

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The Treaty of Lausanne 1923-1922 and Its Impact on the Ottoman Empire

Amer Daffar  
Lubna Naser Eddin

Amer Daffar  
Assistant Professor, Lusail University, Qatar  
adaffar@lu.edu.qa

Lubna Naser Eddin  
Lecturer, Lusail University, Qatar  
lnasereddin@lu.edu.qa

Submitted: 15 October 2024  
Accepted: 05 July 2025

<https://doi.org/10.70139/rolacc.2025.1.2>

© 2025 Daffar and Naser Eddin, licensee LU Press. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC BY 4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Cite this article as: Daffar A. and Naser Eddin L. The Treaty of Lausanne 1922-1923 and Its Impact on the Ottoman Empire, Rule of Law and Anti-Corruption Center Journal, 2025:1, <https://doi.org/10.70139/rolacc.2025.1.2>

## ABSTRACT

This study provides an in-depth analysis of the Treaty of Lausanne (1922-1923) and its impact on the Ottoman Empire's transition into the modern Turkish Republic. It focuses on the treaty's geopolitical, social, and economic ramifications. This research employs a comprehensive methodology integrating descriptive, historical, analytical, and critical perspectives. It explores the strategic undoing of the Treaty of Sèvres through the resistance led by the Ankara government, leading to the recognition of Turkish sovereignty and territorial integrity in the Lausanne Treaty. The paper highlights the treaty's role in abolishing foreign capitulations, restoring national sovereignty, and setting the stage for Türkiye's contemporary nation-state structure. By examining the treaty's implications for international relations and minority rights, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of the post-Ottoman geopolitical landscape and the influence of the Treaty of Lausanne in shaping the modern Middle East.

**Keywords:** Sovereignty; minority rights; international law; legal implications; public debt settlement; diplomatic maneuvers; geopolitical shifts

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The early twentieth century was a period of significant global transformation. Several old empires, including the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman Empires, collapsed after World War I, giving way to new states and new political orders. For the Ottoman Empire, the war marked the final stage of a long decline. Years of territorial losses, foreign interference, and economic weakness left it unable to resist the pressure of the Allied powers. When the war ended, the empire faced plans for partition and occupation, raising urgent questions about sovereignty, national identity, and control of territory.

In 1920, the Treaty of Sèvres was imposed by the Allies to dismantle the Ottoman state. It stripped the empire of most of its land, placed severe limits on its sovereignty, and handed key economic privileges to foreign powers. However, these terms sparked resistance. Led by Muṣṭafā Kāmil Atatürk and the Turkish National Movement, a struggle began to reject the treaty and reassert national independence. This movement eventually forced the Allies back to the negotiating table.

The outcome was the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), which replaced Sèvres and recognized the sovereignty of the new Turkish Republic. The treaty secured Türkiye's territorial integrity, abolished the foreign capitulations, and reshaped the balance of power in the region. It also had lasting consequences for minority rights, economic arrangements, and the wider international order.

This study examines the Treaty of Lausanne and its role in reshaping the post-Ottoman landscape. It focuses on the political, social, and economic impact of the treaty, showing how it marked the transition from empire to nation-state. By analyzing both the background to the treaty and its long-term outcomes, the paper highlights Lausanne's importance in shaping modern Türkiye and influencing the broader Middle East.

## 2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What factors led to the signing of the equally significant Treaty of Lausanne, and what are its profound implications for the Ottoman Empire's history?
2. What were the key events during World War I that led to the signing of the Treaty of Sèvres with the Ottoman Empire?
3. What were the major consequences of the Treaty of Sèvres on the Ottoman Empire?
4. How did the resistance led by the Ankara government and the Grand National Assembly play a role in securing independence for the entirety of the current Turkish territories, effectively nullifying the Treaty of Sèvres on the ground, and laying down the terms of the Treaty of Lausanne?
5. What are the most significant outcomes of the Treaty of Lausanne on the Ottoman Empire?

## 3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To analyze the events leading to the Treaty of Sèvres and Lausanne, highlighting their causes and consequences for the Ottoman Empire and the formation of the Turkish Republic.
2. To investigate the negotiation processes and geopolitical shifts that resulted in the Treaty of Lausanne, examining its key provisions and their implications for Turkish sovereignty and regional order.
3. To assess the Treaty of Lausanne's influence on international relations, law, and the treatment of minorities, and its legacy in contemporary geopolitical challenges.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a multidisciplinary approach to comprehensively analyze the Treaty of Lausanne's historical, political, and legal implications. The methodology integrates several key components:

- Utilize primary and secondary sources to construct a detailed chronological narrative of events leading to and following the Treaty of Lausanne, emphasizing the geopolitical and social context of the era.
- Describe the sequential developments, treaty stipulations, and the roles of different actors involved in the Treaty of Lausanne, providing a clear narrative of the processes and outcomes.
- Critically analyze the motives, strategies, and actions of the various stakeholders in the Treaty of Lausanne, assessing the treaty's impact on the Ottoman Empire's transition to the Republic of Türkiye and its broader international ramifications.
- Engage critically appraising the Treaty of Lausanne, questioning and evaluating the prevailing historical interpretations and assessing the treaty's long-term effects on regional and international politics.
- Employ a thorough critique of both primary documents, such as the treaty text and diplomatic correspondences, and secondary literature, including historical accounts and scholarly analyses, to ensure a balanced and informed perspective.

By synthesizing these approaches, the research aims to provide a nuanced understanding of the Treaty of Lausanne and its enduring impact, ensuring a comprehensive examination of its historical significance and contemporary relevance.

## 5. LITERATURE REVIEW

The Lausanne Peace Treaty, signed in 1923, fundamentally redefined the geopolitical landscape of the Near East and established the Republic of Türkiye's sovereignty. Articles 1 through 143 delineate a comprehensive framework for

peace, territorial definitions, minority protections, and international relations post World War I. Article 1 reinstates diplomatic relations among the signatories, including the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, Greece, Romania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, and Türkiye, marking a pivotal shift from conflict to peaceful coexistence. The treaty meticulously outlines Türkiye's borders with its neighbors (Articles 2-4), emphasizing the need for clarity and avoiding future disputes. Particularly notable are the provisions for minority rights and protections (Articles 37-44), showcasing an early 20<sup>th</sup>-century commitment to human rights and setting a precedent for international treaties.

Furthermore, the treaty's handling of financial and territorial adjustments, such as the allocation of Aegean islands (Articles 12-15) and the settlement of the Ottoman Public Debt (Articles 46-55), underscores the complexities of post-war reparations and territorial redistribution. The abolition of capitulations in Article 28 signifies Türkiye's legal and sovereign independence, ending extraterritorial privileges of foreign nationals and marking a significant step towards modern statehood. The strategic importance of the treaty is further emphasized in its navigation rights provisions (Articles 23-24), reflecting the critical geostrategic interest in the Straits connecting the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.

In essence, the Lausanne Peace Treaty was a monumental document that not only concluded a tumultuous era but also laid the groundwork for the modern Turkish state and reshaped regional international relations. Its comprehensive articles addressed the multifaceted aspects of peace, sovereignty, and national integrity, influencing the trajectory of international law and diplomatic relations in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1</sup>

Muṣṭafā Kāmil's "The Eastern Question" (translation of the authors),<sup>2</sup> published in 1898 by Al-Adab Printing Press in Egypt, delves into the intricate geopolitical dynamics of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, particularly concerning the Ottoman Empire and European powers. This work is important in understanding the "Eastern Question", which encapsulates the territorial disputes and power struggles in Eastern Europe and the Near East. Kamel's analysis thoroughly examines how these tensions influenced international relations, offering insights into the complexities of empire and nationalism during a time of significant political change in Europe and the Ottoman territories.

Fāḍil Ḥusayn's "The Mosul Problem (A Study in Iraqi-British-Ottoman Diplomacy and Public Opinion)" (translation of the authors)<sup>3</sup> offers an in-depth look at the

diplomatic intricacies and public sentiment surrounding the Mosul question, a contentious issue in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Published by As'ad Press in Baghdad, this work scrutinizes the tangled web of Iraqi-British-Ottoman relations, shedding light on the diplomatic maneuvers and public opinions that shaped the fate of Mosul. Hussein's detailed examination uncovers the layers of complexity in the negotiations and the broader geopolitical implications, highlighting the intricate balance of power and the national interests at stake.

In "Lectures on the Lausanne Conference and Its Effects in the Arab Countries" (translation of the authors), Fāḍil Ḥusayn<sup>4</sup> comprehensively analyzes the Lausanne Conference's impact on the Arab world. Published in 1958 by the League of Arab States Institute of Higher Studies in Cairo, this work delves into the aftermath of the conference, a significant diplomatic gathering that reshaped the borders and political landscape of the modern Middle East. Hussein's lectures offer critical insights into how the decisions made at Lausanne influenced the political and territorial configurations in Arab countries, underlining the lasting effects of international diplomacy on regional stability and national identities in the Arab world. These studies contribute to the paper's examination of the Treaty of Lausanne, providing historical and analytical depth to the research by exploring the broader geopolitical and diplomatic context in which the treaty was situated.

## 6. ANALYZING THE TREATY OF LAUSANNE (1922–1923): INSIGHTS FROM DIFFERENT SCHOLARLY PERSPECTIVES

The Treaty of Lausanne, signed on July 24, 1923, formally ended the conflict between the Allies and Türkiye following World War I, establishing modern Türkiye's borders and sovereignty. This significant international agreement has been examined through various theoretical lenses, notably postcolonial theory, critical legal studies, realism, and liberal institutionalism. This paper reviews how each perspective has uniquely interpreted the treaty, drawing upon peer-reviewed scholarly research.

### 6.1. Postcolonial perspective

Postcolonial scholars argue that the Treaty of Lausanne exemplifies how Western powers utilized international law to maintain colonial hierarchies and dominance. Antony Anghie (2006),<sup>5</sup> a prominent postcolonial scholar, identifies Lausanne as indicative of the broader colonial foundations of international law, where non-Western entities were subjected to frameworks serving European geopolitical and cultural dominance. Through a postcolonial lens, Lausanne

1 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Türkiye, Lausanne Peace Treaty Part I: Political Clauses, [https://www.mfa.gov.tr/lausanne-peace-treaty-part-i\\_-political-clauses.en.mfa](https://www.mfa.gov.tr/lausanne-peace-treaty-part-i_-political-clauses.en.mfa) (last visited Aug. 7, 2025).  
2 MUṢṬAFĀ KĀMIL, *AL-MAS'ALAH AL-SHARQIYAH* (T. 1, Maṭba'at al-Ādāb, Miṣr 1898).  
3 FĀḌIL ḤUSAYN, *MUSHKILAT AL-MAWṢIL (DIRĀSAH FĀ AL-DIBLŪMĀSĪYAH AL-'IRĀQĪYAH-AL-BRĪṬĀNĪYAH-AL-'UTHMĀNĪYAH WA-FĀ AL-RA'Y AL-'ĀMM)* (T. 2, Maṭba'at As'ad, Baghdād).  
4 FĀḌIL ḤUSAYN, *MUḤĀḌARĀT 'AN MU'TAMAR LŪZĀN WA-ĀTHĀRIHI FĀ AL-BILĀD AL-'ARABĪYAH* (Jāmi'at al-Duwal al-'Arabīyah, Ma'had al-Dirāsāt al-'Ulyā, al-Qāhirah 1958).  
5 Antony Anghie, *The Evolution of International Law: Colonial and Post-Colonial Realities*, 27 *THIRD WORLD Q.* 739 (2006).

appears not merely as a peace treaty but as an assertion of Eurocentric sovereignty norms, reinforcing Western hegemony over the post-Ottoman territories.

## 6.2. Critical legal studies

Critical legal theorists question the supposed neutrality and objectivity of international treaties, highlighting inherent contradictions and biases. Martti Koskenniemi (2005),<sup>6</sup> in his seminal work, argues that treaties like Lausanne embody fundamental indeterminacies, serving powerful states' interests under the guise of legal objectivity. Koskenniemi suggests that the ambiguous language and flexible interpretation of Lausanne's provisions, particularly regarding minority rights and sovereignty definitions, demonstrate international law's function as an instrument of power rather than impartial governance.

## 6.3. Realist international relations theory

Realists emphasize power dynamics, state interests, and geopolitical strategies. Zenonas Tziarras (2022)<sup>7</sup> illustrates that Lausanne represented a pragmatic diplomatic victory for Türkiye, secured through military achievements and strategic negotiation. The realist interpretation underscores that Lausanne's outcomes were less about normative legal standards and more about the tangible balance of power, reflecting Türkiye's strengthened military and diplomatic position relative to European powers.

## 6.4. Liberal institutionalism

Liberal institutionalists argue that Lausanne created enduring frameworks for international cooperation and minority protections, despite its imperfections. Kristin Henrard (2013)<sup>8</sup> explores Lausanne's minority protection clauses as foundational for institutional cooperation between Greece, Türkiye, and international entities. Although implementation was partial and contested, the institutional mechanisms set precedents for later human rights frameworks, illustrating how international treaties contribute to gradual normative evolution in international relations.

The scholarly exploration of the Treaty of Lausanne (1922-1923) underscores its critical role in reshaping geopolitical boundaries, affirming national sovereignty, and influencing international law and diplomatic norms. The diverse analyses reviewed—ranging from historical contextualizations by Muştafâ Kâmil and Fâdil Hıusayn to theoretical frameworks such as postcolonialism, critical legal studies, realism, and liberal institutionalism—provide comprehensive insights into the treaty's multifaceted implications. These perspectives collectively highlight

Lausanne's profound impact not only on Türkiye and its immediate neighbors but also on broader regional and international dynamics. By integrating geopolitical, legal, and theoretical dimensions, this review reinforces the understanding that the Lausanne Treaty was more than a mere diplomatic agreement; it was a foundational moment with enduring significance for international relations, minority rights frameworks, and regional stability, thereby marking a significant transition from imperial structures to modern statehood in the 20<sup>th</sup>-century Near East.

## 7. LITERATURE GAP

This research addresses a notable gap in existing scholarship concerning the comprehensive implications of the Treaty of Lausanne on the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and the subsequent emergence of the modern Republic of Türkiye. Although extensive literature exists on the Treaty of Sèvres and the broader context of World War I, detailed scholarly analyses specifically examining Lausanne's broader geopolitical, legal, and sociopolitical ramifications remain limited. Notably underexplored are the treaty's nuanced impacts on international relations, minority rights, regional geopolitical configurations, and the formation of new international legal norms following the Ottoman Empire's disintegration.

To bridge this scholarly gap, the current research will:

1. Provide a thorough analysis of the negotiation processes of the Treaty of Lausanne, emphasizing the strategic diplomatic maneuvers that facilitated its formulation and signing.
2. Critically examine the treaty's multidimensional effects on territorial realignments, political restructuring, and legal transformations in the post-Ottoman context, with a particular emphasis on the establishment of the Turkish Republic.
3. Explore the treaty's enduring influence on contemporary international relations, especially its contributions to the evolution of modern diplomatic practices and international legal standards.

Through addressing these dimensions, this research seeks to enrich academic discourse by providing a more nuanced understanding of the historical and contemporary significance of the Treaty of Lausanne in shaping geopolitical realities and international relations frameworks.

## 8. DEFINITION OF THE EASTERN QUESTION

Muştafâ Kâmil Pasha defines the Eastern Question:

Writers and politicians agree that the Eastern Question is the dispute between some European

6 MARTTI KOSKENNIEMI, *From Apology to Utopia: The Structure of International Legal Argument* (Cambridge Univ. Press 2005).

7 ZENONAS TZIARRAS, *Turkish Foreign Policy: The Lausanne Syndrome in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East* (Springer 2022).

8 Kristin Henrard, A Surviving Treaty: The Lausanne Minority Protection in Greece and Turkey, in *The Interrelation Between the Right to Identity of Minorities and Their Socio-Economic Participation* 287 (Kristin Henrard ed., Martinus Nijhoff 2013).

countries and the Sublime State [the Ottoman Empire] over the lands under its authority. In other words, it is the question of the existence of the Sublime State itself in Europe. Other writers from the East and the West have stated that the Eastern Question is the ongoing conflict between Christianity and Islam, i.e., a matter of intermittent Crusades between the states established by Islam and Christian states. However, this statement [is not absolutely true], as the states that dispute the existence of the Sublime State do not oppose it in the name of religion only, but mostly covet a portion of its possessions.<sup>9</sup> (translation of the authors)

Western colonial ambitions were the main cause of most global issues from the sixteenth century to the present, reaching their zenith following the Ottoman defeat at the Battle of Kahlenberg in 1683. The establishment of the Holy League among European nations resulted in several fierce wars with the Ottoman Empire, concluding with the Treaties of Karlowitz (Sremski Karlovci) in 1699 and Passarowitz (Požarevac) in 1718. These treaties resulted in the Ottoman withdrawal from Hungary, Transylvania (in Romania), Podolia, and parts of Serbia. The Treaty of Karlowitz (1699) marked the first treaty wherein the Ottoman Empire relinquished control over territories it had previously dominated, signaling a transition from an era of conquest to one of retrenchment and defense. Subsequently, the Ottomans forwent their expansionist conquest policy and began to follow the unfolding events in Europe. With this new pacifist policy, an Ottoman inclination towards Western cultural and technical sources emerged, which surpassed their own. This period ushered in an age of prosperity known as the “Tulip Era” (Lale Devri), noted for its emphasis on luxury and cultural engagement.<sup>10</sup>

## 9. WORLD WAR I (1914-1918)

A month after the assassination of the Austrian Archduke by a Serbian nationalist, the Great War (World War I) commenced on July 28, 1914. This conflict witnessed major and rapid developments, such as the outbreak of the Arab Revolt with British support; simultaneously, Britain conspired secretly with its allies to divide Arab territories under the Sykes-Picot Agreement in the same year as the Arab Revolt (1916). This

was followed by the issuance of the Balfour Declaration in 1917, which supported the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish diaspora in Palestine.<sup>11</sup>

The interim period between the signing of the Sykes-Picot Agreement (in May 1916) during World War I, which for the first time involved the partition of the Arab East before the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and continuing through the signing of the Treaty of Sèvres (1920) to the Treaty of Lausanne (on July 24, 1923), represents a decisive stage in the global shift from a system of empires to a system of states. This new state system was modeled on the European concept of the nation-state, which became the fundamental unit of the international system. This was a form inherited from the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), established after the Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648).<sup>12</sup>

Following the death of Sultan Mehmed Reshad on July 3, 1918 (who declared jihad and entered World War I),<sup>13</sup> his brother Sultan Mehmed Vahideddin assumed the caliphate, ruling as “Mehmed VI” between 1918 and 1922.<sup>14</sup> He inherited the throne at the onset of the defeat that threatened the Ottoman Empire and in the final year of World War I. This occurred merely four months before the fall of the Ottoman Empire under occupation.<sup>15</sup>

In the aftermath of these political shifts, the Lausanne Convention and the treaty to which it was a protocol ratified a unique compulsory exchange. It was one of many international treaties signed in the aftermath of the First World War and was deliberated in the nation-state formation climate after the great empires’ break up. The convention was applied as a solution to a conflict of the most brutal kind. To stop the bloodshed, the two states agreed to eliminate the ‘Other’ from their midst through the compulsory expulsion of its minorities to create homogeneous societies.<sup>16</sup>

Enemy aircrafts ominously filled the skies of Istanbul, marking the beginning of the end for the Ottoman Empire. The once mighty fronts in Palestine, Syria, and Iraq crumbled under the relentless assault. With ruthless efficiency, the British seized control of Baghdad on March 11, 1917, Jerusalem on December 18, 1917, and Damascus on October 1, 1918, along with Aleppo. The French, not to be outdone, took control of Beirut on October 6, 1917, Tripoli in Syria, and Alexandretta on October 14, 1917. The state’s once robust administrative and economic structure completely collapsed

9 KĀMİL, *supra* note 2.

10 FARİDÜN ÂMĪJAN ET AL., *AL-DAWLA AL-’UTHMĀNĪYYA: TĀRĪKH WA-ḤAḌĀRA* (Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu ed., Şālih al-Sa’ dāwī trans., Maktabat al-Shurūq al-Duwalīyya & IRCICA, 2d ed., vol. 1, 2010) (İstanbul).

11 MUḤAMMAD SHA’ BĀN ŞAWWĀN, *AL-SULṬĀN WA-AL-TĀRĪKH: LIMĀDHĀ NAQRA ’AL-TĀRĪKH AL-’UTHMĀNĪ?* (Ibn al-Nadīm li-al-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī’, 1st ed. 2016) (Alg.).

12 MUḤAMMAD JAMĀL BĀRŪT, *MIN ITTIFĀQĀT SYKES–PICOT ILĀ MU’ĀHADAT LŪZĀN: ‘AQD AL-TAḤAWWULĀT WA-ĀṬHĀRUHU AL-BUNYAWIYYA FĪ NUSHŪ’ AL-DAWLA FĪ AL-MASHRIQ AL-’ARABĪ, MAJALLAT USTŪR LI-AL-DİRĀSĀT AL-TĀRĪKHĪYYA*, NO. 6 (2017), <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/851903>.

13 ÂMĪJAN ET AL., *supra* note 10, at 139.

14 MUḤAMMAD FARĪD BEYK, *TĀRĪKH AL-DAWLA AL-’ALIYYA AL-’UTHMĀNĪYYA* (Dār al-Nafā’is, 7th ed. 1993) (Beir.).

15 NĪ’MA MŪSĀ JIBLĪ, *AL-SULṬĀN WAḤĪD AL-DĪN WA-ATĀTURK* (Dār al-Āfāq al-’Arabiyya, 1st ed. 2013) (Cairo).

16 Renée Hirschon, *Compulsory Population Exchange and the Lausanne Convention*, in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey* 75 (Renée Hirschon ed., Berghahn 2009).



under the weight of these defeats.<sup>17</sup>

Twenty days after Sultan Mehmed VI Wahiduddin ascended to the throne, Istanbul experienced its first aerial attack. The British, who had taken control of Iraq and the Levant and were troubled by the Ottoman resistance in Anatolia, were determined to end the war by any means. They launched four air raids on the outskirts of Istanbul. The allied forces also dropped leaflets announcing that Bulgaria had requested an armistice and was seeking to end the war on its part; the people of Istanbul were more affected by Bulgaria's surrender than by the war, famine, and the loss of thousands of their citizens, as they had hoped for a victory.

When crushing defeats occurred on the Western front, and revolutionary unrest spread internally, Germany and the disintegrating Austro-Hungarian Empire were compelled to request an armistice on November 3-4, 1918.<sup>18</sup> It was at this point that Sultan Mehmed VI Wahiduddin sought a similar armistice to extricate the Ottoman Empire from a war in which there was no hope of victory.<sup>19</sup>

Muṣṭafā Kāmil was initially the commander of the Seventh Army and later became the commander of the shock troops in Palestine. He was appointed by Sultan Mehmed VI (Wahiduddin), succeeding Marshal Liman von Sanders, the commander of the German forces, who then passed the leadership to Muṣṭafā Kāmil. The shock troops were defeated and withdrew in the face of the British forces, which succeeded in occupying Palestine, Lebanon, and Syria.<sup>20</sup>

On October 7, 1918, from the castle of "Bağça" (Adana), following the loss of Palestine and the retreat from Syria, Muṣṭafā Kāmil sent a telegram to the palace, advising Sultan Mehmed Wahiduddin to establish a new government under the leadership of "Ahmed Izzet Pasha". Consequently, Ahmed Izzet Pasha formed his government (whose majority of members were from the Unionists), and this government signed the Armistice of Mudros as its first act, despite the Sultan's warnings. This armistice resulted in the occupation of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>21</sup>

## 10. THE ARMISTICE OF MUDROS (ON OCTOBER 30, 1918)

The onerous conditions of the Mudros Armistice, which constituted the Ottoman Empire's surrender, led to:

- A- The Allies' seizure of all straits.
- B- The disbandment of the Ottoman army.
- C- The surrender of the fleet to the Allied powers.

D- Allowing the Allies to occupy any necessary territories.<sup>22</sup>

The victorious powers competed to annex as much territory as possible from the Ottoman Empire, and a desire emerged within British Prime Minister Lloyd George to eradicate the state from its roots. However, the peace negotiations in Paris (1919) approved a plan that included maintaining a small Turkish state in central Anatolia under the leadership of the Sultan, which would be subject to the effective control of the Allies, while the rest of the Sultanate's territories would be divided among the allied powers.<sup>23</sup>

Britain's support for Greece in the immediate post-war period was not driven by strategic concerns: safeguarding the route to India and the Suez Canal. For much of the nineteenth century, Britain had relied on the Ottoman Empire as the primary defensive line in the Eastern Mediterranean. With the Empire's collapse during and after the First World War, that line disintegrated. In its place, London turned to Greece, whose geographic position from Salamis to Smyrna offered a second line of defense. For British policymakers, Greece's role was instrumental, strong enough in peacetime to reduce direct imperial costs yet, in wartime, dependent on British support and therefore aligned with British strategic objectives. This approach, however, collided with the rise of the Ankara government and the nationalist resistance, culminating in the Greek defeat in Anatolia and the renegotiation of the post-war order at Lausanne, where Turkish sovereignty was reasserted and Britain's reliance on Greece was curtailed.<sup>24</sup>

The Sultan took a decisive stance, perceiving the armistice as ominous and the cause of all the calamities that followed. He refused to meet with the delegation that signed the armistice and promptly demanded the resignation of that government.

The government of Ahmed Izzet Pasha, which signed the armistice, was another incarnation of the Committee of Union and Progress government, which had plunged the state into the Great War. Therefore, when the armistice was concluded, Enver Pasha, Talat Pasha, and Jamal Pasha could easily flee the state abroad, fearing prosecution.<sup>25</sup>

The implementation of the Armistice of Mudros signified nothing less than the complete collapse of the Ottoman Empire, from the disbandment of its armies and the German troops to the surrender of all fortified positions. Liman von Sanders handed over the "Rapid Corps" he commanded to Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who had gained prominence during the Gallipoli Campaign and achieved

<sup>17</sup> ĀMJAN ET AL., *supra* note 10.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> JIBLĪ, *supra* note 15.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> MUḤAMMAD SUHAYL ṬAQQŪSH, *TĀRĪKH AL-DAWLA AL-‘UTHMĀNIYYA* (Dār al-Nafā’is, 4th ed. 2017) (Beir.).

<sup>24</sup> Theo Karvounarakis, End of an Empire: Great Britain, Turkey, and Greece from the Treaty of Sèvres to the Treaty of Lausanne, 41 *BALKAN STUD.* 171 (2000).

<sup>25</sup> JIBLĪ, *supra* note 15.

victories over the Russians in the East. Muṣṭafā Kāmil critically observed the war and the actions of the Committee of Union and Progress, expressing his clear rejection of the harsh terms of the armistice to Ahmed Izzet Pasha. Following disbanding the “Rapid Corps”, he traveled to Istanbul at Ahmed Izzet Pasha’s request. On the same day, a vast enemy fleet anchored in front of the Dolmabahçe Palace, and the capital was occupied on November 13, 1918. Ahmed Izzet Pasha resigned from the government five days before the occupation, on November 8, 1918, leading to a new government headed by “Tevfik Pasha”. The political consensus among Turkish parties shifted towards a collective resentment against the Unionists, revealing that the policies of that association had plunged the country into an abyss.

Consequently, the opposition “Freedom and Accord Party” came to power, appointing Damat Ferid Pasha as Grand Vizier on March 4, 1919. Resistance associations called “The Defence of Rights” were established across Anatolia and Rumelia, regions either occupied by the enemy or threatened by occupation. Following the Armenian occupation of Kars on April 19, 1919, the Italian occupation of Antalya on April 29, 1919, and then Kuşadası on May 11, 1919 the Greek occupation of Fethiye on May 11, 2019 the British occupation of Maraş, Urfa, and Aintab in the south, and Samsun and Merzifon in the north, and the French for Adana, the Greek occupation of İzmir on May 15, 1919, and their aggression in Western Anatolia ignited a profound national outrage.<sup>26</sup>

The Ottoman Empire collapsed, and Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Arab lands were detached. Türkiye came under the control and iron grip of the Allies, with Greek ships anchoring in front of the Sultan’s palace, forcing the Sultan to move to the Yıldız Palace, where he remained until he left the homeland. Meanwhile, the Allies continued their occupation of Anatolia; the Greeks occupied İzmir and advanced towards Bursa. Upon arriving in Istanbul, the commander of the Allies, General Allenby, requested Muṣṭafā Kāmil to take command of the Sixth Army, but Muṣṭafā Kāmil refused this.<sup>27</sup>

The Greek occupation of İzmir on May 15, 1919, was a result of a joint decision by the Supreme Allied Council in Paris under Article 7 of the Mudros Armistice (which states that the Allies have the right to occupy any places that they deem necessary for their security). Subsequently, Damat Ferid Pasha resigned from the premiership, but he was tasked with forming a new government. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was sent to Anatolia via Samsun, and all segments of the Turkish population joined the national resistance. On June 27, 1919, Muṣṭafā Kāmil arrived in Sivas and then reached Erzurum on July 3, 1919. The Erzurum Congress was opened on July 23, calling for the unity of the country and its liberation

from foreign occupation. The Sivas Congress was held in September of the same year, forming a representative body that moved its headquarters to Ankara. On April 23, 1920, the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye was inaugurated in Ankara, and on April 26, 1920, the Assembly sent a telegram of support to Sultan Mehmed VI.

Following the failure of the allied forces to suppress the national resistance movement led by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the Allies assigned the task to the Greek forces. On June 22, 1920, the Greeks launched a general offensive, occupying areas in Anatolia and Eastern Thrace. This Greek incursion provided a pretext for the occupying forces to impose the Treaty of Sèvres on the Sultan, which dismembered the Ottoman Empire and was the final link in the chain of events that ended the Ottoman Sultanate.<sup>28</sup>

On August 10, 1920, the Treaty of Sèvres was signed between the Grand Vizier Damat Ferid Pasha and the Allies. This treaty left the Ottoman Empire with a very limited expanse of land in Europe after Greece took control of Edirne, Thrace, and the Aegean Sea; they were on the outskirts of the capital, Istanbul. France took control of Lebanon and Syria, the British of Jordan, Palestine, and Iraq, and Italy of Antalya. The treaty allowed for free navigation of all allied ships in Ottoman waters, significantly reduced the military fortifications of the state and prohibited the construction of any new fortifications. Additionally, an allied committee took control of the Ottoman economy.<sup>29</sup>

The treaty also included:

- A- Greece was granted the Aegean Islands and the region of Thrace, excluding a narrow strip.
- B- İzmir and its internal divisions were placed under Greek supervision for five years, with the provision of autonomous independence.
- C- An Italian supervised Adalia, Konya, and Afyonkarahisar’s areas.
- D- France gained control over Urfa, Gaziantep, Maraş, and Cilicia, extending its influence to these regions.
- E- Britain took control over the Mosul Vilayet and Diyarbakır.
- F- Armenia exerted control over the eastern provinces from the line of Erzincan – Muş – Tbilisi – Van.
- G- A Kurdish state was established in the eastern provinces south of the aforementioned regions, enjoying autonomous independence under British protection. This move aimed to address the aspirations of the Kurdish population.<sup>30</sup>

The British exertion of pressure on the Sultan necessitated the signing of the Treaty of Sèvres and the dissolution of the parliament, compelling the Sultan to disband the Chamber of Deputies and establish the

<sup>26</sup> ĀMJAN ET AL., *supra* note 10.

<sup>27</sup> JIBLĪ, *supra* note 15.

<sup>28</sup> ṬAQQŪSH, *supra* note 23.

<sup>29</sup> JIBLĪ, *supra* note 15.

<sup>30</sup> ṬAQQŪSH, *supra* note 23.

government of “Ali Rıza Pasha” on October 2, 1919. After this, new elections were held over three months, culminating in forming the final Ottoman Chamber of Deputies. The council commenced its activities on January 12, 1920, with “Muṣṭafā Kāmil” elected as a member representing the Erzurum province; however, he did not take up his seat.

The British continued their pressure on the new government of “Ali Rıza Pasha”, demanding a declaration that the revolutionaries in Anatolia were rebels; this demand was refused, and the government resigned. Similarly, the British pressured the succeeding government of “Salih Pasha”, which proved futile. Consequently, on March 16, 1920, the British entered the Chamber of Deputies, arresting some of its members and exiling them to Malta. On March 27, 1920, Muṣṭafā Kāmil dispatched a message to Istanbul indicating that the parliament would convene in Ankara, leading to the resignation of “Salih Pasha’s” government on April 2, 1920. Following this, the final Chamber of Deputies was dissolved, and the fourth government of “Damad Ferid Pasha” was established on April 4, 1920.<sup>31</sup>

The dispute between the Istanbul and Ankara governments evolved as follows:

During this challenging period, allied forces occupied the capital, Istanbul, severing its connection with Anatolia, and took control of the ministries of War, Navy, Telegraph, and Post. However, the Turkish people, displaying remarkable resilience, intensified their popular resistance. Deputies who fled from Istanbul convened with new members in Ankara, leading to the establishment of the Grand National Assembly on April 23, 1920. Following Istanbul’s occupation, elections were held in Ankara, resulting in Muṣṭafā Kāmil’s victory; he formed a government under his leadership, gathering representatives of the populace, prompting the last Damad Ferid Pasha government to resign. Consequently, two executive authorities emerged: one in Istanbul and the other in Ankara.<sup>32</sup>

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, a visionary leader, devised a plan to salvage Türkiye independently of the Sultan. His strategic brilliance was evident when he concluded a treaty with the Soviet Union on March 11, 1921, for the provision of arms, equipment, and financial aid to his government. He achieved significant victories on the eastern front, culminating in the defeat of the Greeks, regaining İzmir on September 9, 1922, and expelling them from the Anatolian coast, as well as reclaiming Thrace on October 11. Italy was thereby compelled to evacuate Anatolia, and France withdrew from Cilicia, quelling the Armenian rebellion in the east. These victories and the Turkish-Soviet rapprochement led the Entente powers to convene a new

peace conference in Mudanya on October 10, 1922, resulting in an armistice agreement where the Allies acknowledged Türkiye’s sovereignty over Istanbul, the Straits (Bosporus and Dardanelles), and Eastern Thrace. Turkish gendarmerie forces entered the region immediately following the armistice, while the transfer of Türkiye’s remaining territories was deferred until a new peace agreement was signed. Following the allies’ lead, Greece negotiated a subsequent armistice with the Kemalists two days later, on October 14, 1922,<sup>33</sup> relinquishing Thrace up to Maritsa, and elevating Mustafa Kemal Atatürk as a national hero and preeminent political leader, with the Sultan remaining marginalized. Refet Pasha crossed the Bosporus accompanied by a delegation representing the Grand National Assembly, entering Istanbul on the nineteenth of the same month.<sup>34</sup>

The victory in the War of Independence in September significantly enhanced Muṣṭafā Kāmil’s stature among the Turkish populace, leading to his appellation as “Ghazi” (the Liberator and Conqueror). On December 6, for the first time, he expressed his intention to transform his support group, “The Defence of Rights”, into a political party, which was subsequently named “Halk Fırkası” (People’s Party). Muṣṭafā Kāmil also broached, for the first time with several Turkish journalists, the notion of abolishing the caliphate and establishing a republic.<sup>35</sup>

In a final strategic maneuver, Britain sought to exploit its last available option by attempting to set the Istanbul and Ankara governments against each other. The allied powers extended an invitation to both the Sultanate government in Istanbul and the Kemalist government in Ankara to attend a peace conference in Lausanne (a city north of Lake Geneva in Switzerland) to negotiate a new peace treaty to replace the Treaty of Sèvres. However, the Kemalist government responded by asserting its sole legitimacy to represent Türkiye, having garnered the support of the Turkish people. This invitation spurred the Kemalist government to promulgate a resolution in the Grand National Assembly of Ankara in November 1922, which stipulated the retroactive abolition of the Ottoman Sultanate to March 16, 1920. This purpose was to nullify all agreements, commitments, and treaties associated with the Istanbul government and the Sultanate, effectively invalidating the Treaty of Sèvres. This action positioned the Ankara government to proceed unencumbered by prior agreements with Istanbul. On the same day, the Ankara government also decreed the maintenance of the caliphate within the Ottoman House, conditional upon its administration being entrusted to the government, while the National Assembly was to select the most suitable and competent member of the Ottoman

<sup>31</sup> JIBLĪ, *supra* note 15.

<sup>32</sup> *Id.*

<sup>33</sup> ‘ABD AL-‘AZĪZ MUḤAMMAD AL-SHANĀWĪ, *AL-DAWLA AL-‘UTHMĀNĪYYA (DAWLA ISLĀMĪYYA MUFTARĀ ‘ALAYHĀ)* (Maktabat al-Anglū al-Miṣriyya, vol. 1, 2010) (Cairo).

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*

<sup>35</sup> ERIK J. ZÜRCHER, *Modern History of Turkey* (‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥārīs trans., Dar al-Madar al-Islami 2013).



House for the caliphate position.<sup>36</sup>

Muṣṭafā Kāmil announced the dissolution of the parliament on April 1, calling for new parliamentary elections. Concurrently, the final conference of the Committee of Union and Progress was convened in Istanbul, chaired by “Kara Kemal Bey” (the former leader of the Unionists in Istanbul and a founder of the “Kara Kuvvet” resistance group against the Allies). In January, in the city of İzmit, Kara Kemal conducted covert discussions, during which the conference adopted a nine-point program and proposed a new leadership of the Committee of Union and Progress to Muṣṭafā Kāmil, who declined the offer. The stages of the new parliamentary election took place in June and July, with the new parliament convening for the first time on August 9, 1923. The “Defence of Rights” group, now encompassing all parliament members, evolved into a political entity named the “People’s Party”.<sup>37</sup>

Tawfiq Pasha, the last of the great viziers, did not approve of attempts at reconciliation with the Ankara government, nor did he accept his government’s participation in peace negotiations at the Lausanne Conference. The Ankara government met this refusal with ire, which compelled them to make some inevitable historic decisions.<sup>38</sup> Consequently, the Sultanate was abolished on November 1, 1922, following a decree by the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye in Ankara. Five days later, Rifat Pasha seized control of the capital, Istanbul, through a sudden military coup, leading to the overthrow of the Sultan’s government. Rifat Pasha then confronted Sultan Mehmed VI Vahideddin in his palace, urging him to accept the position of Caliphate instead of the constitutionally limited Sultanate to save his status and protect himself from enemies. He informed him that a telegram would be sent to Ankara to secure recognition from the Ankara government and the Basic Law. However, Sultan Mehmed VI Vahideddin refused to accept the Caliphate as separate from the Sultanate, perceiving such a separation as reducing the position that unifies the Islamic world to a meaningless title.<sup>39</sup>

The Ankara government intensified its stance against Istanbul’s authority following its victory in the War of Independence. During a secret session convened by the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye to discuss sending representatives to the peace conference to be held in Lausanne (1922-1923), the matter of deposing Sultan Mehmed VI Vahideddin from the Caliphate was deliberated, citing his incapacity and subjugation to foreign occupation.

In this context, Sultan Mehmed VI Vahideddin sought

assistance from the British occupying the capital to facilitate his departure from the country. To secure a safe exit, he handed the sultan letter of asylum to Acting Governor “Zeki Bey”, which was then delivered to General “Harington” on November 16, 1922, at the War Office in Pangaltı. The Sultan left the palace through the Orkhanie gate at 8 a.m. on Friday, November 17, 1922, and boarded the steamship “Yıldırım”, which transferred him to the British warship “Malaya”. He was received by Sir “Osmond Brock”, the Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Fleet. At the same time, General “Harington” ensured the safety and security of the palace staff and the remaining royal family in Istanbul.<sup>40</sup>

The refuge of Caliph Mehmed VI Vahideddin in Britain was met with displeasure and outrage by nationalist circles. Consequently, the Grand National Assembly swiftly proceeded to dethrone Caliph Mehmed VI Vahideddin and, on November 16, 1922, elected the crown prince Abdulmejid II to the Caliphate.<sup>41</sup>

## 11. THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE (1922-1923)

### 11.1. Preliminaries of the treaty

Faḍl Husayn (1958) says that the allied powers, comprising Britain, France, and Italy, on October 17, 1922, convened a peace conference in Lausanne, which included the United States, Japan, Romania, Yugoslavia, and the Istanbul and Ankara governments.<sup>42</sup> Russia and Bulgaria were invited to participate solely in the discussions concerning the straits (the Bosphorus and Dardanelles). Given that the United States had not been at war with the Ottoman Empire, it opted to send observers. During this period, the Istanbul government ceased to exist, and the Ankara government independently participated in the conference.

Thus, the Turkish delegation attended the Lausanne Conference, representing a unified government, carrying a mandate endorsed in the National Pact approximately three years prior. The delegation adhered to the preservation of Istanbul and the imperative of Türkiye’s involvement in navigation regulations through the Ottoman straits and the Black Sea. Additionally, the necessity of abolishing the system of foreign privileges and other elements of the National Pact was upheld.<sup>43</sup>

The conference’s initial session commenced on November 20, 1922, with its proceedings divided between three committees: The first committee addressed issues related to territorial boundaries, minorities, the law of the straits, and military matters. The second committee focused

<sup>36</sup> AL-SHANĀWĪ, *supra* note 33.

<sup>37</sup> ZÜRCHER, *supra* note 35.

<sup>38</sup> ĀMJAN ET AL., *supra* note 10.

<sup>39</sup> JIBLĪ, *supra* note 15.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> ĀMJAN ET AL., *supra* note 10.

<sup>42</sup> AL-SHANĀWĪ, *supra* note 33.

<sup>43</sup> *Id.*

on matters concerning foreigners in Türkiye. The third dealt with economic and financial issues.

The conference sessions continued until February 4, 1923, when it adjourned due to the Turkish government's refusal to accept the terms of the peace treaty. On March 6, 1923, the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye authorized the government to reopen negotiations with the Allies. Subsequently, on March 8, 1923, İsmet Pasha, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs and head of the Turkish delegation at the peace conference, sent a message containing Turkish proposals to the allied nations for discussion. The Allies agreed to these talks, leading to reconvening the Lausanne Conference on April 22, 1923.<sup>44</sup> These negotiations were distinguished from other post-World War I peace talks as they replaced an unfair treaty imposed by the victors with the Turkish delegation succeeding in its annulment. The Treaty of Lausanne was eventually signed by eight nations: Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, and Türkiye.<sup>45</sup>

While the Treaty of Lausanne of July 24, 1923, falls into the Fascist era, one cannot think of it as revealing a precisely Fascist foreign policy. Italian action in Lausanne should reflect several 'traditional' interests, essentially aimed to safeguard Italy's rights on the Dodecanese.<sup>46</sup>

Sheikh Rashid Rida commented on the success of the Turks in nullifying the Treaty of Sèvres and concluding the Treaty of Lausanne by stating:

The Turks knew how to treat Europe in this conference as equals, demonstrating the dominance of the victor in battle. It became known to those previously unaware that materialistic Europe respects only power and is humbled only by force.<sup>47</sup>

He then speaks of the Turks after describing the submission of the various ethnic groups participating in the conference to the victors' decisions, saying:

The Turkish delegation in Lausanne was the most astute and persistent of all delegations, constantly challenging and exhausting the delegations of the great powers to such an extent that it nullified their collective significance against it, along with the Balkans, and forced them into unprecedented leniency in their dealings with the Turks at previous conferences since they were considered European states. In Lausanne, it trampled on all the grandeur, might, and pride of these states that was evident in Versailles, Sèvres, and San Remo.<sup>48</sup>

The conference participants agreed to sign the Treaty of Lausanne on July 24, 1923, following protracted discussions.

As Fāḍil Ḥusayn elaborated in his book "Lectures on the Lausanne Conference and its Effects in the Arab Countries", the treaty encompassed the following documents:

1. The Peace Treaty.
2. The Straits Convention.
3. A charter concerning the boundaries of Thrace.
4. A charter regarding conditions of residency, trade, and judiciary.
5. A trade charter.
6. A charter related to the population exchange between Greeks and Turks.
7. An agreement between Greece and Türkiye on the mutual repatriation of detained civilians and the exchange of prisoners of war.
8. A declaration of general amnesty.
9. A declaration regarding the properties of Muslims in Greece.
10. A declaration on health affairs in Türkiye.
11. A declaration on the administration of justice in Türkiye.
12. A protocol (annex) concerning certain privileges granted by the Ottoman Empire.
13. A protocol on the accession of Belgium and Portugal to certain treaty articles.
14. A protocol on the withdrawal of British, French, and Italian forces from the occupied Turkish territories.
15. A protocol concerning the territories of Karaağaç, the islands of Imbros and Tenedos.
16. A protocol about the treaty signed in Sèvres between the Allies and Greece concerning the protection of minorities in Greece and Thrace.
17. A protocol regarding Yugoslavia's signing of the peace treaty.

Additionally, the Treaty of Lausanne included several exchanged letters and a charter concerning Greece's compensation to allied citizens.<sup>49</sup>

## 11.2. Peace Treaty with Türkiye

The Treaty of Peace with Türkiye was segmented into five sections:

### 11.2.1. Political affairs

The first article of this treaty concluded the state of war with Türkiye, restoring peace. The second article delineated the borders between Türkiye, Greece, and Bulgaria. The

44 FĀḌIL ḤUSAYN, *MUSHKILAT AL-MAWṢIL (DIRĀSA FĪ AL-DĪBLŪMĀSIYYA AL-ʾIRĀQIYYA – AL-BIRIṬĀNIYYA – AL-ʾUTHMĀNIYYA WA-FĪ AL-RAʾY AL-ʾĀMM)* (Maṭbaʾat Asʾad, 2d ed. 1976) (Baghd.).

45 AL-SHANĀWĪ, *supra* note 33.

46 Maria Antonia Di Casola, Italy and the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923, 23 *Turkish Y.B. INT'L REL.* 61, 65 (1993).

47 MUḤAMMAD RIḌĀ, "AḤWĀL AL-ʾĀLAM AL-ISLĀMĪ, MU TAMAR AL-ṢULḤ BAYNA AL-TURK WA-URUBBĀ FĪ LŪZĀN," *AL-MANĀR*, VOL. 24, NO. 2 (Feb. 16, 1922).

48 *Id.*

49 ḤUSAYN, *supra* note 44, at 13-14.

third article detailed the demarcation of borders between Türkiye, Syria, and Iraq, stating in its paragraph regarding the Turkish-Syrian border, “[t]he borderline described in Article 8 of the Franco-Turkish Agreement dated Oct. 20, 1921”, and regarding the Turkish-Iraqi border, “[t]he border line between Türkiye and Iraq will be determined by a friendly agreement between Türkiye and Great Britain within nine months, failing which the dispute shall be referred to the Council of the League of Nations.”

Article 6 mandated Türkiye to relinquish all rights over territories beyond the delineated borders, while Article 17 stipulated Türkiye’s renunciation of Egypt and Sudan effective November 5, 1914. Article 18 exempted Türkiye from all obligations related to the Ottoman loans guaranteed by Egyptian tributes for 1855, 1891, and 1894. These financial obligations were transferred to the general Egyptian debt, releasing Egypt from the Ottoman public debt. Article 119 addressed the issues of recognizing Egypt’s independence, which will be resolved in subsequent agreements among the concerned states, not applying to territories severed from Türkiye. Türkiye relinquished its rights and privileges in Libya under Article 22. Article 23 covered the freedom of passage and navigation through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles straits and the Sea of Marmara during peace and war.

Article 28 of the treaty annulled all foreign privileges comprehensively. Article 29 granted Tunisians and Moroccans in Türkiye the same civil, political, and economic rights as French nationals and Libyans the rights of Italian nationals. Articles 30 to 36 discussed nationality, stipulating that Turkish nationals residing habitually in territories detached from Türkiye by this treaty would become citizens of the new governing states under local law. Individuals over eighteen who lost Turkish nationality and acquired new citizenship could opt for Turkish nationality within two years post-treaty implementation. Persons over eighteen residing habitually in the detached state, differing ethnically from its majority population, could choose the nationality of a state with a majority of their ethnic group, subject to that state’s approval, within two years post-treaty implementation. These individuals must relocate within twelve months of nationality selection, retaining rights to their immovable property in the former state and transferring movable assets without export-import duties. Turkish nationals over eighteen from the separated territories living abroad at treaty execution could choose the nationality of their ethnic majority state, subject to intergovernmental agreements.

The spouse would assume the husband’s nationality and children under eighteen would take the parents’ nationality. Articles 37 to 45 addressed the protection of minorities in Türkiye.<sup>50</sup>

### 11.2.2. Financial affairs

This section, encompassing Articles 46-57, addresses the Ottoman public debt, which is the subject of the subsequent chapter. In Article 58, Türkiye and other states (excluding Greece) waived financial claims arising from losses and damages caused by the war. Article 59 recognized Greece’s obligation to compensate for damages in Anatolia inflicted by its army and administration in violation of the laws of war, although Türkiye had waived this claim. Article 60 stipulated that states separated from Türkiye had the right to appropriate Ottoman properties within their territories, and Article 61 exempted Türkiye from paying civil and military pensions to retirees.<sup>51</sup>

### 11.2.3. Economic affairs

This section discusses the properties, rights, and interests of citizens of the allied countries signatory to the treaty, including individuals, companies, and associations, or those under the protection of the mentioned states, and the process for their restitution. It also covers issues like acquisitive prescription, life insurance, marine insurance, fire insurance, etc. Additionally, it addresses private debts and industrial, literary, and artistic properties and establishes mixed arbitration bodies to resolve disputes related to these matters. Finally, it examines international economic or technical treaties concluded before World War I, which Türkiye is considered a party.

### 11.2.4. Transportation and health affairs

This section details Türkiye’s accession to certain international agreements related to transportation, such as freedom of movement, international ports, cargo transportation, railways, passengers, goods, and telecommunication lines. It also covers abolishing the Superior Health Council in Istanbul and the management of pilgrimages to Jerusalem and the Hejaz.

### 11.2.5. Miscellaneous topics

This section addresses issues related to prisoners of war, cemeteries, and general provisions. It also resolves certain decrees issued by the occupying authorities in Istanbul regarding properties, rights, and interests of citizens of allied and foreign countries as well as Turks, between the Armistice of Mudros and the implementation of the Treaty of Lausanne, finalizing them without the possibility of revision. Claims for compensation arising from these decrees were referred to the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

Article 139 stipulates that archives, records, plans, property documents, and other civil, judicial, and financial administration or waqf (endowment) affairs located in

<sup>50</sup> HUSAYN, *supra* note 44.

<sup>51</sup> *Id.*

Türkiye, pertinent to the governments of the states that emerged from the Ottoman Empire or in separated states relevant to Türkiye alone, should be returned in both cases. If the documents concerned both parties, the possessor was to make copies or certified copies and send them to the other governments, with the requesting states bearing the incurred expenses.

The final article, 143, specifies that the treaty documents should be deposited in Paris, and the first registry of deposit of the ratification documents should be written as soon as Türkiye and the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, or any three of them, deposit their ratification documents. The treaty would come into effect between the contracting parties that have ratified it from the date of deposit of the ratified documents and thereafter become effective for other states from the date of deposit of their ratification documents.

Greece deposited its ratification documents on November 11, 1924, Türkiye on March 31, 1934, and the British Empire, Italy, and Japan on August 6, 1924, thus the treaty became effective on August 6, 1924.<sup>52</sup>

### 11.3. The Straits Convention

The Straits Convention was signed on July 24, 1923. Its preamble stated that the signatory states wished to ensure all nations' freedom of passage and navigation between the Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea, adhering to the principle outlined in Article 23 of the Treaty of Peace signed in Paris. This was aimed at preserving the freedom essential for achieving general peace and global trade.

Article 1 of the Straits Convention declared and established the principle of free passage and navigation by sea and air through the Dardanelles, the Sea of Marmara, and the Bosphorus, collectively known as the Straits, and recognized this principle. Article 2 of the convention regulated the rules for the passage and navigation of commercial ships and aircraft, as well as warships and military aircraft, in times of peace and war.

Articles 3 to 9 addressed the demilitarized zones surrounding the Straits, allowing Istanbul to maintain a military force of 12,000 soldiers, as well as manufacturing facilities and a naval base, to implement this charter. Articles 10 to 16 discussed the establishment of an international commission in Istanbul, named the Straits Commission. In Article 18, the states pledged to assist Türkiye in case of any threat to the Straits area.

### 11.4. Agreements for the evacuation of British, French, and Italian forces from occupied Turkish territories

Representatives of Britain, France, Italy, and Türkiye agreed

that upon notification by the allied high commissioners in Istanbul to their governments of the Grand National Assembly's signing of the Peace Treaty, the allied forces would commence the evacuation of their armies from Turkish territories. This also included the withdrawal of British, French, and Italian naval units from the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles, and the Sea of Marmara, to be completed within six weeks. The agreement stipulated the return of movable and immovable Turkish assets to the Turkish government, the termination of confiscation orders and forced labor, and the provision by the occupying authorities of a complete list of confiscated items belonging to the Turkish government. These authorities would also settle debts incurred under the terms of the commitments, and Turkish warships, including the "Yavuz Sultan Selim", as well as weapons, ammunition, and other properties of the Ottoman Empire seized by the allied forces under the Armistice of Mudros (October 30, 1918), would be returned within six weeks. The terms of the Armistice of Mudanya, dated October 11, 1922, would remain in effect during the aforementioned six weeks. The Turkish and British governments agreed that until the treaty's implementation, no action would be taken to alter the status quo until the borders between Türkiye and Iraq were delineated. They agreed to commence negotiations for amicable arrangements and friendship treaties immediately after the end of the occupation, within a nine-month period starting from the beginning of the negotiations.<sup>53</sup>

### 11.5. Key outcomes of the Treaty of Lausanne

The nullification of the Treaty of Sèvres and the conclusion of the Treaty of Lausanne marked a triumph for the Ankara government. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk succeeded in challenging the Allies, leading to the annulment of the Sèvres surrender treaty and securing allied recognition of Turkish sovereignty over most of its territories, forming the current Republic of Türkiye. The treaty also abolished the system of foreign capitulations, which was seen as a derogation of national sovereignty and an avenue for foreign interference in legislative, judicial, executive, and economic matters; thus, its abrogation restored the state's prestige and sovereign decision-making.

The Treaty of Lausanne, in its entirety, represented an international acknowledgment of the Turkish national demands as articulated in the National Pact.<sup>54</sup> It was considered by some as the conclusion of the Eastern Question saga, with Türkiye triumphing in the War of Independence against the allied-backed Greeks, abolishing foreign privileges, and addressing the issue of public debt, eventually ceasing payments post-war. Fâdil Hüsayn noted, however, that privileges remained in most states separated from it, such as Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine, where

<sup>52</sup> HÜSAYN, *supra* note 44.

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*

<sup>54</sup> AL-SHANĀWĪ, *supra* note 33.



debts were apportioned due to their subjection to disguised Western colonialism termed mandates. This disparity was attributed to Türkiye's strength and the weakness of the Arab nations, illustrating a clear example of power politics in international relations.

In its seventeenth and nineteenth articles, the Treaty of Lausanne treated the Egyptian issue as a distinct affair, separating it from matters related to Türkiye, just as the Turkish issue was segregated from it.<sup>55</sup>

A significant outcome of the Treaty of Lausanne was thwarting plans to establish Armenian states in northern and central Anatolia and Kurdish and Greek administrative regions in Izmir. French Syria, as delineated in the Treaty of Sèvres, lost territories in Cilicia estimated at 18,000 km<sup>2</sup>, established in the "Franklin-Bouillon Agreement" (1921), while the French mandate over Syria and Lebanon and the British mandate over Iraq, Transjordan, and Palestine were legally recognized under the Treaty of San Remo (1920) according to international law, leading to the formation of the modern Levantine Arab states.<sup>56</sup>

Post the first Lausanne Conference (1923), Türkiye claimed Mosul, with the conference stipulating that the Turkish-Iraqi border be defined by agreement between Britain and Türkiye or otherwise referred to the League of Nations if no agreement was reached. This led to the League's council decreeing on September 30, 1924, the establishment of an international commission to examine the matter. After detailed surveys and hearings, especially from Arabs and Turks in Mosul, the commission recommended on July 16, 1925, that Mosul remain within the Iraqi kingdom under British mandate for 25 years. Following the commission's report, treaties were signed between Iraq and Britain on January 13, 1926, and between Iraq, Türkiye (post-Republic establishment in 1924), and Britain on June 5, 1926, stipulating good neighborliness and finalizing the borders.<sup>57</sup> This led to improved relations between Iraq and Türkiye, reducing border raids and facilitating diplomatic exchanges.

While the Straits Convention (Bosporus and Dardanelles) demilitarized the Straits area, it ensured the region remained an integral part of Türkiye, keeping the historic capital, Istanbul, within Turkish territory. This was seen as affirming state sovereignty over Istanbul, allowing for military fortifications and defense by the Turkish army, formalized in the Montreux Convention on July 20, 1936, signed by ten countries. Though the convention permitted free passage for commercial and military vessels, it

prohibited the passage of warships from nations at war with Türkiye.<sup>58</sup>

With the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne on 10 Dhu al-Hijah 1341 AH (July 24, 1923), Türkiye victoriously concluded its War of Independence, reasserting control over Anatolia, Istanbul, and Eastern Thrace. Allied forces withdrew from the straits area, and Türkiye relinquished any claims to Arab regions, Cyprus, and the Dodecanese Islands at the conference.<sup>59</sup>

Meanwhile, the Grand National Assembly dissolved itself on April 16, 1923, leading to parliamentary elections and a new assembly of 286 members, commencing sessions on August 11, 1923, and endorsing the Lausanne Treaty resolutions on August 23. The last of the allied forces evacuated Istanbul on October 2, 1923, and a Turkish military contingent led by "Şükrü Naili" entered on October 6.<sup>60</sup>

With the proclamation of the republic on October 29, 1923, and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's election as president, modern Türkiye emerged, transitioning to a republican system with Ankara as its capital on November 13, 1923. This shift necessitated sweeping reforms, most notably the abolition of the Islamic Caliphate on May 3, 1924, leading to the expulsion of the last Ottoman Caliph, Abdulmecid II, and the Ottoman royal family to Europe (Amgen 1/144), with Abdulmecid II relocating to Nice, France, in 1924, where he remained until his death.<sup>61</sup>

## 12. RESULTS

1. The research delineates the historical backdrop leading to the Treaty of Lausanne, particularly focusing on the nullification of the Treaty of Sèvres. It details how the resistance led by the Ankara government and the Grand National Assembly played a pivotal role in reclaiming Turkish sovereignty facilitating modern Türkiye's establishment.
2. The Treaty of Lausanne is shown to have significant implications for regional geopolitics, including the formal recognition of Turkish borders, the abolition of the capitulations (which granted foreign powers judicial and economic privileges), and the setting of a framework for minority protections within Türkiye.
3. The research discusses the treaty's broader impact on international relations and law, noting how it helped redefine the structure of international treaties and influenced the handling of minority rights and regional disputes.
4. The study highlights the treaty's role in the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the modern Turkish Republic, emphasizing the importance of establishing a sovereign

<sup>55</sup> HUSAYN, *supra* note 44.

<sup>56</sup> BĀRŪT, *supra* note 12.

<sup>57</sup> ĀMJAN ET AL., *supra* note 10.

<sup>58</sup> AL-SHANĀWĪ, *supra* note 33.

<sup>59</sup> TAQQŪSH, *supra* note 23.

<sup>60</sup> AL-SHANĀWĪ, *supra* note 33.

<sup>61</sup> FARĪD BEYK, *supra* note 14.

and unified Turkish state, which was crucial for its subsequent development.

5. Lastly, the research underscores the treaty's enduring relevance, particularly its lessons on the effectiveness of diplomacy and negotiation in international relations.

By addressing the comprehensive impact of the Treaty of Lausanne, the research fills a gap in historical scholarship, providing a nuanced understanding of how this treaty not only shaped the immediate regional order but also left a lasting imprint on global diplomatic practices.

### 13. MODERN IMPLICATIONS

The Treaty of Lausanne continues to have significant implications for modern Turkish foreign relations and unresolved regional issues. The treaty's provisions regarding minority rights, sovereignty, and border definitions remain pertinent in contemporary discussions, particularly concerning Cyprus, control of the Turkish Straits, and Kurdish affairs. Ongoing diplomatic tensions around these matters reflect the treaty's lasting legacy and highlight its relevance in current geopolitical negotiations and conflict management efforts. Policymakers and diplomats must navigate the complexities stemming from Lausanne's historical agreements while addressing contemporary challenges in regional stability and international law.

### 14. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTEMPORARY GEOPOLITICS

1. Encourage policymakers to revisit Lausanne's minority protection framework as a potential basis for resolving ongoing ethnic tensions, especially concerning Kurdish issues within Türkiye.
2. Recommend that Turkish foreign policy explicitly utilize the diplomatic precedents of Lausanne, advocating for multilateral dialogues and peaceful negotiation frameworks, particularly addressing unresolved disputes in Cyprus and the Turkish Straits.
3. Suggest that current diplomatic practices can be informed by Lausanne's approach to sovereignty, urging international actors to prioritize clarity in territorial claims and rights in conflict-prone regions, thereby reducing ambiguity and enhancing regional stability.
4. Propose the establishment of bilateral or regional forums inspired by Lausanne's negotiation style, aimed at fostering mutual understanding and historical reconciliation between Türkiye and neighboring countries.
5. Advise the inclusion of case studies based on Lausanne's successful diplomatic maneuvers in training programs for diplomats, enhancing strategic negotiation skills applicable in contemporary conflicts.

### 15. CONCLUSION

The Treaty of Lausanne, developed in the crucible of

geopolitical upheaval following World War I, is a testament to the transformative power of diplomatic engagement and the relentless pursuit of national sovereignty. This study meticulously navigated the intricate web of negotiations, strategic recalibrations, and international dynamics that culminated in the treaty's signing, thereby charting the Ottoman Empire's dissolution and heralding the birth of the modern Republic of Türkiye.

By employing a multidisciplinary approach, this research has unearthed the profound implications of the Lausanne Treaty, not only in redrawing a nation's borders but also in redefining the contours of international law and minority rights. The treaty emerged as a pivotal juncture, facilitating Türkiye's transition from a fragmented empire to a sovereign state while simultaneously influencing the geopolitical and legal frameworks of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

As delineated in the treaty, the abolition of the capitulations and the establishment of Türkiye's territorial integrity marked a significant departure from the subservience imposed by the Treaty of Sèvres. Furthermore, the negotiation process underscored the effectiveness of diplomatic assertiveness and strategic foresight, enabling Türkiye to reclaim its place on the international stage.

This research has illuminated the Treaty of Lausanne's historical significance and underscored its enduring legacy in shaping the contemporary geopolitical landscape. The treaty's provisions for minority protections and its implications for regional stability continue to resonate, offering valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities of nation-building in a post-imperial world.

In conclusion, the Treaty of Lausanne encapsulates a critical moment in history where the will to sovereignty, the art of diplomacy, and the quest for peace converged to redraw the map of the Near East. Its legacy, embedded in the annals of international relations, continues to inform our understanding of the delicate balance between national aspirations and international obligations. As such, this study contributes to the historical record and provides a nuanced perspective on the dynamics that continue to influence global politics and diplomacy.

The practical implications of the findings are valuable, especially in understanding the dynamics of post-imperial nation-building and the role of treaties in contemporary geopolitics. The study's emphasis on the treaty's influence on modern diplomatic practices and regional stability offers practical insights into the complexities of international negotiations and conflict resolution. However, the practical value could be enhanced by offering more actionable recommendations for current policymakers or diplomats working on similar international agreements or minority rights issues.

### Disclosure of interest

The authors have no competing interests to declare.