

UDC 344

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/app.v73.2024.20>

Yunus Emre Aydin

orcid.org/0000-0003-4943-7134

Research Assistant, Master Student

Sakarya University

Erkan Erturk

orcid.org/0000-0002-7427-734X

Master Student

Sakarya University

FACTORS OF TRANSITION TO MULTIPARTY POLITICAL LIFE IN TÜRKIYE

Introduction. The Turkish Republic tried three times to move to a multiparty life and achieved this goal in 1946, which was its last attempt. Although the first step in this direction was taken in 1924 by the Progressive Republican Party, the desired result could not be achieved, and in 1925 the party was closed. The second attempt was made with the Faculty of the Free Republic, which was established in 1930 with the support of Ataturk. Although it was created with the support of Ataturk, the party was closed three months after its creation. The reasons for the closure were public events that took place during these two trial periods, as well as the fact that the public was not ready for this process. Thus, the attempt to transition to a multiparty system was postponed until 1946, which was the last attempt. Trial 46 was the last attempt to reach the final goal. The purpose of this study is to identify the main factors that influenced the implementation of the transition to a multiparty system in 1946, which proved unsuccessful despite attempts in 1924 and 1930, and to study how these factors contributed to this process.

The purpose of the article is to characterize and assess the factors of transition to a multiparty political life in Turkey

The main problem.

1. External factors. Political transformations in the world took place mainly during periods when internal and external factors were in harmony. At this stage, it is possible to explain the failure of Türkiye's first two attempts to switch to a multiparty system and its completion in 1946 with the realization of this harmony. In fact, Samuel P. Huntington believes that the most important element of a country's transition to democracy is compatibility with the international environment. He puts forward this statement by dividing the history of democratization into three periods. This process began with the granting of the right to vote to the majority of men in the first period of democratization (1820-1926). The second wave of democratization is the wave of democracy that began with the defeat of the Fascist bloc by Allied forces at the end of World War II. The third period is the Carnation Revolution movement, which began with Portugal's transition to democracy in 1974 (Akinci and Usta, 2016: 276-277).

In this understanding, which Huntington divides the history of democratization into three parts, the second part is the period that includes Türkiye's transition to a multiparty life. So, how and in what direction did this period influence Türkiye's transition to a multiparty life? The period before World War II was a period when fascist one-party regimes increased their numbers and strengthened in the world. During this period, such regimes were led by States such as Germany, Italy and Japan. During the same period, although Türkiye tried to transition to democracy, it did not succeed and continued its one-party regime. The current market situation also supports this situation. However, the defeat of the Fascist bloc at the end of World War II opened the doors to a new era in the world. From this moment on, the Western understanding of democracy will become the dominant understanding in the world, and this will lead to a change in the approach to governance in many countries of the world (Akkaya, 2011: 45).

With the defeat of the “helmet” states, a democratic system based on free elections came to the fore, while authoritarian one-party regimes remained in the background. As a result, authoritarian states that want to support Western countries, which are the new rulers of the world, have begun to review their own regimes (Karadeniz, 2018: 639). This group also includes the Türkiye party, led by İsmet İnönü. İnönü saw the changing global environment, and it did not take him long to take steps in this direction.

There are two reasons why Türkiye is moving closer to Western democracy in this process. The first of them, as mentioned above, is the desire to support the victors after the end of the war. Another reason is some of the steps taken by the Soviet Union against Türkiye. The Non-Aggression Pact, which was first signed on December 17, 1925 and was in force until the end of World War II, was not extended after the war. Concerned about this situation, the Turkish government instructed Ambassador to Moscow Selim Sarper to meet with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR to find out how they can continue the pact. At the meeting, Soviet Minister Molotov presented three conditions. They argued that the Russians were weak at the time of the Moscow Treaty signed in 1921 and were therefore forced to cede some land to the Turks, and that this treaty should be drafted in favor of the Russians.

Türkiye does not have enough forces to defend the Turkish Straits, so conditions were put forward that it should provide the Turkish Straits and a land base to the Russians and, finally, that a Convention on the Turkish Straits should be agreed upon between the two countries (Sivış, 2019: 57-58). Feeling threatened by this situation, Türkiye has become closer to Western democracies.

In accordance with these reasons, İnönü, passing messages to Western governments in the name of democratization, also put them into practice. It was among the 59 states that signed the establishment agreement at the UN conference, which first met in the spring of 1945. Thanks to this agreement, it was decided that in the new world order, the era of authoritarian one-party regimes was over and democratic approaches to governance would dominate the world (Akkaya, 2011: 45). By signing this agreement, Türkiye announced to the whole world that it would leave the one-party regime and move to a democratic multiparty political understanding.

2. Economic Reasons. Although Türkiye did not participate in World War II, it was affected by the economic difficulties caused by the war. Although the country was not in a state of war, it was very acutely aware of the threat of war. For this reason, İnönü declared semi-mobilization, and about a million people were taken up arms, most of whom were farmers. As a result of the shortage of production caused by the ongoing war in the world and the fact that most of the country's farmers were conscripted into military service, there was a shortage of basic consumer goods (Akindzhi and Ust, 2015: 48). Production fell to the lowest level in the Republican period. So much so that this reduction in production caused high inflation and a black market.

Additional data designed to correct the structure of the economy, which suffered during the war, further increased the discontent of the people. In addition to these additional taxes, the public reaction has intensified due to some illegal rules of law. The first of these rules was the National Protection Act, passed in 1940. Thanks to this law, the Government has gained some powers, such as setting prices, confiscating products and even imposing compulsory labor. Due to incompatibilities and problems that arose during the implementation of this law, farmers living in villages and engaged in agriculture suffered. Two years after the adoption of this law, the wealth tax was introduced. With this tax, put into effect by a law passed on November 11, 1942, the Government had the right to tax the high profitability created by the extraordinary conditions of the war. The attempt to collect this tax mainly from merchants, property owners and large landowners led to these groups taking part in the opposition to the RPP (CHP) in the future (Sanchaktar, 2012: 50-51). Some people argued that this law was adopted on a religious and ethnic basis and that its purpose was to exclude the existence of foreigners who are not Turks and form the dominant part of the Turkish economy. Additional taxes, the wealth tax and the National Protection Act undermined the confidence of both the bourgeoisie and the rich lands in the administration of the Republican People's Party. Such taxes and laws threatened the large accumulation of capital achieved by the bourgeoisie in the war economy, and additional taxes also put pressure on the veteran class, which was already going through a very difficult process. Thus, the government of the RPP faced both the financially strong

bourgeoisie class and the veteran class, which makes up the majority of the people (Haytoğlu, 1997: 50-51). In other words, the economic and social conditions necessary for the emergence of a strong opposition party against the government of the RPP were well developed at the end of the war.

Along with the poor economic conditions, the fact that bureaucrats were in a very good position compared to society, government officials shirked their duties, deputies got richer, and living conditions worsened, the growth of bribery and corruption even intensified the public reaction. Although İnönü stated that the problems are not unique to us and that the same problems are observed in other countries, people hold the government responsible for this situation (Sivış, 2019: 162-166). These economic difficulties are one of the reasons why İnönü decided to move to a multiparty life. Economic problems are one of the main factors in İnönü's post-war transition to a multiparty life: Atatürk founded the Free Republican Party after the economic crisis of 1929. In this case, the opposition party will become the unifying point of the existing reaction, and thus the existing reaction will be prevented from deviating into illegal ways.

During the war years, the bourgeoisie and landlords got rich quickly, unlike ordinary citizens. While government employees, merchants, and workers were rapidly getting poorer, this minority, engaged in hoarding and trading on the black market, increased their wealth. The gap between wages and prices during this period was constantly increasing to the detriment of wages. In addition, the entire burden of state taxes imposed in order to correct the disturbed balance of the national economy fell on the shoulders of rural residents, civil servants and workers (Eroğlu, 2019: 11-12). Despite the fact that this group complained about this situation, they could not react because of the repressive management approach of the one-party regime, and those who did so were subjected to pressure from the regime. This situation has caused growing dissatisfaction with the İnönü administration, not openly, but internally.

Another controversial law passed in 1945 that accelerated the process of creating the Democratic Party is the Farmland Act. The purpose of this law was to increase agricultural productivity by turning rural residents into landowners. Accordingly, farmers working on their own lands will work more willingly and receive higher yields. These lands, which will be transferred to farmers, will be obtained through the expropriation of lands belonging to rich lands (Arslan, Chagrychy and Albayrak, 2017: 827-830). The greatest reaction to this article of the law was caused by Adnan Menderes and a group of deputies. A common feature of the deputies opposing this law is that they are all rich in land. For example, Adnan Menderes owned 30,000 acres of land in Aydin. The reasons why deputies oppose this law are listed as follows: it is that large lands are more productive in agriculture, rural residents do not have technical and financial equipment for cultivating land, and if this law is adopted, trust in land ownership will be shaken (Serysh, 2019: 217-219). Despite these arguments, the law became law on June 11, 1945. As a result of the adoption of this law, the land-rich part of the population experienced great dissatisfaction, and in the subsequent period, most of them opposed the Republican People's Party.

3. Social Transformation. Social transformations are another of the main actors in the transition to a multiparty life in Türkiye. The Republic of Türkiye is a state based on the legacy of the Ottoman Empire. In this regard, the first place to turn to in order to understand the transformation of Turkish society is the Ottoman Empire. First of all, it was a state where Ottoman subjects, Muslims and non-Muslims lived together. In this state, the Muslim community mainly made a living from agriculture and crafts, while non-Muslims mainly engaged in trade. For this reason, most of the rich people of the Ottoman Empire were non-Muslims. This situation began to change gradually with the creation of the republic. With the loss of land and the exchange during the Ottoman Empire, the number of the wealthy minority decreased. Thus, Turks became more actively involved in trade and professional life. The Turks, whose level of prosperity increased over time, created an efficient middle class. This middle class consisted of well-educated lawyers, doctors, bureaucrats, and merchants. This middle class, with its growing level of education and economic opportunities, did not want to simply belong to a controlled class. They believed that they should also have a share in the government of the country.

In addition to this developing middle class, the rich people of the republic will become the main supporting column in the transition to a multiparty life. Industrialists, landowners, and merchants,

along with a group that became rich through stockpiling and black market trading, especially during World War II, make up this class. Most of this wealthy group acquired their wealth during the one-party regime of the RPP. However, this situation is no longer enough for them. Features: This group, which did not like the statist policy that began with İnönü's coming to the head of the country, now wanted to have the right to vote in the country's administration (Eroglu, 2019: 5). This requirement will come to an end with the transition to a multiparty system and the creation of a Democratic Party.

4. Political Ideology and Center-Periphery Conflict. The opposition formed during the transition to a multiparty system was fed from many points. We have mentioned some of these resources in previous sections. So, has political ideology proved effective in the process of forming the opposition? Political ideologies and the resulting political parties have generally emerged in conflict. According to this point of view put forward by Lipset and Roccan, political parties claim that they arose as a result of four different social conflicts. They discussed these areas of social conflict in two groups. The first of these is the area of cultural conflict. The conflict zones forming this territory are conflicts between the "Center-Periphery" and the "State-Church". These areas of conflict arose as a result of the power struggles that arose as a result of the nationalist movements that arose in Europe. The second group is functional conflicts that arose under the influence of the industrial Revolution. This conflict zone consists of conflicts of interest that arise between the segments "Village-City" and "Employee-Employer" (Chelebi, 2019: 38-40).

So, were these conflict zones effective in forming a Democratic Party that emerged with the transition to a multiparty life? One of these areas, the conflict between state and religious institutions, was not questioned either in the Ottoman Empire or in Türkiye. Because there have never been strong religious institutions like in Europe, the Ottoman Empire and Türkiye. Religious institutions in both the Ottoman Empire and Türkiye were under the control of the state. For this reason, although the state-church conflict in Europe has a significant impact on the formation of political parties, such a situation has not been observed in Türkiye. The area of religious political conflict in Türkiye arose because of secularism, one of the fundamental principles of the republic. This conflict zone, of course, has proved effective in creating political parties, but it is not as important as in Europe.

The village-city and employee-employer conflicts, which are functional conflict zones, have not had the same impact in Türkiye as in Europe. The main factor why this situation did not occur is that the industrialization of Türkiye during this period was very limited. Although these conflict zones, which arose as a result of industrialization in Europe, were the main factor in the emergence of peasant-farmer parties and socialist parties, they had not yet been created in Türkiye at that time, but even if they were created, they did not create much potential. The functional areas of the conflict had a very limited impact on the process of creating a Democratic Party.

Another direction of the emergence of political parties is the conflict "Center-Periphery". This conflict zone arose as a result of the power struggle between the feudal principalities and the central government in Europe. Thanks to the nation-state approach that emerged in Europe, the central government no longer wanted to share power. Thanks to a strong army and an administrative system, feudal principalities were abolished and the central government was strengthened. The feudal principalities with local self-government that fueled this conflict did not exist either in the Ottoman Empire or in Türkiye, as in Europe. However, this does not prove that there was no Center-Periphery conflict in the Ottoman Empire and Türkiye.

The concept of "Center-Periphery" was first proposed by Edward Shiels. According to Shiels, every society has a center. This center has a certain sanctity and has the power to influence everyone. The environment is the part that is influenced by the decisions of the center (Gulener, 2007: 37-39). Sherif Mardin, who tried to explain the political life of the Ottoman Empire and Türkiye using the theory of the "center-periphery", put forward valuable ideas on this issue. Unlike Shiels, Mardin tried to explain political relations in both the Ottoman Empire and Türkiye by addressing this area of conflict centered on the ruler and the governed. In this regard, the "Center-Periphery" conflict of the Republican period was not accompanied by a power struggle between the central government and feudal governments, as previously stated. The source of this conflict in Türkiye was modernism and traditionalism. The wave of modernization (Westernization), which began with the creation of the

republic and increased its speed and intensity over the years, caused discontent among a certain part of society. The RPP cadres who managed this modernization process usually consisted of political elites trained within the military-civilian bureaucracy. The main purpose of the RPP created by these elites is to create a modern Türkiye. In accordance with this goal, the RPP recognized itself as identical to the Turkish nation and the state. For this reason, those who oppose the steps they have taken in the name of modernization have considered institutions and groups enemies of the state (Sanchaktar, 2012: 59). The main reason for the failure of attempts to transition to a multiparty life before 1946 was a problematic sense of belonging to the RPP. This problematic perspective caused the closure of both Progressive Republican Party (PRP) and Free Republican Party (FRP).

The identification of the RPP with the state and ignoring the voices of the opposition have become the main source of opposition movements in the Republic of Türkiye. This source, from which the PRP and the FRP draw their power, will also be the main source of power for the Democratic Party (DP). While the RPP, which forms the center of the Center-Periphery conflict, took steps to modernize from the top down and without taking into account the opinion of citizens, the periphery from a traditional point of view complained about these steps. This circle expanded over time and eventually seized power in the 1950 elections.

Although the DP came to power due to the power of the environment, its executive staff usually consisted of the political elite who left the RPP and the economic elite who slowly gained power. Despite the fact that the DP was a party founded by elites, it represented the environment in terms of the values it represented. The DP, which had more liberal economic prospects, managed to win over the bourgeoisie, which it opposed as a result of the statist policy of the RPP. In addition, the economic policies it pursued during World War II left workers, farmers and merchants in poverty. People who were looking for a way out of poverty saw salvation in a new party, the Democratic Party. Another important point that unites people around the DP is the new views it generates regarding religious freedom. Religion, which is one of the most important elements through which people define themselves, of course also has a great political influence. The steps taken by the RPP in relation to religion throughout its history have not received much response from the public and have often met with a reaction. The conservative circle, which could not express itself much in the face of the repressive policies of the one-party regime, thought that it could express itself together with the Democratic Party.

Conclusion. Although the Republic is a form of government in which the people are the sovereign power, Türkiye has not transferred this power to the people for many years. Atatürk was unable to fully realize the republic in the country, which was his goal when he set out and which he expressed in the words: "Sovereignty unconditionally belongs to the nation". Although Türkiye has been ruled by a one-party regime for many years, it has twice tried to create an opposition party, which is the main condition for becoming a real republic. However, some social events that occurred during these tests, and the idea that people in the administration of the RPP were not yet ready for this process, led to the failure of the process.

After these two unsuccessful attempts, the country was ruled by a one-party regime until 1946. After the death of Atatürk, İnönü, who became president of the country, will be able to make the transition to a multiparty life, which his colleague could not achieve, and all elections held from this date will be multiparty. Many factors forced İnönü to make this transition. First of all, the economic difficulties that arose during the Second World War caused great dissatisfaction among the people with the administration of the RPP. These economic difficulties have generally affected the veteran class. On the contrary, the bureaucratic, military and political elites lived in great prosperity, which further intensified the public reaction. In addition to this discontent, at the end of the war, authoritarian regimes lost and Western democracies won, as a result of which authoritarian regimes remained in the background in the world and a world dominated by Western democracies emerged. The desire to position themselves alongside the winning states will force authoritarian states, including Türkiye, to take steps towards democratization. Social transformation has become another important factor. During the Ottoman Empire, although Turks mainly earned their living from agriculture and crafts, they were not particularly active in trade and public administration. However, with the establishment of the republic, the majority of the minorities that dominated

commercial life decreased significantly as a result of land loss and exchange. Thus, the Turks became more actively involved in commercial life. As a result of the expansion of educational opportunities with the establishment of the Republic, more and more Turkish young people began to take part in the government of the country and occupy important public positions. Thanks to these changes, the Turks have created an influential middle class within the country. As their numbers and power increased over time, this middle class began to demand a greater share in the government. This aspiration reached its highest level as a result of the economic difficulties that arose at the end of the war.

Bibliography

- Akkaya, Bülent. (2011). İç ve Dış Gelişmeler Çerçevesinde Türkiye’de Çok Partili Siyasi Hayata Geçiş ve 1946 Seçimleri, Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Cilt: 1 Sayı:2 , 43-61.
- Akıncı, A. ve Usta, S. (2015). Türkiye’de Çok Partili Hayata Geçişte Etkili Olan İç Faktörlerin Analizi, KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, Cilt:17, Sayı:29, 41-52.
- Akıncı, A. ve Usta, S. (2016). Türkiye’de Çok Partili Hayata Geçişte Etkili Olan Dış Faktörlerin Değerlendirilmesi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt:21 Sayı:1, 275-288.
- Arslan, Ali. (2005). Tek ve Çok Partili Dönemlerde Türk Siyasi Elitlerin Toplumsal Profillerinin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi, ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt:1, Sayı:2, 53-66.
- Arslan, D.A., Çağırıcı. A., ve Albayrak. M. (2017). Sosyolojik Açından Türk Siyasal Hayatında Demokrat Parti ve Adnan Menderes, Journal of Human Sciences, Cilt:14, Sayı:1, 820-856.
- Arslan, A.A. ve Çağırıcı A. (2017). Elit Teorisi Perspektifinden Demokrat Parti Milletvekillerinin Sosyolojik Analizi, Journal of Human Sciences, Cilt:14 Sayı:1, 914-949.
- Çelebi, Mustafa. Burak. (2019). Sosyal Bölünmeler Sonucu Ortaya Çıkan Siyasal Partiler ve Milli Görüş Hareketi, İktisadi ve İdari Yaklaşımlar Dergisi, Cilt:1 Sayı:1, 34-53.
- Eroğlu, Cem. (2019). Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi, 3. Baskı, İstanbul, Yordam Kitap.
- Gülener, Serdar. (2007). Türk Siyaseti’nde Merkez-Çevre İlişkilerinin Seyri ve 27 Mayıs 1960 Darbesi, Bilgi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt:1 Sayı:1, 36-66.
- Haytoğlu, Ercan. (1997). Türkiye’de Demokratikleşme Süreci ve 1945’te Çok Partili Siyasi Hayata Geçişin Nedenleri (1908-1945), Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı:3 46-54.
- Karadeniz, Yeşim. (2018). Çok Partili Siyasal Hayatın Dönüm Noktası: 1950 Seçimleri, Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Cilt:8, Sayı:16, 637-648.
- Özçelik, M. HAKAN. (2013). 1938-1960 Yılları Arasında Atatürk Devrimlerine Karşıl Faaliyetler, İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Dergisi, Cilt:3 Sayı:10, 93-114.
- Sancaktar, Caner. (2012). Türkiye’de Çok Partili Rekabetçi Siyasetin Doğuşu: Siyasal Değişimin İç ve Dış Dinamikleri, Bilge Strateji Dergisi, Cilt:4 Sayı:7 31-64
- Salep, Mustafa. (2020). Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş Sürecinde CHP’ nin Siyasal Politikası Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme (1938-1950), İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi , Cilt:9, Sayı:2, 1092-1126.
- Sıvış, Efe. (2019). Türk Demokrasisinin Sıfır Noktası: Amerikan Dışişleri Belgeleri Işığında Türkiye’de Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş, 1. Baskı, İstanbul, Ötüken Neşriyat.

Summary

Yunus Emre Aydın, Erkan Ertürk. Factors of transition to multiparty political life in Türkiye. – Article.

In 1946, 23 years after its creation, a multiparty system emerged in the Republic of Türkiye. It can be said that various factors played a role in Türkiye’s success in 1946, after the failure of two previous attempts. In this study, unlike the first two attempts, the main factors that led to Türkiye’s transition to a multiparty system in 1946 were investigated. In this study, conducted using the method of descriptive literature review, a total of 4 factors were identified: external factors, economic reasons, social transformation and center-periphery conflict. These factors are the main factors in Türkiye’s transition to a multiparty life.

The main source that ensures the transition to a multiparty system and fuels the opposition is the Center-Periphery conflict. Sheriff Mardin used Edward Shiels’ Center-Periphery theory to explain the political relationship between the Ottoman Empire and Türkiye. Explaining this relationship, Mardin touches on the problem of the ruler and the governed. This conflict was the main argument that formed the opposition during the transition to republican and multiparty life. The main point of conflict in the Republican period was the traditionalist environment against the modernist RPP. While the RPP is taking steps to modernize with a Jacobin approach, citizens are very complaining about this situation. These complaints were not widely disseminated because the RPP considered itself identical to the State and considered any steps taken against it to be taken against the State. This understanding is the main reason for the closure of the PRP and the FRP, the first two

attempts to transition to a multiparty system. This management style of the RPP eventually reduced the number of supporters of the center and expanded the peripheral block. This expansion reached its peak at the end of the Second World War, and with the positive influence of the global conjuncture, the İnenu and the RPP had no choice but to switch, so to speak, to multiparty life. In politics, as in chemistry, the necessary conditions must be met for a reaction to occur. As can be seen here, the internal and external conditions became suitable for Türkiye's transition to a multiparty system, and as a result, the multiparty system was implemented in 1946.

Key words: Türkiye, multiparty system, party, RPP, Atatürk, political life.

Анотація

Юнус Емре Айдін, Еркан Ертюрк. Чинники переходу до багатопартійності в політичному житті Туреччини. – Стаття.

У 1946 році, через 23 роки після її створення, в Турецькій Республіці виникла багатопартійна система. У цьому дослідженні були досліджені основні фактори, які призвели до переходу Туреччини до багатопартійної системи в 1946 році. За допомогою методу описового огляду літератури було визначено загалом 4 фактори: зовнішні фактори, економічні причини, соціальна трансформація та конфлікт центр-периферії. Ці фактори є основними чинниками переходу Туреччини до багатопартійного життя.

Основним джерелом, що забезпечує перехід до багатопартійності та підживлює опозицію, є конфлікт центр-периферія. Шериф Мардін використовував теорію центру-периферії Едварда Шилса, щоб пояснити політичні відносини між Османською імперією та Туреччиною. Пояснюючи це співвідношення, Мардін торкається проблеми правлячого і керованого. Цей конфлікт був головним аргументом, який формував опозицію під час переходу до республіканського та багатопартійного життя. Головною точкою конфлікту в республіканський період було традиціоналістське середовище проти модерністської РПП. Поки РПП робить кроки з модернізації яacobinського підходу, громадяни дуже скаржаться на цю ситуацію. Ці скарги не набули широкого розповсюдження, оскільки РПП вважала себе тотальною державою та вважала будь-які кроки, вжиті проти неї, такими, що вживаються проти держави. Таке розуміння є основною причиною закриття ПРП і ФРП, перших двох спроб переходу до багатопартійності. Такий стиль управління РПП з часом зменшив кількість прихильників центру та розширив периферійний блок. Ця експансія досягла свого піку наприкінці Другої світової війни і під позитивним впливом світової кон'юнктури Інени та РПП не мали іншого виходу, як перейти до багатопартійності. У політиці, як і в хімії, для виникнення реакції мають бути дотримані необхідні умови. Як наслідок внутрішні та зовнішні умови стали вдалими для переходу Туреччини до багатопартійної системи і в результаті багатопартійна система була впроваджена в 1946 році.

Ключові слова: Туреччина, багатопартійність, партія, РНП, Ататюрк, політичне життя.