

The Law on Headdress and Regulations on Dressing in the Turkish Modernization

Yasemin Dođaner*

Abstract: In the period of Turkish Republic, there was a need for an idea on which the fact of modernization would be based in order to put into effect this modernization carried out under Atatürk's leadership as well as a mass leading this modernization process and the institutions that would be tasked with orienting the changes to the society. The Ottoman Empire, which dealt with the wars in the first quarter of the century and collapsed in the economic and political areas, was replaced by a Republic. To unify the manpower of this young Republic around a common aim, some decisions were taken in order to carry out significant social, cultural and legal changes in the society as the continuation of the determination displayed in political plan. In this paper, I will try to discuss the meaning and the process in the Turkish modernization of the Law on Headdress as one of the most important changes in the social plan and the following regulations on dressing.

Key Words: Hat Reform, Law On Headdress, Turkish Modernization, Turkish Republic, Regulations On Dressing.

The Law on Headdress and the regulations on dressing were among the Atatürk's revolutions and signified an important change in the daily life of people. The need for making changes in the dressing of people appeared with the westernization and the western styles of wearing started to be adopted by the Turkish people and to be used particularly in the dressing of civil servants. In fact, this movement that was initiated in dressing aimed to produce a serious change in mentality. In other words, the new way of understanding and structuring of the newly founded Republic in every area of life was also reflected in the dressing (Dođaner 2002).

Since the Fez, which was banned by the Law on Headdress, appeared first in the city of Morocco (Fas in Turkish), it was named after the city. This flat-topped conical hat, which was made in general of the red cloth and deco-

* University of Hacettepe Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish Revolution / ANKARA
ydoganer@hacettepe.edu.tr

rated with a tassel, came to Turkey through Europe. During the reign of Mahmut II, the wadded turban was removed and the use of fez started with the declaration of Hattı Humayun, while the dressing of newly established army after the dissolution of Janissaries corps was based on the western style of wearing. In the rules of different sultans, we see different types of fez whose manufacturing was very difficult. These hats were first imported, but with the increase in demands, a factory called as “Feshane” was founded in Istanbul and others ones followed it. When the use of fez became widespread, the civilian people were asked to use “dalfes” (unadorned fez) and not to wrap anything around fez in order to distinct them from the civil servants. However, the people were then allowed to wrap different things around their fezzes, aiming to make people use this hat. In the course of time, the shape of tassel in the fezzes became an important sign for making a distinction between people and civil servants (Tezcan 1995: 415-416).

The issue of hat was first put on the agenda during the period when the Westernization, one of the intellectual currents emerged after the opening of the Ottoman Empire towards the West, was gathering support. Kiliczade Hakkı, one of the representatives of this current wrote a pamphlet (*Akümü's Siyer Münasebetiyle Yusuf Suad Efendi'ye Tahsisen Softa Efendilere Tamimen Son Cevap*) in 1915 in which he argued that the dress used by the Ottomans was not national and there was no inconvenience in wearing hat from the Islamic point of view. Abdullah Cevdet returned from abroad to Istanbul with a hat on his head and in his article entitled “Hat and Fez” in the *İctihad* journal, he reacted to the arrest of a Muslim wearing hat and argued that this would mean a violation of the liberty of a citizen. He also claimed that as a European wearing a fez would not be arrested, a person wearing a hat could not be arrested as well, and that the fez was not a head-dress belonging to our ancestors (Kılıç 1998: 143-144).

In 1924, a clergy called Atif Hoca from İskilip wrote a pamphlet (*Frenk Mukallitliği ve Şapka*) that raised many discussions. In the pamphlet, Atif Hoca considered the hat as a sign of insult and said that it was religiously forbidden¹. In contrast, in his article written in the daily *Son Telgraf*, which was later republished as a pamphlet under the title of *İmana Tasallut Şapka Me-selesi* (Nazif 1925), Suleyman Nazif stated that the backwardness of the society stemmed from this mentality infiltrating the religion, and that religion itself was sacred and should be preserved in the people's conscience. He also questioned why the hat -rather than the western shirt and tie- was considered as sign of religion and nationality and he claimed that the hat was neither an insult nor a forbidden headdress (Baydar 1970:134). Following

the articles written by both writers as a response to each other, the issue was closed, but after the enactment of the Law on Headdress, Atif Hoca was tried by the Independence Tribunals and was executed on the grounds that his pamphlets played a role in the uprisings against the hat.²

Before the enactment of this law³, some regulations were made about the dress of various groups. For instance, it was forbidden for the students of *Istanbul Medresesi* to wear turban and gown (*Tanin*: March 7, 1924), and it was decided to make new arrangements in the dress of judges (*Hakimiyeti Milliye*: July 11, 1924), the hats of policemen were changed with the models having front brim (*Cumhuriyet*, July 16, 1925) and the hats of the soldiers were replaced with the ones used in western armies.⁴ While these regulations may seem unimportant, they were an important start for the steps to be taken in the serious issues (Wortham 1930: 170). In the same days, the issue named “Serpuş Meselesi” (the Issue of Hat) started to be dealt in the public and various views and assessments were voiced on it. Falih Rifki (Atay), writing in the daily *Cumhuriyet*, noted that those considering this matter as an important issue were under the influence of the imperial traditions, and argued that while the religion was a matter of faith, the hat was a matter of fashion. Thus, he displayed his stance against the mentality that can not make a distinction between these two matters.⁵

In the same period, while the views of the then Minister of Religious Affairs⁶ on the question of “serpuş” was seemingly supporting the Law on Headdress to be legislated, the condition that any dress and hat could be worn unless there is imitation was revealing a contradiction within itself, because wearing hat was perceived as imitating the Christians in the then Islamic circles. As a matter of fact, the reactions to the hat stemmed from this imitation. It is, therefore, not possible to say that everybody had the same understanding about the “obligation of wearing hat” which came about in a very radical way.

In the period when the view arguing that there is no relation between the matter of dressing and that of faith was stated frequently before the public, Mustafa Kemal started his visit to Kastamonu. During this one-week-visit⁷ paid to Cankiri, Kastamonu and Inebolu, he stated that Turkey was also obliged to show its modernity through its modern outlook as well. He described the dress to be worn in the country⁸ and announced that the head-dress fitting this dressing style was the hat⁹. The determined attitude of Mustafa Kemal about wearing hat during his speech in Kastamonu was quite striking¹⁰. The naming of hat which was till that time called in the press as

“hat with brim, contemporary and muvafik hifz-ı sihha hat was welcomed (*Cumhuriyet*: September 1, 1925) and with the resolution 2134 of the Council of Ministers on September 2nd, 1925, the civil servants were obliged to wear the common dress and hat of the civilized countries¹¹. In the resolution, the standard dress code of the civilized states was adopted as a model¹² on the dress of civil servants, and the resolution even explained how the greetings with hat should be made¹³. The people were let free to wear hat or not. Also in the same days, it was decided that the clerics would wear white turban and black gown, and that the dress color of the clerics in the army would comply with the military obligations and the clerics were also allowed to wear civil dress during their non-office time. In the same regulation, it was also ordered that the hats should be taken off during the celebrations of Republic’s anniversary. In addition, those who were not clerics were banned to put on the religious dress. Those who did not obey these rules were to be sentenced to one-year-imprisonment (Jaaschke 1972: 28-29). We observe that a very determined approach was carried out in the implementation of this resolution¹⁴.

With the aim of observing the attitude of people to this issue and providing clarifications to them, Mustafa Kemal made a second visit in the country during which he visited Bursa, Balıkesir, Akhisar, Kemalpaşa, Konya and Afyon and gave speeches in these places in order to explain the purpose of these regulations¹⁵. In these cities, Mustafa Kemal was welcomed and received the popular support of the people, and when he returned to Ankara, the residents of the capital welcomed him with the hat on their heads (İmce 1959: 69). He also talked to people and questioned the situation of those who rejected to wear hat. He was told that these people were pacified and had to accept this change willingly or unwillingly. Mustafa Kemal pointed out that the situation should be kept under control until new generations emerge (Altay 1970: 392).

In those days, according to an article by Falih Rifki in the daily *Hakimiye Milliye*, “despite the invitation of Mustafa Kemal for everybody to wear hat, the fact that some people still insist in not wearing hat is very allusive. Furthermore, a Member of Parliament wearing hat in Bursa has been seen with a fur cap in Istanbul. While many hocas and peasants have adopted the hat, some dissidents in Istanbul, who have worn hat many times abroad, persisted in wearing fez”. For Falih Rifki, this negative attitude was intentional and there might be four reasons for this situation: the lack of hat, the lack of money to buy hat, to suppose that there is a relation between hat and religion or to act insincerely in order to get favor of those having such a supposi-

tion. Another point highlighted in the article in question was that the hat was the symbol of the Republic and adoption of the principles of progress, while the dissidents were trying to present it as a trademark of a party (*Hakimiyeti Milliye*, September 24, 1925). Despite the fact that the Law on Headdress was not enacted yet and there was no obligation for the civilians to wear hat, it is noteworthy that considerable public pressure was put on those not wearing hat via press. Following the opening of the parliament, Refik Koraltan, the MP from Konya, and his friends¹⁶ submitted on November 16th, 1925 the proposal of the Law on Headdress and in the covering memorandum of this proposal, it was stated that: “In fact, the issue of headdress does not matter too much, but it is of significance for Turkey which is determined to take its place among the civilized nations. It was necessary to change the actual head covering which was deemed as representing a difference between the Turks and other civilized people, and to replace it with the headdress used by the civilized nations. This proposal should be accepted, as the Turkish people have already set the example for everybody, and begun to use this headdress.” (TBMM Z.C.1341:221).

During the discussions about this law, Nurettin Pasha, the MP from Bursa raised objections to the law on several grounds. According to him, the wearing styles of the civil servants were already regulated by the decisions of Council of Ministers on September 2, 1925. If this issue requires enacting a law, the previous decision would not be in conformity with this law. Given the fact that a law regulating the dress of the civil servants working in the Ministry of Justice was enacted in the previous year, the Council of Minister, therefore, was not authorized to take such a decision. If the hat issue does not require enacting a law, then there was no need to take into account this proposal since the previous decision was already valid. Furthermore this proposal also comprised the members of parliament who were not civil servants but the representative of the people. In addition, as this proposal was in contradiction with some articles of the Constitution, it could not be accepted¹⁷.

The objections of Nurettin Pasha to the Law on Headdress caused great reactions in the parliament. Refik Koraltan, who made this proposal, said that the objection of Nurettin Pasha did not reflect the views of the people of Bursa whom he represented and that the measures were only taken to preserve the presence of the Constitution. Then the Minister of Justice Mahmut Esat Bey stated that there was no relation between the regulation on dressing and the relevant articles of the Constitution and that they trying to do what is best for the country. Agaoglu Ahmet, the MP from Kars, stated that

he found it difficult to establish a relation between the dresses such as hat, shirt, frock coat and handkerchief, and the Constitution which regulated the general principles of the life of a nation, and that the enacting the Law on Headdress aimed to adopt the mentality of the circles who founded the Constitution. In their speeches, the other MPs stated that Nurettin Pasha, who was still not wearing hat, had in fact voiced his own views (İlyas Sami from Mus), and that there was no relation between the dress and the religion, and this problem should be solved through scholarly methods (Rasih Bey from Antalya), and that the civilized nations had the same dress styles, and the Turkish nation should not be dressed differently (Sukru Kaya from Mentese), and to assert that the Constitutional articles in question were in contradiction with this law was not meaningful for this nation had already adopted the hat, and to object it was incompatible with the spirit of the revolution (Mustafa Necati from Izmir) (TBMM Z. C. 1341: 223-232).

In the parliamentary session held on November 25, 1925, there was no other objection apart from that of Nurettin Pasha, and the Law 671 on Headdress was accepted. According to the Article 1, “the members of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, and the civil servants and employees working in the general, special and regional administrations and all forms of institutions are obliged to wear hat that the Turkish nation has been wearing. The general headdress for the Turkish nation is the hat, and the government bans the continuation of any habit in contradiction with this”¹⁸.

To wear hat was not appreciable in the eyes of the Turkish people who used to wear fez until the enactment of the Law on Headdress. The Turks used to wear hat only when they were visiting European countries and the hat was considered as a headdress belonging to the minorities in Istanbul¹⁹. Before the enactment of this Law, wearing hat instead of fez might cause troubles to a student²⁰. In addition, to wear nothing on head was also not an approved situation. While the fez replacement of the wadded turban was considered as a symbol of progress during the reign of Mahmut II, it became the sign of conservatism during the era of Atatürk. The fez, which was seen as a component of the Islamic custom, was not a religious headdress. Its relation to the religion stems from the necessity to use a brimless headdress in fulfilling prayers during which one’s forehead needed to touch the flour and that his head should also be covered. In addition, based on Prophet Muhammad’s imperative saying that “you should fight by turning towards the sun”, there was objection against the hat having brim since this imperative was considered as an order to not use sun protection brim in the headdresses rather than an order to avoid timid behaviour (Gentizon 1983: 93).

With the enactment of the Law on Headdress, it became obligatory for the Turkish citizens to wear hat. While the Turkish public addressed this issue without any criticism, this change was very interesting for the occidental observers who made different assessments and evaluations about it. Before the enactment of this law, some assessments appeared in the British *Manchester Guardian* newspaper upon the increase in the tendency to wear hat. The newspaper noted that changing the headdresses was easier than changing the mentalities and that they were not sure whether the mentality of the new republicans was different from that of the old Ottomans (Yılmaz 2002: 76). *The Illustrated London News* observed that the fez was replaced by the hat, and that Mustafa Kemal was playing a leading role in the field of fashion as well. The newspaper, which noted the obligation to wear hat as an unfamiliar situation, nevertheless added that the use of hat would become permanent, and that this state of affairs produced very strange consequences²¹. In general, we see some comments in the British press which considered the regulations on dressing in Turkey as a requisite for the modernization and westernization. On the other hand there were also different assessments which stated that it was not possible to remove an established tradition in one day, this movement did not develop on its own and it was not right to impose what was copied from the European models, this situation could upset the position of Mustafa Kemal, the changes took place very quickly and the views of the people were not taken into account during these changes, and while Turkey displayed a soft attitude towards the exterior, it conducted a very harsh policy within the country (Yılmaz 2002: 78-79). It was also indicated in the news that the changes in the male dressing would also have impacts on the female dressing, and after a short period of time the women would be liberated from the veil, and they could be dressed up like their western sisters (*The Illustrated London News*, January 2, 1926). In the comments made some time after enactment of the law, it was emphasized that “there was a significant change in the minds beneath the hat” and that all of these were indicators of a real reform and rebirth²².

Apart from these evaluations, it is possible to say that the attitude of some other western writers toward the Law on Headdress was more reasonable. According to Bisbee, “wearing hat is not a superficial achievement for the Turks, it is essentially the psychological transfer of the cultural roots, primarily not from the East to the West, but from the past to the future” (Bisbee 1951: 21). Lewis put emphasis on the cultural dimension of the issue by stating that: “the dresses and especially headdresses of the Turks were to make distinction between them and the Christians” (Lewis 1959: 89).

In the eyes of the westerners, the hat has not only a cultural dimension, but it has also an economic one. With the removal of fez, an important market was founded to provide hat. Before the arrival of Atatürk to Izmir, the stocks of hat in the shops finished and when he arrived at Izmir, he did not come across anybody with fez around him. Since a person would need at least three or four hat, it was stated that this situation would be an important opportunity for the hat manufacturers (*The Economist*, November 7, 1925). Therefore, the hat ateliers, in which even the blankets and sacks were used, were given a great opportunity to make a commercial rise. In the beginning, there were even some speculations regarding the sales of hat; but some standards were set for the prices through the measures taken by the government (*The Illustrated London News*, December 26, 1925).

The high officials of the state played a leading role in the use of hat, which also had an important economic dimension for the people. First of all, there were only a few ateliers producing hat in the country for the Christians and their owners were Christians. And as these were taken out of the country, it was very difficult to find hat. It was, therefore, necessary to start the manufacture of hat immediately; and also because the hat was more expensive than the fez and a person needed more than one hat to wear them in accordance with the fashion (*Cumhuriyet*, September 4, 1925). The first measure taken in this regard was to produce hats in the factories of Hereke and Feshane by making necessary adjustments with the production instruments. (*Cumhuriyet*, September 7, 1925). The fez manufacturers started to produce hats with brim and thus met some of the demand for hat²³. In the first days, even the decorated female hats were taken from the shop of an expelled Armenian in Izmir and they were put on the heads. In addition, the old bowler-hats, straw hats, the cloth hats manufactured by the women and the imported ones from Austria were used in order to avoid violating the law (Armstrong 1996: 207). Some shops in the district of Beyoğlu, whose regular customers were, in fact, the minorities, were also overcrowded by the people seeking to buy hats. In the Thrace and Western Anatolia, the village headmen were tasked with making wholesale hat purchases. In order to meet the demand for hat in the country, the first cap factory was founded in Kararmusel, and the local manufacturers started to produce felt hat by using the goat hair (Gentizon 1983: 99). Buying a hat was also a financial burden due to the post-war economic crisis. Since the law had banned to wear fez or fur cap and the stocks of hat were already exhausted, the people could not wear anything on their head until the arrival of new hats. Some indifferent tradesmen brought the worst types of hat and consequently one could see people

with strange hat on their head in the streets. There were even esteemed persons wearing the summer hats made of white cloth in the month of November (Gentizon 1983: 105).

During Atatürk's visit to Western Anatolia, the "ceremonies to tear down the fezzes" were held and some locally produced hats were presented to him (Jevakhoff 1998: 259). On the other hand some incidents erupted against the use of hat in the Eastern Anatolia. This dissident attitude escalated by the reactions against the closures of dervish lodges, shrines and sacred tombs and spread to the eastern cities in a short period of time. Different reactions were shown in the cities of Malatya, Sivas, Kayseri, Erzurum, Giresun and Rize where the declarations including insulting remarks were put on the walls, people were incited to re-wear turban and it was propagated that the Quran would be removed and widows would be exhibited. We also observe some passive resistance elsewhere. Although there was no explicit reaction, some people tended not to wear such new headdresses²⁴. The opponents of the hat –the majority of which were made up of the members of the religious sects and imams- were tried by the Independence Tribunals and were sentenced to imprisonment, exile or death²⁵. For those who received heavy punishment, the reason was not the objection to wear hat; but that they were conducting reactionary riots, inciting people to join such riots and betraying to the nation by misusing the religion for the political motives²⁶. In fact, in the origin of these incidents was the re-emergence of the opposition against the modernization process dating back to the second Constitutional era and even before it. We observe the reaction of this opponent tendency which used the hat as a pretext against the deep changes led by Atatürk. In the same period, we also see some abuses in the issue of hat. Some people who introduced themselves as "hat inspector" fined the villagers for having worn the hats violating the law²⁷. The reactions against the hat were suppressed harshly during the Takrir-i Sukun era and put down before they spread.

While many people, under the impact of the laws, opted for remaining silent regarding the reactions raised after the enactment of the Law on Headdress, the most severe reaction came from Halide Edip who was living abroad at that time. According to her "the purpose of the Turkish westernization has not been and should not be the imitation of the appearance. This is a deeper and more significant process. Saying to a Turk to make him civilized through his headdress is as absurd as saying to him that he would be imprisoned or hung. The struggle against the use of hat show that the self-respect of the people has been damaged and this attitude is much more civilized than the attitude of those who enacted this law". It was also indicated in the article

that while the westerners were overlooking a number of more significant changes in Turkey, the statements like “the Turks have been civilized and they are wearing hat” were abundant there. Halide Edip claimed that, after many trials and executions, it was not possible to say that there was a good psychological atmosphere in the country and she questioned whether this change did help in approaching to the occidental mentality²⁸. We realize that there were no serious criticisms on this issue after a long period of time since the enactment of the law and even after the spontaneous removal of the obligation to wear hat. It is likely that Halide Edip could express her views on the issue more freely because she had been living abroad. While we cannot see clearly the views of intellectuals of that time on this issue because of the legal sanctions, Halide Edip stated in another book she wrote subsequently that there were serious objections among the intellectuals on the issue of hat²⁹.

The main purpose of the Law on Headdress, which was one of the first and most important reforms of the young Republic, was to reach a common dress style by changing the actual headdresses which were considered to be representing a difference with the civilized nations. A psychological impact on the society was aimed through this change. It would be, therefore, possible to prevent the negative perceptions of the Western world against the Turk and emphasize that the Turkish people were not different from the westerners. But the change in dress and the change in mentality were not the same thing. Furthermore, regulating the dresses worn by the people through the legal sanctions was an interesting situation. It was obvious that the aim here was to make a shift from the eastern mentality to the western one in the society, but the appropriateness of the methods used to achieve this aim was questionable. According to a view, the limits of the popular tolerance towards other social reforms would be tested through the Law on Headdress which was enacted in the first years of the Republic (Sitembölükbaşı 1999: 69).

After the suppression of the first reactions against this law and the use of hat became widespread among the people, some developments in this issue took place from time to time in Turkey. The first one was the fez crisis which erupted in the official reception during the Republic celebrations in 1932³⁰. During the reception, the use of fez by a foreign diplomatic representative, even though considerable time had passed after the enactment of the Law on Headdress, received serious reaction. Such an event illustrates the sensitivity of the new administration and especially of Mustafa Kemal in this issue.

Another development in respect to this issue was the enactment of the Law, in 1934, to the effect that some dresses could not be worn. As the purpose of this law, it was stated that the state and religion were independent from each other, the religion would remain out of the state as a moral factor, the clerics would wear their religious garments only during the religious ceremonies as the requisite of the main principle of secularism of the regime and they would wear civil garments in other times (Yalçın-Gönülal 1984: 206). The Law on Headdress obliged the clerics to get an authorization for wearing the turban. With the enactment of this law, they started to wear hat when they were in the street³¹.

In the parliamentary discussions, Hakki Kilic, the MP from Mus, stated that they wished this law had been put into effect with the Law on Headdress, there was no need for wearing special clothes in the prayers and even the provincial directorates of religious affairs should be removed. The minister of Foreign affairs Sukru Kaya said that this law was a requisite for the secular state and revolution, and it was not a measure taken against certain persons or organizations. Turgut Bey, the MP from Manisa, noted that this law would be the only power in the implementation of the secularism (*TBMM Tutanak Dergisi*, Dönem 4, vol.25: 40-74). The Law 2596 was accepted on December 3, 1934 (*TBMM Kanunlar Dergisi*, vol.14: 30) and the Regulation explaining the implementation of this law was published on February 18, 1935 (*Ulus-Cumhuriyet*: February, 18 1935). In the coded telegram dispatched to the party inspectors and city authorities, it was stated that the law should be executed in all provinces and villages in the country and the sanctions should be implemented seriously given the fact that there were still people wearing turban or the imams traveling without putting anything on their head (*B.C.A CHP Fonu*, 490.01.611.122.1). The changes in the dress aimed to bring people, who hear and think differently, together to make them achieve a level of national maturity (İsmail Hakkı 1934: 2).

This law banning the use of religious garments with the exception of the places where the religious ceremonies were held had a negative impact on the clerics, particularly those in Istanbul, and this issue occupied the agenda for a while. In spite of the negative news reported in the Greek press, we also notice some reports stating that “the impact and power of the religious garments would be greater when they are used only in the holy places, these clerics, each of whom is also a citizen, will be able to walk among the people easily and the garments having holy significance will not be abused” and thereby emphasized the psychological factors (*Cumhuriyet*, December 6, 1934). It was also stated that the Armenian Patriarch, the Catholic Chief

Priest and the Religious Chief of Jewish community had given positive reaction in the talks held with them and the practices in the western regions were already in line with this policy (*Ulus*, December 6, 1934). On the other hand, it was reported that no objection had been raised against this decision in the meeting of the Saint Sinod Assembly of the Greek Patriarchate (*Cumhuriyet*, December 7, 1934). Moreover, the Greek Patriarch, who was the religious leader of the Greeks, would be allowed to wear his garments permanently, while other priests would wear them during the religious ceremonies. The Turkish Foreign Minister informed his Greek colleague M. Maksimos that this law was a general measure, and it was not against Greece, and thereafter this issue was closed down between the parties (*Cumhuriyet*: December 10 1934). With the exception of a single incident, we do not notice any reaction in the press³². There were also some people who removed their religious garment even before the 6-month-implementation period of the 6 mounts of this law³³.

Another incident, which occurred in Hatay during the period of escalation in the Hatay Question, in reaction to use of hat, was the persecutions and pressures against the Turkish villagers wearing hat in Hatay . This struggle, initiated in Sanjak of Hatay and Syria by the French, spread along the region. In some villages, the hats of the villagers were removed from their heads forcefully, and they were threatened with having their licensed arms confiscated (*Ulus*, January 18, 1937). Furthermore, the fact that the Turcoman tribes residing in Halep started to wear hat was used by local officials as a pretext for oppressing the people in the region (*Ulus*, March 19, 1937). The insistence of the Turks residing in this region on wearing hat resulted form their wish to emphasize their Turkishness.

Although there was no legal regulation about the female wearing when dealing with issue, there was an instruction to remove the veils in a secret circular sent by the General Secretariat of the CHP to the cities. When analyzing the documents, we notice that in the Congress of CHP in 1935, the issue of banning the veil and the garment, called as “kara don” (black trousers), was also discussed (B.C.A CHP Fonu, 490.01.17.88.1). Based on this decision, the municipalities banned the veil. For instance, it was forbidden for the women to cover their face with veil or headscarf in Bartın and those breaking this ban would be fined (*Yeni Adam*, August 29 1935: 5). In Maras arrangements were to be made until the January 1st, 1936, to the effect that the veil and kara don would be banned and the women would wear coat, while the men would wear frock-coat and trousers. In the documents sent to the centre from the cities of Yozgat, Muğla and Trabzon, it was stated that

the veil was removed. According to a decision taken in Sinop, the women in the families of high-ranking officials were requested to sew coats for themselves until the Republic celebrations and the local tradesmen were given a period of 3 months to get and wear coat (B.C.A CHP Fonu, 490.01.17.88.1).

The main inclination in this issue was to remove the veil by through conducting propaganda among the people rather than legislative sanctions. It was also intended to make the same practices in Istanbul (*Cumhuriyet*, September 1, 1935). Nevertheless, there was always a cautious approach about the female dress both in making the first regulations and its aftermath. This approach differed from the attitude displayed in the hat issue and the potential reactions were prevented to some extent through dealing with this issue at the local level. The individual objections did not create significant impact³⁴. It can be seen that the change in the female dress was not completed during the administration of single party, and twenty years later, it reappeared as a new problem to be solved.

In 1956, three female members of parliament (Nazlı Tilabar from Istanbul, Edibe Sayar from Zonguldak and Aliye Timucin from Ankara) submitted a proposal of law regarding the removal of the black veil used by the women (*Cumhuriyet*, March 12, 1956). Edibe Sayar noted that they submitted such a proposal “to make amendments in some articles of the Law 2596 in order to remove this non-national and uncivilized wearing which is completely in contradiction with our reforms and which makes us humiliated in the eyes of foreign countries” (*Cumhuriyet*, March 13, 1956). Then, the daily *Cumhuriyet* started a campaign for banning the veil and it called attention to this issue by publishing the comments and assessments of numerous readers. Another institution which had an interest in this issue was the Union of Women³⁵. After the submission of the proposal to the parliament, while some of the DP representatives considered it as the completion of missing parts in Atatürk’s reforms, a considerable number of them said they would vote against the proposal. While the DP representatives declared their views, the CHP representatives remained silent saying that the party did not determine its view yet (*Cumhuriyet*, March 28, 1956). In the meantime, the female MPs were mobilized in order to supply cheap coats to women by making collaboration with the Olgunlasma (Maturing) Institute.

In those days when this proposal was on the agenda, the daily *Cumhuriyet* conducted an inquiry in 35 villages and with more than 6000 people, according to which there were not so much supporters for the veil. It was indi-

cated that during the inquiry conducted in the region between Istanbul and Yalova, there were no veiled women, while there were sometimes men supporting the veil, but this case was rare and at the end of this inquiry, it was realized that the veil should be searched in the cities. On the other hand, the Turkish Cultural Centers Headquarters declared that they would work zealously to make women remove their veils voluntarily. To this aim, they held conferences and meetings and worked to supply the cheap coats replacing veils. It was also reported in the press that the female MPs, who had submitted a proposal for the removal of veil, prepared a new proposal of law to ban the use of loincloth by the women in the region of Eastern Black Sea. In addition to the political and social dimension of the issue, the economic dimension –the fact that the veil was used not because of the bigotry but because of economical reasons - was also dealt (*Cumhuriyet*, March 30-April 17, 1956). Nevertheless, such a law was not accepted in the parliament. This situation signaled the beginning of dissolution of the centralist administration during the rule of single party.

In the course of time, the sensitivity on the hat issue decreased. While the law was in the effect, wearing hat in the state offices and daily life became no obligation. In female dressing, the change and modernization took place on its own as a result of the extension of western styles of models through fashion. In fact, throughout the Republican era the issue of dress was perceived as a problem in the urban areas. As there was no use of veil in the rural areas, we do not observe a struggle against these non-used dresses in these areas. After a long period of time, this problem would be locked into the problem of “turban” (headscarf) and would re-merge as a problem of Turkey which is yet to be solved.

Notes

1. For a simplified and Latin script version of this pamphlet, written in 1924, see: İskilipli Muhammed Atif (1977).
2. For İskilipli Atif Hoca-Süleyman Nazif incident, also see: Tahir'ul Mevlevi (1991).
3. In 1920, in the first term of TGNA, the motion, submitted by Bursa Deputy Operatör Emin Bey and Sinop deputy Şevket Bey, for wearing calpac instead of fez was rejected. TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, Devre I, c.1, (29.4.1920), pp.149-150. In 1920, the fact that Mustafa Kemal wore calpac caused a trend named “Mustafa Kemal Fashion” and especially the young started to wear calpac instead of fez. On this subject, see: Karaveli (1999).

4. Of the caps adopted by the Army in July 1925, the ones for the officers were taken from the British Army, and the ones for lower-rank officers and soldiers were taken from the Swiss and Italian armies. While the colorful cloth, laces and laurels that demonstrate the various ranks of the officers were preserved, the stars were replaced by the crescent and star. Furthermore, an official letter of instruction was issued on how to use the new visored caps. *Cumhuriyet*, (July 19, 1925)
5. ‘This small crowd of people who talk about Allah and the right on one hand, but actually acting unscrupulously have reduced the Islam to a matter of serpuş (hat) and a pabuç (shoe) in the end. Probably, rumours about ‘the issue of serpuş’ has been all round because we may not have liberated ourselves completely from the zihniyet-i anane (minds of the old tradition) even today. The issue of serpuş... but could one find a more ridiculous matter than this? What is the relation between religion and serpuş? Religion is a matter of conscience, a matter of comprehending the life and the mystery of the world. Serpuş is, on the other hand, a matter of fashion. It changes constantly. If the mentality that bounds these two matters, and that cannot separate them is still alive, we must be sure that it is alive only in Istanbul. There is no such thing in Anatolia.’ *Cumhuriyet*, (June 16, 1925)
6. ‘Religiously, Islam has no kisvei hususa (a special form of apparel). (“Dinen ve İslamiyetin bir kisvei hususası yoktur. There are no ayeti kerime (verses of the Holy Quran) or a hidayet-i şerif (words of the Prophet Mohammad). It is a pleasurable right for an individual to delude as s/he likes provided that s/he does not impose indecency and depravation. Provided that no exclusive resemblance is born, every Muslim citizen can wear any libas (clothing) and serpuş s/he likes.’ *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, (June 30, 1925)
7. It is understood from the telegram to the Prime Minister that the public greeted Atatürk with the white fabric hats as he greeted them with a Panama hat in his Kastamonu visit. The telegram also notes that Atatürk would not be back to Ankara before 1st of September, and for the upcoming welcome meeting which would be organized for return of the President, the fact that deputies, ministers, intellectuals, officials, and as many people as possible should wear hats would also demonstrate the importance of the matter. *B.C.A Başbakanlık Özel Kalem Fonu*, 030.01.40.238.1
8. Mustafa Kemal describes modern dress in his speech in Inebolu as follows: “I would like to state clearly, scarpino or ankle boots on feet, trousers on legs, cardigans, shirts, ties, collars, jackets and of course as a supplement a visored serpuş. This serpuş is called ‘şapka’ (hat)” Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri (1997).
9. For a detailed information on Atatürk’s visits to Kastamonu and Inebolu, see: İmece (1959).
10. “The goal of the revolutions we have made and are making is to have the people of the Turkish Republic as a modern and, by all means and meanings, a perfect society. It is a must to abolish the opposing mentalities. Those are the ones that have benumbed and corroded the minds so far.” Soyak (1973).

11. The related article of the decree states that “the apparel and the way of clothing of the citizens are exclusively social and suitable for modern life style and since it is understood that they are not actually related to conscience and have been under a public pressure, the apparel of officials have been determined as the same as the common and social apparel of the other nations of the world.” *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, (6th September 1925).
12. For the whole text of the decree, see: *B.C.A Bakanlar Kurulu Kararları Fonu*, (030.18.01.015.54.7)
13. The decree states that there will be nothing on the heads inside the buildings and the greetings will be performed with a head movement such as nodding, and the greeting will be performed with hats outside the buildings. In the *Yeni Adam* magazine, which played a very important role in the adaption of the ideology of the regime, it is uttered in a critical manner that even 10 years after the regulation ‘a man, though he looked like a European with his elegant suit and a felt hat, salutes raising his hand and touching his hat with his four fingers, and even some men bend to the ground while wearing hats, and they do so in order to resist the European version of greeting, while nourishing the unchanged mind despite changing outlook” *Yeni Adam*, (November 1934, vol.:44).
14. After the enactment of the law, upon the persistence of a man called Abdullah Azmi in Eskişehir in not taking off his sarık (turban) and cübbe (cloak), Mustafa Kemal, after having learned about the incident, addressed a telegram instructing the officials to take necessary measures, and stated that the negligent officials should also be punished. *B.C.A Başbakanlık Özel Kalem Fonu*, 030.01.40.239.5
15. For Atatürk’s visits and his speeches in these cities, see: Goloğlu (1972).
16. Other deputies that submitted the motion for ‘hat’ were Cevdet (Kütahya), Hakkı Şinasi (İstanbul), Ragıp (Kütahya), Recep Zühtü (Sinop), Mahmut (Siirt) ve Mükerrrem (Isparta) Beys. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi* (1993).
17. Article 2 in *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* states that Sovereignty unconditionally belongs to the people; Article 68 states Each Turk is born and lives free; Article 70 states The freedoms of personal conscience, expression, action, property ownership and savings are the natural rights of the Turks; Article 71 states Any attack on life, property, honor, abode are prohibited; Article 73 states Torture, torment, confiscation are prohibited; Article 74 states No one can be forced to make self-sacrifices. *TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi*, (1925).
18. Law for Wearing Hat : Article 1: Members of TGNA, officials and the employees in public, private and local administrations, are obliged to wear the hat that the Turkish Nation adopted. The general headdress of the people in Turkey is the ‘şapka’ (hat), and the persistence of any habit in opposition to hat is prohibited by the government. Article 2: This law is valid as soon as it is published in the official gazette. Article 3: The Council of Ministers is responsible for the execution of the law. *TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi* (1925).

19. The memoirs of Refik Halit record how the Turks in Istanbul regarded the hat as a strange dress: "Is a hat molded or not? We've learnt that well. This was the never-imagined one, neither aeroplane nor automobile: to surpass the people with hats in Ayastefanos (San Stefano) one day. They used to look at our generation a bit strange at the time and we would look odd among them. When we got off the train, we used to feel as if we were abroad, or at least in Athens. Karay (1990); For another negative instance on the issue of wearing hats, see: Rıza Nur (1991).
20. During the first days of 1925, a college student walked in the campus with a hat on caused excitement in the whole city, since even the implication of replacing 'fez' with 'hat' was seen as a sign of going astray. The student with the hat had to wrap his head with plasters as if he had a toothache. The witness expresses that wearing a hat was not welcomed in Turkey. See: Robinson, (1963).
21. It is also stated in the news that an ordinary Turkish citizen in Ankara walked around unaccustomedly in şalvar (a traditional baggy trouser), a yellow shirt, a red kuşak (a fabric belt) with a fabric cap and he looked like funny actor in a famous British musical. It is also stated that a citizen wearing a long cotton shirt, rubber shoes and a cap was halted by the municipality officers in the street in İzmir; and that it wasn't a reasonable idea to make an Anatolian wear hat, and that a red kuşak would not go well with a hat. *The Illustrated London News*, (December 26, 1925)
22. It is also stated in the article that after the abolishment of fez, it was a matter of regret to lose the dashing image of the old times. *The Spectator*, (January 11, 1930).
23. Felt hats, which supersede fez, are molded at Thursday nights in order to get them look better on Friday prayers. Owen Tweedy, "Turkey in Modern Dress", *Fortnightly Review*(June 1930).
24. Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın writes in his memoirs that when he was in exile in Çorum, the public ignored the hat he was wearing at the time the Hat Law was introduced, and also relates a rumour, according to which one of the notables of the town, serving as the local chairman of the Republican People's Party [CHP], decided to isolate himself and not to be around in the town in order not to wear a hat. Yalçın (2000).
25. Kazım, one of the Florina emigrants in Alaşehir, Mekkeli Arap Hacı Ahmet in Kayseri, Hafızağazade Hoca Hacı, Nebioğlu Vehbi, Medineli Arap Hacı Mehmet Efendi, Hacı Abdullah from Kars and Mehmet Fahri, one of the individuals of the fighting troop in the Ninth Army Corps, who all resisted not to wear a hat, were sent to Independence Tribunals in accordance with the Takriri Sukün (Re-establishing the Peace) Law with the very will of President Mustafa Kemal. *B.C.A Bakanlar Kurulu Kararları Fonu*, 030.18.01.016/69.1-71.4.
26. For details about the reactions against Şapka Law, see: Aybars, (1998).

27. During the trial at the Independence Tribunals, it is expressed that those who introduced themselves as ‘şapka’ inspectors imposed a fine of 15 Lira on the people saying: “the hat you are wearing is against law, its visor is too big”, and imposed a double amount to those who objected, or sometimes criticized people as if their hats had been dirty or gauche. *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, (September 23, 1926).
28. The author indicates that the hat law made the European hat manufacturers rich at the risk of making the already-poor Turks poorer, and that there were people struggling against ‘hat’, among whom were Islamic opponents, liberals, and others who knew the European spirit. She also stated that those who wore hats were mostly in towns and the Turkish peasants continued to wear the old cap. Halide Edib (1930).
29. According to Halide Edip, there are various reasons why the public have opposed the ‘hat’. Even among the intellectuals, who more or less had a Western culture and wore hats in their journeys abroad, there were oppositions. This is caused by the understanding that the government’s changing the clothing, which is a personal matter, forcibly is seen as a primitive and oriental-like behaviour. The objection of the crowds and the peasants were due to the abundance of those who saw this law as being contrary to religion. Adivar (1955).
30. Mustafa Kemal saw the Egyptian ambassador, who attended the reception with a fez on, sweltering and told him that he could take his fez off. That perception of this incident as an imposition, and the subsequent news spread by the Reuters News Agency made it a big problem and caused the Turkish and Egyptian governments give mutual diplomatic notes. Diplomatic attempts by Numan Memencioğlu helped the incident to settle amicably. Arıkoğlu (1961).
31. In the memoirs of Kutuz Hoca, who was also a cleric, it is stated that the increase in the number of people who applied to the office of Rize Mufti for a permission to wear a turban put the Mufti into a difficult position, and as the Mufti had subsequently worn a hat in accordance with the law enacted, the people found his actions odd. See: Kara (2000).
32. In Antakya, a hoca called Kürt Mehmet, claiming to be a relative of Şeyh Sait, spoke against the Law in a vaaz (speech) he gave in Yeni Cami (Mosque) *Cumhuriyet* (December 19, 1934).
33. In Aydın, the hocas took off their turbans without waiting for the deadline noted in the Law and wore hats in a meeting in Aydın Halkevi (Aydın people house). *Ulus*, (December 4, 1934), Abdülhad , the assignee for the Assyrian Patriarch in Istanbul, wore civilian clothes right after the Law. *Cumhuriyet*, (December 19, 1934)
34. Upon the request of Biçuv İbrahim, who had a weaving shop in Kılıç Ali street in Maraş, to withdraw the prohibition since he stated that 250 people would be unemployed due to the prohibition of wearing aba (strong coarse wool cloth) and şalvar (baggy trousers) , it was announced from the Head Office that the de-

cision would not be withdrawn, but the workers could weave cloths for trousers to compensate. *B.C.A CHP Fonu*, 490.01.17.88.1.

35. Saime Eraslan, aged 66 and one of the founders of Women's Union, stated that she had received death threats as she worked for the prohibition of 'çarşaf' in the TGNA. Eraslan said that she would not give up despite the threats, and she would try to ban the peasants from going into the urban centres in their peasant clothes *Cumhuriyet* (March 20, 1956).

References

- Adıvar, Halide Edip (1955). *Türkiye'de Şark, Garp ve Amerikan Tesirleri*. İstanbul: Dođan Kardeş Yay.
- [Adıvar], Halide Edib, (1930). "Dictatorship and Reforms in Turkey". Ed. by Wilbur L. Cross. vol. XIX. Yale University Press.
- Albayrak, Sadık (Haz.) (1977). İskilipli Muhammed Atf. *Frenk Mukallitliđi ve İslam*. İstanbul: Çile Yay.
- Altay, Fahrettin (1970). *On Yıl Savaş 1912-1922 ve Sonrası*. İstanbul: İnsel Yay.
- Arıkođlu, Damar (1961). *Hatıralarım*, İstanbul: Tan Matb.
- Armstrong, H. C. (1996). *Bozkurt*. trans. Gül Çađalı Güven. İstanbul: Arba Yay.
- Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri II* (1997). Ankara: Atatürk Araş. Mrk.Yay.
- Baydar, Mustafa (1970). "Şapka Konusunda Atf Hoca-Süleyman Nazif Çatışması". *Türk Dili* 23 (230) (November): 132-136.
- Bisbee, Eleanor (1951). *The New Turks Pioneers of the Republic 1920-1950*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dođaner, Yasemin (2002). *Atatürk İnkılaplarının Topluma Yansımaları Ankara Örneđi*. Doktora Tezi. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Gentizon, Paul (1983). *Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Dođu*. trans. Fethi Ülkü. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bak. Yay.
- Golođlu, Mahmut (1972). *Devrimler ve Tepkileri (1924-1930)*. Ankara: Başnur Matb.
- İmece, M. Selim (1959). *Atatürk'ün Şapka Devriminde Kastamonu ve İnebolu Seyahatleri*. Ankara: İş Bankası Yay.
- İsmail Hakkı (1934). "İki Büyük Deđişiklik Kılık ve Dil". *Yeni Adam* 20. 12.1 934 (51): 2-3.
- Jaeschke, Gotthard (1972). *Yeni Türkiye'de İslamlık*. Trans. Hayrullah Örs. Ankara: Bilgi Yay.
- Jevakhoff, Alexandre (1998). *Kemal Atatürk Batı'nın Yolu*. Trans. Zeki Çelikkol. İstanbul: İnkılap Yay.
- Kara, İsmail (2000). *Kutuz Hoca'nın Hatıraları*. İstanbul: Dergah Yay.
- Karaveli, Orhan (1999). *Bir Ankara Ailesinin Öyküsü*. İstanbul: Pergamon Yay..
- Karay, Refik Halid (1960). *Bir Ömür Boyunca*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.

- Kılıç, Selami (1998). *II.Meşrutiyetten Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sine Türk İnkılabının Fikir Temelleri*. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniv. Yay.
- Lewis, Geoffrey (1959). *Turkey*. London: Ernest Benn Ltd.
- Rıza Nur (1991). *Hayatım ve Hatıratım I Dr. Rıza Nur Kendini Anlatıyor*. İstanbul: İşaret-Ferîat Ortak Yay.
- Robinson, Richard D. (1963). *The First Turkish Republic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sitembölükbaşı, Şaban (1999). "Kültür Devrimi Yönüyle Atatürk Reformları". *Türkiye Günlüğü* (56) (Summer): 62-73.
- Soyak, Hasan Rıza (1973). *Atatürk'ten Anılar I*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yay.
- Süleyman Nazif (1925). *İmana Tasallut (Şapka Meselesi)*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Tekfur
- Tahir'ul Mevlevi (1991). *Matbuat Alemindeki Hayatım ve İstiklal Mahkemeleri*. İstanbul: Nehir Yay.
- Tezcan, Hülya (1995). "Fes". *İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol.12. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay: 415-416.
- Türk Parlamento Tarihi TBMM II. Dönem 1923-1927* (1993). Volume II. Ankara: TBMM Yay.
- Tweedy, Owen (1930). "Turkey in Modern Dress". *Fortnightly Review* 127 (June): 811-821.
- Wortham, H.E. (1930). *Mustapha Kemal of Turkey*. London: The Holme Press .
- Yalçın, Bekir Sıtkı-İsmet Gönülal (1984). *Atatürk İnkılabı Kanunlar, Kararlar, Tamimler, Bildiriler, Belgeler*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bak.Yay.
- Yalçın, Hüseyin Cahit (2000). *Siyasal Anılar*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yay.
- Yılmaz, Mustafa (2002). *İngiliz Basını ve Atatürk'ün Türkiye'si*. Ankara: Phoenix Yay.

Türk Modernleşmesinde Şapka Kanunu ve Kılık Kıyafete İlişkin Düzenlemeler

Yasemin Doğaner*

Özet: Cumhuriyet döneminde Atatürk önderliğinde gerçekleştirilen modernleşme olgusunun hayata geçirilebilmesi için buna dayanak oluşturacak bir fikre, ona öncü olacak bir kitleye ve değişimi topluma iletme görevini üstlenecek kurumlara ihtiyaç vardı. Yüzyılın neredeyse ilk çeyreğini savaşlarla geçiren ve iktisadi ve siyasi anlamda çöken İmparatorluğun yerine kurulan genç Cumhuriyet'in elinde kalan insan malzemesini bir arada ve bir amaç uğrunda birleştirebilmek için siyasal alanda gösterdiği kararlılığın bir devamı olarak sosyal, kültürel ve hukuki alanda köklü değişiklikleri gerçekleştirecek kararlar alınmış ve ilk on yılda da bunlar büyük ölçüde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu çalışmada sosyal alanda yapılan en önemli değişikliklerden biri olarak Şapka kanunu ve onu takip eden giyim kuşam konusundaki düzenlemelerin Türk modernleşme sürecinde taşıdığı anlam ve izlediği seyir incelenmeye çalışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Şapka Devrimi, Şapka Kanunu, Türk Modernleşmesi, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Kılık-Kıyafet Düzenlemeleri.

* Hacettepe Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü / ANKARA
ydoganer@hacettepe.edu.tr

Закон о головном уборе и положения об одежде в процессе турецкой модернизации

Ясемин Доганер*

Резюме: Для претворения в жизнь процесса модернизации, проходившей под руководством Ататюрка в период становления Турецкой Республики, необходимы были основополагающая идея, общественный класс как проводник этих идей и институты, на которые возлагались задачи ориентации и претворения в жизнь изменений в обществе. На смену Османской империи, воевавшей почти всю первую четверть двадцатого века и переживавшей экономический и политический упадок, пришла молодая Республика. С целью проведения радикальных изменений в политической, культурной и правовой сферах как выражения политической решимости и для объединения оставшихся человеческих ресурсов и использования их для единой цели были приняты значительные решения, которые в первые десять лет были в значительной степени реализованы. В этой статье показаны значение и процесс претворения Закона о головном уборе и последующих положений об одежде как одного из наиболее важных изменений в социальной области в процессе модернизации.

Ключевые Слова: Революция Шляпы, Закон О Головном Уборе, Турецкая Модернизация, Турецкая Республика, Положения Об Одежде.

* Университет Хажеттепе, Институт принципов Ататюрка и истории республики /Анкара
ydoganer@hacettepe.edu.tr