

## Sadrazam Tevfik (Okday) 23 Şubat 1921 Günü Londra Konferansındayken Sözü TBMM Delegasyonuna Devretti Mi?

Ömer Faruk Altay\*

Londra Konferansının 23 Şubat 1921 tarihli oturumu resmî tutanağında görüyoruz ki Sadrazam Tevfik (Okday), İstanbul Hükümetinin görüşlerini içeren Fransızca muhtıra okutmuştur. Söz hakkını TBMM Hariciye Vekili ve Delegasyonu Başkanı Bekir Sami'ye (Kunduh) devrettiğine ilişkin herhangi bir ifadesi yoktur<sup>1</sup> (**Ek 3'e** bakınız). Nitekim İstanbul Hükümeti delegasyonu üyesi Osman Nizamî Paşa, Bekir Sami'den birkaç fasıl sonra söz almış ve görüşlerini beyan etmiştir<sup>2</sup> (**Ek 5'e** bakınız). Daha açık bir deyişle, hem İstanbul Hükümeti delegasyonu hem TBMM delegasyonu, mülahazalarını ayrı ayrı beyan etmişlerdir.

İngiliz liberal *The Guardian* gazetesinin 24 Şubat 1921 tarihli nüshasından: *Londra Konferansı'nda [...] iki Türk Delegasyonu da dinlendi ve her biri Türkiye için konuşma yetkisine sahip olduklarını iddia etti. İki delegasyon da ayrı ayrı sunum yaptı.*<sup>3</sup>

İspanyol *La Accion* gazetesinin 24 Şubat 1921 tarihli nüshasından: *İstanbul Hükümeti ile Ankara Hükümeti'ni temsilen gönderilen Türk heyetler, bugünkü konferansta kendilerini ifade etti.*<sup>4</sup>

Paris'de münteşir *La Matin* gazetesi, özel muhabiri Jules Sauerwein'in "Asırlık Doğu meselesi. Türklerin programı birkaç kelimeden ibarettir: Yenilgileri zafere çevirmek" sernameli makalesini neşretti:

Aşırı saygılı ve titreyerek konferans salonuna girip Mösyö Lloyd George'un karşısına oturan ve romatizmalı organları üzerine bir yün örten Tevfik Paşa diplomasi edebiyatında Türkiye'yi temsil eden İstanbul'un "Hasta Adam"ının gerçek sembolü idi. Mösyö Lloyd George'un acıyarak onun sağlığını sorduğunu görmek hüznü vericiydi. Sadrazam, böylesine yüksek bir meclise kabul edildiğinden memnunluk duyduğunu belirterek teşekkür etti ve Roma'daki elçisi Osman Nizami Paşa'ya söz verdi; o da bir kaç cümleden sonra "Türk Millet Meclisi"nin temsilcileri olarak tanıttığı Ankara'nın adamlarına sözü bırakmayı uygun gördü. [...]<sup>5</sup>

24 Şubat 1921 tarihli İspanyol matbuatının belirttiğine göre:

Sultan'ın temsil heyeti, sekreteri vasıtasıyla, kendilerinin Ankara'nın politikasını takip edeceğini ve Sevr Antlaşması'nın yeniden gözden geçirilmesini talep edeceğini beyan etmiştir. Tevfik Paşa, İstanbul ve Ankara hükümetleri arasındaki ihtilafların iç meselelerle ilgili olduğunu açıklayacaktı. Konferansın o günkü oturumu yaklaşık bir saat sürmüştür. Oturuma başkanlık eden Lloyd George, sözü, İstanbul heyeti başkanı Tevfik Paşa'ya vermiştir. Tevfik Paşa da Türkiye adına kısa bir konuşma yapmıştır. Onun ardından General Osman Paşa, Tevfik Paşa'nın konuşmasını belge ve bilgilerle destekleyen bir konuşma yapmıştır. Ardından, İstanbul heyeti, sözü Ankara heyetine bırakmıştır. Ankara heyeti başkanı Bekir Sami Bey, Türk millî tezini savunan uzun

---

**Atıf Gösterimi:** Ömer Faruk Altay. (2025, Ekim 1). Sadrazam Tevfik (Okday) 23 Şubat 1921 Günü Londra Konferansındayken Sözü TBMM Delegasyonuna Devretti Mi? [Geliştirilmiş baskı]. *Tarih Tahkik*, tarihtahkik.com adresinden temin edilmiştir.

\* Siyasî tarih talebesi & işçisi. Elektronik posta: [tarihtahkik@gmail.com](mailto:tarihtahkik@gmail.com).

<sup>1</sup> R. Butler, J. P. T. Bury & M. E. Lambert. (1967). (Eds.). *Documents on British Foreign Policy 1919-1939*, First Series, Volume XV, p. 168-169. Great Britain, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

<sup>2</sup> *Documents on British Foreign Policy 1919-1939*, 1967, First Series, Vol. XV, p. 171.

<sup>3</sup> Aylin Hacıhanıfioğlu, *Millî Mücadele'nin İngiliz Basınındaki Yankıları (1919-1922)* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi], 2019, s. 127.

<sup>4</sup> Beatriz Lozoya Hortelano, *İspanyol basınında Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Kuruluşu*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi], 2015, s. 62.

<sup>5</sup> Yahya Akyüz, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Fransız Kamuoyu (1919-1922)*, 2023, s. 248.

konusmasında, kendi heyetinin, Türk milletini temsil eden tek ve gerçek merci olduğunu söylemiş olsa da konferansın, İstanbul heyetinin açıklamalarını dinlenmesine itiraz etmemiştir. [...] <sup>6</sup>

İbnülemin Mahmut Kemal İnal, Sadrazam Tevfik'i ve TBMM delegasyonundan Doktor Nihat Reşat Belger'i<sup>7</sup> şahit göstererek, Sadrazamın diplomatik söz hakkını tamamen devrettiğini ileri sürmüştür. Lafız şöyledir: *Söz, asıl millet vekillerine aiddir. Binaen aleyh Anadolu hey'etine söz verilmesini teklif ve reca ederim.*<sup>8</sup>

Bâb-ı Âlî Londra Büyükelçisi ve Londra Konferansı Murahhası Mustafa Reşit'in mütalaasına bakalım dedik mamafih H. Basri Danışman, dedesinden veyahut ailesinden aktarım yapmak yerine Sadrazam Tevfikzade Şefik Okday'dan nakille Doktor Nihat Reşat'ın mahut rivayetine atıf yapmış olduğunu gördük. Lafız şöyledir: *Söz asıl milletvekillerine aittir. Binaenaleyh Anadolu heyetine söz verilmesini teklif ediyorum.*<sup>9</sup>

TBMM Trabzon mebusu ve Londra Konferansı Murahhas Heyeti mensubu Rıdvanbeyoğlu Hüsrev (Gerede), Tevfik'in sözü TBMM delegasyonuna tevdi ettiğini fakat Nihat Reşat'inkinden bambaşka bir lafızla yazmıştır: *Türk ulusunun temsilcileri konferans huzurunda olduklarından, sözü Anadolu delegelerinin söylemeleri gerekir.*<sup>10</sup>

TBMM Sinob mebusu Doktor Rıza Nur: *Tevfik paşa Londra konferansında sözü "Söz sahibi bunlardır" diye Bekir Sami'ye bırakmış. Bırakmak büyüklüğünü de yapmış. Bu adam hakikaten büyüktür.*<sup>11</sup>

Londra Konferansı TBMM murahhaslarından Yunus Nadi, İngiliz istihbarat raporuna bakılırsa, konferans hakkında muhtıra kaleme alıp TBMM Hariciye Vekâletine takdim etmiştir. Fakat TBMM zabıt ceridelerinde böyle bir muhtıranın izine rastlanılmamaktadır.<sup>12</sup>

Yunus Nadi'nin şهادeti kritiktir. Yunus Nadi, Sadrazam Tevfik'e atfedilen sözün *efsane* olduğunu 1 Kasım 1922 tarihli gazete makalesinde belirtmiştir. Yunus Nadi'nin aktarımı da bambaşka bir lafızladır: *Söz bizim değil, milletin hakiki mümessilleri olan Anadolu murahhaslarındır.*<sup>13</sup>

*İncelediğimiz İngiliz Gazeteleri arasında Tevfik Paşa'nın Türk Halkı'nın gerçek temsilcisinin Bekir Sami Bey olduğunu söylediğine dair bir habere rastlanmamıştır.*<sup>14</sup>

İngiltere'nin İstanbul Fevkalâde Komiseri Sör Horace Rumbold'un 8 Mayıs 1922'de İngiltere Dışişleri Bakanı Lord Curzon'a gönderdiği gizli yıllık raporda belirttiğine göre, Londra Konferansındayken TBMM delegasyonu, İstanbul delegasyonundan daha baskındı. İki heyet arasında "gurur" meselesi, çekişme yaşanmıştı.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Esin Tüylü-Turan, *İspanyol Basınında Türk Milli Mücadelesi (1918-1923)* [Doktora Tezi], 2019, s. 210.

<sup>7</sup> Doktor Nihat Reşat Belger, A.H.206 kod adlı bir İngiliz ajanıydı: Rifat N. Bali, *Satvet Lütüfi Tozan*, 2018, s. 365.

<sup>8</sup> İbnülemin Mahmut Kemal İnal, *Son Sadrazamlar*, c. 4, s. 1734-1735.

<sup>9</sup> H. Basri Danışman, *Artçı Diplomat*, 1998, s. 117.

<sup>10</sup> Sami Önal, *Hüsrev Gerede'nin Anıları*, 2019, s. 215. Sami Önal, Hüsrev'in hatıratını dilde "sade"leştirerek ve birtakım ifadeleri sansürleyerek neşretmiştir.

<sup>11</sup> Dr. Rıza Nur, *Hayat ve Hatıratım*, 1967, c. 3, s. 780.

<sup>12</sup> Ferhat Eroğlu, *Yunus Nadi - Hayatı ve Eserleri (1879-1924)* [Doktora Tezi], 2016, s. 362.

<sup>13</sup> Ferhat Eroğlu, *Yunus Nadi - Hayatı ve Eserleri (1879-1924)* [Doktora Tezi], 2016, s. 363.

<sup>14</sup> Aylin Hacıhanıfioğlu, *Millî Mücadele'nin İngiliz Basınındaki Yankıları (1919-1922)* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi], 2019, s. 129.

<sup>15</sup> Ali Satan, *İngiliz Yıllık Raporlarında Türkiye 1921*, 2011, s. 37-38, 42.

Yunus Nadi'nin tanıklığı, Londra Konferansı zabıtnamesiyle ve İngiliz yıllık gizli raporuyla örtüşüyor: (i) Söz devri mevzubahis olmadığı gibi bilakis Bâb-ı Âlî delegasyonu sulhçu, münferid bir muhtıra takdim etmişti. (ii) İki delegasyon arasında alenen değil fakat hafiyen bir sürtüşme vardı.

### Netice

Ber vech-i bâlâ verileri şöyle mütalaa ediyoruz: Bâb-ı Âlî ve TBMM murahhas heyetleri Londra'da maslahat icabı alenî bir çatışma hali göstermemek hususunda prensibde sözleşmiş görünüyorlar fakat Sadrazam Tevfik'in "Söz, asıl millet vekillerine aiddir. Binaen aleyh Anadolu hey'etine söz verilmesini teklif ve reca ederim." tarzı bir cümleyi Londra Konferansı resmî oturumunda söylemiş olduğu iddiası, gerçek dışıdır.

EKLER

Ek 1.

DOCUMENTS ON  
BRITISH  
FOREIGN POLICY  
1919-1939

EDITED BY  
ROHAN BUTLER, M.A.  
*Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford*

AND  
J. P. T. BURY, M.A.  
*Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*

ASSISTED BY  
M. E. LAMBERT, M.A.

*FIRST SERIES*  
*Volume XV*

LONDON  
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE  
1967

## Ek 2.

## No. 19

I.C.P. 161] *British Secretary's Notes of an Allied Conference held in St. James's Palace, London, S.W., on Wednesday, February 23, 1921, at 11 a.m.*

PRESENT: *British Empire*: The Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd George, O.M., M.P., Prime Minister (*in the Chair*); The Rt. Hon. the Earl Curzon of Kedleston, K.G., Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; POLITICAL EXPERTS, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Vansittart; SECRETARIES, Sir M. Hankey, G.C.B., Mr. Howorth, Mr. Sylvester.

*France*: M. Briand, M. Berthelot, M. Loucheur, Count de Saint-Aulaire; POLITICAL EXPERTS, M. Kammerer, M. Brugère; SECRETARIES, M. Massigli, M. Chastenet.

*Italy*: Count Sforza, Signor de Martino; POLITICAL EXPERT, Signor Galli; SECRETARY, Signor Guariglia.

*Japan*: Baron Hayashi, Mr. Nagai; SECRETARIES, Mr. Saito, Mr. Yoshizawa [Yoshizawa].

INTERPRETER: M. Camerlynck.

## TURKISH DELEGATES:

*Constantinople*: His Highness Ahmed Tewfik Pasha, Grand Vizier; His Excellency Mustapha Reshid Pasha, Ottoman Government delegate at London; His Excellency Osman Nizami Pasha, Ottoman Government delegate at Rome; SECRETARY, His Excellency Ali Chevki Bey, Turkish Minister at Stockholm.

*Angora*: His Excellency Bekir Sami Bey, Deputy for Amassia, Minister for Foreign Affairs (President of Delegation); Djami Bey, Deputy for Aidin, delegate; Khousrew Bey, Deputy for Trebizond, delegate; Yamous Nadi Bey, Deputy for Smyrna, delegate; Zekaia Bey, Deputy for Adana; SECRETARIES, Dr. Nihad Reshad Bey, Munir Bey.

(The delegates from the Turkish Governments at Constantinople and Angora respectively entered the Conference at 11.15 a.m.)

1. *The Sèvres Treaty: Case presented by the Turkish Delegation*

MR. LLOYD GEORGE said that he desired, on behalf of the conference, to express great regret at the illness of his Highness Tewfik Pasha, and to say

## Ek 3.

how delighted he was to see that his Highness was sufficiently recovered to be able to be present at the meeting to-day.

TEWFIK PASHA thanked Mr. Lloyd George for the interest which had been taken in his health, and said that he wished to say how glad he was to find himself in the presence of the distinguished persons assembled at the conference.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE reminded the conference that on the 10th August last the Treaty of Sèvres had been signed between the Allied Powers and Turkey. This treaty had been designed with a view to ending the long and devastating conflict which had inflicted on the participants greater losses than possibly any similar war known to history. Since the signing of the treaty, the real peace which that treaty had been intended to evoke had not in fact been restored, and the world was constantly reminded of the massing of armies, of marching and counter-marching, of sanguinary conflicts, and of preparations for even worse events. The whole world was most anxious for peace, and needed peace, and in this respect Turkey was no exception. Turkey had suffered losses in the war as great, in proportion to her population and resources, as possibly any other Power, and it was essential that some action should be taken with a view to her speedy reconstruction and restoration from the ravages of war. The Great Powers, appreciating the necessity of action, had decided to invite the representatives of the Turkish Empire to London in order to assist in the beneficent task of terminating conflicts and restoring peace in Asia Minor, and the conference would now be glad to hear from the Turkish delegation what they had to say on the subject.

TEWFIK PASHA informed the conference that a document in French would be read out, which document summarised the views of the Turkish Government at Constantinople.

(For the English text of this document, see Appendix 1.)

PRESIDENT BEKİR SAMİ said that the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, by appointing delegates to meet the representatives of the Great Powers at this important conference, had shown its sincere desire to secure the restoration of a lasting and just peace in the East. The Turkish nation, after carrying on the war in circumstances of great difficulty, had, towards the close, entertained the greatest confidence in the promises made by the Great Powers, on the faith of which promises Turkey had ultimately decided to lay down her arms. While he did not wish to go into this particular aspect of the question, he thought it right to say that the consequences to Turkey of her decision to lay down her arms had not been of the kind which she had been led to suppose they would be. The Turkish delegates had come to the conference to ask that their case should be dealt with fairly and justly, and he expressed the hope that the conference would provide the means by which it would be possible for Turkey to continue and to develop her national and economic life. The claims which it was his duty to make could be summarised in a few words: Turkey must insist on some measures being taken which would secure her continued existence as a separate and independent nation, and would

## Ek 4.

also enable her to maintain her national honour. With the consent of the conference he would now read a statement which contained the particulars of the programme of the Angora National Assembly.

(For the English text of this statement, see Appendix 2.)

MR. LLOYD GEORGE said that, as a general statement of principle, the documents which had just been read by the delegates of the Constantinople and Angora Governments respectively were clear, and he did not propose to take any exception to them; but he must point out that the contents of those documents did not in the least assist the conference in the consideration of the very practical difficulties which it was its duty to discuss and endeavour to find some solution for. The conference would like to know how these general principles were related to the practical application of the Treaty of Sèvres; how far, in other words, did the Treaty of Sèvres fall short of the aspirations on which these general principles were based, and in what directions was it suggested that the treaty infringed these general principals [*sic*] or hampered effect being given to them? Take, for example, questions like the complete restoration of Turkey's sovereign rights; the protection of minorities; the arrangements for the control of the Straits; in what respect did the Turkish delegates consider that the treaty clashed with the general principles just enunciated? Until the conference had details it was clear that no substantial progress was possible.

PRESIDENT BEKİR SAMİ said that once the conference had definitely recognised the justice of the general principles he had mentioned, he would be quite prepared to enter into a discussion of the ways and means by which peace might be restored and Turkey enabled to return to her normal life.

(The heads of the Allied delegations briefly conferred among themselves.)

MR. LLOYD GEORGE said that he had had a short consultation with his colleagues on the two statements which had been made, but, short as that consultation had been, all the Allies were in the most complete agreement that a mere statement of general principles did not at all advance matters or help the conference in its consideration of the problems confronting it. As he had already said, general principles might be quite unexceptionable in themselves, but at the same time might be useless for the purpose of solving practical difficulties. The Allies must insist on knowing how far, in the view of the Turkish delegates, the Treaty of Sèvres fell short of the general principles which had been stated, and in order to answer this question it was absolutely necessary to have details. One could not incorporate general principles in a treaty. He therefore felt bound to press the Turkish delegates to say precisely in what respects they thought the Treaty of Sèvres unjust and an infringement of those general principles contained in the two documents which had been read to the conference.

PRESIDENT BEKİR SAMİ said that he had listened with great interest to the remarks made by Mr. Lloyd George, and he wished to say at once that, in the view of the Angora Government, the carrying into effect of the Treaty of Sèvres meant the doom of the economic and political life of the Turkish

## Ek 5.

nation. Turkey could not continue to exist as a separate nationality so long as the treaty was maintained. On these grounds the Angora delegates had thought fit to submit to the conference certain general principles, the adoption of which would secure to Turkey her national and economic life. The acceptance by the conference of those principles would be an indication to the Turkish delegates that the parties concerned had entered on a path which would lead to the restoration of peace, and as soon as that path had been entered upon he was willing to discuss details and ways and means.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE remarked that it was quite useless for the conference to endeavour to conduct business on the lines indicated by President Bekir Sami. It might be desirable for the Allied delegates to have a separate consultation.

M. BRIAND said that there was a question which he would very much like to ask the Turkish delegates, as on its answer would depend the probability of a practical result being reached. Within the four corners of the general principles which had been enunciated and the Treaty of Sèvres, what were the particular amendments or modifications of the treaty desired by the Turkish delegates? In order that the conference might usefully discuss the problem, it was necessary for it to have some concrete proposals of a definite character drawn from the treaty.

COUNT SFORZA added that the clearer the Turkish amendments and modifications were, even if, as a result of clearness, some dissent might be provoked, the greater would be the likelihood of the conference being able to have a profitable discussion.

OSMAN NIZAMI PASHA remarked that there were certain clauses in the treaty which might be discussed on the basis of the general principles which had been submitted to the conference. It would be possible for the Turkish delegates to draw up a programme of their proposals and claims if the conference thought that this procedure would be helpful. It would, of course, be necessary, however, for the Turkish delegates to have an opportunity of discussing their proposals *inter se* before submitting them to the conference.

PRESIDENT BEKIR SAMI indicated that, without going into particulars, the kind of questions which would appear on the list would be those relating to the future of Thrace and Smyrna, the arrangements regarding the Sea of Marmora and the Straits, and the economic and financial restrictions imposed on Turkey by the treaty.

M. BRIAND enquired whether it would be possible to have a further explanation of some of these points now.

PRESIDENT BEKIR SAMI said that the Turkish delegates would like time to consult together, and suggested that the conference should be postponed until the day after to-morrow, Friday, the 25th February.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE pointed out that the Germans were to arrive in London on Monday next, and that any delay would be most difficult to justify or arrange. He declared that the questions which had been referred to were questions which both the Turkish delegations must have considered carefully before they came to London, and they must know substantially what

## Ek 6.

proposals they were in a position to submit to the conference. He thought that there ought to be no difficulty in arranging for a resumption on the following morning.

PRESIDENT BEKİR SAMİ said that the Turkish delegates would do their best to be ready by 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, but he must add that the Angora delegation was a separate entity, representing the Turkish nation, and repudiated the claim or right of the delegates from Constantinople to enter into any arrangements or make any engagements in the name of the Turkish nation.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE said that the conference would be glad to listen to both delegations, and pointed out that if the delegations could agree among themselves it would save time, but that in any case a hearing would be given to both.

PRESIDENT BEKİR SAMİ said that he quite realised the position. It would be the duty of the Angora delegation to state their views, but of course they had no intention of attempting to impose them, and the ultimate decision would be one for the conference to take.

The conference agreed—

To adjourn the meeting until 11 a.m. on Thursday, the 24th February, 1921, when the Turkish delegates would enter into a detailed statement of their case.

*(The proceedings then terminated.)*

2, Whitehall Gardens,  
February 22. 1921.