[8] For this reason, the Republic's official cadre, from its first days, had a dual character, with both young, nationalistic officials and Bâbıâli (Ottoman Prime Minister's office) bureaucrats in its ranks. We see in a document that is one of the first of those that support this view, that the materials and documents, together with the officials of the Divân-ı Muhâsebat Dairesi (Imperial Audit Office), which was closed in Istanbul, were given over to the Finance Ministry.[9] The transfer of the bureaucracy, as it existed, to the new state was undoubtedly unavoidable because of the lack of trained personnel during that period. Thusly, the result was that the administrative habits and writing traditions tied to Ottoman customs of the existing cadre were quite naturally continued in the bureaucratic processes of the newly-established state.

However, the transfer of the civil bureaucracy from Istanbul to Ankara was not accomplished in one fell swoop. In particular, it was not easy for officials to adapt to the new administration and there was some resistance, manifested in an inability to adjust to the new concept and institutions of the new Turkish state, which was experiencing a rapid westernization process.[10] This was because the work force in the young Republic's

---

8 İlhan Özel, "Cumhuriyetin Dini", *İdare Hukuku ve İlimleri Dergisi*, 2/3 (December 1981), p. 17.

9 BCA, 30.10/16.89.1.

10 These officials did not show sufficient enthusiasm toward contributing to the struggle being made in regard to westernization, to the same degree that they resisted the transfer from Istanbul to Ankara. For this reason, at the same time the new state was trying to ensure the adaptation of this old guard's loyalty to the state and to its inclusion in the new institutional organizations, it was also endeavouring to train a new

institutions was comprised of both newly-trained nationalist youth and the old cadres from Bâbıâli.[11] Metin Heper explains this situation by saying that "in one regard, the governor and district chiefs, as well as bureaucrats at various levels, maintained their sympathy to the Istanbul government, despite being absorbed into the newly-established Ankara government".[12] After the Ankara government took the civil bureaucracy totally under its control, it tried to remove bureaucrats linked to Ottoman traditions from service.[13]

The Turkish Republic was endeavouring to complete its organizing through the employment of cadres, while trying to form its administrative structure. With the official occupation of Istanbul on 16 March 1920, the Parliament, which accepted the "Misak-ı Milli" (National Pact), dissolved. Mustafa Kemal, with the title Representative Committee Chairman given him for the Erzurum and Sivas congresses, convened the Büyük Millet Meclisi (Grand National Assembly) in Ankara on 23 April 1920, with some parliamentarians saved from Istanbul and others newly elected from each province. As the assembly convened one of the first jobs was setting up an organ to run administrative affairs. In accordance with decision number five, the assembly, gathering on 25 April 1920, established the "Muvakkat İcra Encümeni" (Provisional Implementation Council).[14] The chairman of this council, the first implementation organ of the new state still setting its foundations, was also the Assembly Chairman, Mustafa Kemal. The provisional council's service came to an end on 2 May 1920 with the passage of the "Büyük Millet Meclisi İcra Vekillerinin Suret-i İntihabına Dair Kanun" (Law Concerning the Method of Selecting Implementation Deputies of the Grand National Assembly), which formed ministries by making separate selections for each ministry. The chairman of this new Deputies Committee was, as for its predecessor, the Assembly Chairman. With the "Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law" (Constitution), the Vekilleri Heyeti (Council of Ministers) was able to select a chairman from within its ranks. From the establishment of the new state to the proclamation of the Republic, the nation was administered by these councils

---

generation of bureaucrats. (Metin Heper, *Bureaucratik Yönetim Geleneği: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Gelişimi*, Ankara: ODTÜ, 1974, p. 104).

11 In this regard, Doğan Avcıoğlu made this statement about the actors in the bureaucracy of that period, saying that Ankara (Turkish Republic) opened its arms to the Bâbıâli bureaucrats: "Starting from the first days of the Republic, the state cadre had a dual character, harbouring young nationalistic officials and Bâbıâli bureaucrats." (Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968, p. 155).

12 Metin Heper, *Bürokratik Yönetim Geleneği…*, p. 103.

13 Op. cit, p. 104.

14 *Dünden Bugüne Başbakanlık 1920-2004*, Ankara: DAGM, 2004, p. 5.

and committees, known as the Grand National Assembly Governments. We observe that during the nearly four year period, five councils of ministers were established, having different ministries.[15]

With the proclamation of the Republic on 29 October 1923, the organization of the Başvekâlet (Prime Minister's office), the implementing organ, was re-established, and its attached ministries and other organs were formed based on the institutional personality and modern bureaucratic understanding of the new Republic. Certain paragraphs of the Constitution were changed such that the state presidency and the government presidency were legally separated from one another and the government system became a parliamentary one.

One sees, though, that however much these two implementation organs were separated by law, the parliamentary state organization model was finally realized with the new Constitution adopted on 20 April 1924. Like its predecessor, this Constitution accepted the Turkish Grand National Assembly as the highest organ of the state. The parliament, formed from general elections, used its implementation authority through the President and Council of Ministers it elected.

Administrative Acts and Document Processes

As in the bureaucratic example, the similarity in bureaucratic implementations during the transition period from the Ottoman State to the Republic was also reflected in administrative matters and document processes. In fact, one sees that the process used for most documents was accomplished with the same style. Consequently, the production of this type of well-organized, well-arranged document form a couple of years after the organization of the new state shows that both the administrators and the bureaucrats and officials began to use the administrative experience and deposits of the Ottoman State in the new Republic right away.

The most important effect that ensured this bureaucratic continuity may be seen as the continued employment of the administrative personnel who implemented the processes in the institutions of the Republic. Truly, historians and political scientists who work on the recent period state that the veteran bureaucrats and officials of the dissolved Bâbıâli bureaucracy continued to work in the administrative organs of the central institutions in Ankara and in the hinterland, regardless of whether or

---

[15] In the period when the 1921 Constitution was in force, implementation, to mean the Parliament Governments, was made up of 11 ministries – Religion, National Defense, Justice, Finance, Interior, Economy, National Education, Public Works, Health and Foreign Affairs. In this period the General Staff was represented as an implementation organ, like a separate Ministry (Gencay Şaylan, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Devlet Yapısının Evrimi", *CDTA*, c. 2, Istanbul: İletişim, 1983, p. 389).

not they were able to accept the new administrative understanding.[16] There a many documents on this subject and a few examples follow. For example, finance personnel, their bureaus, ledgers, equipment, rules and regulations were transferred to the Republic.[17] One of the subjects that signals a continuation in administrative methods, in particular, we see in the transfer of document and ledger series from Istanbul to Ankara and in the form requested for document samples. The administration of the Şûrâ-yı Devlet (Danıştay/Council of State) that began its duty together with the new government in Ankara, conducted its affairs by requesting copies of the documents held in Istanbul, when necessary, in order to implement its processes; but when this proved untimely, it was requested that the documents be moved to Ankara or kept safely in their place but made ready for use quickly. "...in view of the fact that it is not feasibly possible to put the decisions of each office and the general assembly's decisions into a file and make separate parts of these belonging to the general assembly, and in view of the fact that, with regard to the organization and handling of documents and ledgers of the council of state offices and the performance of treasury duty for another, the ledgers and files of the aforementioned council in Istanbul should be moved to Ankara by whatever means available..."[18] We see from this and other similar examples that the organs of the government in Ankara, when necessary, used the documents and ledgers of the closed offices of the previous administration in Istanbul. Consequently, in the first years of the Republic the continuation of the personnel from the old regime in , especially, the central government organizations, signalled that administrative processes were conducted in the same form as the existing administrative acts and procedures until the transition to the new administration and the emergence of new procedures.

An important piece of evidence that strengthens this view is a document in which the Prime Minister's Secretariat Directorate, in order to conduct the administrative procedures in the newly-established Prime Minister's organization in a more organized and systematic manner, asked how the processes in the defunct Sadaret (Prime Minster's office) in Istanbul has been previously handled and according to which bases and methods the documents had been processed.[19] Based on the answer received, decisions were made as to how the institutions of the Prime Minister's central organization, in particular the Council of Ministers, ought to be formed, and how various bureaucratic

---

16 Avcıoğlu, op. cit, p. 155.

17 BCA, 30.10/16.89.1.

18 BCA, 30.10/16.82.13, p. 2.

19 BCA, 30.10/14.82.25, p. 1.

affairs such as meetings ought to be organized, how meeting minutes ought to be prepared, and how discussions ought to be conducted.

This document, dated 25 January 1925 and written with Arabic letters, was written to the Başvekâlet Hazine-i Evrak (Prime Ministry State Archives) in Istanbul.[20] After the salutation, the purpose of the letter and what was being requested were stated in the following manner, in an introductory section known as "üst yazı" (upper message): 'With the aim of bringing the correspondence of the Prime Minister's office to a more progressive form, I profoundly request that the existing and printed official ledger paragraphs in the attached documents be obtained and forwarded with speed in order to be of help in the knowledge of the preparation of the principles which have been acquired and which will be implemented, and that you urgently inform us with a memorandum that includes information about undetermined subjects, by means of instructions, and your recommendations."[21]

After this upper message, there was an effort to learn about the preexisting situation, in order to re-create the organs set up in Ankara and to run administrative procedures there properly. The requested information was asked for with six questions, the first of which concerned the processes in the central organization of the defunct administration, and it was asked in this way: "in order for the correspondence organization to be more productive and progressive, what was the situation of the defunct Prime Minister's office during the War of Independence?" Following this, questions were directed about "office director titles", "basic cadres", "classes and degrees", "officials' salaries", and "duties and responsibilities", and any available instructions about these subjects were requested.[22]

The second question was asked in this manner: "how were the relations and administrative processes of the defunct Prime Minister's office vis-a-vis the now-defunct Council of State, Parliament, its members and ministries?" Continuing along this line, "did parliamentarians provide their views on any matters?", "were problems solved with official correspondence" or "was the decision made that a question be withdrawn by the parliamentarians", in which case "how was this transmitted to the concerned state organization, on what basis and with what method" and, with regard to this matter, "in the framework of which rules was it accomplished", "how was the issue recorded" and "please send responses and include instructions and document and ledger examples."[23]

---

20 BCA, 30.10/14.82.25, p. 2.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

The third question in the letter asked for information in the following manner: "what was the form of the administrative processes which the defunct Prime Minister's office officially performed?", "were submissions to offices" recorded "based on the priority of the paragraphs submitted in the document" or "based on to the application to be made for solution of the problem", "under what basis would the response be provide to the questioner and if there was no particular form prescribed for this subject what kind of announcement would be made."[24]

The forth question in the letter asked "how were matters handled in the defunct Prime Minister's office regarding the investigation of an issue and writing approvals" and "provide examples of matters' classification, recording and transmittal" according to "the document's proximity to a decree", "to the statement of the Parliament and a member", "to a transmittal of an announcement and investigation to the Council of State", "to the priority degree of pardons and privileges" and to "secrecy and special features."[25]

The fifth question asked "the implementation form of the instructions that prescribed the duties of the defunct ministries."[26]

In the sixth and last question: "in the archive is there a file containing regulations, instructions or rules of other nations that were identified via previous investigations and applications for the organization of the defunct Prime Minister's office's correspondence." If so, "provide complete information about them and send examples of the existing documents."[27]

Documents at the Beginning of the Republic

In the Republic's first years, at least up until the transition to the Latin alphabet in 1928, correspondence was naturally written with Arabic letters, in the Ottoman language and according to its grammatical rules. In this regard, the clearest form characteristic was that the letterhead, number and text of a letter were started from the right hand side. The place for information about the institution or unit which was shown as the source of the letter, called 'serlevha' in those days and 'antet' (letterhead) today, was found in correspondence produced prior to the transition to the Latin alphabet, placed in the upper right-hand corner of the writings of the central organization of the late-period Ottoman State.[28] The letterhead was printed on the document and not re-written for each separate document.

---

24 BCA, 30.10/14.82.25, p. 3.

25 Ibid.

26 BCA, 30.10/14.82.25, p. 4.

27 Ibid.

28 Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili (Diplomatik)*, Istanbul: Kubbealtı Akadmisi Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı, 1994, from p. 189 BOA, DUİT, dos. 3/2-13-11.

When one looks at the document profile produced in those days, it is understood that there is a similarity with writing examples of the late-Ottoman regime. In fact, in the first years of the new state this profile was used for the form characteristics of a letter.

Correspondence between institutions was rather plain. Generally, there was a text, signature and date in documents, and in rural administrations, in particular, there was no letterhead or number in documents produced there. This situation may be related to the lack of printed forms in the young Republic just emerging from war and low on resources, and the fact that processes for recording-transporting documents had not yet been completely implemented. Additionally, the organization of the public administration infrastructure had not yet been realized and in many places the institutional process had not yet been completed.

The form characteristics of document samples in these first years were rather plain. It cannot be said that the documents had a single form dictated by rules. When one looks at the handling records of documents without any real standard measures one sees that that administrative procedures did not follow an organized path. This view is supported by the fact that in handling records for administrative procedures of documents from various institutions a number of different implementation methods are encountered. We see an example of these different implementation methods for administrative processes in the names and titles of institutions. In correspondence from institutions related to the "İcra Vekilleri Heyeti", equivalent to today's Council of Ministers, which was part of the Grand National Assembly structure and which was headed by the Chief of Parliament, one sees that different names were used, such as "İcra Vekilleri Riyaseti", "Heyet Vekili Riyaseti", "İcra Vekilleri Heyeti Riyaseti", "Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi İcra Vekilleri Heyeti Riyaseti", all essentially meaning 'presidency of the council of ministers'. In reaction to these different implementations, the Parliament Presidency promulgated a circular stating that letters sent from the ministries to the committee should use the title "İcra Vekilleri Heyeti Riyaseti" (Presidency of the Committee of the Council of Ministers) and that in the signature portion of letters produced by the committee, particularly decrees, the office title "İcra Vekilleri Heyet Reisi" (President of the Committee of the Council of Ministers) should be written.[29] With regard to these differences in implementations related to the handling of correspondence, the view can be offered that this was caused by the *delayed realization of the institutionalization process* in a newly-established nation and one should also keep in mind that the regulations prescribing the implementations in many fields, together with nascent organizational efforts, were just beginning to be formulated.

---

[29] BCA, 30.10/14.82.19, p. 1-2.

Also, the differences can be attributed to the lack of a general fundamental procedure concerning the handling of administrative processes.

As in the first years of the Republic, one encounters implementations that arise from different interpretations of administrative processes in later periods, as well. For example, with regard to different handling procedures which the Divân-ı Muhâsebat Reisliği (Head of the Imperial Audit Office) faced for documents related to the approval of paymasters in ministries, it was stated that the signature and date were required to be written together with the approval of a paymaster's confirmation.[30] Consequently, we see that in this period a standard measure had not yet been adopted not just for daily communications of written correspondence, as has been seen, but the form characteristics for a payment document had not been set down either.

After these first correspondence examples, which present matters different from one another, more organized writings began to be produced in the nation quickly entering a period of institutionalization. Systematic correspondence examples with separate sections for address, text and signature, which gave a letter the status of a document, along with a summary, attachments and handling records, are encountered for the period two years after the establishment of the Republic. When various correspondence examples for various institutions are examined one sees that correspondence was being produced in the framework of these document parts in both the Grand National Assembly Government, established in the first years of the Republic, and in the State Presidency and Government Presidency, and all its attached ministries, the two of which were separated by the law concerning the change of certain paragraphs of the Constitution proclaimed on 29 October 1923.[31] For example, the general form of a letter sent from the Parliament Presidency to the Prime Minister's office in 1921 was done this way.[32]

In the letterhead place showing the letter's origin in the upper right corner of the document the word "Türkiye" is at the top and under it "Büyük Millet Meclisi Riyaseti"(Presidency of the Grand National Assembly) is written as the institution name. In smaller letters underneath the subdivisions written, "baş kitabeti" (Chief Secretariat), and beneath that the lowest office is written, "laws directorate". Underneath this letterhead information "adet" (number) is written and the document's record number is given, "7/174". The address to which the letter is to be sent is placed above the text in the centre, "Başvekâlet-i Celileye" (to the esteemed ministry). We see that the document's date and city are written in this manner "Ankara/29-12-339", and placed in the upper left corner of the paper. After this

30 BCA, 30.10/14.82.22, p. 1.

31 BCA, 30.10/6.35.15.

32 BCA, 30.10/6.35.15.

protocol information, the text begins on the right side of the paper with the statement "Devairde evrak..." (Documents in offices...) and ends with the sentence "...leffen takdim kılındı efendim" (presented in the attachment sir...). The initials of the secretary who prepared the letter are in the right bottom area of the text and on the left side is the title and signature of the official who is the chief of the organization, "Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Reisi" (Turkish Grand National Assembly Chief).

As is seen when looking at the general structure of Latin alphabet correspondence, in the Republic's first years and the period up to 1928, one encounters a few different kinds of implementations in both bureaucratic processes and in the form characteristics of the documents that are the face of these processes.

The document samples of this period show a great similarity to the correspondence of the previous regime. Consequently, the view can be put forth that the correspondence method used by the Ottoman bureaucracy, together with its document form, were used for a specific period in the young Republic.

An element that supports this view is the alphabet used. As is known, after the Ottoman State dissolved the Arabic alphabet was used for a time in the newly-established Turkish Republic. Naturally, the writing manner, types of statements used, forms that took shape within the bureaucratic traditions and phrases came along with this transition. The form structure of correspondence was, of course, affected by writing from right to left. Perhaps most important sign that serves as evidence is the movement of the secretaries who produced these documents from one administration to another and their transfer of the writing structure they had learned to the Arabic alphabet writing in the the newly-formed organs.

Conclusion

It is known that nations and countries affect the states with whom they have relations on many subjects, ranging from architecture to trade and from culture to bureaucracy. This effect is seen more so in states that succeed one another and we see an example of this in the new Turkish Republic established in the aftermath of the ruined Ottoman State.

The result of research shows that there are great similarities between the late-period Ottoman bureaucratic culture and the administrative processes in the first years of the Republic. Concrete data was identified in archival investigations to strengthen this view.

A noteworthy aspect of this that first comes to one's attention is the request from the Prime Minister's Secretariat that was trying to arrange administrative activities in the organs being set up along with the new government, asking how procedures were run in the defunct Prime Minister's office in Istanbul and on what basis and according to what methods

were document processes implemented. Based on the answer received, decisions were made as to how the institutions in the Prime Minister's central organization, in particular the Council of Ministers, would be formed and how various bureaucratic procedures like meeting arrangements, preparation of meeting minutes and method of discussion would be handled.

The officials and bureaucrats were a factor signalling the existence of this bureaucratic relationship. Administrative personnel who conducted affairs in the previous regime transferred to the Republican institutions. For example, bureaucrats and officials from the defunct Prime Minister's office bureaucracy continued to work in administrative organs at the centre in Ankara and in rural organizations. Similarly, finance personnel, bureaus, ledgers, materials, rules and regulations all passed to the Republic. This transfer did not just include personnel and bureau materials, but also document and ledger series were shipped from Istanbul to Ankara. In the same way, the Danıştay (Council of State) conducted its work by asking for copies, when necessary, of documents held in Istanbul, in order to conduct its affairs. Although it was envisioned that over time the existing documents would be transported to Ankara, they were safeguarded in place in Istanbul and held at the ready so that they could be used when needed.

Until the Latin alphabet, which was accepted in 1928, correspondence was written with the letterhead, number, text and other sections tied to the right since the script employed was Arabic letters used within the framework of Ottoman language and grammatical rules. When one looks at the document types that emerged during this period it is clear that there is a great similarity with the late-Ottoman writing samples. In fact, it is possible to say that the form characteristics on correspondence in the first years of the establishment of the new state were essentially the same.