



**Turkish State Formation and the Distribution of the  
Armenian Abandoned Properties from the Ottoman Empire  
to the Republic of Turkey (1915-1930)**

by

**Mehmet Polatel**

**A Thesis Submitted to the  
Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of  
Master of Arts  
in  
Comparative Studies in History and Society**

**Koc University**

**September 2009**

Koc University  
Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a master's thesis by

Mehmet Polatel

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by the final  
examining committee have been made.

Committee Members:

---

Asst. Prof. Yonca Köksal

---

Assoc. Prof. Dilek Barlas

---

Prof. Dr. Zafer Toprak

Date: 16 September 2009

## **STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP**

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for any award or any other degree or diploma in any university or other institution. It is affirmed by the candidate that, to the best of her knowledge, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Signed                      Mehmet Polatel

## **Abstract**

This study is an attempt to assess the distribution of the Armenian properties left by the Armenian population during the deportations under the control of the late Ottoman and the early Republican state. This distribution issue has been analyzed in terms of the Turkish state formation. This thesis has attempted to display that the Turkish state made use of the Armenian abandoned properties by distributing them to certain groups in alliance with the newly established state in order to get consent of society and consolidate its rule over the populace between three different periods, war period (1915-1917), post-war period (1918-1922) and Republican period (1920-1930). Focusing on the regions of Adana and Ma'muretül'aziz and on the distribution policy of the state, this study has pointed out that this power consolidation and consent seeking resulted in homogenization of Anatolia. This thesis argues that the state adopted three main policies about Armenian abandoned properties which were the settlement of immigrants, the creation of national economy and use of the properties for the needs of the state through the analysis of the laws, decisions and orders of the state and the practice of them. Based on the documents from the Ottoman, British and American state archives, these three policies have been analyzed from the Ottoman state to the Turkish Republic in a comparative perspective.

**Keywords:** state formation, Ottoman Empire, early Turkish Republic, Armenian abandoned properties, settlement of immigrants, national economy, Adana, Ma'muretül'aziz

## Özet

Bu çalışma, tehcire tabi tutulan Ermenilerin bırakmış olduğu malların geç Osmanlı ve erken Cumhuriyet devletinin kontrolü altında dağıtımını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu dağıtım meselesi Türk devlet oluşumu bağlamında incelenmektedir. Bu tez, üç farklı dönem arasında-savaş dönemi (1915-1917), savaş sonrası dönem (1918-1922) ve Cumhuriyet dönemi (1920-1930)- Ermeni emval-i metrukesinin devlet ile ittifak halinde olan belli gruplara dağıtıldığını ve devletin toplumun rızasını almak ve egemenliğini sağlamlaştırmak için bu mülklerden faydalandığını göstermeye çalışmaktadır. Adana ve Ma'muretül'aziz bölgelerinde devletin dağıtım politikalarına odaklanan bu çalışma, belirtilen dönemlerdeki bu egemenlik sağlamlaştırma ve rıza aramanın Anadolu'nun homojenleşmesiyle sonuçlandığını belirtmektedir. Bu tez, devletin, Ermeni emval-i metrukesini yönetmek için muhacirlerin iskanı, milli ekonominin kurulması ve devletin ihtiyaçlarının karşılanması gibi üç ana politika benimsediğini devlet kanunlarını, kararlarını, emirlerini ve bunların uygulamasını inceleyerek tartışmaktadır. Osmanlı, İngiliz ve Amerikan devlet arşivlerinden belgelere dayanılarak bu üç politika Osmanlı devletinden Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ne kadar karşılaştırmalı bir perspektiften incelenmektedir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** devlet oluşumu, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, erken Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Ermeni emval-i metrukesi, muhacirlerin iskanı, milli ekonomi, Adana, Ma'muretül'aziz

*To Hrant Dink*

## **Acknowledgements**

I owe many people gratitude for the completion of this thesis. First of all, I thank to the CSHS faculty for their ceaseless efforts for educating and supporting me during the MA program. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Yonca Köksal for her guidance, advices, criticisms and encouragements throughout the thesis. From the beginning of my master studies, she supported me and helped with my problems in all respects. She endeavored as much as me for this thesis with her priceless experiences, boundless knowledge and energy. She inspired me not only working on this thesis but also in many aspects which granted me new perspectives and viewpoints on social sciences and academic study. I believe that this thesis could not come into life without her valuable comments and insights.

I would also like to thank my committee members Dilek Barlas and Zafer Toprak. I am grateful for their valuable comments and contributions to this thesis. They kindly answered my questions and provided their ideas.

I am especially grateful to Sait Çetinoğlu not only for providing me archival documents and manuscripts I needed but also encouraging me working on such a topic. This thesis would not have been realized without his support. Also, I would like to thank to the Armenian family whose names will be anonymous. They guided me and provided support by sharing their ideas and a plenty of materials about the topic. I am also indebted to Serhat Bozkurt and Bahattin Demir who helped me to transcribe the Ottoman documents and to Alp Kanzık who edited my writing in thesis.

I could not have completed this thesis without support I received from my friends. I specifically thank my good friend Harun Ercan who encouraged me to work on this topic, helped and supported me during the writing process and made my life easier. I have been



blessed with many good friends, Buket Bozacı, Sure Köse, Orhan Sevim and Melih Şengölge who have been with me all along the way with their friendship and support.

I am also deeply indebted to my family. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my father Sefer Polatel, my mother Zayime Polatel and my brother Semih Polatel who have always believed in me and unconditionally supported my efforts.

## Table of Contents

	Statement of Authorship	I
	Abstract	II
	Özet	III
	Acknowledgements	V
	List of Abbreviations	X
1	Introduction	1
	1.1. Theoretical Background: State Formation	9
2	Political Ideas and Economic Policies of the CUP and Kemalists	17
	2.1. Introduction	17
	2.2. The political ideas of the Committee of Union and Progress	17
	2.3. The Economic Policies of the Committee of Union and Progress	26
	2.4. Power Struggle within the Kemalists and Their Political Ideas	33
	2.5. Economic Policies of the Kemalists	39
	2.6. Conclusion: the Relations between the CUP and the Kemalists	47
3	Armenians and the State from the Late Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic	49
	3.1. Armenians in the Ottoman Empire	49
	3.1.1. The Administration of the non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire	49
	3.1.2. Reorganization of the Non-Muslim Millets in the Nineteenth Century	56
	3.1.3. The Armenian Political Organizations and Their Relations with the CUP	65

3.2.	Contention between Armenians and Muslims: the Armenian Massacres	69
3.2.1.	Adana Massacre	75
3.3.	The Homogenization of Anatolia	77
3.3.1.	‘The Armenian Deportations’	80
3.3.2.	The Decisions of the Deportations	83
3.4	The Trial of the Members of the CUP after World War I	91
4	The Legal Process of the Armenian Abandoned Properties	97
4.1	Introduction	97
4.2	‘The land issue’ and Armenian Properties prior to 1915	97
4.3	The Laws, Decrees and Orders about the Abandoned Properties	105
4.3.1	First Period: During World War I (1915-1917)	107
4.3.2	Second Period: Post War Events (1918-1922)	114
4.3.3	Third Period: Republican Period (1920-1930)	116
4.4	Conclusion	125
5	Armenian Abandoned Properties from 1915 to 1930	128
5.1	Introduction	128
5.2	First Period: During World War I (1915-1917)	129
5.2.1	The settlement of Immigrants in the Armenian Abandoned Properties	129
5.2.2	The Creation of National Economy	133
5.2.3	Use for the Needs of the State	136
5.3	Second Period: Post War Events (1918-1922)	139
5.4	Third Period: Republican Period (1920-1930)	149
5.4.1	The Settlement of Immigrants in the Armenian	

	Abandoned Properties	150
	5.4.2 The Creation of National Economy	156
	5.4.3 Use for the Needs of the State	159
	5.4.4 Distribution of the Abandoned Properties to Martyrs	161
	5.5 Adana	163
	5.6 Ma'muretül'aziz	173
6	Conclusion	181
	Bibliography	185
	Appendix 1 BCA/BMGMEK 30.10.01.01.80.529.20	193
	Appendix 2 BCA/BKKK 30.18.01.01.16.72.13	195
	Appendix 3 BCA/TİGMA 272.01.01.11.19.96.19	197

## List of Abbreviations

<b>BCA</b>	Prime Minister's Republic Archive ( <i>Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi</i> )
<b>BKKK</b>	Catalogue of the Council of Ministers Decisions ( <i>Bakanlar Kurulu Kararları Kataloğu</i> )
<b>BMGMEK</b>	Document Catalogue of General Directorate of Transaction of Prime Minister ( <i>Başbakanlık Muamelat Genel Müdürlüğü Evrakı Kataloğu</i> )
<b>BOA</b>	Prime Minister's Ottoman Archive ( <i>Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi</i> )
<b>CPU</b>	Committee of Progress and Union ( <i>Terakki ve İttihat Cemiyeti</i> )
<b>CUP</b>	Committee of Union and Progress ( <i>İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti</i> )
<b>DH.ŞFR</b>	Ministry of Interior Cipher Office ( <i>Dahiliye Nezareti Şifre Kalemi</i> )
<b>DH.KMS</b>	Private Secretariat Directorate of Ministry of Interior ( <i>Dahiliye Nezareti Kalem-i Mahsus Müdürlüğü</i> )
<b>FO</b>	Foreign Office, British Public Record Office
<b>Ibid</b>	In the same place
<b>MAZC</b>	Notable Assembly Minutes Book ( <i>Ayan Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi</i> )
<b>PRP</b>	Progressive Republican Party ( <i>Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası</i> )
<b>RPP</b>	Republican People Party ( <i>Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi</i> )
<b>TİGMA</b>	General Directorate of Land and Settlement Archive ( <i>Toprak ve İskan Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi</i> )

## Chapter 1: Introduction

This study focuses on the distribution of Armenian properties left by Armenian population during the deportations under the control of the late Ottoman and the early Republican state. This study discusses this distribution issue in terms of the Turkish state formation. In this vein, three general questions and one specific question will be answered in the scope of this thesis. First question is about the conditions which lead the ruling elites to establish alliances with some groups within the society and exclude some others according to changes in the state power throughout the state formation process. The other one is on how the nationalist policies changed the economic structure of the state. The last general question to understand the state policies on the Armenian properties is how the war provides conditions for the state to achieve its policies. Lastly, the main question specifically investigates what were the consequences of the Armenian deportations and massacres on socio-economic structure of the Ottoman Empire and on its successor, the Turkish Republic. The process of the distribution of Armenian properties will be studied from 1915 to 1930. Through these questions, the socio-economic policies of the Committee of Union and Progress (hereafter CUP) during World War I and the CUP's attempts to Islamize the Ottoman Empire, and continuation of these policies by Kemalist rulers in terms of Turkification will be analyzed.

The main argument of this thesis is that between three different periods, *1915-1917*, *1918-1922* and *1920-1930*, the state made use of the Armenian properties by distributing them to certain groups in alliance with the newly established state in order to get consent of society and consolidate its rule over the populace. After

focusing on the regions of Adana and Ma'muretül'aziz and on the distribution policy of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic, I show that this power consolidation and consent seeking in the given period resulted in homogenization of Anatolia.

I will focus on the distribution of Armenian abandoned properties (*emval-i metruke*)<sup>1</sup> referring to Armenian properties which were left during deportation including lands, houses and factories in terms of process of Ottoman Turkish state formation. For the purposes of this study, I will analyze three main themes which are related to the distribution of Armenian abandoned properties. These are national economy, settlement of immigrants and the needs for the establishment of Turkish national state. In general, these are important because they are simultaneously formed within the same process. They will be explained briefly in the below pages.

National economy refers to attempts of the CUP to impose economic policies under the control of the state especially after 1913. The state intervened in the economic sphere and tried to create its own incorporated companies and entrepreneurs. The main aim of the policy of national economy is the creation of national bourgeoisie. For this aim, the CUP government assisted Muslim entrepreneurs and abolished privileges of foreign and non-Muslim merchants.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ottoman government after the decision of deportation used the abandoned properties term to refer the properties of Armenians who had to leave during deportations. After the first law of abandoned properties adopted on September 27, 1915 Ahmet Rıza gave a bill of law to reject this law. Ahmet Rıza criticized the use of term abandoned properties since he claims that Armenians did not abandoned their properties but they had to leave. For the discussion about this issue and the opposition of Ahmet Rıza in the Assembly of Notable (*Ayan Meclisi*): MMAZ, 3,2,1, December 13, 1915, p. 133-136

The other point related to the Armenian properties is the settlement of the immigrants from the Balkans and Caucasus. After the Balkan Wars and World War I, there were immigration waves from these regions to the Ottoman Empire, which resulted in a problem for the Ottoman government. With the deportations of Armenians, the government solved this problem by settling immigrants in the evacuated land and satisfying the needs of immigrants from the abandoned properties. This process also contributed to the state's homogenization policy. Like the Ottoman Empire, the new state also continued to settle immigrants who escaped from the invaded regions during and after the War of Independence.

Final theme in the Armenian abandoned properties is the use of the properties for the needs of the state and needs of the establishment of the new nation-state. These consisted of the needs of the people, the military and the government. The buildings and houses from Armenian abandoned properties were used by the state to meet the needs of military and government. In terms of the Armenian abandoned properties, the Turkish Republic continued to apply these policies, but the main purpose of the new ruling elites was to meet the needs of the new nation state.

In this vein, the Armenian abandoned properties and their distribution appeared when these policies were adopted. The CUP government took a decision of deportation of Armenian population in 1915, and its consequences led to severe changes in the socio-economic structure of the Ottoman Empire. The Armenian abandoned properties were the main part of these consequences. The first law about the properties was adopted in May, 1915 with the decision of the deportation. During World War I, new laws were adopted. However, the end of the Ottoman Empire did



not end the significance of the Armenian abandoned properties. The Turkish state also continued to adopt new laws including the distribution of these properties. This also explains why this study chose this periodization specifically because the distribution of the Armenian abandoned properties did not end with the CUP period. It continued in the Kemalist period.

Therefore, considering these policies in terms of the distribution of the Armenian abandoned properties, it can be claimed that liquidations and distributions of the Armenian properties under the control of the state took important part in the formation process of Turkish nation-state from the Ottoman Empire to the Republican period in the light of the policies of national economy.

This process will be analyzed in two regions, namely Adana and Ma'muretül'aziz. These regions were chosen for this study because Armenians took important roles in the political and economic life of these regions. Particularly, Armenian merchants had factories and workshops in different sectors, and there were many Armenian craftsmen who mainly dominated such sector in the regions. Muslim immigrants from Caucasus and Balkans were also settled in these regions during and after World War I. Finally, Armenians formed the majority of Christian population in these regions. In Adana, cotton was produced, and its production was an important part of local economy. Moreover, foreign merchants such as British ones established factories to produce cotton. These foreign merchants generally made business with the Christian population. Thus, they supported the Armenian merchants, and these merchants formed the bourgeoisie within the Ottoman subjects of the sanjak. Ma'muretül'aziz was one of the six provinces of the Ottoman Empire where the

population of the Armenians formed the majority of Christian population. The Harpout plain was not directly a battlefield during World War I, and there was no form of resistance from Armenian population.

This study is a multiple case study. There are two cases which were exposed to deportation policies in this comparative case study. As mentioned before, they are Adana and Ma'muretül'aziz. I will examine some differences and similarities of the demographic structure of these regions. To measure these characteristics, the data of the census will be assessed to reach the population of the Armenians in these regions. There are different studies about the census so they will be used in this study.

Documentary analysis will be used in order to understand the distribution mechanisms of the state. Ottoman archives mainly take important part in this thesis while some documents from the British archives and the reports of American ambassadors and missionaries are also used to strengthen the arguments of this thesis. For the Ottoman archives, the ciphered telegrams which are published by Turkish Republic Prime Ministry General Directorate of the State Archives are utilized to analyze the fate of the Armenian properties. Although these published documents were a selected sample (because this issue is highly debatable in Turkey), it is possible to study them. Additionally, documents in the Archive of Republic (*Cumhuriyet Arşivi*) located in Ankara are utilized in this thesis. Although for the deportations, the documents from the Ottoman archives take significant part of the study, in the case of properties, the Archive of Republic is also very useful since the properties issue continued in the Republican period and many decisions about this issue were taken by the Republican government. In this sense, to conduct research in

the Archive of Republic is a must to understand the complete analysis of the Armenian properties. Indeed, in the Archive of Republic, documents from the catalogue of General Directorate of Land and Settlement Archive, (*Toprak ve İskân Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi*), the Catalogue of Council of Ministers' Decisions (*Bakanlar Kurulu Kararları Kataloğu*) and Document Catalogue of General Directorate of Transaction of Prime Minister (*Başbakanlık Muamelât Genel Müdürlüğü Evrakı Kataloğu*) are used in this study. Despite the fact that the Ottoman and Republican archives had some limitations and restrictions about the deportation issue, the analysis of these documents also provide significant information to understand the Armenian properties issue.<sup>2</sup> The documents from British archives are also used in this study since after World War I Britain had power in the Ottoman Empire and collected many claims about the restitution of the Armenian properties. These claims will be used to understand the period between 1919 and 1922. The American official documents were also important in this time because there were American consulates and many American missionaries in the area. They provide information about the conditions and situations of Armenians to the USA during the war. Some of these documents which are published are also used in the thesis.

Although in the literature there are few important studies which mention the Armenian abandoned properties, it is the first time that this thesis directly focuses on the abandoned properties in academic sense. The contribution of previous studies for this thesis is significant. Some of these studies focus on the management of

---

<sup>2</sup> For the discussions about the limitations and restrictions in the Ottoman archives: Hür, Ayşe (May 25, 2008), "Taşnak Arşivini Bırak, Osmanlı Arşivine Bak", *Taraf*, URL: <http://taraf.com.tr/makale/728.htm>; Deringil, Selim (2002), "The Study of the Armenian Crisis of the late Ottoman Empire, or 'Seizing the Document by the Throat'", *New Perspective on Turkey*, No.27, p.35-59; Ara Sarafian (1999), "The Ottoman Archives Debate and the Armenian Genocide," *Armenian Forum*, V.2: 1, p.35-44

Armenian abandoned properties during World War I but they do not analyze the Republican period in a comparative perspective.<sup>3</sup> Also, there are some indirect studies about this issue but these studies discuss the issue in terms of the Turkification of capital. These studies concentrate on the attempts to Turkify the capital and to eliminate the non-Muslim communities from the economic sphere of the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic.<sup>4</sup> Finally, there are some preliminary researches and/or articles about the Armenian properties.<sup>5</sup>

In this vein, the main contribution of this thesis will be to fill a significant gap in the Armenian studies and studies of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey. The Armenian studies have mainly focused on the reasons of the deportation ignoring the transition period from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic with few exceptions. In terms of the Armenian properties issue, this study aims to contribute these studies through analysis of the consequences of the deportations and their impact on the socio-economic structure of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. The other importance of this thesis is about the debate on the similarities and differences between the Unionists and Kemalists. This thesis is one of the first studies that

---

<sup>3</sup> Akçam, Taner (2008), *Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur: Osmanlı Belgelerine Göre Savaş Yıllarında Ermenilere Yönelik Politikalar*, İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları

<sup>4</sup> Çetinoğlu, Sait (2006), "Sermayenin Türkleştirilmesi", in Fikret Başkaya (ed.) *Resmi Tarih Tartışmaları*, Özgür Üniversite Kitaplığı, p. 91; Aktar, Ayhan (2008), *Varlık Vergisi ve Türkleştirme Politikaları*, 9. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

<sup>5</sup> Marshlian, Levon (1999), Finishing the Genocide: Cleansing Turkey of Armenian Survivors, 1920-1923, in Richard G. Hovannisian, *Remembrance and Denial: the Case of the Armenian Genocide*, Michigan: Wayne State University Press; Matossian, Bedross der (April 21, 2007), "From Confiscation to Appropriation: Historical Continuity and the Destruction of the Armenian Economy in the Ottoman Empire", *Armenian Genocide Insert*, v. 73: 16, URL: [http://www.hairenik.com/armenianweekly/gin042107\\_022.htm](http://www.hairenik.com/armenianweekly/gin042107_022.htm); Kouymjian, Dickran (?) Confiscation of Armenian Property and the Destruction of Armenian Historical Monuments as a Manifestation of the Genocidal Process, URL: <http://armenianstudies.csufresno.edu/faculty/kouymjian/articles/confiscation.htm>

establish a link between them through the analysis of the distribution of Armenian properties.

This thesis consists of four main chapters. Before explaining these four chapters, the literature about the state formation will be introduced in terms of the state-society relations. First chapter focuses on the political and economic policies of the CUP and the Kemalists in comparative sense. This provides information about ideological debates among the Young Turks “to save the empire” and discusses the path toward the adaptation of Turkism by the Unionists. The policies to establish national economy and create national bourgeoisie will be analyzed. In the second section of this chapter, the rise of the Kemalist movement and the opposition to this movement will be discussed in reference to the continuity and/or rupture from the previous period. Additionally, the economic policies of the Kemalists within first ten year period will be elaborated by comparing the policies of the CUP.

Second chapter concentrates on the situation of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire from the beginning. Indeed, after the analysis of the relatively tolerant period of the early Ottoman rule, this chapter will discuss why the relations between Armenians and Muslims evolved into a bloody hostility. The atrocities committed by the Ottoman Empire from the Hamidian period to World War I will be deeply elaborated in the scope of this chapter.

Chapter three focuses on the legal processes about the Armenian properties during and after the deportations. Before the analysis of this legal process, in the first part of the chapter “the land issue” resulted from the Hamidian atrocities will be analyzed

in terms of the report published by the Armenian Patriarchate in 1911. Despite the fact that these properties were seized by Kurdish and Circassian people during the Hamidian era, this issue took significant part in the relations between Armenian political organizations and the CUP. In the second part of chapter three, the laws, decrees, orders and other decisions about the Armenian abandoned properties legislated by the Ottoman and Republican governments between 1915 and 1930 will be analyzed in a comparative perspective.

Chapter four concentrates on the practice of this legal process. The distribution mechanism of the Armenian abandoned properties will be elaborated in three periods, namely war period, post-war period and the Republican period. Through the analysis of these periods, based on the archival documents, the questions of how and why the state distributed the Armenian properties will be discussed. In the second part of this chapter, the distribution of the Armenian properties will be analyzed in two cases including Adana and Ma'muretül'aziz.

### ***1.1. Theoretical Background: State Formation***

I will examine some theories which analyze the state formation processes and relations between state and society in order to understand the interactions between the state and society in the Turkish state formation. The statist approaches advocated by Theda Skocpol see “the state conceived as organizations claiming control over territories and people may formulate and pursue goals that are not simply reflective of the demands or interests of social groups, classes, or society (Skocpol, 1985: 9). This approach emphasizes on the autonomous power of the state and its insulation from the society. Also, they criticize the Marxist approach which mainly focuses on

the state as an instrument of bourgeoisie class. Michael Mann claims that Marxist, liberal and the functionalist traditions of theory of the state explain it “as a place, an arena, in which the struggles of classes, interest group and individuals are expressed and institutionalized, and they are united in denying significant autonomous power to the state (Mann, 1993: 331). Both Skocpol and Mann argue that these kinds of approach ignore the autonomous power of the state and reduce it to either to the instrument of interest groups (in case of pluralism) and to the class dominations (in case of Marxism). However, this statist approach sees the state as *sui generis* and ignores the importance of the society as a factor during the formation process.

Joel S. Migdal, Atul Kohli and Vivienne Shue criticize these statist claims and offer *the state in society perspective* which is also adopted in this thesis. According to this model, these scholars claim that the state is not independent from the society. Rather, “states are parts of societies. States may help mold but they are also continually molded by, the societies within which they are embedded” (Migdal, Kohli and Shue, 1994: 2). They mainly emphasize on the role of social forces and the interactions between the state and these forces. In their words, “if states have to be viewed in their social contexts, it is important to study not only the peak organizations of states and key social groups, often located at the center of the polity in the capital city but also state-society interactions at the periphery” (Migdal, Kohli and Shue, 1994: 3). The other point of their approach is about mutual advantage of the interactions between the state and social forces. They claim that these kinds of interactions may create more power for the state and social segments and both mutually benefit from these interactions. This shows that state and society relations are not zero-sum conflict.

The other important frame for this thesis is *the relations between the war and the state*, and *state-led nationalism*. Two studies of Charles Tilly, namely the book *Coercion, Capital and European States* (1992) and the article *Warmaking and Statemaking as Organized Crime* (1982), mainly focus on the relations between war and state. In these studies, Tilly explains the formation of the European nation states and shows the long term contribution of war to this formation. Tilly states the ideal type for the formation of European nation states and emphasizes that in order to survive the state has to achieve state-making, war-making, protection and extraction. In the European state-making experience, these four activities were interdependent. In this relation, war-making led to increased extraction of the means of war such as men and arms. The activity of extraction entailed the elimination, neutralization or cooptation of rival or dominant class such as landlords. Tilly notes that, “War-making likewise caused state-making through the expansion of military organization itself, as a standing army, war industries, supporting bureaucracies and (rather later) schools grew up within the state apparatus” (1982: 18). Through this ideal schema, Tilly attempts to explain the formation of the states in Europe. In my study, I will try to apply this schema to the Ottoman Empire in terms of the effects of World War I and the policies of the CUP.

Tilly claims that during this process, the organic relations between state and society emerged, and he discusses the negotiation and bargaining process between state and society. Bargaining processes created individual and collective claims on the state, individual and collective state vis-a-vis the state and obligations of the state to its citizens (Tilly, 1992). During the war period, to finance the war and take consent



from the society, according to Tilly, “a population divides into enemy classes and the state extends its favors partially to one class or another, state-making actually reduces the protection given some classes” (1982: 16). These negotiation and alliance processes directly related to the consolidation of state rule. As Antony Marx argues, the state should ensure consent yet without constant resort to force. In other words, during the state-building process, the state needs some resources, or to recruit armies. If the state did not provide popular cohesion and unity, it did not achieve these needs. As Marx points out; “internal conflicts and diversity remained or grew within large scale polities, with the political incorporation of new territory, peoples, immigrants, or factions into states, threatening political unity” (2002: 13). Thus, the state should consider this diversity while consolidating its rule. According to Marx, the state uses inclusionary and exclusionary tools to provide cohesion and allegiance. Indeed, the state and its rulers exclude an internal “other” as a common enemy while encouraging and supporting an included group which makes an alliance with the state. In the alliance-making process, the state rewards and encourages these groups for legitimacy, its preservation and centralization.

This discussion about the state-society relations means that the state has to establish alliances with some groups or classes in society. In light of this argument, I will try to explain how the CUP financed the war and how it established its alliances. During World War I, the CUP tried to achieve its policies including the development of a national economy, the creation of national bourgeoisie and elimination of the opponent groups or fractions in the state. In other words, the CUP used the war and profited from the conditions of war in order to realize these policies. Indeed, establishing alliances with different groups of society provided fruitful opportunities

for these aims. The Unionists and the newly emerging commercial Muslim bourgeoisie, who were both the former officials and were members of the CUP, founded an alliance to create a national economy. This is significant because the CUP aimed to achieve a centralized state while an emerging commercial Muslim bourgeoisie required capital to establish firms or to make trade. In this respect, Muslimization of Armenian abandoned properties was useful for the realization of these aims. This process also continued after the demise of the empire and establishment of new Turkish state by the Kemalists. Kemalists also advocated this Muslimization policy and continued similar alliances to establish a nation state. In this thesis, it will be claimed that the formation of the Turkish state includes capital-coercion intensive paths and features of these paths changed its policies.

*The relations between top-down and bottom-up power* related to the state in society perspective in the process of the state formation will be discussed as a part of the theoretical framework of this study. This is significant because the general understanding about the formation of the Turkish state is that Mustafa Kemal and his friends established the state from above, or top-down. Instead, I argue that in the formation process, the state rulers made some alliances and took consent from some groups within the society at the expense of the others. Just a top-down conception of power would not explain this process. Tilly (1999) discusses the relations of these powers in his article, “*Survey Article: Power-Top Down and Bottom Up*”, and criticizes arguments which ignore the interactions between top-down and bottom-up power. Tilly claimed that these arguments “failed to recognize negotiated character of power” (Tilly, 1999: 344). In other words, the state should create interaction with society through these processes in order to generate its policies. Antony Marx gave

importance to this bargaining process and did not ignore the power of bottom-up. He claims that the state must take consent from below. Indeed, “to build national cohesion came not only from power above needing to reach down but also encountered assertions from below fed by linguistic and economic developments” (Marx, 2002: 16). This shows that the state should bargain with some groups within society because use of force to prevent resistance and discontent might not be enough. Therefore, these processes will be used to explain the state and society relations in the late Ottoman Empire and early Republican period. Consequently, through analysis of bargaining and negotiated processes between the state and society, I will cover the interactions between the top-down and bottom-up power in the case of the Turkish state formation.

Finally, I will give more emphasis of the attempts of the rulers and elites and their relations with each other because they are influential in making state policies. Elites will be divided into two categories, namely state elites and local elites since I aim to focus on alliance between these elites and on intra-elite conflicts within and between them. Local elite is a broad category and consists of different classes, namely, landowners, commercial bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, peasants and workers. State, or bureaucratic elites are defined as Mann point out that they are officials “separated from ownership of office by an employed, salaried status and appointed, promoted, and dismissed according to impersonal criteria of competence...[In addition], their offices are rationally arranged by function and hierarchy, and are similarly arranged into single, centralized administration” (Mann, 1993: 444; 422). This analysis also helps us to understand relations between the state and dominant classes because in spite of arguments of instrumentalist understanding of the state, the attempts of state

rulers merely to perform state functions may create conflicts of interest with the dominant classes. Sometimes, the state has its own distinct interests vis-à-vis subordinated classes. Finally, both state and the dominant classes share a broad interest in keeping the subordinate classes in place in society and at work in the existing economy but the state's own fundamental interest in maintaining sheer physical order and political peace may lead it to enforce concessions to subordinate class demands and these concessions may be at the expense of the interests of the dominant class (Skocpol, 1979: 30).

Under the light of this theoretical framework, this study attempts to understand the distribution of Armenian properties in terms of the Turkish state formation. In the first period (1915-1917), the CUP was the major power and imposed its policies without any opposition. However, this period was the war period, namely World War I. Thus, the CUP government benefited from the opportunities of this war in order to realize its policies. One of the most important policies was to create a national economy and the other to homogenize Anatolia. Another importance of this period is the decision to deport the Armenian population in 1915. The deportation had severe impact on the social structure of the Ottoman Empire. The end of World War I also ended this period and the CUP lost its power.

In the second period (1918-1922), the post-war developments took significant place. The new İstanbul government was established to replace the Unionist government. It had different policies and judged the members of the CUP who were accused of crimes committed during the war and deportations. Also, the Allied Powers

pressured on the government to change its policies towards the non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire.

The third period (1920-1930) started with the “National Movement” led by Mustafa Kemal and his friends. During this period, the Ottoman Empire collapsed and the Republic of Turkey was established. However, this establishment did not show the power of the state because there were many opposition groups against the Kemalists. At the end of this period, the Kemalists overthrew these oppositions, namely some of the former CUP members and the Kurdish movement (Zürcher, 1984). In this period, the Turkish state imposed its policies and tried to consolidate its rule by new rules and regulations. Except for Kurdish uprisings, the Turkish state completed this construction process without significant opposition (Tuncay, 1999). Consequently, these periods will be used to show the process of the nation state formation from the CUP to Kemalists through their similarities and differences. At different times, there appeared new strategies, new opportunities and unintended consequences for the rulers and social groups. Under the light of this theoretical framework, an analysis of these consequences is also the main problem for this study in terms of the Armenian abandoned properties.

## **Chapter 2: Political Ideas and Economic Policies of the CUP and Kemalists**

### ***2.1. Introduction***

There are many studies on the CUP and Kemalism from different perspectives. In this chapter, I will analyze the works of leading scholars in order to understand the political ideas and economic policies of the CUP and Kemalists. The main purpose of this chapter is to compare these works and to analyze the similarities and differences of the Unionists and Kemalists. First, I will discuss the ideas of the CUP and their evolution throughout the changing internal and external dynamics of the Ottoman Empire. Second, I will analyze the emergence of the Kemalist policies. Finally, I will examine the relations between the Unionists and Kemalists in terms of the similarities and differences of their ideas.

### ***2.2. The political ideas of the Committee of Union and Progress***

M. Şükrü Hanioglu analyzes the Young Turks and their ideas before the 1908 revolution in his book, *Preparation for a Revolution, 1902-1908* (Hanioglu, 2001). His main argument about the Young Turks is that they were not a unique organization, and that they included various groups. However, the main policies of the Young Turks were to save the empire, to overthrow Abdülhamid II and to reestablish the constitutional regime of 1876 which was abandoned by Abdülhamid II in 1878. Hanioglu mentions the emergence of three groups within the Young

Turks after the 1902 Congress of Ottoman Opposition.<sup>6</sup> They were “the so-called majority, an alliance between the followers of Ahmet Rıza and the so-called activists and finally the remaining members of the old CUP organization” (Hanioglu, 2001: 8). The so-called majority referred to the people under the leadership of Prince Sabahattin while the second group included Ahmet Rıza and so-called majority including Bahattin Şakir and Dr. Nazım. The last group was not major and included the people who published the journal about Turkish nationalism in Egypt.

The first group formed the Ottoman Freedom-lovers Committee (*Osmanlı Hürriyetperveran Cemiyeti*) after the 1902 Congress and covered the League of Private Initiative and Decentralization under the leadership of Prince Sabahattin Bey. Politically, this group defended foreign intervention of Great Powers to overthrow Abdülhamid II and advocated the decentralization to save the empire. This decentralization means the establishment of a federal structure. In economic sphere, they offered the minimum state intervention.

The second group was formed by Ahmet Rıza, the leader of Young Turk movement between 1895 and 1902 and by the activists. Unlike the group of Sabahattin Bey, this group criticized the policies of Great Powers and advocated anti-imperialism. It is because “whenever the Great Powers intervened in our domestic affairs they

---

<sup>6</sup> Feroz Ahmad also mentions about the differences within the Young Turks but Ahmad divides them into two categories: the Unionists and the Liberals. The latter came largely from the prosperous and conservative element in Ottoman Society and was socially above the former. Prince Sabahattin was the leading figure in this group. Under Prince Sabahattin’s ideas, they advocated decentralization in government and offered autonomy for ethnic groups of the Ottoman Empire. Economically, they maintained a laissez-faire economic system and minimum intervention of the state in economic sphere (Ahmad, 2008:4). The former came from lower and middle class in the Ottoman Empire and included mainly of professional men. They did not aim to maintain the status quo. Unlike the Liberals, they wanted a centralized government and aimed at ending the system of religious communities (the ‘millet’ system).

concluded their intervention by separating an element of the empire from us or obtained new privileges for profiteers and missionaries” (Hanioglu, 2001: 34). Also, they rejected decentralization because they claimed that this could cause the dissolution of the empire. In other words, non-Muslim communities would try to separate from the Ottoman Empire. Finally, they advocated Turkish policy to save the empire. This means that the policies oriented to the Turkish elements were necessary to prevent the dissolution of the empire. They claimed that the activities of the non-Turkish ethnic groups were always against the Turks and directed to ethnic separatism (Hanioglu, 2001: 40). After the loss of lands to the Christian nations, this strong nationalism shaped the new Young Turk conviction.

Nevertheless, in 1905, this coalition group was transformed, and activists referring to Bahattin Şakir, Dr. Nazım, Talat Bey, Ömer Naci and Enver Bey became the leading figures. Previously, this coalition under the scientific ideology of Ahmet Rıza advocated non-revolutionary and evolutionary change within the Ottoman Empire. This position was criticized by the activists who defended immediate change to solve the problems of the Ottoman Empire. In 1906, the activists reorganized the committee through limiting Ahmet Rıza who considered himself as the natural leader of the entire movement to a regular membership. These new leading figures did not want to give Ahmet Rıza a role in the decision making process of the movement because Ahmet Rıza was against revolutionary change and strongly admired positivism. In the new organization, Ahmet Rıza became the director of correspondence in foreign languages. This reduced the position of Ahmet Rıza from the charismatic leader to a regular member in the organization. Under the leadership of Bahattin Şakir, the committee was reorganized, and new regulations for the



organization were prepared by Şakir. The name of the organization was the Committee of Progress and Union (hereafter CPU) which was renamed as the Committee of Union and Progress later following the revolution. This new organization was described as reorganization by the founders, which enabled them to own heritage of the old CUP (Hanioğlu, 2001: 130-141). This transformation also indicated the political ideas of the Young Turks because they “shifted from grand theories aimed at reshaping the world order to simpler and more narrowly political doctrines and tactics” (Hanioğlu, 2001: 289). The new organization gave little attention to the grand theories and some concepts including science, progress and natural laws because they were of little help to resolve the great problems of the Ottoman Empire (Hanioğlu, 2001: 294). Therefore, pragmatic activism became the agenda and enabled the CUP to play major role in the revolution of 1908.

According to Hanioğlu, in spite of its lack of political organization, third group played an important role in Turkish nationalism. The journal published in Cairo, “Turk (*Türk*), can be considered as a cornerstone in the molding of Turkish nationalist ideology” (Hanioğlu, 2001: 65). The articles of this journal focused on Turks not only in the empire but also outside the empire. The articles discussed the Turkish race in the pre-empire period coming from the Central Asia. They rejected foreign intervention and accused European powers of waging a crusade against the Turks. This journal disappeared in November 1907 after making an important impact on the development of Turkish nationalist ideology (Hanioğlu, 2001: 73). In spite of their significant role in the development of Turkish nationalist ideology, the third group was of little importance from organizational viewpoint.

After the analysis of the different groups within the Young Turks, I will analyze the political ideas of Young Turks until the 1908 revolution. First, an attitude of Young Turks towards Ottomanism, Turkism and Islamism is a debatable issue and different scholars reached different conclusions. According to Hanioglu, the CPU had adopted a Turkist ideology in its early days. Until late 1907, its propaganda included strong Turkist or even Turkish nationalist themes. However, by late 1907, the CPU had comprehended the difficulty of carrying out revolution with maintaining the strong Turkist ideology. Thus, “despite their Turkist proclivities, the new leaders viewed Turkism like Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism as a tool to be used to fulfill their supreme political goal: the salvation of the empire” (Hanioglu, 2001: 296). By the early 1908, they used Turkism, Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism interchangeably in their propaganda. In their publications including Turkish Homeland (*Türk Yurdu*), despite their Turkist proclivities, they did not include any article to harm the policy of Ottomanism. This interchangeable usage of the policies can be clarified in the discussion between Ahmet Ferit and Yusuf Akçura. The latter wrote the article “Three Political Systems” (Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset) in which Akçura discusses the advantages and disadvantages of three policies in order to save the empire. With the ambiguous evaluation of these policies, it can be claimed that Akçura concludes that “to pursue a Turkish nationalism based on race” is the best policy. However, Ahmet Ferit criticizes this idea and claims that “the best policy for the Ottoman state was an opportunist one, that is, to use Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamist policies to its own advantage” (Hanioglu, 2001: 299). Although he did not deny the usefulness of Turkism in the long run, he argued that Ottomanism preserved the national existence of the empire. This had also become the agenda of the CUP for the late 1907.

The other claim of Hanioglu is about the interpretation of Ottomanism by the CUP. He maintains that theoretically, the CUP's Ottomanism viewed all Ottomans as equals. However, in their publications, they gave a dominant role to the Turkish element in the Ottoman Empire. Ahmet Rıza claims that "despite being Ottomans, these elements are not interested in the maintenance of this Ottoman government as Turks are. Most of them work together with the European consuls" (Hanioglu, 2001: 299). After the revolution, this version of Ottomanism created the clash with non-Turkish communities. In early 1908, the CUP imposed on itself the duty that prevents any activity of separation from the empire. In the negotiation between these two parts, there appeared two important facts. On the one hand, in spite of the claim of the CUP to represent all Ottomans, the non-Turkish organizations viewed the CUP as representing only Turks in the empire. On the other hand, the CUP understood that the non-Turkish organizations regarded their communities as defined and distinct nationalities within the empire and believed that they did not give up their ethno-religious characteristics of their communities by adopting Ottomanism (Hanioglu, 2001: 301).

Tarik Zafer Tunaya (1984), Feroz Ahmad (1999) and Erik J. Zürcher (2001) are other scholars who work on the CUP. According to the studies of Tunaya, Ahmad and Zürcher, Ottomanism became the official ideology of the 1908 revolution. This continued until the coup d'état of 1913. However, from the revolution until the coup, Greeks, Armenians and Bulgarians did not give up their particular goals. In 1910, Muslim Albanians preferred Albanian identity rather than the Ottoman one. In addition, the interpretation of Ottomanism of the CUP was different and it meant the Turkification of the non-Muslim communities. Tunaya argues that the Unionists

advocated Ottomanism through offering the ideology of common homeland (*vatan-ı umumi*). They believed that through Ottomanism, the state could be saved. However, Tunaya emphasizes that in the rise of nationalist movements in the Ottoman Empire from Balkans to the Arab world and considering Turkism among the Unionists, nobody believed in Ottomanism and the union of cultures (*ittihâd-ı anâsır*) of the CUP. He claimed that the CUP adopted Turkish nationalism and that Ottomanism was only a mask to save the state (Tunaya, 1984: 307).

The Balkan Wars of 1913 were the cornerstone for the loss of popularity of the Ottomanism. During the Balkan Wars, the CUP propagated Ottomanism and aimed to unite all Muslims and non-Muslims under the Ottoman nation. According to Eyal Ginio, it depends on the assumption that “the different religious and ethnic groups inhabiting the Ottoman state could be united under the vague ideology of a secular multi-ethnic Ottoman nationality-Ottomanism” (Ginio, 2005: 158). However, this expectation did not realize during the war because the Christian population of the Balkan states did not admire Ottomanism. The other reason was that “the non-Muslim soldier proved to be untruthful in battle” (Ginio, 2005: 175). In spite of the hope of fighting during the war as one nation, the Balkan Wars ended Ottomanism and the Ottoman state tried to replace Ottomanism with alternate policies including Islamic Ottomanism and Pan-Turkism. Ginio claims that the secular Ottomanism including the non-Muslim communities was ended and the vitality of Islam was more emphasized. From this time, the Islamic symbols were mainly used in the wars such as World War I. This Islamic Ottomanism excluded the non-Muslims (Ginio, 2005: 177).

According to Zürcher, after the Balkan Wars, Pan-Turkism and Turkish nationalism became the new agenda for the CUP. On the one hand, Pan-Turkism aimed to unite all Turks not only inside the Ottoman Empire but outside the Ottoman Empire. However, until the Balkan Wars, there was no official approval of this policy. As Zürcher points out; “during the First World War, Pan-Turkism was stimulated by the Young Turks in the context of the struggle with Russia” (Zürcher, 2001: 134). On the other hand, the second type of Turkish nationalism was developed which competed with Pan-Turkism. This new type was based on Anatolia as the central area of land for Turks. According to Zürcher, this type advocated the idea of populism (*halkçılık*) which aimed to create national solidarity during the war. Towards the People (*Halka Doğru*) established in 1917 in İzmir represented the Turkish nationalism and was founded by the CUP (Zürcher, 2001: 135).

On the other hand, Feroz Ahmad claims that after the defeat of Balkan Wars and loss of lands to Italy and new Balkan states, the Unionists revised their ideologies. However, the components of their ideology-Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism- could not be abandoned. Instead of giving up from all of these ideologies, they chose only one of them to emphasize it more than others. According to Ahmad, in spite of increasing importance of Turks which became a statistically significant group in the Ottoman Empire, the CUP emphasized Islam more than nationalism because Turkish nationalism was only common among some intellectuals in İstanbul. Although the CUP included many intellectuals including Ziya Gökalp, they continued to depend on Islam. The appointment of Sait Halim Pasha, who adopted Islamism, as a grand vizier was not a coincidence. Another factor of the use of Islam as a policy is that most Turks considered themselves firstly as Muslims and depended

on the Ottoman Dynasty which represented the sultanate and the caliphate. Not only Turks but also Muslim Arabs and Kurds cherished the Ottoman Dynasty. Therefore, this policy was useful for the CUP to mobilize people during the war time. The Unionists continued using Islam as a political tool during World War I to take loyalty from Arabs and Muslim inhabitants of the colonies (Ahmad, 1999: 53; Zürcher, 2001: 135-137).

In short, it can be argued that the leaders of the CUP were not ideologues but men of action. They were ideologically eclectic and did not share a common ideological programme. Rather, they advocated a mix of attitudes: nationalism, positivism, faith in the power of education, implicit belief in the role of the central state as the prime mover in society and a belief in change, in progress.

Above, I have tried to explain the political ideas of the CUP from different scholar's viewpoints. These scholars emphasized the Balkan War of 1913 as a cornerstone in the political shift of the CUP: The Balkan Wars marks the shift from Ottomanism to Turkism. However, all accept that the CUP was an eclectic organization and used different political ideas as a tool. It was a pragmatic party. Therefore, Ottomanism, Islamism and Turkism came to agenda at the same time but under different circumstances. Now, I will analyze the economic understanding of the CUP from 1908 to the end of World War I.

### ***2.3. The Economic Policies of the Committee of Union and Progress***

Zafer Toprak analyzes the economic policies of the CUP in two periods. The first is between 1908-1913 and the second 1913-1918. In the first period, he argues that the Unionists adopted the English model for economic development. This means that the CUP tried to establish liberal economies in the Ottoman Empire. Unionists like Cavit Bey advocated liberal economy because they claimed that “capital was necessary for the state to reach civilization” (Toprak, 1982: 24). However, due to the wars, the popularity of liberal views declined. The other reason for the decline of liberal views was that the Unionists hoped that the liberal policies including free trade and the encouragement of the foreign investments would enable them to gain the cooperation of the European powers, which would lead to increase in the foreign investment in the Ottoman Empire. In addition, after earning respect from these powers, they would abandon their privileges and the Ottoman state would become equal to other states. However, the foreign investment did not rise. Attempts for the abolishment of the capitulations were failed due to the rejection of European powers. Also, Britain and France refused to grant the Ottoman Empire loans. In that time, Germany intervened in the situation, and through Deutsche Bank, German government provided loans for the Ottoman Empire. In this respect, the CUP government did not gain cooperation from the European powers since they were frightened by the nationalism of the CUP (Zürcher, 2001: 128-129). Britain was also afraid of the constitutional regime because India and Egypt could follow the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the liberal views began to lose its popularity. Market mechanisms lost their efficiency. In this period, the Unionists began to adopt the German model in their economic policies. This was the model of the national economy.

Friedrick List prepared this type of the economic model by criticizing the liberal policies of British Manchesterians who provided framework for the English economy. According to List, the British model suited England and it was not considered a general and universal model. Rather, based on the uniqueness of England, this model offered a national economic model according to England's industrialized economy and imperialist policies (Toprak, 1994: 264). Because England was an enormous industrialized country, and because it needed to export the manufactured products and import raw materials, the open trade policy was appropriate for this country. However, if a country which had not established big industry applied this policy, they would depend on the countries like England. According to Gökalp, leading CUP ideologists who were affected by the ideas of List, the Ottoman Empire should have established the national economy according to its own conditions. As Taha Parla claims, there are three meanings in the policy of national economy of Gökalp. The first was the advanced division of labor, organic/occupational solidarity and interdependent modern and developed market. The second was the nationalist and solidaristic economy which did not include class conflict or private interests. The last was the nationalist state capitalism (Parla, 1993: 192-193). This was the sign of the shift within the idea of Gökalp on economy. The liberal view lost its popularity.

According to Zafer Toprak, "Ziya Gökalp and Tekin Alp criticized liberal policies, and they emphasized the role of the state in economy. According to some publications such as New Periodical (*Yeni Mecmua*) and Turkish Homeland, the national economy means that every nation had their own economics and institutions which carried out its economy. Unlike classical economy, the national economy



advocated concrete development” (Toprak, 1982: 29). Toprak argues that this shows the impact of the German economists. Gökalp’s and Tekinalp’s ideas provide conceptual framework for the national economic policy. They advocated economic development and industrialization under state supervision. This did not mean the suppression of the private sector. Rather, “the state would act as an intermediary between public and private sectors” (Toprak, 1994: 265). In this respect, the ‘national economy’ also had different meanings among the Unionists. Gökalp used the ‘guild economy’ derived from Durkheimian sociology and which was based on crafts whereas Tekinalp originated from German ‘national economy’. According to Gökalp, national economy meant market economy with an advanced division of labor and did not include class conflict. He refuted class conflict and offered national economy with no class tensions. However, Tekinalp criticized Gökalp’s emphasis on solidarity. By underscoring the inevitability of class in the capitalist system, he claimed that to advance in civilization necessitated capitalist development (Toprak, 1994).

In practical sense, the Balkan Wars and the Muslim Boycott of 1913 were the crucial starting point in search for a national economic policy. (Toprak, 1994: 260) During that period, Muslims were advised to emulate their non-Muslim companies in the trades and to buy from their co-religious shopkeepers. With World War I, the CUP took a radical decision to realize the aims of the national economy: “Even before the war, in June 1914, a Law on the Encouragement of Industry had been promulgated, which stipulated that products of Ottoman industry would be preferred, even if they were as much as 10 percent more expensive than the imported equivalent” (Zürcher, 2001: 130). With the war, capitulations were abolished and payments of debts were

delayed. The CUP adopted protectionist policies in international trade and new customs tariffs were applied for infant industry. Also, language reform was realized, and Turkish became the necessary language in all official accounting and business correspondences. Therefore, in few months of the attempts of national economy, around 600 shops were opened in the different districts of İstanbul. Also, the Unionist nominees directed most of institutions including the National Weighers' Company and the National Bakers' Company. During the war period, the CUP aimed to establish its own banks. In January 1917, National Credit Bank (*İtibar-ı Millî Bankası*) was founded (Toprak, 1994: 262). In this vein, Tunaya discusses the idea of the CUP on foreign capital and argues that in spite of the policies of the national economy, the CUP did not eliminate foreign capital. Rather, the CUP gave guarantee of the security to foreign businessmen in the Ottoman Empire. According to Tunaya, it was necessary for the state to improve economy both because in the Ottoman Empire capital was insufficient and because Muslim bourgeoisie was not strong (Tunaya, 2007: 401-408).

In the late war period, the understanding of economy by the CUP changed because of the social consequences of the national economy. Inequalities in income widened and the majority of the lower strata worsened. "Individual interests endangered public well-being". (Toprak, 1994: 265) Thus, the state started to protect the common interests of the nation. They considered that liberal thought harmed the national harmony. This new policy was named as "state economy" (*devlet iktisadiyatı*). However, this view of statism did not aim to suppress the private sectors by the state. Rather, the state encouraged the private entrepreneurs and provided appropriate conditions for them. According to Toprak, this means that "since the natural

harmony that liberal thought assumed had lost its credibility, the state had to interfere on behalf of the have-nots” (Toprak, 1994: 265). The role of the state in the economy was an intermediary between the private and the public sphere. Therefore, both sectors might gain profits under the support of the state. According to Toprak, this was the archetype of Republican statism (Toprak, 1994: 265).

On the one hand, like Toprak and Tunaya, Zürcher analyzes the economic policies of the CUP in two periods, and the Balkan Wars was the cornerstone in the change of the policies. On the other hand, unlike Toprak who emphasized the effects of Gökalp and Tekinalp, Zürcher claims that Alexander Helphand known as Parvus played an important role in shifting from liberal economy to national economy: “He advocated nationalist economic policies and the building of an indigenous merchant and industrial bourgeoisie in the number of articles in the journal Turkish homeland” (Zürcher, 2001: 129). The ideas of Parvus gained importance after the coup of the CUP. The state began intervening in economic sphere and in the following years, national economy (*Milli Ekonomi*) became the economic model in which German industrialization served as an example. Feroz Ahmad also emphasizes on the role of Parvus by quoting from Niyazi Berkes, “probably influenced by Parvus’s socialism and inspired by the economic development of the bourgeoisie of the Turkish speaking people of Russia, they developed the idea of economic nationalism and the policy of etatism in order to combat the economic bondage of the Turkish masses to the European economy and to foster the economic growth of a middle class which would be the carrier of the economic interests of the Turkish nationality within the Ottoman Empire” (Ahmad, 2008: 39). As Asım Karaömerlioğlu points out, Parvus contributed to the policy of national economy by giving it an anti-imperialist and

anti-liberal character. Parvus advocated that the debts of Europe created a relation of exploitation relation and the capitulations became an instrument for this relation. Indeed, the Ottoman Empire had to gain economic independence in order to abolish this exploitation (Karaömerlioğlu, 2001: 305-306). Thus, with the outbreak of World War I, the CUP government immediately abolished the capitulations to gain financial independence. Suspension of payment on the national debt followed the abolishment.

According to Zürcher, “the programme of the National Economy gained impetus after the unexpected triumph at Gallipoli”, which increased Turkish morale and nationalism (Zürcher, 2001: 130). Ziya Gökalp wrote during this time: “One of the factors which will give to the Turks the character of a nation and contribute to the formation of a Turkish culture is the national economy” (Ahmad, 2008: 46). After this triumph, Kara Kemal Bey, inspector of the CUP for İstanbul, controlled the national companies through the Special Trade Commission (*Heyet-i Mahsusa-i Ticariye*). About 80 new joint stock companies were founded between 1916 and 1918. The Society of Guilds (*Esnaf Cemiyeti*) was established in this period to unite all guilds in İstanbul and to invest their profits in the new companies. Finally, through the Committee of National Defense and the Guilds Society, the CUP trustees controlled the sale and distribution in the towns, and this caused the accumulation of capital in the hands of Muslim traders (Zürcher, 2001: 131).

Unlike Toprak and Zürcher, Feroz Ahmad does not differentiate the economic policies of the Unionists. Rather, he emphasizes the national economic policies from the beginning of the 1908 revolution with some limitations. However, he also claims that the war provided opportunities to foster the national economy. Ahmad claims

that the CUP aimed to gain independence in the economic sphere and tried to abolish capitulations. Also, they tried to establish their own finance house. As Ahmad points out, “even during the years of political struggle it is possible to discern the outlines of the economic policy which later evolved into etatism...the concept of nation with a national economy was also put forward, though not articulated by the Young Turks during these years” (Ahmad, 2008: 30). Its first appearance came immediately after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Austrians in 1908. The Unionists organized a boycott against the goods of Austrians and the shops who sold them. This directly affected the non-Muslim communities because their shops were the agents of Western goods and Muslim traders benefited from this boycott because instead of the fez cap made in Austria, Anatolian kalpak was to be used. During this time, the Liberals criticized the boycott decision because of its damage on local commerce while the Unionists supported the boycott. This conflict between the Unionists and the Liberals was not only about the economic dimension but also about the ideas of the Unionists which included state monopoly and state control over the economy (Ahmad, 2008: 30-31).

Finally, Kemal Karpat suggests that the Young Turks opened a new phase in the socio-economic history of the Ottoman Empire. There were three aims of the Young Turks to solve the economic problems: “to establish a national economy; to replace the minorities and foreign agents who held the economy of the countries in their hands with ethnic Turks and to encourage the population to enter economic activities of all kinds beside agriculture and to bring about the readjustment of social, cultural and ethnic values to the new developments” (Karpat, 1959: 83). Karpat claims that the Young Turks carried out some attempts to realize these aims. Some of these

attempts were the abolishment of capitulations in 1914, the establishment of a national bank in 1916 and the founding of a local enterprise and enforcement of a law to encourage industrial development. During this period, Young Turks advocated the idea which aimed to place Turks in economic positions. While the CUP adopted law that foreign companies include certain number of Turkish citizens on their administrative boards, the shops owned by the minorities were boycotted and the government supported this boycott to increase the business in the enterprises owned by Muslim Turks. Consequently, Karpat claims that the economic policy of the Young Turks including the piecemeal combination of statism, liberalism and nationalism set the tone for an economic policy which was developed by the Republicans (Karpat, 1959: 83-84).

#### ***2.4. Power Struggle within the Kemalists and Their Political Ideas***

After the analysis of the political and economic policies of the CUP, I will attempt to examine the policies of the Kemalists who made the national struggle and established the Republic of Turkey. In the transition period from the CUP to Kemalism, the national struggle and the establishment of the new state reflected the power struggle of the bureaucratic-military elites. To understand the nation-state building process of Turkey, the analysis of this power struggle becomes the must since it reflected the authoritarian, secular and nationalist character of Kemalism.

First, Feroz Ahmad analyzes the Kemalists in terms of the political struggle during the nationalist movement. According to Ahmad, Kemalists were minority in the assembly in 1923 but due to the leadership of Mustafa Kemal and their success in the

National Liberation movement, the Kemalists gained more advantages in this time (Ahmad, 1999: 69). Ahmad defines two sides in this political struggle: nationalists and conservatives. The former including Mustafa Kemal aimed to modernize the state, to establish a new state by removing the institutions of the old regime and to introduce laicism. On the other hand, the latter wanted to preserve the institutions of the old regime including sultanate and caliphate and to protect Islam as the state religion. However, Mustafa Kemal and his friends saw the notion of an Islamic state as a continuity of the status quo and backwardness of Turkey. The conservatives consisted of comrades in arms and played significant role in the national movement. Rauf Orbay, Kazım Karabekir, Rıfat Bele and Ali Fuat Cebesoy were among them. They wanted to utilize moderation and legitimacy that came with the old constitutional order. They advocated the abolishment of sultanate due to its tactical error but they did not see any reason for the abolishment of the caliphate. Ahmad relates the conservatives and the Unionists in this policy and claims that “they like the Unionists before them believed that Turkey could be ruled by a symbolic figure, formerly the sultan-caliph, now president-caliph who would be unassailable from below, yet easy to manipulate from above” (Ahmad, 2003: 84). On the other hand, the Kemalists wanted a total social, political and an economic transformation. They did not want to continue ruling the state and society with traditionalist values and symbols. Rather, they aimed to establish a new, secular ideology by adopting materialism of the West.

The declaration of the republic increased the tension among both sides. To prevent the uprising from the comrades in army, Mustafa Kemal forced the assembly to take a decision that prohibited the members of army who wanted to join the politics. To

join the politics, they had to resign from the army. In this sense, the opponents of Mustafa Kemal resigned from the army to continue their opposition in the assembly. One political party, the Republican People Party (hereafter RPP) dominated the assembly with ineffective opposition. Thus, the opponents resigned from the RPP and established a new party, the Progressive Republican Party (hereafter PRP) in November 1924. This party emphasized people's sovereignty, liberalism, democracy, and free trade and the minimization of the state intervention in economic sphere. Nevertheless, Mustafa Kemal considered this opposition party as a threat to his own authority. Ahmad states that "according to Mustafa Kemal, this was the attempt of counter-revolution and could end the enforcement of radical laws to transform Turkey. Although Mustafa Kemal did not strongly attack this party, he used the opportunity of Kurdish uprising of Şeyh Sait in 1925 in order to destroy the PRP". (Ahmad, 1999: 75) Ahmad claims that the Kemalists interpreted this rebellion as an indicator of Islamic reactionism and a threat of counter-revolution. Kemal strongly responded to this attempt, and the assembly adopted the law for Maintenance of Order (*Takrir-i Sükûn*) (Ahmad, 1999: 76). With these laws and the establishment of Independence Tribunals (*İstiklâl Mahkemeleri*), all opposition was silenced and in 1925 the PRP was closed. The members and deputies of the PRP were arrested and excluded from the political arena. Mustafa Kemal achieved his authority without oppositions.

The other important claim of Ahmad is about the democratic character of the Kemalist ideology. He maintains that the Kemalists, as the founder of a transitional regime aimed to raise Turkey to the level of contemporary Western civilization. Indeed, the Kemalists wanted to establish a capitalist and democratic order (Ahmad,



2008: 176). Of course, this does not mean that Ahmad accepts that the Republic of Turkey during the single party period is democratic. Rather, “given the prevailing internal and external circumstances during these years, it would be rash to expect such a regime” (Ahmad, 2008: 174). In other words, he sees the Kemalist period as a transitional period towards a democratic regime. As discussed above, in 1926 the Kemalists excluded and destroyed the opposition movement and realized the revolution against the order. However, according to Ahmad, the threat of the traditional institutions was possible in spite of their abolishment and it would be necessary to struggle for many years against ideas of them. In other words, it can be argued that according to Ahmad, due to the special conditions of the period, the attempts of the single party regime including the anti-democratic items were necessary to reach a democratic regime.

Unlike Ahmad who defines a political struggle between the conservatives and Kemalists, Zürcher interprets three groups within the struggle during and after the national movement. First is the PRP including old officials Rauf Bey and Kazım Karabekir who supported the national movement but later became against the dominant role of Mustafa Kemal. This group began to oppose Mustafa Kemal after the declaration of the republic. They established the PRP and advocated liberal views. The second group is the Unionists who tried to bring Enver back to Turkey in 1921. Enver even had effect in the army and among local and regional Unionist group which built the national movement. Enver aimed to raise Turkish army in Caucasus with the support of Soviets and enter Anatolia as the head of this army. However, the Soviet support did not realize. After the death of Enver, this group dissolved. The last is the Unionists who tried to re-organize the CUP in 1923

including the old leaders of the CUP, Dr. Nazım and Kara Kemal. They formed the Second Group (*İkinci Grup*) in 1922. Many of them became prisoners of Britain in Malta and after they were released, they joined the opposition movement and established this group. These groups formed the opposition movement in the assembly and Mustafa Kemal saw these groups as a threat to his own authority. With the Şeyh Sait uprising, he had the opportunities to suppress his opponents. The assembly adopted a law on the Maintenance of Order and established the Independence Tribunals. However this was not only used to suppress Kurds but also conservative and liberal press in İstanbul.

Although the political opposition and its press had been silenced in 1925, “as long as the former leaders of the CUP and the PRP were still around, with their prestige as heroes from the independence war intact, they could exploit the prevailing discontent arising from the continuing bad economic situation and the unpopularity of the reforms” (Zürcher, 2001: 182). Thus, Mustafa Kemal still felt insecure. There appeared a plot to assassinate Mustafa Kemal during his tour of the south and the west of the country but it was uncovered. By adopting the law for Maintenance of Order and establishing Independence Tribunals, all opponents were excluded from the politics and some of them were arrested. Zürcher and Mete Tuncay argue that the arrested politicians were accused of having supported the assassination plot and of having planned a coup d'état (Zürcher, 2001: 181-182; Tuncay, 1999: 61-62). The position of the military heroes, Kazım Karabekir, Ali Fuat and Refet Bele in politics were clearly lost. Consequently, the oppositions were ended, and Mustafa Kemal consolidated his power (Zürcher, 2003: 182).

Mete Tuncay is another scholar who discusses the establishment of single party regime in the Republic of Turkey. He analyzes the opposition movements against Mustafa Kemal and how he suppressed these movements. By doing this, he aims to discuss the democratic strand in the Kemalist ideology. According to Tuncay, the Kemalists suppressed the opposition movements in the beginning of the Republic in anti-democratic ways. He analyzes the record of the Independence Tribunals and tries to show how these anti-democratic ways were realized. Tuncay maintains that the PRP and the group who tried to reorganize the CUP started to carry out an opposition against Mustafa Kemal. These people also joined the national movement and they saw the power of Mustafa Kemal as a threat for them. The PRP aimed to establish liberal democracy and adopt decentralization. During this time, some criticized the PRP that this party aimed to re-establish the CUP. However, Tuncay claims that it is not possible because of the ideological difference between the CUP and the PRP. The CUP did not advocate liberalism in economic sphere and it tried to establish a more centralized state. Thus, the CUP was more similar to the RPP (Tuncay, 1999: 108).

In conclusion, the scholars who work on the Kemalists had different conclusions. Feroz Ahmad discusses the opposition movement as against the Kemalists through his analysis of PRP and the Kemalists. According to Ahmad, the suppression of the opposition movement was understandable to promote democratic structure in the republic in the near future. Mete Tuncay and Eric Zürcher reach similar conclusion and reject the idea of the suppression of opposition movement at the expense of democracy. Tuncay and Zürcher perceive this suppression as a dictatorship of

Mustafa Kemal. They claim that Mustafa Kemal consolidated his rule through excluding the opposition groups.

### ***2.5. Economic Policies of the Kemalists***

There are few studies about the economic policies of the Republic's first ten years. Many studies focus on statism which was adopted during 1930s. However, in the first ten years of the Republic, there appeared some significant events and some significant regulations on economic development. In the light of these few studies, I will analyze these events and regulations. First, I will try to analyze the İzmir Economic Congress in 1923 and its decisions to explore the economic understanding of the Kemalists.

Yakup Kepenek and Nurhan Yentürk analyze the first ten years of the Republic as a period that defined the principles of the economic policies and new arrangements and institutions which became the base for the future economic developments. Kepenek and Yentürk focus on the İzmir Economic Congress as an indicator of these economic principles. According to these scholars, there were two aims in this congress. First is to define the unique problems and wills of merchants, workers, industrialists and farmers through integrity and to provide acceptance of these wills by the government. Second is to show the entourage of foreign capitals related with the future conditions of the economic structure (Kepenek and Yentürk, 2004: 32-33). Four groups, namely merchants, industrialists, farmers and workers participated in the İzmir Economic Congress. However, considering the demands of the congress, two groups dominated the congress. These are commercial bourgeoisie of İstanbul and landowners (Ahmad, 2008: 214). As a representative of commercial bourgeoisie

of İstanbul, the Union of National Turkish Commerce (*Milli Türk Ticaret Birliği*) established in 1922 was the dominant figure in this congress. As Korkut Boratav determines, the aim of this union was to eliminate the non-Muslim merchants who made intermediate trade with Western capital, and this space in trade should be filled by Turkish merchants (Boratav, 2006: 36-37). Also, the other attempt of the union was to nationalize the Chamber of İstanbul Commerce and Industry in which foreign and non-Muslim merchants and industrialists were dominant. According to the Union, the board of directors was formed by non-Muslims and they had to be replaced by patriotic and nationalist merchants. In other words, they attempted to unite Muslim-Turkish merchant in the frame of the policy of national economy (Koraltürk, 1997: 18-23).

According to Boratav, during the establishment period of the republic, the Turkish bourgeoisie of İstanbul tried to form good relations with the Ankara Government because the government thought that the Turkish bourgeoisie did not support the National Movement. Their aim was to gain encouragement and assistance from the political cadre of the Turkish state (Boratav, 2006: 38). Therefore, in January, 1923, the Union planned to organize the Foreign Commerce Congress (*Ticaret-i Hariciye Kongresi*) to show their thesis and principles. However, after taking the telegraph from Mahmut Esat (Bozkurt), the Minister of Economy who offered the Union to join economic congress in İzmir, the Union canceled its congress and supported the İzmir Economic Congress.

As a representative of workers, the Union of İstanbul Workers (*İstanbul Amele Birliği*) joined the congress. However, this union was established by the Union of

National Turkish Commerce. Ahmet Hamdi, a chair of the Union of National Turkish Commerce, claimed about this situation that “the Union of Workers was a puppet organization of the merchants” (Boratav, 2006: 40). Therefore, considering the delegation of the congress, merchants and landowners joined the congress in organized ways. On the other hand, one hundred deputies from the Grand National Assembly of Turkey became the delegates in the congress as representatives of merchants and industrialists. Interestingly, although Kazım Karabekir was chosen as the president of the Congress, in spite of being a bureaucrat, he became the representative of industrialists (Kepenek and Yentürk, 2004: 33). Therefore, the principles of the congress were formed according to the demands of bureaucrats, commercial bourgeoisie and landowners.

The Congress adopted the Principles of Economic Agreement (*Misak-ı İktisadi Esasları*) which included the views and principles about the attitudes of Turkish people. This agreement emphasized the independence and sovereignty of Turkish nation and their dependence on the assembly and the government. It also claimed that Turks worked more, produced their own products, adopted the scientific and technological developments and were not against the foreign capital which adopted the rules of the country. In addition, Turks without considering any classes worked together for the country (Ökçün, 1997: 323-325). In the light of these principles, Turk is the only unit in the future economy. Kepenek and Yentürk conclude that the economic structure which was inherited from the Ottoman Empire was accepted through nationalist understanding by the Kemalists (Kepenek and Yentürk, 2004: 33-34). Boratav argues that the economic policies which the new state of Turkey follows was adopted in this congress and the principles of the congress specified the

economic policies of the Republic until 1931 (Boratav, 2006: 43). Feroz Ahmad also argues that the Congress gave information about the economic understanding of the Kemalists. According to Ahmad; “one aim of this congress was to show the world that there was a unity between the political leadership and the various economic groups” (2008: 204). Also, during the congress, to advance the establishment of a national economy and to further economic forces in the country was claimed as an ultimate goal.

Despite the fact that national economic goals were fostered during the İzmir congress, the implications of these policies had limitations since the economic implications of the Lausanne Treaty prevented their implementation. As Dilek Barlas points out, “the treaty required Turkey to pay two-thirds of the Ottoman debt, which formed an important burden for the state” (Barlas, 1998: 80). Also, the government could not develop custody policy because of the foreign trade restrictions imposed by the Lausanne Treaty. This process continued until the year 1929 which referred to the end of the economic implications of the Lausanne Treaty (Barlas, 1998: 80-81).

After the analysis of the İzmir Economic Congress to explore the economic agenda of the Republic, it will be necessary to analyze economic development during the first ten years of the Republic in terms of discussing the continuity between the Kemalists and Unionists. The economic policies of the Kemalists had roots in the attempts of the Young Turks. Some scholars including Korkut Boratav, Zafer Toprak and Kemal Karpat claim that there is an economic continuity between the policies of the Unionists and the Kemalists. As Zafer Toprak points out; “due to the emphasis given to the political and legal structure of the new republic, historians tend to

underestimate the continuity between these two epochs of modern Turkey” (Toprak, 1999: 266).

Korkut Boratav claims that the economic policies of the 1908-1922 and 1923-1929 had similarities and points the continuity between these two periods. The attempt of creating a national economy during the second constitutional period and its implementation during the war conditions showed this continuity, because this policy dominated the post-1923 periods. This policy aimed to establish the national bourgeoisie supported by the state. This was crucial for economic development and modernization (Boratav, 2006: 39-40). For this aim, the state monopolies were controlled by private entrepreneurs and companies. In other words, political entourage and private entrepreneur worked together.

Gülten Kazgan is another scholar who suggests that there are adopted continuities between the Unionists and Kemalists in terms of the economic policies. Kazgan makes a comparison between two periods and claims that due to massive migrations, the population of both the Ottoman Empire and Republic changed. Nation-building of Turks was achieved by the Republic easily after these migrations. The aim of creating a national economy by the CUP was not realized completely because of the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the First World War. Mustafa Kemal and his cadres continued and completed this aim after the victory of the Independence War (Kazgan, 2002: 41-42). Indeed, the aim of creating national bourgeoisie as a part of national economy dominated the 1920s. After the decrease of the Armenian population after the deportation and the decline of the Greek population after the population exchange, the economic life changed. The Republic used this



homogeneous sphere to achieve its aim, and Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie replaced these non-Muslims with the aid of the state (Kazgan, 2002: 55-58). On the aim of creating national bourgeoisie, Ahmad also claims that the Kemalists tried to establish this class without the wishes of 'infant class' because this class preferred the foreign collaboration to the Kemalist autarchy. However, the Kemalists were aware of the importance of the bourgeoisie class for the society. In other words, the Kemalists advocated the capitalist system but like Young Turks, they defended the protectionist trend (Ahmad, 2008: 204).

Taha Parla also emphasizes the continuity between the Unionists and Kemalists on the policy of creating national bourgeoisie. In the analysis of the ideas of Ziya Gökalp, Parla attempts to show the impact of Gökalp on the Unionists and Kemalists. According to Parla, the policy aimed to dispossess the foreign and non-Muslim merchants, to establish relations between the nationalist bureaucracy and the national commercial bourgeoisie and through the state protections, credits and privileges to encourage the weak industrial bourgeoisie (Parla, 1993: 198). Dilek Barlas also argues the influence of Ziya Gökalp's views on the economic policies of the Kemalists. Barlas claims that Gökalp published his articles on the economic nationalism in the early 1920s but "his opinions on the economy set the basis for etatism, which was implemented by the leaders of Turkish Republic in the 1930s" (Barlas, 1998: 44). By criticizing the Turkish leadership who did not understand that a liberal economic system was not suitable for Turkey, he gave an advice to the Turkish statesmen to follow protectionist and nationalist policies in the economic level (Barlas, 1998: 45).

Kemal Karpat also supports this point and adds that the purpose of the Kemalists was “to develop the national economy by liberating it from dependence on foreign capital and by supplementing and encouraging locally owned private industries through state action” (Karpat, 1959: 85). İş Bank was established by Celal Bayar on August 26<sup>th</sup>, 1924 to provide capital to local industries. İş Bank played a role in the integration process of national and foreign capital to political power. As Korkut Boratav points out, soldiers, governors and politicians who took significant part in the National Movement used their authorities in the state in order to increase their own economic advantages. This was named as the Is Bank Group which indicated the cooperation of political cadres and capital groups (Boratav, 2006: 44-46). Also, the Industrial and Mineral Bank (*Sanayi ve Maadin Bankası*) founded in 1925 was delegated to create an industry of Turkey. The main aim of this bank was to provide credits for the private sectors, to establish associations with private sections and to control the industrial enterprises temporarily which were owned by the state. This bank functioned until 1932 and established 16 associations with private capital enterprises (Kepenek and Yentürk, 2004: 44).

Finally, in 1927, the Law for the Encouragement of Industry (*Sanayii Teşvik Yasası*) was adopted. This law was similar to the law legislated in 1913 but the scope of the new law was enlarged. According to this law, the lands were given appropriate enterprise without any cost, enterprises gained the right of exemption from custom duties and fees, and the state supported the enterprises about ten percent of annual production. The most important decision of this law includes that the enterprises which were supported by the state had to employ Turks in their working places and that only directors or accountants could become foreign citizens (Kepenek and

Yentürk, 2004: 45). As Ahmad emphasizes; “the government’s aim was to create an infrastructure without which the internal market would remain pitifully undeveloped” (Ahmad, 2008: 214).

The other continuity between the Unionists and the Kemalists is about the role of the state in the economy. During World War I, the state intervention in economic affairs was implemented and this term was described as state economics. During the Republican period, the state continued intervening in economic affairs, but this did not mean that the state suppressed the private initiatives. Rather, the state nurtured the private entrepreneurs and companies to foster the economy. For this aim, the state destroyed many of the institutional and juridical obstacles of the traditional, pre-capitalist order to the emerging of modern structure (Ahmad, 2008: 206). On the other hand, there is a difference about the role of state in the economy among two periods. Unlike the Ottoman Empire, the Republic had more advantageous position to implement its policies because of being nation-state. Karpat claims that “the country was politically free to pursue its own economic policy, for the abolishment of the capitulations already accepted by Mustafa Kemal’s nationalists in 1920, was recognized by the West in the Lausanne Treaty of 1923...The government was strong and in effective control of the entire national territory, and the population was culturally homogenous” (Karpat, 1959: 84). Consequently, the Kemalists continued the economic policies of the CUP, but with a more advantageous position to apply them since the country was politically free to promote its economic policy and the population was culturally and relatively homogenous due to the deportations of Armenians and population exchange of Greeks.

## ***2.6. Conclusion: the Relations between the CUP and the Kemalists***

After the analysis of the policies of the CUP and Kemalists, in this conclusion part, I will assess the relations between the CUP and Kemalists. There is a debate about the similarities and differences of these two groups in terms of ideological, political, economic and organizational bases. For the economic continuity, as I have analyzed above, there is continuity between them in terms of creating national bourgeoisie. Scholars including Zafer Toprak, Gülten Kazgan, Kemal Karpat and Taha Parla support this point but could not underestimate the structure of the new nation-state which gave more advantages than the imperial structure. On the ideological base, Eric Zürcher advocates the continuity between two periods about the nationalism while Taha Parla discusses this ideological continuity in related with the impact of the ideas of Ziya Gökalp on the Kemalists. On the other hand, Feroz Ahmad emphasizes the differences between them in terms of the understanding of the religion in the political mechanism. On the political and organizational base, Eric Zürcher defends the continuity between the Unionists and Kemalists as he applies the term Young Turks to Kemalists and Unionists. He argues that their social backgrounds including their educational developments and nationalities displayed the similarities. In addition, some institutions and their establishments such as a party played crucial role for two groups.

In this vein, there were some similarities between the Unionists and Kemalists in terms of the ideological, political and organizational bases but the differences of the Kemalists cannot be underestimated. Like the Unionists, the Kemalists had an authoritarian character but they also gave importance to the legality. For instance, the Society for the Defense of the National Rights of Anatolia and Thrace were evolved

into the RRP. Also, despite the fact that there were ideological similarities, their aims and instruments were not the same. The Pan-Turkist aim of some Unionist leaders was totally dismissed by the Kemalists and they aimed to create the nation-state (Türkeş, 45-46, 1999). In spite of the continuity of the Turkish nationalism, the Kemalists refined it to base on Anatolian territory defined as the National Pact of 1920. Şerif Mardin claims that “all of Mustafa Kemal’s speeches indicate that he, as well as the founding fathers of the republic, believed that Ottomanism, Islamism, and pan-Turkism had failed as ideological frames for the promotion of new principles of citizenship. Turkish nationalism was his own answer...” (Mardin, 1997: 119). Finally, the Republic was more united with having better developed institutions and state apparatus than the Ottoman Empire.

## **Chapter 3: Armenians and the State from the Late Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic**

### ***3.1. Armenians in the Ottoman Empire***

#### **3.1.1. The Administration of the non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire**

The millet system was established to rule the non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire. In order to understand the role of Armenians in the economic and political life of the Ottoman Empire, it is necessary to assess the millet system. Also, it is essential to answer the question of why the relations between the loyal millet, Armenians and Muslims evolved into the bloody hostility. The scholars from Turkish side who analyze the position of Armenians focus on this system as a sign of the tolerance of the Ottoman Empire towards non-Muslims, especially Armenians. Indeed, Armenians were considered as loyal millet (*millet-i sadıka*). On the other hand, the scholars from Armenian side rejected this terminology and focus on the subordinated position of non-Muslims.

The rule of the non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire can be understood through the analysis of the Islamic law which defined the borders of the relations between the state and religious communities. In the Islamic law and practice, “the relationship between the Muslim state and the non-Muslim communities to which it extended its tolerance and protection was conceived as regulated by a pact called *dhimma*” (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 5). *Dhimma* refers to the non-Muslims who had a monotheistic religion based on revelation. These are named as people of books

*(dhimmis)* including Jews and Christians. According to this pact defined by the Holy Law, non-Muslims would be protected, would be allowed to practice their own religions, maintain their own places of worship, and to a very large extent run their own affairs. With this, they recognized the supremacy of Islam (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 5; Barkey, 2008: 120).

On the other hand, this recognition included some restrictions which imposed on dhimmis by Sharia. These restrictions involved limitations on clothes the dhimmis might wear, the beasts they might ride, the arms they might bear. These were related with the rule of conduct and included rules and regulations concerning dress, housing and transportation. Non-Muslims were also not allowed to build houses taller than Muslims. In addition, there were some limits on building new houses of worship. For instance, these houses might not be higher than mosques. The dhimmis were prohibited to build new churches but the old ones might be restored. Indeed, they had to wear distinctive clothes to identify themselves; for instance, the hats and shoes of Armenians were red, of Greeks black and of Jews blue (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 5; Barkey, 2008: 120; Eryılmaz, 1990: 48-49). According to Islamic law, these restrictions as part of the Islamic way of life were necessary to display who belonged to the dominant group and who did not. In other words, these restrictions were used to establish boundaries between Muslims and non-Muslims. Karen Barkey mentioned about two sultanic decrees in the mid-sixteenth century to exemplify the meaning of these restrictions. These decrees emphasized that “the distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims were blurred when non-Muslims do not abide by the clothing codes” (Barkey, 2008: 120). Then, periodically, sultans issued edicts which determined the rules of dressing of dhimmis and their punishment needing to

provide hierarchical ordering of religious society. In this respect, the practice of these restrictions is significant since despite the fact that these restrictions were true in theory, they were used partially in the practice. For instance, the decrees quoted by Barkey involved the case with the Jewish community whom many of rules were broken, new synagogues built and white turbans, special to Muslims were worn. In spite of references to these restrictions, especially in decrees, Ottomans were unable or unwilling to practice them (Barkey, 2008: 121). Thus, as Braude and Lewis argue that “most of these disabilities have a social and symbolic rather than a tangible and practical character. The only real economic burden imposed on unbelievers was fiscal” (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 6).

This Islamic framework became the main tool for the Ottoman Empire to rule its non-Muslim communities. Nevertheless, unlike other Middle Eastern empires, the Ottoman Empire had other precedents including the legal traditions of Islam, their own knowledge of the Byzantines and the distinctive customs of the Turkish peoples which shaped the Ottoman policy toward its non-Muslim subjects (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 10). With this combination of different traditions, the Ottoman Empire began to establish relations to its non-Muslims subjects who formed the majority in the early periods. In this period, as in the case of relations between Turks and Greeks who formed a common culture of the frontier over the centuries of conflict, borders between two communities had blurred. For practical advantages, the Ottoman Empire gave a degree of autonomy to these communities, which was also compatible with the Islamic tradition (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 11). However, the Ottoman state also used new administrative policies for the rule of non-Muslims which had little precedent in Islamic law. These were the levy of Christian children (*devşirme*),



conversion and forced migration (*sürgün*) which regulated boundaries between Muslims and non-Muslims between the fifteenth century and the seventeenth century (Barkey, 2008: 122).

After the analysis of Ottoman policies toward non-Muslims, it is necessary to explore the Ottoman rule of non-Muslims which was called the millet system<sup>7</sup>. Millet was a term which originally referred to the religious community. According to the millet system, every community had been allowed to practice its faith without much intervention from the Muslim community (Sunar, 2004: 44). It means that the non-Muslims had fiscal and juridical autonomy which was guaranteed by the edicts of the sultan by ruling their communities. In the Ottoman Empire, there are three millets, Orthodox, or Greek (*Rum*) recognized in 1454, Armenians in 1461 and Jews remained without a declared definite status for a while but it was unofficially recognized around same time as Greeks and Armenians (Barkey, 2008: 131; Eryılmaz, 1990: 51). The patriarch or rabbi which was selected among higher ranked religious ecclesiastics as a chair of millet was “responsible to the state for his community and to his community for the state” (Braude, 1982: 69). Mehmet II after

---

<sup>7</sup> The details about the millet system were debatable issue. Some including Bernard Braude and Bernard Lewis argue that the details were inaccurate. Additionally, Braude claims that reexamination of available sources about early Ottoman period shows that the millet was used little in these documents and called the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and religious communities as foundation myths (Braude, 1982). On the other hand, Karen Barkey rejects the foundation myth argument to emphasize institution building instead. Barkey who focuses on the institutional arrangements to mark the Ottoman-religious leader relationship used the meaning of millet system as an example of indirect rule. This means that the Ottoman Empire used the community leaders as intermediary role between communities and the state, and “it had created dependent and compliant elites who had been incorporated into the state and who were given favored status over other potential religious and ethnic elites” (Barkey, 2008: 142). Therefore, being aware of little usage of the term millet in the sources prior to nineteenth century, I will use the millet system as a similar to Barkey through focusing on the institutional role for the Ottoman Empire’s rule of its non-Muslim subjects.

the conquest of İstanbul appointed as patriarch of Constantinople Gennadius Scholarios and made him the titular head of all Orthodox faithful in the Ottoman Empire. Mehmet II gave some privileges including fiscal and legal autonomy to the community. Similar arrangements were also made with Armenians and Jews (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 12). As a limit of this study, I will focus only on the treatment of Armenians in the millet system.

Before the conquest of Constantinople, the ecclesiastical centers of Armenians were either the newly strengthened see of Etchmiadzin (in Yerevan) or the see of Cilicia which were beyond the Ottoman borders. Mehmet II tried to foster the development of Armenian ecclesiastical center in İstanbul but the İstanbul patriarchate also faced opposition from Armenians (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 14). In this sense, Ottomans established two centers within its territory, namely in Constantinople and in Jerusalem<sup>8</sup>. The bishop of Bursa, Hovagim, was appointed to the patriarchate of İstanbul (Ortaylı, 1985: 1000). Other patriarchates were incorporated. Barkey argues that “where they had jurisdiction, the Armenian patriarchs were responsible for tax collection and administration, and outside jurisdiction, simple local prelates performed these duties” (Barkey, 2008: 141).

---

<sup>8</sup>Based on the study of Kevork Bardakjian, Braude argues that “there is no evidence for empirewide patriarchal authority established through Ottoman fiat. Rather, the authority and jurisdiction of the Constantinople Patriarchate evolved gradually over the centuries in fits and starts” (Braude, 1982: 81). Braude claims that due to the political and military situation in Eastern Anatolia where two warring Turkmen faction, Akkoyunlar and Karakoyunlar following toleration policy toward Armenians controlled Ejmiacin, Aghtamar and much of historic Armenia, the Ottoman Empire frightened the strategy of these factions which tried to strengthen their basis against Ottoman through gaining benefits from Armenian subjects. In this sense, the Ottoman Empire used the sürgün system forcing Armenians to the security regions of İstanbul and encouraged the autonomy to the Patriarchate of İstanbul (Braude, 1982: 82). For the whole story for the Patriarchate of İstanbul: Bardakjian, Kevork (1982, "The Rise of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople." in B. Braude and B. Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by B. Braude and B. Lewis, 2 vols. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1982, vol. 1, p. 89-100.

After the large scale movement of Armenians to İstanbul by the policies of Mehmet II, the patriarch in İstanbul fostered power and influence until the seventeenth century. Despite the fact that Armenians established the hierarchical control, by the mid-sixteenth century Armenian lay leaders which were called *amiras* including wealth, bankers, minters and merchants had taken on some of broker roles between the İstanbul community and Anatolian settlements (Barkey, 2008: 142; Ortaylı, 1985: 1000). As a policy, the Ottomans aimed to provide religious leaders with the sanction to administer their people. Because there were many religious centers with no centralized authority, the Ottomans tried to negotiate complex issues of religious and territorial jurisdiction with the leadership. Thus, the Armenian patriarchs who were farthest from İstanbul would have to base on intermediaries at the capital, which increased the role of new secular class, *amiras* (Barkey, 2008: 142). The *amiras* began to gain prestige and power within the Armenian community. As servants and advisers to Ottoman officials in capital and provinces, they were in a better position to represent Armenians than were the leaders of the Church. In the eighteenth century, “the Armenian hierarchy parried the trust of the *amiras* by sharing power with them” (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 21).

This is the general characteristic of the rule of non-Muslims before the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Before the analysis of change in the relations between the Ottoman Empire and Armenians in terms of reform projects, I will briefly discuss the toleration and persecution policies towards non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. Karen Barkey defines the toleration “as a way to qualify and maintain diversity of the empire, to organize the different communities, to establish peace and order, and to ensure the

loyalty of these communities, and had little to do with ideals or with a culture of toleration” (Barkey, 2008: 110). Rather than equality or a modern form of multiculturalism in an imperial setting, toleration refers to a means of rule, of extending, consolidating and enforcing state power. Braude and Lewis also argue that the tolerance can be understood to show the willingness of a dominant religion to coexist with others (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 3). According to these definitions, how can we categorize the attitude of the Ottoman Empire toward its non-Muslim subjects in the early centuries?<sup>9</sup> In general, Muslims imposed discrimination on followers of other religions but by and large without persecution. According to Islamic law, the non-Muslims were second-class citizens with certain prospects and disabilities which have been analyzed above. As the summary of Barkey, we can describe Muslim and non-Muslim communities in three words: separate, unequal and protected (Barkey, 2005: 16). In the Ottoman Empire, the non-Muslims were “tolerated as long as they did not disturb or go against the Islamic order. If they did transgress, their recognition could easily turn into suppression and persecution” (Barkey, 2008: 110). In addition, according to Ottoman understanding, the diversity contributed to imperial welfare. In this vein, the difference was tolerated. In other words, toleration had systemic quality and it provides peace and order in the Ottoman Empire, which were beneficial for the imperial life (Barkey, 1982: 110-111). Therefore, we can claim about the Ottoman Empire that, until the mid-eighteenth century, due to the Islamic tradition and the strategy of providing peace and order in the state, the non-Muslims and Muslims lived in relatively tolerated rule. For this point, as Braude and Lewis summarize, “while persecution was rare and

---

<sup>9</sup> For the detailed analysis of toleration policies in the Ottoman Empire related to Islam: Barkey, Karen (2005), “Islam and Toleration: Studying the Imperial Model”, *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 19: 5-19

atypical, usually due to specific circumstances, discrimination was permanent and indeed necessary, inherent in the system and maintained by both Holy Law and common practice” (1982: 3-4).

### **3.1.2. Reorganization of the Non-Muslim Millets in the Nineteenth Century**

From the late eighteenth century on, the Ottoman Empire began to change due to both external and internal dynamics. As a result, the Ottoman state chose to embark on the period of remodeling and centralization. This new form of centralization included the responses to the international threats, to the Balkan demands for autonomy and independence, as well as to internal transformations of regional, or provisional, level administration. Unlike the previous attempts for centralization, in this period, the Ottoman Empire used the new model of centralization which was applied in Europe (Barkey, 2008: 264-265).

Two developments affected the traditional structure of the Ottoman Empire in the early nineteenth century. These were the rise of the commercial relations between European states and the Ottoman Empire and the spread of the nationalism after the French Revolution. Although the Ottoman Empire had not participated in the political system of the Europe, in the economic sphere, the Ottoman Empire gave some privileges toward European states due to the political and economic reasons in the early centuries (Keyder, 2007: 40). The capitulations included privileges to the European states in economic sphere of the state from the early period of the Ottoman Empire. Partially, these capitulations became useful for the state economically

because the state imposed taxes on the exported goods which provided incomes for the state and politically because with these privileges, the state could balance one state to another. With these privileges, the Ottoman Empire aimed to foster the economy (Ortaylı, 1987: 85; Bağış, 1983: 2). In the mid-eighteenth century, Austria received privilege (*ahidname*) from the Ottoman Empire for maritime trade in Mediterranean Sea. Greeks in the Balkans played a crucial role as an intermediary in this trade, and this led to the emergence of commercial bourgeoisie in the Balkans. With capitalization of the Balkans, Serbs, Croats and Bulgarians also participated in the trade. On the other hand, Russia also increased its role in the Balkan and Mediterranean trades. As in the case of Austrian Hungarian Empire, Slavic people participated in commerce and this resulted with the appearance of bourgeoisie (Ortaylı, 1987: 59-60).

In the nineteenth century, due to the need of raw materials and market place, the Ottoman Empire became the crucial area for European states. Great Britain had emerged from the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars and became an actor in the world as a global trading nation and industrial power. Due to the protectionist policies in Europe and America which were traditional trading partners, Great Britain tried to gain free trade agreements in order to open up new markets in Asia. The old Levant Company was disbanded in 1825 in the Ottoman Empire, which created a chance for Great Britain to gain free trade agreement from the Ottoman Empire. Russia gained some commercial concessions from the Ottoman Empire after the treaty of Edirne in 1829. However, the state monopoly on some products and restrictions continued in the Ottoman Empire. When Britain supported the Ottoman Empire against Mehmet Ali Pasha, the Ottoman Empire offered free trade agreement

to Britain. This treaty, known as Treaty of Balta Limanı, opened up the Ottoman market completely to Britain. The state monopolies were abolished. After the demands of other states on the same rights, the other states signed similar free trade agreements between 1838 and 1841 (Zürcher, 2001: 49; Pamuk, 2005: 207-208).

The non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire participated in trade under the protectorate of European powers as a result of free trade agreements. Indeed, unlike Muslim merchants, the non-Muslim merchant gained some privileges such as paying low taxes and political immunity. Çağlar Keyder claims that due to the religious and cultural familiarity between European merchants and non-Muslim merchants, non-Muslims could benefit from these privileges (Keyder, 2007: 48). This process led to appearance of new group in the Ottoman Empire which engaged in the European knowledge and developments through being trading partners. This also affected the rise of nationalism within non-Muslim communities. İlber Ortaylı argues that although the French Revolution took an important part in the rise of nationalist demands in Balkan regions, these nationalist trends could be traced to the Siege of Vienna (1683) and Renaissance. Since Renaissance, both Slavic and Greek elites began to adopt nationalism. During the late eighteenth century, through activities of merchants and churches and the impact of European states, they adopted and organized the nationalist movements (Ortaylı, 1987: 48). In this respect, Karen Barkey argues that rather than the traditional narrative that emphasized the commercial success of non-Muslims and decline of Muslims in trade, communities benefited and endured hardship in different ways: “Given the vagaries of commerce and the insecurity of the intermediate position that many non-Muslims were locked in to, they chose to revert to a community based on ethnic and religious ties, familiar

local identities trying them to the national discourses available in their Western interactions” (Barkey, 2008: 279). Thus, in the eighteenth century, communities through trade and finance networks began to consolidate their national identities.

The ideas of the French Revolution also mainly affected the members of the Christian communities of the Ottoman Empire. The first to be influenced were Greeks due to their commercial connections with all the major European ports and the Serbians who established relations with Central Europe through their exports to Austria. The liberty which is one of three catchwords, ‘liberty, equality, fraternity’ of French Revolution was adopted by these communities. They perceived meaning of liberty as national independence. In 1808, Serbian insurrection began in order to protest the abuses of the local Muslim landowners and the Janissaries but it developed into movement for autonomy and then independence. After the treaty of Edirne in 1829, Serbia gained autonomy. Although Serbia became an independent state with the Berlin Congress (1878), this autonomy indicated the total separation, and it became warning for the Ottoman rule. Also, with the treaty of Edirne, Greece gained independence (Ortaylı, 1987: 64; 67).

The Reform Edict (*Tanzimat Fermanı*) of Gülhane written by Mustafa Reşid Pasha in 1839 aimed to halt the growth of nationalism and separatism among the Christian communities, and to remove pretexts for foreign, especially Russian, intervention (Zürcher, 2001: 54). This imperial edict included four basic reforms: “the establishment of guarantees for the life, honor and property of the sultan’s subjects; an orderly system of taxation to replace the system of tax-farming; a system of conscription for the army and equality before the law of all subjects whatever their



religion” (Zürcher, 2001: 53). The last reform also related with the non-Muslim communities who were considered as second-class citizens according to the Islamic law. The ultimate implication of the phrases of this sort on equality without distinction as to religion was that millet barriers would be undermined, that the creation of multinational brotherhood of all Ottoman subjects became the official aim, and, therefore, that the concepts of state and citizenship would become increasingly western and secularized. Davison states that “the hope was, as Reşid had argued and as the Gülhane had also hinted, that such general guarantees of equal protection under law would strengthen the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire by increasing the loyalty of its subjects, Christian as well as, and by diminishing separatist tendencies” (Davison, 1973: 40-41).

However, this reform project faced opposition from both the ulema and Greek clergy who aimed to continue the status quo. More conservative ministers and ordinary officials via the ulema were prepared to see radical departures toward equality and secularization. According to them, with the principle of equality, the sacred law of Islam was being subverted. These Muslim objections spread into some Anatolian cities where there appeared conflicts between Muslims and non-Muslims. On the other hand, provincial governors who feared closer supervision, tax farmers and Greek clergy who was curious about the traditional position of the Greek millet as the first among the subject peoples of the Ottoman Empire would be threatened by this doctrine of equality (Davison, 1973: 42-43; Ortaylı, 1987: 75).

However, this attempt to gain the loyalty of non-Muslim subject did not achieve its aims. The principle of equality continued to be accepted but its application to be

deferred. For instance, in 1850, there occurred a debate about the serving of Christians in the army equally with Muslims. However, Muslims were reluctant to accept Christians as officers while Christians preferred to pay traditional exemption tax (Davison, 1973: 45). Barkey claims that the Tanzimat led to increasing differentiation among communities and to produce a sense of Muslim inferiority (Barkey, 2008: 287). In this respect, under the continuous attempts to apply reforms and the rise of inter-communal tensions, after the Crimean War (1853-1856), Britain and France used their status as allies of the Ottoman Empire and urged it toward further westernization and more effective application of the principle of the equality. At the end of the war, new Reform Edict of 1856 (*Islahat Fermanı*) was adopted by the Ottoman Empire (Davison, 1973: 52). Unlike Davison who emphasized the foreign pressure to this edict, İlber Ortaylı claims that the principles of the Reform Edict of 1856 were appropriate with the policies of the Ottoman Empire during nineteenth century. To provide non-Muslims to establish their churches and schools wherever they wanted, to freely restore them and to collapse of traditional constraints did not oppose to the understanding of the Ottoman administration in nineteenth century. This edict aimed to prevent foreign intervention into the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire (Ortaylı, 1987: 91-92).

Like Tanzimat Edict, the Reform Edict of 1856 also faced some opposition from the Muslim religious authorities and Christians. Muslim authorities criticized the complete equality in the edict that this undermined the traditional distinction between the ruling millet and the ruled. Among Christians, unlike Bulgarians who perceived this edict as a chance to eliminate the Greek Orthodox hierarchy, ordinary Christians resented the principle of equality in military service. Additionally, the higher

Christian clergy also opposed to the edict since it abolished their power over the millets and their ability to rule their spiritual subjects (Davison, 1973: 59). In spite of these resentments and opposition, the Reform Edict of 1856 mainly changed the traditional structure of the millet system and reorganized the rule of the non-Muslims. In this respect, I will attempt to analyze this reorganization of the non-Muslim millets in terms of the Armenian millet.

Until the last years of Mahmud II's reign, management of the affairs of the Armenian millet was in the hands of the İstanbul patriarch and highest clergy. Despite the fact that the patriarch was the independent head of civil administration for members of his community in the Ottoman Empire, the patriarchate was dominated by some of the members of wealthy of urban aristocracy known as *amira*. In 1838, the Armenian college was established in İstanbul, which led to the split within the *amira* through the increase of the influence of artisans in community affairs. On the one hand, there were moneylenders (*sarrafs*), bankers and great merchants; on the other hand, there were Armenian notables who gained the Ottoman posts including imperial architect, director of the mint and officer of the imperial powder works. This split affected the financial management of the communities because the bankers withdraw their support from the college. This conflict within the civil administration was solved by the patriarch who established two councils, civil and ecclesiastical, to manage the millet affairs (Davison, 1973: 120-121).

Meanwhile, there were three developments, including the literary renaissance, the influx of French political ideas and Protestant example, which led to the leading bourgeoisie of the Gregorian millet to work for the constitution. In the beginning of

the nineteenth century, classical Armenian learning revived and the secular and vernacular literature under the leadership of Garabed Utujian who founded the Armenian journal of İstanbul, *Massis*, strengthened the position of lay reformers of the Armenian millet. Secondly, like Utujian, other Armenian intellectual leaders who lived and studied in Paris during 1840s and experienced the 1848 Revolution and the second republic introduced the French ideas to the Ottoman Armenians. A third influence, Protestant missions also affected Armenian reform. In spite of low conversion from Gregorian Armenians to the Protestantism, some Gregorian Armenians look to Protestantism for political reasons. The Protestant rules including the representative principle and lay control spread among Ottoman Armenians and influenced the Armenian reform (Davison, 1973: 121-123).

While these developments were consolidated within the Armenian millet, the Reform Edict of 1856 deeply affected the Armenian community. The Ottomans directly addressed “the issues of clerical versus lay control, participation by the community at large in the selection of religious leaders, the nature of hierarchical authority, the notion of a constitution itself” which led to the deep divisions within the community (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 22). The Ottoman government with the coalition of new thinkers, the liberal constitutionalists and the opponents of the traditional leadership within the Armenian community resolved the issue of the reform. The Armenian National Constitution was prepared by the committee including Krikor Odian, Rusinian, Servichen and other new intellectuals and was officially adopted on March 29, 1860 (Davison, 1973: 124). The constitution preserved the patriarchate and the civil and ecclesiastical councils but these were subordinated to a general assembly which had a right to select the patriarch and two councils. The religious council deals

with dogma, religious education and ordination of clergy while the civil council was concerned with education, hospitals, millet property, finance, justice and like. Through these councils, the general assembly managed all Armenian community affairs (Davison, 1973: 124). Meanwhile, the constitution recognized “the right of all members of the community to have some voice in determining its affairs and it [constitution] institutionalized the high degree of autonomy (Braude and Lewis, 1982: 23). From 1869 until 1892, the Armenian National Constitution functioned and general assembly met regularly. In spite of the underrepresentation of provincial Armenians, there were the complaints of provincial Armenians which were collected by a committee of assembly. These complaints included submitting to the Porte recommendations on tax farming, curbing the Kurdish depredations and on strict control of the Ottoman government over the provincial officials (Davison, 1982: 125-126).

To sum up, all these developments and reform projects which had greater impact on the non-Muslim millets and traditional structure of the Ottoman Empire led appearance of the differences among its subjects. In the early centuries, the Ottoman Empire achieved to absorb diversity, to integrate but not to change its cultural and social inheritance (Barkey, 2008: 277). With change appeared in the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire could not manage this diversity which resulted in the ethnic violence between Muslim and non-Muslim communities. To save the integrity of the empire through reform projects was successful in the short run but it also ironically increased the national consciousness and difference among these communities. As we shall see below, there appeared government-approved ethnic violence against groups which were perceived to be in revolt or dangerous to the

state, Greek in the 1820s, Syrian and Lebanese in 1869s, Bulgarians in 1876 and the Armenians of Zeytun in 1862 (Barkey, 2008: 278). Before the analysis of this ethnic conflict in terms of the Armenians, I will analyze the Armenian political organizations which rose in this conflictual atmosphere.

### **3.1.3. The Armenian Political Organizations and Their Relations with the CUP**

One of the consequences of the French Revolution was the rise of nationalism not only in France but all over the world. In the Ottoman Empire, nationalism was spread among the non-Muslim communities. The Armenians were also affected by the rise of nationalism during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Related to the rise of the bourgeoisie, the Armenians sent their children to the European capitals for their education. Additionally, the European and American missionaries established western line schools in the Ottoman Empire, and Armenians went to these schools. With this process, they became aware of the nationalist ideologies. After Serbs who firstly gained their autonomy in the Ottoman Empire in 1829 and of Greeks who gained independence in 1829, the Armenians tried to reform their conditions and to gain autonomy at the Congress of Berlin in 1878 (Ahmad, 2008: 175-176). In that period, the Armenians began to create their own political organizations. I will briefly analyze the most important of these organizations, namely *Hnchak party* (Social Democrat Hnchak Party) and *Dashnaktsutiun party* (Armenian Revolutionary Federation), focusing on their relations with the CUP after the 1908 revolution.

The Hnchak party was established in 1887 as “a semi-Marxist group of Caucasian intellectuals who hoped to resurrect the Armenian Question” (Suny, 1993: 99). The aim of this party was to create an independent and united Armenia and to provide national and social freedom of Armenia. It was established in Paris under the leadership of Avedis Nazarbeg. The Armenian patriarch and bourgeoisie were not interested in the program of Hnchak.<sup>10</sup> Rather, the Hnchak was influential among young Armenians, Armenian peasants and small producers. The Hnchak party organized social movements in Sasun and Zeytun, and meeting of İstanbul Kumkapı and Bâb-ı Âli (Tunaya, 1988: 568-569; Maraşlı, 2008: 141-143). The Dashnaktsutiun party was established in 1890. Unlike the Hnchak party, the program of the Dashnaktsutiun did not include the independence of Armenia. The aim of the Dashnaktsutiun was vague. Suny claims that “the Dashnaktsutiun proposed a program of autonomy within the Russia and the Ottoman Empires, a free Armenia” (Suny, 1993: 100). Like the Hnchak, the Dashnaktsutiun aimed to stir the exhausted Armenians to action. By doing this, the Dashnaktsutiun hoped to improve the conditions of the Armenians. The Dashnaktsutiun organized the raid of the Ottoman Bank (1896), the Sasun Resistance (1904) and Yıldız Assassination against Abdülhamid II (Tunaya, 1988: 570; Maraşlı, 2008: 144-145).

The Armenian political organizations and the Young Turks tried to establish relations during Abdülhamid II period. The Young Turks aimed to overthrow Abdülhamid II and to establish the constitutional regime. For this aim, they tried to establish links with the Armenian political organizations which also aimed to overthrow

---

<sup>10</sup> For the full program of the Hnchak party: Uras, Esat (1987), *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, p.432-439

Abdülhamid II. In the period of 1894 and 1902, there were some attempts for this aim. Ahmed Rıza, as a representative of the CUP, negotiated with the Dashnaksutun and the Hnchak party. He opposed to the demands of the Armenians including the establishment of free Armenia. Thus, the Hnchak party and the Dashnaksutun rejected the alliance with the CUP. Prince Sabahattin who advocated decentralization established good relations with the Armenian organizations. In 1902, the opposition movements organized the congress of the Ottoman Liberals in order to overthrow Abdülhamid II. The Dashnaksutun and Hnchak party joined this congress. Again, due to the aim of establishing Armenia there was not decisive alliance between them. Until 1907, there were not any relations between Armenian organizations and the CUP. In 1907, the opposition movements organized the second congress in Paris. The CUP and the Dashnaksutun joined this congress whereas the Hnchak rejected to attend. In spite of the discussion among the parties, the congress resulted in the united opposition movement against the Hamidian regime (Avagyan, 2005: 15-26).

After the establishment of the Second Constitutional Regime which was celebrated by all communities of the Ottoman Empire, the relations between Armenian political organizations and the CUP continued until 1909 Adana Massacres. As I shall analyze this massacre in later part, the Hnchak accused the CUP of the massacre. It cut its relations with the CUP. However, the Dashnaksutun took a different part. In the fifth congress of the Dashnaksutun, in order to prevent the loss of relative acquisitions of the constitutional regime, it continued communicating with the CUP: “For a moment, the Young Turks and the Dashnaksutun had a working relationship” (Ahmad, 2008: 187). However, with the rise of Turkism among the



Unionist, there emerged problems in this relation. Especially, the aim of creating a Turkish bourgeoisie during the second constitutional period worried Armenian subjects because this project aimed to impoverish them who dominated the economy with Greeks (Avagyan, 2005: 77). The other problem was the land policy of the CUP because according to Avagyan, the CUP attempted to assimilate Christian subjects and seize their lands (Avagyan, 2005: 78). About the land policies, Feroz Ahmad claimed that in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Kurdish tribes had seized the lands of Armenian peasants and these Armenians fled to the Caucasus. The Dashnaktsutiu aimed to resolve this land issue and forced the CUP to return these lands to the real owners. As Ahmad points out; “while the Porte was willing to consider Armenian proposals, other forces were at work in the eastern provinces undermining İstanbul” (Ahmad, 2008: 187). These forces included the Kurdish notables establishing an alliance with Abdülhamid II to suppress the Armenian population (For instance: in Erzurum, Pirinçizade Feyzi Bey). Therefore, the CUP became passive on this issue because when the CUP decided to take a measure to restore lands seized by Kurdish tribes, tribes attacked on Armenian villages (Ahmad, 2008: 188). In this sense, these problems became unsolved in the relations between Armenians and the CUP.

After the outbreak of the war in the Balkans, this relation ended. “The Balkan War resulted in restricting the Ottomans to their Asiatic provinces” and a quarter of one million Muslims/Turks migrated from Balkans into İstanbul (Ahmad, 2008: 195). This period led to a deep change in the policies of the CUP and instead of Ottomanism, Turkism became popular. According to the Dashnaktsutiu, the main agenda of the CUP was Turkism and it aimed to suppress Armenians. In the seventh congress of the Dashnaktsutiu on August 17<sup>th</sup>, 1913, the Dashnaktsutiu declared

the end of the alliance with the CUP. According to the decisions of the Congress, “during five years after the declaration of the constitution, the CUP did not satisfy the demands of Armenian people and the Dashnaksutiun including guarantee of security, land issue in spite of its promises. In addition, the CUP did not apply the rules of decentralized policy. Because the alliance with the CUP led the Dashnaksutiun to share its policies, the Dashnaksutiun finished the alliance with the CUP” (Avagyan, 2005: 118)

### ***3.2. Contention between Armenians and Muslims: the Armenian Massacres***

In this part, I will analyze the conflicts between the Armenians and Muslims from the 19<sup>th</sup> century until World War I. First, I will briefly assess the Armenian resistance in different regions which were suppressed by the Hamidian regime. Second, I will focus on the ‘provocation thesis’ which was advocated to explain the reasons of Armenian massacres. Third, I will analyze the Adana Massacre of 1909. Finally, I will discuss the ‘Armenian deportations’ of 1915 from different viewpoints.

Provocation thesis was advocated by the scholars including Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw (1977), William Langer and Bernard Lewis to explain the reasons of the Armenian massacres. Provocation thesis means that “revolutionary Armenian parties, some of which evinced pro-Russian sympathies and all of which articulated demands for self-administration were active preceding the massacres...the activities of these parties occurred during the period when the Ottoman Empire was being disintegrated by internal demands for autonomy and even self-determination of several minorities...the decision to attack the Armenians was a result of Armenian

provocation” (Melson, 1982: 485). In addition, this provocation thesis means that the Armenian revolutionary party, the Hnchak, thought that “the massacre of their peasant constituents was required to interest Europe in the plight of Armenians” (Suny, 1993: 98).

This is the general understanding of the studies in Turkey on the Armenian massacres during the reign of Abdülhamid II. Ahmed Rüstem Bey who became Turkish ambassador in Washington in 1914 wrote the book about the Armenian question which was published in French in 1918. In this book, Ahmed Rüstem Bey claims that the Armenian groups carried out armed rebellion against the state through killing Muslims, raping and plundering in order to provide European intervention (2005: 31-32). Cezmi Yurtsever (1983), Esat Uras (1987), Kamuran Gürün (2007) and others also focus on this provocation thesis that with bringing out the rebellion, the European power immediately intervened in the Ottoman Empire and the demands of the Armenians were realized.

Robert Melson criticizes this argument that this provocation thesis only includes the intentions, perceptions and actions of the massacres but it did not involve the intentions, perceptions, and actions of the perpetrators of massacre. This means that the provocation thesis did not inquire into the intentions of Abdülhamid II, his views of Armenians or the context of the Ottoman-Armenian relations (Melson, 1983: 486). Through the point of Melson, I will attempt to understand the causes of the Armenian massacres.

The Armenian massacre began in Sasun, in the province of Bitlis in 1894. The Armenian peasants resisted the plunder of Kurdish tribes. The reasons of the Sasun resistance were that Armenian people were obliged to pay double taxes. In addition to paying taxes to the Ottoman Empire, Armenians paid taxes to the Kurdish tribes who took proportion from Armenian products (Bruinessen, 2004: 291; Melson, 1983: 487; Mann, 2005: 119). This resistance was suppressed by the Hamidian regime and the Hamidian troops who was established to be used against the Russian enemy but “in reality with the potential to exercise pressure upon the local population, and made the situation of the Armenians in the east more precarious” (Adanır, 2002: 73). It resulted in the killing of 8,000 Armenians according to the estimate of British vice consul, Hallward (Melson, 1983: 487). After the massacres, British, French and Russian consular tried to investigate the Sasun event and they pressured the Porte for instituting reforms. After the discussions between the ambassadors of Britain, France and Russia and the Porte during May, 1895, they approached the reform-scheme to the Porte in order to apply in the six vilayets of the Ottoman Empire, Erzurum, Bitlis, Van, Harput, Sivas and Diyarbekir and Zeytun and Sasun regions within two years. According to the articles of this reform-scheme, the Porte had to carry out reforms on some subjects such as “the appointment of the Inspector-General, the Commission of Control, administrative reforms, the reorganization of the communes, the reforms about police and gendarmerie, judicial and fiscal matters, and about the control of the Kurds and the Hamidiye Cavalry” (Şaşmaz, 2000:185).<sup>11</sup> However, in spite of this

---

<sup>11</sup> In the literature, there is a debate about the application of these articles in the reform-scheme. On the one hand, some including Roderic Davison (1948: 481-482) and Robert Melson (1982: 487-488) claim that the reform project of 1895 which offered effective scheme had never been implemented and remained in the paper. On the other hand, Musa Şaşmaz (2000: 184-253) specifically focuses on this reform project and argues that the Ottoman Empire executed all subjects proposed in the reform scheme and completed the application of articles in 1897.

reform project, massacres continued spreading throughout the Ottoman Empire including six vilayets of the Ottoman Empire, where reforms aimed to institute. In addition, in 1895 the Armenian resistance began in the mountain town of Zeytun (Maraşlı, 2008: 155; Lewy, 2005: 24). In the results of the massacres of 1894-196, thousands of people were killed. Richard Hovannisian estimates the number of killings between 100,000 and 200,000; Johannes Lepsius cites 88,000 and Shaw and Shaw believe that “the estimate of 20,000 killed following the events at Sassoun [Sasun] to be a great exaggeration” (Melson, 1983: 489).

Considering the easy analysis of the provocation thesis and without exaggerating the agitations of the Hnchak which encouraged Armenian peasants to resist, there were other causes for the Armenian massacres. First, the context of the massacres can be analyzed to show the Armenian-Ottoman relations. As seen in the first part, the millet system was used to treat the non-Muslim communities in the Ottoman Empire until the reforms of 19<sup>th</sup> century. Relatively, the Muslims and non-Muslims established peaceful relations, and for the Armenian cases there did not emerge any conflicts with the Muslims. However, as consequences of the Tanzimat and Reform edicts, the Ottoman regime began to satisfy the demands for equality and self-determination of various communities of the Ottoman Empire. Related to this, “the fallout from the French Revolution, the rise of European nationalism, the inroads of European capitalism, the expansion of Russia into the Caucasus and British shipping into the Black Sea- all had effects on the internal life of the Ottoman peoples, differentially felt by the various millets” (Suny, 1993: 102). This process resulted that the classical hierarchical status of the non-Muslims and Muslims were abolished and the equality of all communities replaced this structure. However, these reforms

failed to be institutionalized and the Ottoman state faced the problem of disintegration and the emergence of nationality problem. Abdülhamid II came to power in 1876 when the Ottoman Empire was subject to the military and economic pressures of European power. Additionally, the nationalism and self-determination began to rise among nationalists and millets of the Ottoman Empire (Melson, 1983: 499). In this sense, the perceptions of Abdülhamid II on this process were necessary to understand changing relations between Armenians and Muslims. According to Melson, the sultan may have become suspicious of Armenians because he could see Armenians against a backdrop of disloyal millets. Moreover, the geographical conditions of Armenians were significant for the Ottoman Empire. Armenians lived on Russian-Turkish border and Russian tried to expand its territories in that period (Melson, 1983: 499-500). On the other hand, there was rise of nationalism and the nationalist agitators in the Armenian community led Abdülhamid II to be suspicious of the Armenian millet. This led Armenians to drop into the disloyal millet of the Armenians. Selim Deringil argues about the role of Abdülhamid II in the massacres that according to most sources, there is no evidence of a direct order on the part of Abdülhamid II to massacre Armenians. According to Deringil, “Abdülhamid intended to cow, decimate, and humble the Armenians, but not to destroy them” (Deringil, 2009: 368).

Second, in the eastern region of the Ottoman Empire there emerged the problem of agricultural resources. During the late nineteenth century, Muslims from Caucasus and the Balkans settled in this region. With the rise of population of the Ottoman Empire, there emerged competition on agricultural resources (Suny, 1993: 104). In the same region, Kurdish and Armenians lived together. Armenians peasants faced

strong pressure of the Kurdish tribes. The state did not control fully the region and Kurdish tribes dominated it. Besides the taxes imposed by the Porte, the Armenian peasants had to give a special tax to Kurdish tribes. This special tax symbolized the loyalty of Armenians to Kurdish tribes. Without paying this tax, Armenians experienced plunder of Kurds (Maraşlı, 2008: 153). In this respect, to understand the relations between Kurds and Armenians, the policies of Abdülhamid II about the regions were crucial. As we have seen above, the Hamidian Troops which was established to be bulwark against Russia threat (McDowall, 2000: 59) began to be used for suppressing Armenian resistance against the pressure of Kurdish tribes and local governors and to get the loyalty of Kurdish subjects of the Ottoman Empire (Akçam, 2002: 86-87; Maraşlı, 2008: 137-138).<sup>12</sup> Deringil defines that “the official primary aim of these units was to quell what the state saw as ‘the perfidious and subversive activities of the Armenian brigands’ The Sultan’s policy was to kill two birds with one stone—to cow the Armenian population and to secure the loyalty of the Kurds” (Deringil, 2009: 349). To gain loyalty of Kurds, Abdülhamid II used the conferment mechanism to Kurds. According to this mechanism, Hamidian Troops provided their expenses from the income which came out the plunder of Armenian properties, and the Kurds who joined the Troops became exempt from taxes (Akçam, 2002: 96). Based on Ottoman sources, Deringil also claims that “the Armenians were to be the bait for Kurdish obedience and loyalty: ‘By thus providing paid employment of high prestige and a virtual license to raid, the sultan hoped to install in the Kurds a strong loyalty to him personally’ (Deringil, 2009: 349). Through guaranteeing loyalty of Kurds, the Ottoman state rejected the reform project

---

<sup>12</sup> During this time, Kurds revolted against empire and collaborated with Russians. For further details: McDowall, 2002: 59-63

demanded by the European powers to solve the problems of Armenian peasants and maintained the status quo in which Armenian subjects remained the silent victims of the Kurds and state injustice (Suny, 1993: 105).

Third, during the nineteenth century, Armenians were developed culturally, economically and politically. Especially, the success of the Armenians in economic activities including trade, banking and industry led to call this period as ‘Armenian renaissance’ (Melson, 1983: 503-504). Abdülhamid II thought that Armenians were too rich, they consisted quarter of the Ottoman officials and did not join the military. He claimed that the status of Armenians depended on their success in the economy. To abolish this condition, he sent orders to control the Armenian merchant in vilayets (Akçam, 2002: 91-92). Thus, he used one of his divide and rule policies which balanced different ethnicities by preventing rise of any particular ethnic group. In this vein, he established alliance with Kurdish tribes which took significant part in the suppression of the Armenians.

### **3.2.1. Adana Massacre**

In the early period of the second constitutional regime, the regime faced the attempts of the counter revolution by the Muhammadan Union (*İttihad-ı Muhammedi*) which was led by the Nahşibendi sheikh Derviş Vahdeti on April 13<sup>th</sup>, 1909 known as the ‘event of 31 March’. These attempts had religious, reactionary tendencies but “it was a liberal conspiracy designed to destroy the CUP” (Ahmad, 2008: 184). At the same time, the Armenian massacres were committed in Adana which undermined the relations between Muslims and non-Muslims.



After the occurrence of the event of 31 March, telegraphs informed the events in İstanbul and spread through the provinces of the Ottoman Empire (Akçam, 2002: 129). Especially, in Adana, there emerged many dissidents between Armenians and Muslims. Salahi Sonyel claims that “an incident took place at Adana when an Armenian shot down two Turks who were said to be trying to abduct Armenian wife, and immediately the whole town was in an uproar” on the night of the April 14<sup>th</sup> (Sonyel, 1988: 81). The massacre began on April 14<sup>th</sup> and finished on 16<sup>th</sup> April. However, the second massacre occurred on April 24<sup>th</sup> and finished on April 25<sup>th</sup>. The provincial government did not immediately control the events. The government sent troops from Rumelia and controlled the region. After the massacres of Adana, according to Cemal Pasha who were posted by government to Adana, 17000 Armenians and 1850 Muslims were killed (Gürün, 2007: 216)<sup>13</sup>. The Parliament which could gather after the event of 31 March in May sent military courts and an investigation commission. Local tribunals and military courts-martial altogether convicted and executed on the gallows 124 Turks (Dadrian, 1995: 182; Akçam, 2002: 130). 30 of them and 7 Armenians were hung (Gürün, 2007: 217).

According to Feroz Ahmad, “the Armenian massacres in Adana had local reasons for the conflagration but one of the aims of the Liberals was to bring about foreign intervention via a naval landing” (Ahmad, 2008: 184). European marines might be landed for intervention in the port of Mersin which was close to Adana. On the other hand, Esat Uras argues that the Armenians led to emerge the dissidents of Adana.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Patriarchate gives number of dead as 21,300 according to their investigation and Dadrian gives number of dead as 25,000 (Gürün, 2007: 216; Dadrian, 1995: 182)

They benefitted from the softness character of the government and trusted on their guns and organizations. They provoked the Muslim people and crushed Muslims. This event did not relate to the events of 31 March (Uras, 1987: 566). The grand vezir, Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha accused of the reactionary movement in İstanbul and claimed that they provoked the troubles in Adana (Ahmad, 2008: 185). The role of the CUP was disputable. Akçam and Dadrian claim that the CUP tried to keep away from the events in Adana but the local branch of the CUP and soldiers who were sent by government to prevent massacre joined in the massacres (Akçam, 2002: 130-131; Dadrian, 1995: 182-183).<sup>14</sup> However, Feroz Ahmad claims that the government dealt with the Adana massacres very seriously and posted Cemal Pasha, “a strict disciplinarian respected in the army”, to Adana in order to restore confidence in the province among the Armenians and fear among the reactionaries. For Ahmad, as a result, the government provided security in the province and Dashnaksutiun reported that the attacks on the Armenian people declined (Ahmad, 2008: 185). Therefore, the Adana massacre was concluded but this resulted in the good relations between the CUP and Armenian political organizations. By giving 30000 liras for the victims of Adana massacres, the CUP tried to prevent dissolution of the relations with Armenian parties until the Balkan Wars.

### ***3.3. The Homogenization of Anatolia***

The Balkan Wars played a crucial role in the change of the policies of the CUP. Before the Wars, the Ottomanism which aimed to unite all communities under the Ottoman nation was tested in the Balkan Wars. The loss of the regions from Balkans

---

<sup>14</sup> Dadrian argues that radical nationalists of the CUP in Salonika including Dr. Nazim had crucial role in the Massacres of Adana. It became rehearsal for the Armenian Genocide of 1915 (Dadrian, 2007: 5).

including non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman state ended Ottomanism. Turkish nationalism and Islamism became the only policies for the CUP after the Balkan Wars. They tried to prevent the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire with these ideologies. Additionally, there emerged the immigration waves from Balkan regions where there were attempts to massacre Muslims. The settlement of the immigrants became a problem that could “damage the safety and public order of the Ottoman Empire” for the CUP government before World War I (Dündar, 2007: 34). On the other hand, the change of the policies of the CUP affected the relations between Muslim and non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire, especially Greeks and Armenians. The perception of the government on Armenians also changed and began to regard them as an internal enemy of the state. Thus, in this part, I will focus on the homogenization of Anatolia through “deportations of Armenians” and settlement of the Muslim immigrants in Anatolia.

Fuat Dündar claims that after the Balkan Wars, the CUP aimed to Islamize and Turkify the population of the Ottoman Empire to save the remaining territories. The main policy of the settlement by the CUP was to mix the population. However, whenever this policy did not work, purification became the main method for the settlement of the population. The main aim was to provide the domination of Turkish and Muslim population in the Ottoman Empire besides economic and humanitarian reasons and to open empty land to the production (Dündar, 2007: 246). The immigration movements from the Balkans and Caucasus and the First World War provided the opportunities for this policy. From the Balkans, approximately 640.000

people immigrated into the Ottoman Empire.<sup>15</sup> These immigrants included Albanians, Bosnians, Gypsies, Turks, and Circassians from Balkans.<sup>16</sup> With the outbreak of World War I, the second wave of immigration began into the Ottoman Empire. These immigrants consisted of Circassian, Georgians, Kurds and Laz who escaped from the Russian forces. All of these immigrants were Muslims, and they were settled in different regions of the Ottoman Empire where the non-Muslim populations were forced to migrate by the state.

The CUP did not only settle the Muslim population but also settle the non-Muslim population of the Ottoman Empire. However, this settlement process involved mutual agreement and/or forced migration of Bulgarians, Greeks and Armenians which resulted in the purification of the regions. First, after regaining of Edirne from Bulgaria on September 29<sup>th</sup>, 1913 as a result of Ottoman-Bulgarian Convention, the Ottoman state and Bulgaria took agreement about the population exchange. This convention included that the people of Bulgarian and Muslim villages in the borderline between two states were exchanged with their goods. This area was expanded towards all Thrace by the pressure of the CUP. As a result of this population exchange, 48,570 Muslims and 46,764 Bulgarians were exchanged (Akçam, 2008: 79-80; Dündar, 2008: 188-190). Thus, the CUP achieved one part of the homogenization of Thrace with this population exchange. Second, the CUP

---

<sup>15</sup> It is not possible to reach the actual number of the immigrants because the Ottoman Empire did not calculate the number of immigrants. Hamdi Bey, administrator of Settlement office, said in the Parliament of Notables that the state estimated 450,000 immigrants who came after the Constitutional regime and Balkan Wars (Dündar, 2007: 56-57). On the other hand, according to the notebook of Talat Pasha, 339,074 immigrants came to the Ottoman Empire (Bardakçı, 2008: 39).

<sup>16</sup> For the detailed analysis about the settlement of all these nations in the Ottoman Empire: Dündar, Fuat (2007), *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası (1913-1918)*, 3. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

began to target Greek population in Thrace to provide security in the borderland. The Greek population had to leave their villages due to the pressure of army. According to Dündar based on the report of the British Consulate in İstanbul, in the first three months of 1914, 20,000 Greeks from Edirne immigrated from the Ottoman Empire while Muslims were settled to replace them (Dündar, 2008: 195). With the outbreak of World War I, the CUP tried to provide security for the coastal regions of Marmara and Black Sea where Greeks lived. These Greek populations were settled in the Anatolian hinterland (Dündar, 2008: 230-34). Akçam argues that there was a political decision on the Greek people during the war. Before, the government aimed to exclude them with tow mechanisms including legal process and excluding them through pressure and massacre. However, during the war, settlement of Greeks into the Anatolian hinterland was committed due to military and security reasons (Akçam, 2008: 116-117). Consequently, the CUP settled or deported Greeks and Bulgarians to homogenize Anatolia. These regions where Greeks and Bulgarians had to leave were settled by the Muslim immigrants. Now, I will focus on the “Armenian deportations” which took crucial part in the homogenization of Anatolia.

### **3.3.1. ‘The Armenian Deportations’**

The decision of the deportations of the Armenian populations by the CUP is one of the most disputable and dramatic issue of the Turkish history. It deeply changed the political and socio-economic structure of the Ottoman Empire. It was the main part of the homogenization policies of the CUP which were openly shaped after the Balkan Wars. World War I provided opportunities for the CUP government to achieve this project. In this part, I will focus on this issue. First, I will assess the

process of the deportations which resulted in the massacres of the Armenians. I will attempt to contextualize this issue. Then, I will briefly discuss the genocide debate from Armenian and Turkish sides.

World War I began on June 28<sup>th</sup>, 1914 and the Ottoman Empire established an alliance with Germany on August 2, 1914. This resulted in the declaration of war to Russia, France and Britain. Taner Akçam argues that the CUP considered the war as an opportunity to implement its projects. Like the Capitulations and Armenian Reform Plan, the CUP aimed to eliminate all international treaties which restricted the economic and political independence of the state. The other project of the CUP was related to the Pan-Islamist and Pan-Turkist aims. Through the war, some leaders of the CUP including Enver attempted to reach the Turks and Muslims in Central Asia and Northern India to establish a Turkish state. Final project was to regain the territories which were lost from Balkan regions (Akçam, 2002: 200). After the entrance of the Ottoman Empire in the war, on August 23, the cabinet decided to send a note to all powers for the unilateral abrogation of the capitulations. It came into effect on October 1 (Ahmad, 2008: 40). On December 31, the government ended the works of inspectors who controlled the application of the Armenian Reform Plan (Maraşlı, 2008: 195).

Thus, in the beginning of the war, the CUP began to implement its projects and this led the government to exercise “full sovereignty throughout the war” (Ahmad, 2008: 41). However, these successes were not followed by the success in the war. In the beginning of the war, the Ottoman Empire was defeated in different fronts. I will briefly mention about the defeat of Sarıkamış which deeply affected the Pan-Turanist

ideology and Armenians of the Ottoman Empire. Enver aimed to defeat Russia in eastern frontline. He led a huge army against the Russian forces in late 1914. In the beginning he was victorious. Kars was ceased and Sarıkamış surrounded. However, the army was not prepared for the harsh winter (Suny, 1993: 109). Under the harsh weather conditions, the Turkish army faced a disastrous defeat. Only in twelve days, without any conflict with the Russian forces, approximately 90000 soldiers died due to cold weather, starvation, typhus and other epidemic diseases (Maraşlı, 2008: 203). The defeat on the eastern front affected the policy of the CUP. Despite the fact that causes of deaths in Sarıkamış were related to the policy of Enver who led the army to fight against Russian forces in unsuitable weather conditions, the CUP targeted the Armenians as treachery to Russian forces. The Armenians were declared as disloyal and enemy of the Ottoman Empire in the fronts of the war.<sup>17</sup> Suny claims that “Enver’s defeat on the Caucasian front was the prelude to the final solution of the Armenian Question” (1993: 109).

After the defeat of Sarıkamış, the CUP government took decisions about the Armenians. On February 25<sup>th</sup>, 1915 the order which aimed to disarm the Armenian soldiers in the army was sent to the army troops.<sup>18</sup> Taner Akçam argues that after the

---

<sup>17</sup> After the defeat of Sarıkamış, it was claimed that a Turkish Armenian soldier escaped from the troops to the Russian forces. This soldier explained detailed information about the tactics of Enver. Russian forces who were aware of Enver’s plans retreated. This resulted in the defeat of the Turkish army. For this kind of claim: Kocaş, Sadi (1967), *Tarih Boyunca Ermeniler ve Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara: Altınok Matbaası, p.167. For the critic of this claim including how the Armenians became the main responsible of the defeat of Sarıkamış through the analysis of contemporary telegraphs and reports: Maraşlı, Recep (2008), *Ermeni Ulusal Demokratik Hareketi ve 1915 Soykırımı*, İstanbul: Peri Yayınları, p. 205-213.

<sup>18</sup> After the declaration of the war, the government decided the state of war (*seferberlik*) which led recruitment of Armenians to the army. This included the adults from 15 years old to 60 years old. The Armenian parties, the Dashnaksutiun and Hnchak, declared the neutrality but to carry out the duties of the citizenship after negotiation with the CUP. On the other hand, the Caucasian Armenians who were citizens of Russia joined the Russian army to fight against the Ottoman Empire. In spite of the decisions of the parties, Armenians in İstanbul voluntarily recruited into the Ottoman army.

disarmament, Armenians in the army began to be exterminated. As Akçam points out, the health officer, German Jakob Kunzler in Urfa Mission Hospital maintained that Armenians who were recruited into Worker Battalions (*Amele Taburları*) were annihilated (Akçam, 2002: 251). These continued during the wars.

### **3.3.2. The Decisions of the Deportations**

The deportations of the Armenians began in the early years of 1915 before the official decision to deport all Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. According to Akçam, this early deportations were implemented due to military reasons and did not aim to exterminate Armenians in spite of some killings during these deportations because British officials pursued some intelligent activities (Akçam, 2002: 252). The other reason for this kind of deportations was that Armenians planned to rebel. In the order sent by Talat to the province of Adana on March 2, 1915, the Armenians of Dörtüol was deported to the determined areas, and every attempt to revolt was immediately annihilated with their reasons.<sup>19</sup> Another telegram from the Ministry of the Interior to the Fourth Army Command on April 24<sup>th</sup>, 1915 shows that the government deported Armenians of Zeytun and Maraş to Konya. In this telegram, the Minister of the Interior, Talat, gave an order that no more Armenians were sent to Konya other than those who had already been sent because they could collaborate with other Armenians in this region. Additionally, if it was necessary, the Armenians

---

However, with the recruiting of non-Muslim subjects into army, the state aimed to control them because the Armenians in the army had only backward duties. The Armenians worked in the Worker Battalions (*Amele Taburları*), which consisted of the constructions of roads and mine (Maraşlı, 2008: 195; 208-209; Akçam, 2002: 248-249).

<sup>19</sup> BOA. DH. ŞFR, nr. 50/141 in Basbakanlik Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı, (1995), *Armenians in Ottoman Documents (1915-1920)*, Ankara, p.22



from İskenderun, Adana, Haçin, Zeytun and Sis could be deported to Haleb, Zor and Urfa.<sup>20</sup>

After these deportations, the government was going to deport all Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. On April 24<sup>th</sup>, 1915 the CUP government began to inquire against Armenian political organizations in the Ottoman Empire: “The Ministry of the Interior ordered with a circular that the Armenian Committee centers be closed, that their documents be seized and that the committee leader be arrested” (Gürün, 2007: 263).<sup>21</sup> 235 people were arrested after this order in İstanbul and within two days this number rose to 2345 (Dündar, 2008: 276). These people were sent to Ayas and Çankırı.<sup>22</sup> Fuat Dündar argues that the causes of April 24<sup>th</sup> decision were the political power of Armenians in the eyes of foreign states, to prevent the intensification of Armenians and the Çanakkale war and Russian proceeding in eastern frontline (Dündar: 2008: 276). In the early days of May, the evacuation of Zeytun Armenians continued. The telegram from Talat to the governor of Maras on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 1915 ordered that the removal of all Armenians of Zeytun was necessity which was communicated to the Supreme Military Command.<sup>23</sup> On the same day, the Ministry of Interior ordered the deportations of Armenians of Van, Bitlis, Muş, Sasun and

---

<sup>20</sup> BOA. DH. ŞFR, nr. 52/93 in *ibid*, p. 26

<sup>21</sup> On April 24<sup>th</sup>, 1915, this order sent to the provinces of Edirne, Erzurum, Adana, Ankara, Aydın, Bitlis, Haleb, Hüdavendigâr, Diyarbekir, Sivas, Trabzon, Konya, Ma’muretül’aziz, Van and mutassarrıflık (governors of Sanjak) of Urfa, İzmit, Bolu, Canik, Karesi, Kayseri, Niğde, Eskişehir, Karahisar-i Sahib and Maraş. DH. ŞFR, 52/96, 97,98 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı (2007), *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, Ankara, p.125-126

<sup>22</sup> BOA. DH. ŞFR. Nr. 52/102 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı, (1995), *Armenians in Ottoman Documents (1915-1920)*, Ankara, p. 26-27

<sup>23</sup> BOA. DH. ŞFR. Nr. 52/286 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı, (1995), *Armenians in Ottoman Documents (1915-1920)*, Ankara, p.30-31

Erzurum to the southern regions of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>24</sup> The other telegram sent on May 23, 1914 ordered the settlement of these Armenians in Zor, Aleppo and Urfa.<sup>25</sup>

After these deportations of Armenians, the allied countries published a declaration that Kurds and Turks organized the Armenian massacres. They stated that all members of the Ottoman Empire and people who joined the massacres would become responsible. The Unionist government published counter-declaration in which the allied countries were accused of provoking Armenians (Dündar, 2008: 285). Thus, the declaration of allied countries became effective for the policies of the government. At first, the CUP tried to legalize this deportation process. On May 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 the Ministry of Interior prepared a temporary law and the Ministry of State (*Meclis-i Vukela*) took the deportation decision on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This decision ordered the deportation of Armenians who engaged in dangerous activities such as collaborating with the enemy, massacring innocent people and instigating rebellions to Mosul, Zor, Aleppo and some regions of Syria.<sup>26</sup> The government also adopted a temporary law about the deportation of Armenians on May 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915<sup>27</sup> which was accepted on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This law had four titles. This included practices of the government against opposition groups. Also, the army was authorized to eliminate all opposition movements including violations in arms and any resistances. Also, the army was authorized to deport the people of villages and towns. If the army corps

---

<sup>24</sup> DH. ŞFR. Nr. 52/282 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı (2007), *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, Ankara, p.134-135

<sup>25</sup> DH. ŞFR. Nr. 53/93 in *ibid.* P. 151

<sup>26</sup> BOA. Meclis-i Vükela Mazbatası, 198/163 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı, (1995), *Armenians in Ottoman Documents (1915-1920)*, Ankara, p.33-35

<sup>27</sup> This law was published on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915 in *Takvim-i Vekayi*. For the copy of original document: Kardeş, Salâhaddin (2008), 'Tehcir ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı, Ankara, p. 19-20

and commanders perceive the spying or betrayals of these people, or they see necessary, they would deport these people to other places. The Minister of War, Enver Pasha, was responsible for the enforcement of this law. Although this law did not directly specify Armenians, their deportations were committed according to this law. Thus, the army was responsible with full authority to apply this law. Whenever it senses any betrayals of people, the army was ordered to exterminate them.

On June 21, 1915 the order was sent to Trabzon, Diyarbakir, Canik, Sivas and Ma'muretül'aziz which were not deported before. The term, "without exception all Armenians", was used in this order to deport Armenians in these regions.<sup>28</sup> After these decisions, the deportations continued until August 29<sup>th</sup>, 1915.<sup>29</sup> The decision to end the deportations was taken after the protest of the USA which wanted to prevent mass displacement (Dündar, 2008: 311). However, Armenian deportations were continued. The Ministry of Interior gave an order to learn the number of Armenians who had not reached to the region of Zor (Dündar, 2008: 312). The deportations were finished on March 15<sup>th</sup>, 1916 with the telegram sent to the provinces and governors of sanjaks which ordered that due to administrative and military matters, no Armenian be deported for any reasons from now on.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, after the deportations of the Armenians, the project of homogenization of the Anatolia was barely implemented. The Armenians from many regions of the Ottoman Empire<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> DH. ŞFR. Nr. 54/87 in Dündar, Fuat (2008), *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi, İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği (1913-1918)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 489

<sup>29</sup> DH. ŞFR., 55/292 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı (2007), *Osmanii Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, Ankara, p. 227-228

<sup>30</sup> BOA. DH. ŞFR, nr. 62/21 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı, (1995), *Armenians in Ottoman Documents (1915-1920)*, Ankara, p.143-144

<sup>31</sup> According to the notebook of Talat Pasha, the deportation decisions were applied to the vilayets including Ankara, Erzurum, Adana, Bitlis, Halep, Hüdavendigâr, Diyarbakir, Sivas, Trabzon, Ma'muretül'aziz and the sanjaks including İzmit, Canik, Karesi, Karahisar, Kayseri, Maraş, Niğde and Konya (Bardakçı, 2008: 77).

were forcibly deported. More importantly, these forced deportations resulted in the death and killing of many Armenians due to various reasons. There are two kinds of views about the death of the Armenians during deportations. Many studies from Turkey maintain that it was such a forced migration which was used in the Ottoman Empire from the beginning, and deaths emerged due to some misuses of the officials and epidemic diseases. On the other hand, most studies from outside Turkey and few studies in Turkey argue that the massacres of the Armenians were systematically organized by the state and it was the first genocide of twentieth century. Now, I will analyze this kind of arguments through assessing the institutional and individual role in the deaths of Armenians.

From the Turkish state perspective, the studies advocate that the events of the deportations could not be considered as genocide because the deportations were implemented in the legal process of the Ottoman laws. These studies include *the Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi (Armenians in History and the Armenian Question)* written by Esat Uras, *Ermeni Tehciri ve Gerçekler (Facts on the relocation of Armenian)* by Yusuf Halaçoğlu, *the Armenian Question* by Mim Kemal Öke, *the Armenian File* by Kamuran Gürün and the *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi (History of Turkish Revolution)* by Yusuf Hikmet Bayur.

All these scholars discuss the Armenian issue in terms of Armenian nationalism and imperialism. All argue that the state had to deport Armenians because the Armenian nationalist organizations aimed to establish their own independent state and they joined the Russian army to attack the Ottoman Empire during the war period. First, they argue that both Armenians and Turks lived in harmony and there were not any

discrimination against Armenians. However, with rising of the nationalism, Armenians demanded separation from the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, Great Powers had the role in this demands and they used Armenian separatists to undermine the Ottoman Empire. During World War I, they claim that the state decided to deport Armenians because they cooperated with enemies as belligerents and broke out uprisings in various places in Anatolia (Uras, 1987: 593-616); Halaçoğlu, 2001: 40; Gürün, 2002: 206; Öke, 2001: 122 and Bayur, 1991: 35-38). Thus, they legitimized the policies of the state to show atrocities and demands of Armenians related with aims of the Great Powers.

According to these studies, deaths occurred for various reasons during the deportations. These reasons included epidemics, climatic factors, the hardships suffered during the journey, some attacks from brigands. Also, some officials participated in illegal acts, and did not protect the Armenians. Kamuran Gürün interprets this process as “certainly not the ones who were killed while fighting, nor those who died of epidemics of typhus, typhoid fever, cholera, and variola, which were widespread in Turkey, or of famine. It can not be claimed that they would not have died if they had stayed in their homes because the epidemics spread to the areas of their residence and took hundreds of thousands of lives” (Gürün, 2007: 276-277). This is the common point of the studies from Turkish side.

The studies including the book *the History of the Armenian Genocide* (1995) written by Vahakn Dadrian, *From Empire to Republic: Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide* (2004), *İnsan Hakları ve Ermeni Sorunu* (2002) and *Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur* (2008) by Taner Akçam, *Looking toward Ararat* (1993) by

Ronald Grigor Suny and *Ermeni Ulusal Demokratik Hareketi and 1915 Soykırımı* (2008) by Recep Maraşlı<sup>32</sup> define the events of the deportation as genocide and discuss it in terms of the Turkish nationalism reacting to the Armenians and their nationalist movement. These scholars claim that the cadre of the CUP planned to homogenize Anatolia, and in a systematic program of murder, the Unionists organized massive attack on Armenians. Dadrian, Akçam and Maraşlı argue that military defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans, the interference of Western powers, inflow of migrations from the Balkans and Caucasus and rising of nationalism among non-Muslims resulted in fears of dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the state systematically repressed non-Muslims, especially Armenians in order to save the Ottoman Empire. Suny rejects the point that Armenian and Turks lived in harmony. Rather, he claims that Armenians were subordinated to Muslims because of being Christians. Also, Suny rejected an argument that Armenian revolts forced the state to take a decision of deportation. He argues that only small minority of Armenians organized rebellions in Anatolia. Fuat Dündar also discusses this argument with the analysis of report on the possibility of alliance established between Armenians and Kurds and concludes that the state investigated the possibility of insurrection among Armenians and did not see any possibility of insurrections. Moreover, the Armenians did not have any courage for this (Dündar, 2008: 340).

---

<sup>32</sup> Despite the fact that these scholars advocate the events of the deportations of 1915 as genocide, they were differentiated in their analysis. Dadrian claims that the Armenian genocide was planned before it happened and he emphasizes the intentions of the Unionists toward Armenians. However, Akçam and Suny emphasize the post-Balkan wars situations and rising radicalization in that period resulted in the genocide. For them, contingent events which appeared during the war led the CUP to commit the genocide against Armenians.

According to these studies, the Armenians were killed by the organized brigands, the Special Organization<sup>33</sup> (*Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa*) and the army. The party, the Ministry of Interior and the Special Organization had coordination and the order of the massacres was implemented by the coordination of these institutions (Dadrian, 1995: 235; Akçam, 2007: 273). Besides these institutions, governors of provinces and sanjaks played active role in the massacres. Taner Akçam gives the hierarchic scheme to show the responsibility for the massacres: official deportation order was delivered by the Ministry of Interior to the governors of the provinces. The governors sent this order to the security organizations of the region including police organization and gendarme. The extermination of the convoys was organized by the Center of Public (*Merkez-i Umumi*) and Bahattin Şakir who was one of the leading figures of the Special Organization. The main role in the massacres was taken by Party Inspectors (*Katib-i Mesûller*) who sent ciphered telegrams to determined regions (Akçam, 276). Akçam also mentions about three significant sources for the organization of massacres: criminals, immigrants and Kurdish tribes. These became the basis for the cadres of the Special Organization. Firstly, the government adopted a decision to free the prisoners in order to recruit them into the organization of brigands (Akçam, 2002: 236). Secondly, Maraşlı claims that like the Hamidian troops, the Kurdish tribes were

---

<sup>33</sup> The Special Organization was established by the Unionist in 1913. One of the purposes of its establishment was to resolve the Armenian Question. "Equipped with special codes, funds, cadres, weapons and ammunition, they functioned as semi-autonomous the state within the state". According to Dadrian, the mission of this organization was to deploy in remote areas of the interior of the Ottoman Empire and ambush and destroy the convoys of Armenian deportation. Their cadres mainly consisted of convicted criminals (Dadrian, 1995: 236). For the detailed information about the role of special organization in the Armenian deportations: Maraşlı, Recep (2008), *Ermeni Ulusal Demokratik Hareketi ve 1915 Soykırımı*, İstanbul: Peri Yayınları, p. 250-255; Akçam, Taner (2002), *İnsan Hakları ve Ermeni Sorunu*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 269-276 and Dadrian, Vahakn (1995), *ibid*, p. 236-239. Tarık Zafer Tunaya gives different definition for the purpose of the Special Organization. According to Tunaya, the aims of the Organization are to make easy the duties of the army, to collect information, to undermine the enemies from inside and to approach guerilla warfare. Ideologically, this organization aimed to spread Turkism and pan-Islamism (Tunaya, 2007: 344).

used in the massacres of Armenians in order to seize the goods and properties of the Armenians (Maraşlı, 2008: 273). Finally, the Muslim immigrants from Balkans and Caucasus took active role in the organizations of the brigands (Akçam, 2002: 237).

In this respect, the deportations of the Armenians during World War I resulted in the homogenization of Anatolia with dismissing and killings of the Armenians. According to the notebook of Talat Pasha which was published by Murat Bardakçı in 2008, the numbers of the deported Armenians were 924,158. In that time, Talat Pasha estimated 1,500,000 Armenians in the Ottoman Empire (Bardakçı, 2008: 77; 109). According to the estimate of Dündar from the notebook of Talat, three hundreds thousands of Armenians were missing and five hundreds thousands of them reached to the concentration camps (Dündar, 2008: 340). Consequently, the deportations of the Armenians resulted in the massacres of Armenians and homogenization of Anatolia. It changed the political and socio-economic structure of the Ottoman Empire deeply.

### ***3.4. The Trial of the Members of the CUP after World War I***

After the end of World War I, the Unionists faced the trials from allied powers and the Ottoman government due to the war crimes. These trials included the responsibility of the institutions and individuals during wars. In this sense, the massacres of Armenians during the deportations took crucial part in these trials. In this part, I will assess these trials related to the Armenian massacres.

First, the allied powers tried to judge the Ottoman Empire due to three main reasons. One reason was to share the territories of Anatolia. This was the aim of the European



powers from the nineteenth century but this was not realized due to the disagreement of the powers about how they shared Anatolia. However, this problem was resolved through the treaties among the Great powers before World War I (Akçam, 2002: 338). Second reason was cultural clashes. Akçam claims that the Great Powers aimed to expel Turks from Europe since the invasion of İstanbul (2002: 342). The final reason was the Armenian massacres. The news about the massacres of Armenian affected the public of the West and they accused of Turks for human right crimes (2002: 344). At first, the allied powers tried to apply principles of international law to the perpetrators of the massacres (Dadrian, 1995: 303). During the Paris Peace Conference, the allied powers tried to judge the Ottoman Empire according to the international laws.<sup>34</sup> In the conference, there emerged a discussion on the war crime and crime of humanity because in the international law, it was not clearly cited. Because the crime of humanity included moral values and it could be changed according to the characteristics of different states, it was not used. In the conference, Commission on the Responsibility of the Authors of the Wars and the Enforcement of Penalties was established to investigate the war criminals and the rules to apply them (Akçam, 2002: 369-370).

The Allies' desires and attempts to prosecute Turkish military and government officials led the Ottoman Government to establish the trials to prosecute them in order to get positive results from Paris Peace conference. After the war, the CUP government resigned on October 8<sup>th</sup>, 1918 and on October 19<sup>th</sup>, Ahmet İzzet Pasha Cabinet replaced it. The program of this cabinet did not include any articles which

---

<sup>34</sup> During this time, the 1907 Hague convention included the articles about principles of humanity, sense of community and the law of humanity which determined the rules of the wars on the peoples (Dadrian, 1995: 304)

criticized the war policies of the CUP. Rather, it prepared some political arrangements. For the deportations, it planned to provide the expenses of the people including returning of their goods. This cabinet was pressured by the allied powers, sultan and media. As a result, Ahmet İzzet Pasha resigned and Tevfik Pasha established the new cabinet on November 11<sup>th</sup>, 1918.

On November 4<sup>th</sup>, 1918 a motion was adopted by the Parliament. This motion stated ten charges against the Minister of two wartime Cabinets “referring to their misdeeds related to the Turkish participation in World War I including aggression, military incompetence, political abuses and economic crimes. Two of these charges were related to the Armenian massacres” (Dadrian, 1995: 319). To investigate these charges, the Fifth Committee of the Chamber of Deputies was founded. The investigations began on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 1918 and ended on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 1918. Although the statements of the investigation were sent to deputies, the Sultan dissolved the Parliament on December 21, 1918. Thus, the decision about the Court Martial was not taken. Indeed, after the dissolution of the Parliament, the investigation remained inconclusive (Akçam, 2002: 424).

The real prosecutions of the criminals of the massacres were implemented by the cabinet of Damat Ferid Pasha which replaced the Tevfik Pasha cabinet on March 4<sup>th</sup>, 1919. Main aim of the new cabinet was to prosecute the CUP. Damat Ferid continued to the judgments of the Court Martial was initially formed by Imperial authorization on December 16<sup>th</sup>, 1918. According to Dadrian; “part of the task of this Tribunal (*cümle-i vazife*) was the investigation of the charges of massacres and unlawful, personal profiteering (*taktıl ve ihtikâr*)” (Dadrian, 1995: 321).

After these trials, there emerged some arrests including the governor of sanjaks in Adana, Ankara and Çorum in the beginning of December, 1918. The kaimakam of Bogazlıyan, Mehmet Kemal Bey, was arrested on January 7<sup>th</sup>. The arrests of governors and former deputies began after January 14<sup>th</sup>, 1919. These arrests were implemented according to the determination of the government but some arrests were carried out according to the testimonies of victims of massacres (Akçam, 2002: 465-467). The turning point of these trials was the use of the death penalty. The Cabinet of Damat Ferid executed the death penalty of Mehmet Kemal Bey who was hung on the Beyazıd square on April 10<sup>th</sup>, 1919. This execution led to reaction. The ceremony of funeral of Kemal Bey became a national demonstration and he was declared as ‘a great martyr of Turks’ (Akçam, 2002: 472). On the other hand, Greece invaded İzmir on May 15<sup>th</sup>, 1919 which led to the massacres of Turks. People protested the invasion and massacres in every region of the country. After these protests, Damad Ferid began to free 46 arrests in the Court Martial. In this sense, to prevent releases of other arrests, Britain sent them to Malta on May 28<sup>th</sup>, 1919 (Yeghiayan, 2007: XIX).

Ali Rıza Pasha formed the new government after the resignation of Damad Ferid on October 2, 1919. By this time, Mustafa Kemal began to shape the Turkish National Movement. After the congress of Erzurum and Sivas, national movement created the Board of Representation (*Heyet-i Temsiliye*) which led to the resignation of Damad Ferid. Damad Ferid tried to arrest Mustafa Kemal but this attempt was unsuccessful. Then, national movement began to boycott the government through telegraph wars aiming to resign Damad Ferid. The new government did not carry out any acts against the criminals of war and massacres. The national movement established links

with Ali Rıza Pasha. After the vote, the new parliament was opened on January 12<sup>th</sup>, 1920 including many deputies who were candidates of the Committee of Defense of Anatolia and Rumelia. These deputies created the group of Happiness of Homeland (*Felâh-i Vatan*). Their main concerns were harsh peace conditions and injustice against Turks including the massacres of Turks, the attempts of establishment of Armenia and Kurdistan and invasion of Anatolia (Akçam, 2002: 475-478). Therefore, the prosecution of criminals was not the main aim of the cabinet of Ali Rıza Pasha.

In this sense, the occupation of İstanbul by allied powers on March 16<sup>th</sup>, 1920 changed this process. The leaders of the national movement including Rauf Orbay and Kara Vasif were arrested and sent to Malta. With the formation of the government by Damad Ferid after the invasion of İstanbul, the judgments of criminals of massacres continued. On June 20<sup>th</sup>, 1920 the other death penalty was executed and the Kaimakam of Urfa, Nusret Bey was hung. Then, the responsible for the gendarme organization, Abdullah Avni was hung on June 22 (Akçam, 2002: 552). Ankara Government began to oppose to the prosecutions of the Court Martial because the followers of the Ankara Government were arrested by Damad Ferid. The courts did not separate them from the criminals of massacres. Indeed, Mustafa Kemal and his friends were also judged by default, and the court decided the death penalty for them. In this vein, the Ankara government rejected the judgment of the criminals and began to protect them. In this respect, Ankara Government adopted a law which invalidated any political and commercial treaties and contracts adopted by the İstanbul government on June 7<sup>th</sup>, 1920. However, the Court Martial continued to judge the members of the national movement until April 24<sup>th</sup>, 1922 when the İstanbul

Government declared that it was authorized to judge them. On June, 11<sup>th</sup>, 1922 the Court Martial was dissolved (Akçam, 2002: 558). Consequently, the prosecution of the CUP became unsuccessful to judge the criminals. With the changes of the process, these prosecutions lost their significance in the clash between Ankara and İstanbul governments.

In the next chapter, I will analyze the legal process on the Armenian abandoned properties from 1915 to 1930. The laws, decrees, orders and decisions on the Armenian properties between these years will be assessed in the next chapter. Before the analysis of the legal process, the land issue as a result of Hamidian massacres will be also analyzed in terms of the report of Armenian patriarchate prepared in 1911.

## **Chapter 4: The Legal Process of the Armenian Abandoned Properties**

### ***4.1. Introduction***

In this chapter, I will try to analyze the legal situation of the Armenian properties during and after the Armenian deportations of 1915. During the deportations, the Armenian properties which were left by Armenians became a problem, and the Ottoman government adopted different laws about the management of these properties. In this vein, I will assess the laws, regulations and decrees legislated from 1915 to 1928 about the Armenian properties which were called '*the abandoned properties*' in the legislation of the Ottoman Empire. Before this analysis, I will briefly focus on the Armenian properties which were seized by the Kurdish, Circassian and Turkish notables in the eastern regions of Anatolia during the reign of Abdülhamid II. It was called 'land issue' which became the main topic in the relationship between the CUP and Armenian political organization during the second constitutional period. Therefore, through this analysis, I will aim to assess the attitude of the CUP toward the Armenian properties in terms of its relations with local notables.

### ***4.2. 'The land issue' and Armenian Properties prior to 1915***

During the reign of Abdülhamid II, there appeared many massacres occurred between 1894-1897 in the eastern regions of the Ottoman Empire, one of which was begun in the Sasun district and spread throughout the regions including Erzincan, Bitlis, Erzurum, Diyarbakir and elsewhere. As seen in the second chapter, these massacres were carried out by the Hamidian Cavalry established by Abdülhamid II.

The main purpose of the Hamidian Cavalry was “to provide a bulwark against the Russian threat” (McDowall, 2000: 59). This cavalry was from selected Sunni Kurdish tribes who proved their loyalty to the state. Being a part of this cavalry gave some advantages to the Kurdish tribes, which included the exemption from the conscription as one of the measures of the Ottoman centralization and a chance for tribes to send their children to the tribal school founded in İstanbul. For the Hamidian regime, the establishment of the Hamidian tribes drew Kurds into the fabric of the empire since during this time Russia exploited the complaints of the Kurdish tribes about both centralization attempts and reforms which favored Christian peasants. In addition, the Hamidian regime could not afford to alienate the Kurdish tribes regarding military and tax collection (McDowall, 2000: 59-62). Thus, recruitment of Kurdish tribes into the Hamidian regime gave opportunity to make Kurdish tribes loyal to the state.

In practice, with the establishment of the Hamidian troops, Abdülhamid II aimed to suppress the developing separatist Armenian movements and to control Kurds. By permitting raids and depredations for the Kurdish tribes, the Hamidian regime aimed to integrate Kurds into the Ottoman Empire (Bruinessen, 2004: 286; McDowall, 2000: 62; Adanır, 2002: 73). In this respect, the Hamidian regime reorganized eastern Anatolia which was enhanced by settlement of tribes, “sedentarized by the state to increase its control of peoples and resources” (Barkey, 2008: 288). This regular settlement resulted in the struggle between Muslim and non-Muslim population of the region. The Hamidian troops used their forces to put pressure on peasants, both Christians and Muslims. This was the result of the conflicts among tribes on taking authority in the region. During this period, the Armenian peasants

were mainly affected by the pressure of Hamidian troops. As Feroz Ahmad argues; “in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, Kurdish tribes seized the land of Armenian peasants and the Hamidian regime had done nothing to rectify the situation and many Armenians had fled to the Caucasus” (Ahmad, 2008: 187). In that period, the Armenian peasants who had to pay taxes to both the government and Kurdish notables refused to pay taxes and resisted the Kurdish tribes (Mann, 2005: 119). In summer 1894, “an affray between Armenian villagers and the local kaimakam concerning tax arrears gave the pretext for wholesale massacre in which Hamidian tribesman played a prominent part” (McDowall, 2000: 61). These massacres resulted in the deprivations of the Armenian properties including lands, houses and churches and led them to migrate into the Russian empire. Therefore, these properties became an important issue in the reform projects which were pressured by Great Power to the Ottoman Empire in terms of improving conditions of Christians in eastern Anatolia.

After the Sasun massacres, Britain, France and Russia wanted reform for the Armenian provinces. In May, 1895, through the diplomatic process between three ambassadors of these countries and the Hamidian regime, the Porte accepted this reform project. This reform project includes: “an amnesty for Armenian prisoners; approved governors, reparations for victims of the outrages at Sassoun [Sasun] and elsewhere; Kurdish nomadic movements to be allowed only under surveillance and for them generally to be encouraged to settle; and the Hamidiya to be disarmed” (McDowall, 2000: 61). In this reform-scheme, there was also an article directly about the property issue: “According to the reform-scheme, the Porte was to establish commissions consisting of two Muslims and two Christian members under the presidency of the superintendent of real estate, for the revision of titles to property in



the principal towns of the provinces and sanjaks” (Şaşmaz, 2000: 245). They collected the complaints in their districts and prepared reports to the administrative councils of their provinces. Also, the Porte sent four delegates from İstanbul to investigate any irregularities occurring in matters relating to the property. The instructions of the investigations were sent to the commissions, and emlak-commissions [land] in the provinces dealt with these inquire (Şaşmaz, 2000: 245). Nevertheless, it is unknown whether this reform project was implemented or not.

After 1908 revolution, the Dashnaksutiun gave the property issue priority in its relations with both government and the CUP. The Dashnaksutiun proposed “resolving the land issue by having the government pay financial compensation for disputed lands which were returned to rightful owners” (Ahmad, 2008: 187). The Porte was eager to consider this proposal about the land issue, and indicated a desire to restore these lands to their rightful owners (McDowall, 2000: 95-96). Also, İstanbul press focused on this land question and the grievances of the Armenian peasantry in the region. As Feroz Ahmad quoted from the newspaper *Near East*; “the question of the restoration of lands seized during the Armenian troubles by Kurdish Beys and Aghas has been discussed...The minister of the Interior may be trusted to do his utmost on behalf of Armenians, who have deserved well of the new regime” (Ahmad, 2008: 188).

However, these attempts to restore the lands faced oppositions from local Kurdish notables who tried to undermine the Porte’s aims. Some of them were the deputies in the parliament. Pirinçizade Feyzi Bey, Diyarbakir deputy was one of them: “On behalf of many other Kurdish notables, he vehemently protested in the Ottoman

parliament against the proposed government plan of expropriating Kurdish landowners” (Üngör, 2005: 33). The other Kurdish notable was İbrahim Pasha whose depredations had been indulged for years and “it was his harassment of Diyarbekir that had led to popular protests in that city against the sultan” (McDowall, 2000: 96). Another notable was Kör Hüseyin Pasha who had been a general in the Hamidian troops in the province of Van. During this time, he terrorized population and seized many lands. When the Armenian refugees returned from the Caucasus and the lands were returned to them, Hüseyin Pasha planned a Kurdish rebellion against the Porte. Indeed, the Patriarch warned that Hüseyin Pasha was active and continued confiscating villages (Ahmad, 2008: 191).

This process resulted in the conflicts between Kurds and Armenians in the eastern regions. The newspaper, *Sabah*, warned of the dangers of the situation in eastern Anatolia, specifically in Bitlis because of the passivity of the Porte against the land usurpation by Kurdish beys. When the Ottoman government wanted to take measure to restore land seized by the Kurdish aghas and beys, these aghas and beys began to attack Armenian villages in the Muş and Bitlis region (Ahmad, 2008: 188). During this time, the government was unable to control these massacres and too weak to establish law and order. Since the local notables were powerful in the regions and were able to win elections, they also had representation in the assembly (Ahmad, 2008: 191). Due to the clash among the CUP, Kurdish notables and Armenian political organizations, the attempts to restore the lands became unsuccessful. Despite the fact that three Armenian parties including the Dashnaktsutium, Hnchak and Constitutional Democrats agreed that Armenians voted with the CUP since the Committee guarantee the land and the school question (Ahmad, 2008: 190), the

relations between the CUP and Armenian political organizations ended in the effect of the Balkan Wars which resulted in the changes in the policy of the CUP toward Turkish nationalism. Therefore, the land issue became an unsolved issue in this relation.

In this point, a report<sup>35</sup> prepared by the land commission which was constituted by the Armenian Patriarchate about seized properties in the Anatolia included two sub-reports, one of which was written on April 7<sup>th</sup>, 1910, and second on May 29<sup>th</sup>, 1910. The main purpose of these reports was to show which properties were seized by Kurds and Circassians from the reign of Abdülhamid II and to give suggestions to the Patriarchate in order to take measure against these depredations. In the first report, the land commission reviewed the complaints including documents and lists about the Armenian properties. The commission argued that in every place, there were agreements and pacts in order to deprive Armenians from lands. The lands which were owned by the Armenian millet were seized and depredated through illegal and unlawful means. Moreover, in many districts, houses and buildings of Armenians were seized and given to Kurds and Circassians. Under miserable conditions, Armenians were expelled from their villages. Additionally, the churches and monasteries were seized and destroyed. In this report, the commission described fourteen types of the depredations which were used to sequester Armenian properties. These types included: lands which were sold cheaply by the government due to the tax debt; the lands which were sold cheaply by the Agriculture Bank

---

<sup>35</sup> Atatürk Library (*Atatürk Kitaplığı*), İstanbul Kitaplığı Bölümü, BEL\_OSM\_O.811, "*Anadolu'nun Muhtelifesinde Emlak ve Arazi-i Magsube Hakkında Ermeni Patrikhanesinde Teşkil Eden Komisyon-u Mahsusa Tarafından Tanzim Olunan Raporların Suret-i Mütercimesi*", Dersaadet: Doğramacıyan Matbaası, 1327 (1911).

(*Ziraat Bankası*) due to religion; valuable lands which were sold by the courts due to debts of persons; the lands which were seized by courts through false creditors corresponding to their credits; the lands which were seized by force due to the punitive debts; the lands which were occupied without any cession procedure; the unclaimed lands which were owned to Armenians who migrated abroad; and lands owned by churches and monasteries which were occupied. These were some categories of the lands which were seized and occupied. In these lands, the commissions gave suggestions to the Patriarchate that it was necessary to claim compensation for the events which appeared after 1880 and that judgments of the constitution could demand for a solution since it might prevent every grievance.

In the second report, the commission was constituted by the Patriarchate after the review of the first report. The general assembly of the Armenian millet urged the commission to evaluate hundreds of bills and reports which reached the Armenian bishops. These included about 7000 lands and real estate properties of 35 sanjaks, which were reviewed in 193 lists. In these lists, there was information about name of sanjaks, districts, liva (subdivision of province) of the lands and properties, name of the owners, types of properties, the date of depredations, name of the occupiers and the values of the properties. For these lists, the commission prepared four notebooks which were attached to the report. There were 33 monasteries, 27 churches, 16 graveyards and 81 big and small buildings which were owned by the millet. Also, there were the lists of grievances which appeared after 1890. These grievances included the confiscation of lands and properties by the government due to tax debts; the confiscations by Ziraat Bank due to religion; the confiscations of lands and properties by the government due to the tithe, or tax on corps (*aşar*); the confiscation

of important lands and properties due to unimportant debts; and occupations and confiscations without any lawful acts due to the religion.<sup>36</sup>

These occupations and depredations of the Armenian lands and properties appeared in the eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire including Diyarbekir, Bitlis, Siirt, Erzurum, Sivas, Van, Erzincan, Muş, Ma'muretül'aziz, and some of them in other regions such as Sinop and Amasya. In this respect, since this report was written by the commission of the Armenian Patriarchate, this information about the conditions of the Armenian lands and properties could be exaggerated. Nevertheless, as we have seen above, from the Hamidian regime, there were many events of depredations and occupations of the Armenian properties by Kurdish tribes. The Armenian Patriarchate took many complaints from the Armenian peasants. For instance, according to the Patriarchate's report, in 1896, Emin Pasha from Van vilayet seized the church of the monastery, three mills, two vineyards and three thousands dönüm (forty by forty arshins) lands owned by Armenians in 1896. The son of Emin Pasha, Ahmet Bey, looted a church in Erciş, Van, and the wife of Emin Pasha, Cevher, depredated the lands surrounding Arpizon church in Van. The other example is that Deyab Agha, the grandson of Kahraman Agha from Ulak tribe in Ma'muretül'aziz seized Garmiruk Surp Nişan Monastery which had 1000 dönüm lands, large meadowland pastures, forests and houses.

In addition, this property issue took prominent place in the relations between the CUP and Armenian political organizations, and the latter proposed the return of the properties to the real owners. This report was prepared in this period through the

---

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*

complaints which were collected by the Armenian bishops. However, in spite of the promise of the CUP about the land issue, the return of properties to the real owners was not satisfied due to the pressures of the Kurdish notables and changes in the policy of the CUP after the Balkan wars. In this vein, this report was significant in order to show the impact of the socio-economic motivations on the massacres of Armenians. The alliances between the Kurdish notables and the Porte which were established in the Hamidian regime shifted to the support of the CUP and constitutional regime when the interests of Kurdish notables were concerned. Therefore, I will attempt to analyze the legal process concerning the Armenian properties left behind during deportations of 1915 which were designated as abandoned properties in the legislation of the Ottoman Empire.

#### ***4.3. The Laws, Decrees and Orders about the Abandoned Properties***

The Armenian properties and goods left behind during deportation were an important issue for the Armenian Question. After the official decision to deport Armenians, many laws, regulations, decrees and public acts were adopted by the Ottoman and Republican governments.

In 1915, the Ottoman government adopted laws to manage. These laws legalized the liquidation of Armenian properties and included the settlement of migrants from the Balkans and Caucasus on these properties. After World War I, the new Government which was established by Ahmet İzzet Pasha in October 1918 and then by Tevfik Pasha in November 1918 attempted to satisfy the damages of Armenian properties and rejected previous laws. In contrast, the Ankara Government which ruled the

national movement in 1920 abolished the laws of the İstanbul government because they were adopted under the pressure of the Entente Powers. With the establishment of the Turkish Republic, the abandoned properties became the properties of the Treasury. Although the Republic proposed laws including items about the return of properties to original owners, it did not allow Armenian refugees in different neighboring countries to return to their homes.

Before the analysis of these laws, it is necessary to clarify the terms concerning Armenian properties. The term, abandoned properties is used in Legislation but there is no specific definition about who abandoned these properties. In the practice of laws, the laws about deserters and missing people (*mütegayyib*) are designated as ‘the laws of the abandoned properties’. The state applied the laws about abandoned properties to all people including Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarian, Jews and Syrians. However, in the legislation, there was a separation in the execution of the laws. Deserter and missing people (*firari ve mütegayyib kişiler*) refer to Armenians. The laws of abandoned properties were applied to those Armenians (Düzceer, 1994: 96). In other words, Greeks, Bulgarians, Jews and Syrians were not considered deserter and missing people, and the laws about abandoned properties would not be applied to their properties. Their conditions were defined by different categories and applied according to different laws. For instance, the laws about Greek migrants (*mübadil*) who migrated according to the law of population exchange between Greece and Turkey referred to conveyance of property laws (*temlik kanunları*) (Düzceer, 1994: 101).

However, despite the fact that this separation can be true in the legal terminology, the state did not use this separation in the liquidation of the properties. Indeed, the

properties of Greek migrants were managed according to the specific treaties and contracts between Greece and Turkey. However, during the Republican period, in some cases, Greeks and Bulgarians were considered in the category of deserted and missing people and decisions of their trials were made according to the abandoned property laws (Düzceer, 1994: 96-125). In other words, in practical sense, all properties which were left behind by Armenians, Greeks or other groups were managed according to the legislation on the abandoned properties.

#### **4.3.1. First Period: During World War I (1915-1917)**

The deportations of Armenians began during World War I. This deportation was considered the necessity of the war because Armenians were claimed to have collaborated with enemies. By doing this, the state legalized the evacuation of the Armenian population to benefit from the war. In the beginning of the war, there were some decisions to deport Armenians without taking any legal decisions. The deportations of Armenians began in February 1915.

Despite the fact that deportation of Armenians in some provinces started earlier, the Ottoman government needed to legalize these deportations. First, the government adopted a temporary law about the deportation of Armenians on May 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This law had four titles, one of which included practices of the government against opposition groups. The army was authorized to eliminate all opposition movements including armed struggle and any resistances. Also, the army was authorized to deport the people of villages and towns. If the army corps and commanders perceived the spying or betrayals of these people, or when they saw necessary, they



would deport these people to other places. The Minister of War, Enver Pasha, was responsible for the enforcement of this law. Although this law did not directly specify Armenians, their deportations were committed according to this law. However, this law did not include any items about the Armenian properties.<sup>37</sup>

Second, after a few days of the adaptation of this temporary law, the cabinet decided to enact a law about the deportation. The deportation decision of the cabinet was adopted on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This decision legalized the previous temporary law and expanded its range. This decision directly referred to Armenians. It aimed to deport Armenians who “have engaged in dangerous activities such as collaborating with the enemy, massacring innocent people and instigating rebellions”.<sup>38</sup> As different from the previous one, it included items about the Armenian properties. This decision on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915 aimed at protecting the properties left behind or giving back the worth of these properties to the deported Armenians. Also, this decision anticipated the determination of the types, values and amounts of the immovable properties and land. After this, all of them including lands and properties were allocated to the migrants. In the law, the term, migrants, was not defined but it referred to the people who migrated from Balkans and Caucasus. In other words, the cabinet gave the order to settle these migrants in the evacuated villages or towns with this decision. The other properties including olive orchards, mulberry orchards, vineyard and orange orchards, and workshops, road houses, factories and stores were sold by auction. The auction’s worth was protected by revenue authorities in order to give back to owners.

---

<sup>37</sup> Original document in Kardeş, Salâhaddin (2008), *“Tehcir” ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara: Maliye

Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, p. 19-20

<sup>38</sup>BOA. Meclis-i Vükelâ Mazbatası, 198/163 in *ibid*, p. 28-30

Finally, the decision included the establishment of liquidation commissions to implement the protection and administration of the abandoned properties, and to control the administration of the settlements.

The Ottoman government adopted a secret order (*talimname*) to inform the local government about the management of the Armenian properties immediately after the decision of the deportation on June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1915. The laws on abandoned properties were not enough for the local governments to manage the properties of deported people. Thus, the Ottoman Government sent this secret order to give detailed information (Kaiser, 2007: 134). With this secret order, the commissions are formed to carry out the management of properties and lands belonging to Armenians. In the secret order, the type, amount, value and name of the owners of goods taken under protection would be registered in detail. The movables would be preserved in the name of owners but the movables whose owners were unknown would be registered and preserved in the name of the village. However, the spoiled movables and animals would be sold at an auction by the Commissions. Also, the crops which would be harvested from the abandoned lands would be sold at auction. Their money would be preserved in the finance office in the name of the previous owners. The goods, pictures and holy books found at the churches would be preserved in stores after they were registered and listed. The commissions arranged the books in which the type, quantity or number and values of goods and land deserted by the population would be registered by the local government.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Original document in Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Staratejik Etüd Başkanlığı (December 1982), *Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi*, p. 147-153 and for the English translation of original document in Prime Minister Directorate General of Press and Information (1982), *Documents*, Ankara, p.74-80

In this secret order, there were also articles about the resettlement of the migrants from the Balkans and Caucasus in the abandoned properties. During the war period, the migrants from the Balkans and Caucasus escaped to the Ottoman Empire as a result of the war. The settlement of these migrants became a problem for the Ottoman government and the deportation of Armenians provided the solution for this problem. In the beginning of the deportation, the government resettled the migrants in evacuated villages and places of Armenians by legalizing this resettlement through laws. In the secret order, many articles determined the settlement policies in detail. One of them is that “migrants will be resettled in evacuated villages and the existing houses and the land will be distributed to the migrants through temporary documents by taking into considerations the capacity of work and demands of the migrant families”.<sup>40</sup> The places of origin, resettlement date and places of the migrants would be registered in detail. The migrants would take documents which showed the quantity of land and property given to them. After the resettlement of the migrants, this secret order proposed that nomads were to be settled in the remaining villages, and procedures would become similar to those of migrants. During the resettlement, the migrants would be given enough land in line with their financial and economic conditions in the past as well as their productive power. Income building properties including shops, inns, factories and depots might be offered for sale by the Commissions. The land properties that no one wanted to buy might be leased for a maximum period of two years. Finally, the sums received as a result of the sale would be trusted to the financial offices in the name of original owners. However, it was not clear whether it would be given back or not.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Prime Minister Directorate General of Press and Information (1982), *Documents*, Ankara, p. 77

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid*, p. 77-80

The Ottoman government legalized the management of the abandoned properties because of foreign pressure. The state would face some restrictions to take decisions in spite of the war conditions. In the case of the properties, there were pressures on the government from the foreign countries. Hilmar Kaiser argues that it was not clear how the creditors (*alacaklılar*) received their holds from Armenians with the laws about the deportations. Notably, Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire which allied with the Ottomans during World War I had creditors. Thus, they directly intervened in the Ottoman Empire through their consulates. The entrepreneurs wrote many complaint petitions to the consulates for their losses. Thus, the consulates criticized the Ottoman government and wanted to end the liquidation of the Armenian properties because there were not any legal articles to allow the sale of the properties (Kaiser, 2007: 137-138). The consulate of Austria-Hungary also protested the Ottoman government and declared the sale of the properties at an auction as a despoilment (Kaiser, 2007: 150).

Thus, the Government adopted the law about the abandoned properties belonging to Armenians on September 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915. It was called the temporary law “*the law about the abandoned properties, debts and credits of the population who were sent elsewhere*”. In comparison with the previous secret order, there were few changes about the management of the properties of Armenians in this new law. According to this law, the Commissions were established to liquidate the abandoned properties, debts and credits of the natural and legal persons who were sent elsewhere. The Finance Office was responsible to register all properties. Different than the previous one, this law explained the details of how the creditors would follow the procedure to

receive credits from the deported population. After the enforcement of this law, the creditors from the Ottoman Empire within two months and the outside creditors within four months would apply to the commissions to claim their rights. However, if there appeared suit after the end of these periods, general rules were applied to the suits. Thus, someone who won a case could not apply to claim the abandoned properties which were liquidated according to this law.<sup>42</sup>

The other importance of this law was to cancel all property transactions including cession (*feragat*) of the property fifteen days before the deportation date if the court stated any fictitious transactions. In the law, the properties of foundations were registered by the Treasury of Foundations to give the holders. However, in the scope of the law, the properties of the foundations were allocated to the migrants without cost in terms of the by-laws of the migrants. In this sense, the Ottoman government legalized the administration of the Armenian properties due to the pressures of foreign countries but these laws did not satisfy these countries. These laws were only considered as a legalization of the liquidation of the properties. The Ottoman government continued to liquidate and sell the Armenian properties through the help of these laws.

On November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915, the new regulation was adopted to determine the practice items of the law legislated on September 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This regulation gave detailed information about the rules and duties of the commissions. Also, it gave direct information about the immovable properties of the deported persons. One of the

---

<sup>42</sup> Original document in Kardeş, Salâhaddin (2008), "*Tehcir" ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara: Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, p. 23-31

differences of this regulation from the law of abandoned properties was about the books (*defter*) which include the types, values and amounts of the properties as the secret order proposed. The other difference was about the properties of the churches. According to the regulation, existing goods, pictures and holy books of the churches were registered and preserved as the secret order proposed. However, in the new regulation, usage rights of the materials of the schools and monasteries were transferred to the Ministry of Education. Also, the commissions became responsible to sell the movable properties at an auction with appropriate values. Because of this aim, the commissions would decide on more appropriate time and place to define the property values. According to the law, the commissions recorded three different books for the properties. The kinds of the abandoned properties including money, movables, immovable properties, debts and credits were recorded in these books. In the regulation, the contents of the books were defined by adding the sample of tables to show how to register. Moreover, the commissions were responsible to keep these books.<sup>43</sup>

After this law and these regulations, there was only one law about the abandoned properties until 1918. This law added one item to the first article of the law. According to this addition, the people who were sent elsewhere were supported by the properties and lands given by the Treasury without any cost.<sup>44</sup>

Above, I analyzed the laws which were adopted during the war period. In this period, the Ottoman parliament was dominated by the members of the Committee of Union

---

<sup>43</sup> Original document in Kardeş, Salâhaddin (2008), "*Tehcir*" ve *Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara: Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, p.53-61

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid*, p. 35-38

and Progress (CUP). The laws were easily decided by the parliament. The parliament adopted laws about the abandoned properties without any opposition. However, after the war, the process was changed.

#### **4.3.2. Second Period: Post War Events (1918-1922)**

At the end of the war, the CUP fell from the power. The new government was composed of the opponents of the CUP. Also, the Entente powers including France and Britain occupied İstanbul in March, 1920. This created a pressure on the government. Also, the Entente powers brought a case to judge war criminals. Specifically, they defined the deportation as a war crime, and people who were responsible for the deportation were judged. Besides this case, the İstanbul government also judged the members of the CUP due to war crimes.<sup>45</sup> In this political situation, the İstanbul government adopted some decisions about the abandoned properties.

The İstanbul government which was ruled by Ahmet İzzet Pasha gave an order to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which claimed that deported Armenians could return to their homes on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 1918.<sup>46</sup> Also on November 4<sup>th</sup>, 1918, İstanbul Government rejected the laws legislated on 27<sup>th</sup> May, 1915 and 26<sup>th</sup> May, 1915 (Düzceer, 1994: 101). In this period, the CUP fell from the government and the parliament was reopened. The deputies who opposed the CUP began to criticize

---

<sup>45</sup> For the detailed information about the trials of the Unionists: Akçam, Taner (2002), *İnsan Hakları ve Ermeni Sorunu: İttihat Terakki'den Kurtuluş Savaşı'na*, 2. Edition, Ankara: İletişim Yayınları, p. 388-482 and Akçam, Taner and Dadrian, Vahakn N. (2008), *'Tehcir ve Taktik' Divan-i Harb-i Örfi Zabıtları: İttihat ve Terakki'nin Yargılanması 1919-1922*, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları

<sup>46</sup> Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı, (1995), *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler*, Ankara, p.182

World War I events and policies of the CUP. Therefore, by bringing a case to judge the members of the CUP, the parliament rejected the laws about deportation and abandoned properties due to the violation of constitution (Akçam, 2002: 407).

On January 8<sup>th</sup>, 1920, the İstanbul government ruled by Ali Rıza adopted a decree about the properties of the deported people. Although this was adopted before the invasion of İstanbul, after World War I there were pressures on İstanbul government by the allied powers. Specifically, Britain pressured the government to give rights to non-Muslims, to allow the return of Armenians and to pay damages of Armenians during deportations (Akçam, 2002: 444; Bertan, 1976: 203). In this respect, the İstanbul government made a decision about the abandoned properties. This decree was different from the previous ones and changed all articles and items because this decree was formed to protect the rights of ex-owners of the properties. This decree included the return of the properties which were liquidated according to the law legislated on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 and the Regulation legislated on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915. If the immovable properties of these people were transferred to someone without the approval of original owners, the properties had to be returned to original owners. On the other hand, the worth of the properties would be given to original owners to legalize the liquidation.

Moreover, if original owners of the properties were dead and did not have any inheritors, the values of the properties defined by special laws would be given as financial aid to the minority and charity institutions of people who were sent elsewhere. If the movables which were liquidated by the government had not been sold yet, they would be given to real owners. If they were sold, the values of properties would also be returned to the original owners. Again, if the original



owners were dead and did not have inheritors, the worth of sales would be given to religious leaders in order to distribute to orphans and dependents of minorities. The money which was collected by the liquidation commissions in the name of the deported people would be given back. Also, people who destructed the properties had to pay the cost to original owners. From the deportation date to the return of the original owners, the income of the properties would be given to the ex-owners by extracting the expense. In this decree, only the immovable properties which were expropriated according to the rules and procedures for the benefit of the public were not given back. Rather, this expropriation transaction is valid, and results of the transaction depended on these rules and procedures.<sup>47</sup> These are all laws, regulations and decrees about the abandoned properties, which were adopted by the Ottoman government.

#### **4.3.3. Third Period: Republican Period (1920-1930)**

With the rise of the national movement, the Kemalists established a new government in Ankara. This government became independent from İstanbul and adopted different decisions. The Grand National Assembly of Turkey was established by the Ankara government on April 23, 1920. The Assembly adopted laws without consulting the İstanbul government. Moreover, immediately after the establishment, the Assembly adopted the law which invalidated any political and commercial treaties and contracts adopted by the İstanbul government on June 7<sup>th</sup>, 1920. This law covered the treaties and transactions which were carried out after the invasion of İstanbul on

---

<sup>47</sup> Original document in Kardeş, Salâhaddin (2008), *“Tehcir” ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara: Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, p. 79-91

March 16<sup>th</sup>, 1920.<sup>48</sup> Therefore, the clash between İstanbul and Ankara became clearly defined with this law. In the case of the abandoned properties, the Ankara Government rejected the decree of the İstanbul government which aimed to give abandoned properties to their original owners. The Ankara government re-adopted the laws legislated by the CUP which were rejected by the İstanbul Government after World War I. It only changed some of their articles. This means that the Kemalists also accepted the liquidation of the properties. Also, being a nation-state provided opportunities. Before the Republic, the Armenian population was deported, and the Greeks also left with the population exchange. As a result of these events, the new state had a homogenous population and was dominated by Muslims. Therefore, the Kemalists easily gained the consent of the society when they adopted their decisions in comparison to the Ottoman Empire.

The Ankara government adopted many laws about the deportations and the abandoned properties which started in 1922. The first law was adopted by the Kemalists on April 20<sup>th</sup>, 1922. According to this law, the unclaimed movable properties of the population who escaped from the places which were freed from the invasion of the enemy were sold by auction, and the immovable properties and agricultural products were controlled by the government. The incomes of these properties were registered by revenue authorities. However, if these people returned, their immovable properties and registered incomes would be given back. Also, the items of this law were applied to the people who escaped or who disappeared as a result of the state of the war and political reasons. Interestingly, according to this

---

<sup>48</sup> Türk Parlamento Araştırma Grubu, *Türk Parlamento Tarihi: Milli Mücadele ve TBMM I. Dönem 1919-1923*, Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Yayınları, p.126-127

law, if someone denounced the abandoned properties which became secret or were not determined yet, they could gain the denouncement bonus.<sup>49</sup>

After the enactment of this law, the governmental decree adopted by the İstanbul government on January 8<sup>th</sup>, 1920 was rejected by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on September 14<sup>th</sup>, 1922.<sup>50</sup> This was an important decision because this decree aimed to protect the rights of the original owners or deported people. However, the Ankara government abolished this law. In its place, the previous law legislated on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 which was rejected by İstanbul Government in 1918 because of violating the constitution, was adopted by the Ankara Government.

Although these were the laws to define the abandoned properties and their liquidations, during this time, the Republican government re-adopted the regulations and decrees related to the abandoned properties. After the Treaty of Lausanne signed on July 24<sup>th</sup>, 1923, the conditions of the abandoned properties were changed. As a part of the treaty, during the separate convention concluded on January 30<sup>th</sup>, 1923, the population exchange between Greece and Turkey was accepted. According to the convention, the Greeks in Turkey were sent to Greece and vice versa. With this exchange, the Greek properties became the problem. This necessitated changing the law which included the people who were exchanged. Before the population exchange, the laws of abandoned properties contained only Armenians. Unlike the Armenian case, the government would not easily liquidate the properties of Greeks.

---

<sup>49</sup> Original document in Kardeş, Salâhaddin (2008), *"Tehcir" ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuati*, Ankara: Maliye

Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, p. 97-98

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid*, p. 122

Rather, it was bound to the law of population exchange. However, the government did not return the non-Muslim properties which were liquidated before the population exchange and it legalized this with new laws.

Also, the properties of Armenians which were deported were discussed in the Lausanne conference in terms of the issue of the return of Armenians under the title of general amnesty but Turkish Representative Committee rejected these claims. In the Conference, İsmet İnönü, the representative of Turkey, did not allow discussion of mass return of Armenian refugees because he argued that this would become a threat to the security of Turkey.<sup>51</sup> Also, İsmet İnönü separated the issue of general amnesty from Armenian refugees. According to İnönü, in various periods, hundred of thousands of people who migrated were a different problem from general amnesty and it could not be solved under the frame of the Peace Conference.<sup>52</sup> In this respect, in the part of the general amnesty of Lausanne, the properties of Armenians and their return were not included. However, Turkey had responsibility to arrange its laws in accordance with the Lausanne Treaty. This also showed that the laws of properties both in the Ottoman and Republican period which proposed that properties of deported people were to be given back became invalid because Armenians who migrated from the Ottoman Empire without passports did not have any permission to return to Turkey. Thus, the Republican government formed new decrees by changing the previous ones to accord with the Lausanne and the issue of abandoned properties entered a new phase.

---

<sup>51</sup> *Lozan Barış Konferansı: Tutanaklar, Belgeler*, Vol. 2 (1), Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, p. 162

<sup>52</sup> *Lozan Barış Konferansı: Tutanaklar, Belgeler*, Vol. 2 (1), Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, p. 193-194

All laws had to be in accordance with the rules of the Treaty because this Treaty was the act for establishment of the Republic. In the case of the abandoned properties, the Ankara government changed the articles of the laws which created clashes with the Treaty. Also, the government was forced to give properties to their original owners. Nevertheless, with the establishment of special laws, the government violated this condition. For instance, the government did not accept the proxy statement of evacuated and missing non-Muslim subjects as we will see below. In this sense, I will analyze the decrees and regulations from 1922 to 1928 by showing effects of Lausanne and other events.

The first decree by the Ankara government was adopted on March 12<sup>th</sup>, 1922. According to this law, the proxy statements of the missing non-Muslim subjects were not accepted. These people were the subjects who were accused of defending Pontus during the national movement who escaped to Greece, İstanbul or other places after the armistice, and were the Greeks of Trabzon, Samsun, Ordu and Giresun who collaborated with the enemies and betrayed the government. If they sent proxy statements, they would not be accepted by the government.<sup>53</sup>

The other law about the abandoned properties was adopted on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 1923. This law changed some items of the law legislated on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 and abolished the law legislated on April 20<sup>th</sup>, 1922. After these changes, it became the new law about the abandoned properties for the Kemalist era. Through this law, only a few articles were changed. One of the changes was about immovable properties which were recorded by the Foundation and Finance Treasury. After the liquidation of these

---

<sup>53</sup> Original document in Kardeş, Salâhaddin (2008), *"Tehcir" ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara: Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, p. 125-126

properties, their worth was recorded as income for these treasuries in the name of the evacuated people. However, if someone claimed the properties or had credits from the evacuated people, after the publication of this law, they would apply within 4 month if they were the residents of Turkey and within 6 months if they were residents in foreign countries.<sup>54</sup> The decree legislated on March 12<sup>th</sup>, 1922 was changed on June 28<sup>th</sup>, 1923 because the people from the other regions sent proxy statement to possess their properties. Thus, the Ankara government changed the decree and proposed that the proxy statements from all missing non-Muslim subjects would not be accepted.<sup>55</sup>

The Ankara government also used the first regulation which was legislated by the Ottoman Government. Nevertheless, on October 31, 1922, the Ankara government adopted a decree which changed some articles of this regulation legislated on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915. These changes included some details about the forms and rules of the commissions. Through this change, commissions had to complete their duties within four months after the date of evacuation or migration. One article was also added to this regulation. This article stated that after or before the general war, in any terms the movable and immovable properties of the persons who went to the foreign or invaded countries for a journey were to be controlled by the government.<sup>56</sup>

In 1923, there were two decisions for the movable and immovable properties of the people who were from occupied cities or escaped from İstanbul and disappeared. First was the ordinance (*talimatname*) which was adopted on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 1923. The

---

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* p. 101-104

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.* p. 129-130

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.* p. 126-128

properties of the population who escaped from İstanbul were managed according to the law of abandoned properties. If the members of their family needed feeding, only their commercial goods were liquidated and their household goods would be given back.<sup>57</sup> After the legislation of the law on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 1923, this ordinance was changed, and the decree about this issue was adopted on April 29<sup>th</sup>, 1923. With this new law, the abandoned properties of the missing people who escaped from İstanbul were managed by the law legislated on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 1923.<sup>58</sup>

On April 29<sup>th</sup>, 1923, the Ankara government adopted the by-law to determine the administration of the abandoned properties. This by-law changed a few items of the by-law legislated on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This was also about the immovable properties and the forms and rules of the commissions. According to this by-law, in any terms the properties of the persons who escaped to İstanbul, foreign countries or occupied places became the possession of the treasuries of the Ministry of Finance and Foundation. Also, liquidation commissions were authorized to manage the abandoned properties. The abandoned properties of the people except those of migrants (*mübadil*) were seen as the immovable properties of the Treasury. The properties which did not yield income were sold at an auction.<sup>59</sup>

With the Treaty of Lausanne and population exchange between Greece and Turkey, the abandoned properties again became a problem. Specifically, how the government intervened in the properties of Greek and Armenian subjects after these events were not clear in previous laws or decrees. Thus, the Republican Government adopted

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.* p. 153-154

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.* p. 128-129

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.* p. 154-164

decrees to solve this unclear situation. The first decree was adopted on February 5<sup>th</sup>, 1925. This decree proposed that the properties of the people who left after the acceptance of the Treaty of Lausanne would not be interfered with. If these properties were liquidated, they would be given back.<sup>60</sup>

The decree legislated on July 15<sup>th</sup>, 1925 suggested that the distraint of the deposit bank account (*bakiye*) of the missing persons who were not subject to the population exchange would be abolished. They were given to the owners.<sup>61</sup> Also, another decree was adopted on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 1925 about the mines owned by the missing people. The decree decided that the grants, lots and rights of the mine of the missing people were canceled; they were considered as invented mines by the state.<sup>62</sup>

As I mentioned, the Treaty of Lausanne changed the scope of the abandoned properties. The government made a decision to improve the laws according to the Treaty of Lausanne. The first decision was made on June 13<sup>th</sup>, 1926. This accepted the by-law which changed the law legislated on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 and the law legislated on April 20<sup>th</sup>, 1923. The first article of the by-law suggested that after the publication of the Treaty of Lausanne on August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1924, it was necessary to seize the abandoned properties. The second article proposed that if the government was aware of the abandonment of the properties before this publication date, the government could seize them. The other articles stated that if the government discovered the properties after this date, these properties were given to the owners. On the other hand, if the owners or their inheritors were not found, the government

---

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.* p. 136-139

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.* p. 139

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.* p. 139-140



would control the properties in the name of their owners. If these properties were given to the migrants, their prices were paid back to the owners.<sup>63</sup>

On July 17<sup>th</sup>, 1927, the government adopted a decree which changed the by-law legislated on June 13<sup>th</sup>, 1926. This decree changed the first and second articles of this by-law. It proposed that the government continued to apply the rules of the laws on the abandoned properties which were liquidated before the Treaty of Lausanne. However, if the government had not intervened in the properties, and the owners returned and managed their properties, the government could not intervene in these properties. Also, the abandoned properties which would not be liquidated according to the first article were given to their owners.<sup>64</sup>

The other laws related to the abandoned properties were adopted on May 28<sup>th</sup>, 1928. The first one was about giving the title deed to exchange and non-exchange people and migrants who possessed the immovable properties in return for the documents of the transfer of possessions. Also, according to this law, the immovable properties which were allocated to the immigrants or liquidated by the Treasury according to the laws of abandoned properties would not be given to their original owners. Rather, their values which were decided by the law legislated on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 1925 were paid from the Treasury of Finance.<sup>65</sup> The second law was about the current accounts (*cari hesap*) of the abandoned properties. According to this law, the balances of the current accounts of the abandoned properties were recorded as income in the income budget of the 1928 finance year. In addition, the amounts of about three hundred thousand

---

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.* p. 164-165

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.* p. 141-142

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.* p. 107-109

liras from this income were used by the Ministry of Finance to supply the cost of the management and organization of the abandoned properties.<sup>66</sup>

Finally, in the case of the abandoned properties, the Ankara government adopted a law on the distribution of properties but this was different from other laws because it did not relate to the management of the properties. Moreover, these laws for the abandoned properties were adopted in terms of nationalist claims. Despite the fact that they suppressed the ex-members of the CUP in the beginning of the Republic, in 1926 they declared the ex-leaders of the CUP which were killed by the Armenian conspiracies as martyrs. Their families were given the properties from the Armenian abandoned properties. The law legislated on May 31, 1926 related to the people who were killed by the Armenian conspirators. They were the ex-members of the CUP including Talat Pasha, Cemal Pasha, Cemal Azmi, Bahattin Şakir, Sait Halim, Kemal Bey, the kaimakam of Bogazliyan, aides of Cemal Pasha and the governors (*mutasarrıf*) of Urfa and Muş. According to the law, the families of these people were given immovable properties from the Armenian abandoned properties. These properties were worth twenty thousand liras. Also, they took the title deed for these properties but they were not allowed to sell these properties within ten years.<sup>67</sup>

#### **4.4. Conclusion**

The management of the abandoned properties began immediately after the decision of deportation with secret regulations; the Ottoman government legalized the application of rules of the regulation with the help of external factors. Each period

---

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.* p. 113

<sup>67</sup> Karakoç, Sarkis (1925-1985), *Sicilli Kavanin*, vol. 3, 1926-1927, İstanbul: Cihan Kütüphanesi, p. 278

had its own conditions and these conditions affected the contents of the laws. From the beginning of the deportation, the Ottoman government aimed to liquidate the Armenian properties. Some articles of laws were composed of granting the return of properties to original owners whereas other articles did not allow to the return of these properties. Indeed, the settlement of migrants from the Balkans and Caucasus in the abandoned properties was managed by the laws. In addition, the return of Armenians after the war was not permitted. They showed that the Ottoman government did not aim to give back these properties. The laws only aimed to legalize the liquidations.

After the war, the İstanbul government arranged some regulations and laws which aimed to protect the rights of deported people and solve their problems including properties. These were realized under the control of the Entente powers. However, with the establishment of the Ankara government, two clashing powers dominated Turkey and their decisions differed. Moreover, the Ankara Government abolished the regulations and laws of the İstanbul government and re-adopted the laws which were accepted by the Unionists. After the success of the national movement and establishment of the Republic, the Kemalists became the sole power and easily adopted laws about abandoned properties. Although the Treaty of Lausanne created some restrictions on adaptation of laws relating to minorities, the new Republic solved these restrictions by legislating special regulations.

After 1925, the Kemalists began to consolidate their power without any opposition. The Grand National Assembly of Turkey easily adopted the laws. In the case of abandoned properties, the liquidated properties were registered as income in the budget and the migrants or nomads who were settled in the abandoned properties

were allowed to take the title-deed for these properties. They were also the proof of the permanent liquidation of the abandoned properties.

Consequently, although some laws included the articles which gave the properties to original owners, the liquidation and sale of the Armenian properties continued. The changes which were carried out for the rights of the original owners were adopted by the pressure from the external factors. In addition, internal factors provided opportunities to liquidate and to allocate the properties. The national claims against Armenians played the role in the distribution of the properties by taking consent from below. The liquidations of the abandoned properties were legalized under the control of the state.

## **Chapter 5: Armenian Abandoned Properties from 1915 to 1930**

### ***5.1. Introduction***

In this section, I will attempt to analyze the application of the laws on Armenian abandoned properties. In the previous chapter, the laws which were adopted by Unionist government, İstanbul government and Ankara government between the years, 1915 and 1918 were assessed. All three governments adopted the laws of abandoned properties some of which were different from each other. These laws also signified the tendencies and attitudes of these governments towards the fate of Armenian properties after the deportations. Thus, I will analyze the distribution, confiscation and return of the Armenian abandoned properties through comparison of these governments. For this aim, I will categorize three periods which indicated the transition period from the Ottoman Empire to the new nation-state, the Republic of Turkey. First period refers to 1915 and 1917 when the CUP governed the state and deported the Armenian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. The event of World War I dominated the period. The second period is 1918 and 1922 which signified the era after the CUP, and the post-war developments dominated this era. In this period, the İstanbul government ruled by Ahmet İzzet Pasha, and then Ali Rıza Pasha embraced different policies and began to judge the old members of the CUP who were accused of crimes committed during deportations. The last period is 1920 and 1930 which refers to the national movement and establishment of the new Republic of Turkey. The Ankara government ruled by Kemalists took measures against the İstanbul government and made some arrangements in order to form structures for the new state. These periods included specific arrangements about the Armenian abandoned properties.

It can be argued that the state adopted three policies in order to execute the Armenian abandoned properties. These policies were *the settlement of immigrants (muhacir)*, *the creation of national economy and use for the needs of the state*. Besides these policies, the state used the Armenian abandoned properties for different reasons including some symbolic and nationalist ones. These aims can be differentiated in different periods. Therefore, I will assess these policies in terms of the similarities and differences of the periods.

## ***5.2 First Period: During World War I (1915-1917)***

After the deportations, the Ottoman state gave more importance to Armenian properties including lands, houses, money and movables. As analyzed in the third chapter, in that period, the government adopted laws and orders about the execution of the properties. These orders and laws were used by the state in order to manage, confiscate and distribute the Armenian abandoned properties. In this section, I will attempt to display the fate of the Armenian properties during World War I.

### **5.2.1. The Settlement of Immigrants in the Armenian Abandoned Properties**

The settlement of migrants in the Armenian abandoned properties begun with the deportations of the Armenians. The deportation law enacted on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915 and the secret order included the items which aimed to settle the immigrants in the abandoned properties. The application of laws showed the methods and ways of this settlement process in detail. The properties were also used to meet the needs of the

immigrants. In this part, I will give some examples in order to indicate this usage of the properties.

First example is about the settlement of immigrants in Konya, Hüdavendigâr, Ankara, Sivas and Kayseri. On December 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915, the telegram was sent to these regions in order to take information about the possibility of the number of families who could be settled. These Muslim Arab families were expelled from Syria and had to be settled in Anatolia. The Ministry of Interior ordered the governors to inform about the number of lands and farms which remained from Armenians and were appropriate for the settlement about how many families could be settled in these lands and farms.<sup>68</sup> Fuat Dündar claims that the Ottoman government aimed to settle Arabs in the interior of the Ottoman Empire to prevent an Arab uprising. After the appointment of Cemal Pasha in Syria, he tried to make relations with local Arab population who supported Islam and Caliph and were against British invasion. On the other hand, the nomadic Arab tribes created a problem for the Ottoman Empire because Cemal Pasha reached some documents which included some of nomadic Arab tribes supported France and Britain. In this vein, Dündar argues that the CUP aimed to settle these nomadic Arab tribes in interior regions to satisfy the policies of Muslimization and Turkification of Anatolia (Dündar, 2007: 92-104). In this sense, the evacuated villages by Armenians and their abandoned properties were used to settle Arabs. The ordinance (*talimatname*) adopted by settlement office on April 23, 1916 sent to Fourth Military Commandership in Damascus and stated that each family were settled in abandoned properties according to their old social and

---

<sup>68</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 59/107 from the Ministry of Interior to Konya, Hüdavendigâr, Ankara, Sivas and Kayseri on December 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915 [Document online] available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/562.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/562.doc)

economic conditions and the number of family members. In addition, their expenses were also satisfied from the abandoned properties. (Dündar, 2007: 97).

The other example was about the settlement of immigrants in the village of Alemdar in the province of İstanbul. This document is significant because it included the purpose of the settlement of immigrants. In the district of Kartal, there was a village of Alemdar which was previously called as “Armenian village” (Ermeniköy). This district had an Alemdağ forest. After the deportation of Armenians in this district, the Ministry of Foundation wanted to transfer the evacuated village with the forest to the Atik Valide Hanim Foundation. Also, the Ministry of Foundation maintained that houses, stores (*dükkan*), vineyards and lands of Armenians reverted to the foundation after their deportations. In addition, the foundation wanted the settlement of immigrants who pledged to carry woods in this village.<sup>69</sup> Talat Pasha sent a telegram on October 16<sup>th</sup>, 1915 to the governor of İstanbul that the Armenian village with the Alemdağ forests belonged to the Atik Valide Sultan Foundation and that the settlement of immigrants in this region would start to cultivate and public works.<sup>70</sup> Also, it can be extracted from the other document that between July 14<sup>th</sup>, 1915 and September 25<sup>th</sup>, 1915 fourteen families were settled in this region.<sup>71</sup>

The Armenian abandoned properties were also used for the needs of the immigrants and refugees. The telegram sent to Aleppo, Urfa and Maraş on February 26<sup>th</sup>, 1916 suggested that some part of the refugees in Diyarbakir would be sent to Aintab, Maraş and Urfa, and settled in these regions. Abandoned houses were used for this

---

<sup>69</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272,12,36,10,1, October 5, 1915

<sup>70</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272,12,36,10,1, October 16<sup>th</sup>, 1915

<sup>71</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272,12,36,10,1



purpose, and the feeding (*iaşse*) and clothing of the refugees were provided from the abandoned properties the value of which was carried out from the allowance of immigrants (*muhacirîn tahsisati*).<sup>72</sup> The other telegram was sent on March 4<sup>th</sup>, 1916 to the province of Trabzon. This telegram ordered that for clothing the refugees, manufactures in the stores of the abandoned properties should be distributed to people in need.<sup>73</sup> In addition, the telegram was sent on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 1916 to the Ministry of Interior, which was about the distribution of clothing fabrics from the abandoned properties. This telegram informed the research about the availability of these fabrics and included the production of these fabrics in order to distribute to the immigrants.<sup>74</sup> During World War I, there was a refugee wave from the east borders. After the invasion of Russia, the people from these invaded regions began to immigrate into the interior regions of Anatolia. These people firstly immigrated to the neighboring provinces including Diyarbekir. Thus, the Ottoman government faced the refugee issue since hundreds of thousands of refugees who gathered in interior regions resulted in the settlement and feeding problem. The state tried to control their settlement since some tribes began to escape into the interior. In this respect, the government began to settle some of refugees in the evacuated villages by Armenians. The telegram sent on June 27 1915 ordered that the refugees were settled in the evacuated Armenian villages in Erzurum and Van.<sup>75</sup> By settling refugees in the Armenian abandoned properties, the government aimed to prevent both the

---

<sup>72</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 61/117 quoted in Akçam, Taner (2008), *Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur*, İstanbul: İletişim, p. 223

<sup>73</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 61/247 quoted in Akçam, Taner (2008), *Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur*, İstanbul: İletişim, p. 224

<sup>74</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272, 11, 9, 14, 6, November 12, 1916

<sup>75</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 54, 203 quoted in Dündar, Fuat (2007), *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası (1913-1918)*, 3. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 230

proceeding of Russian forces and escape of refugees into interior region in an unorganized way (Dünder, 2007: 230).

The final example was about the distribution of insignificant goods (*eşya-yı hasise*) of Armenians to the immigrants. The telegram was sent from the Ministry of Interior to the governor of Kale-i Sultaniye on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 1916. It ordered that until now there were not any treatments about the properties of Armenians who were deported from Kale (*Çanakkale*) and that the insignificant goods should be distributed to the Muslim immigrants.<sup>76</sup>

### **5.2.2. The Creation of National Economy**

As seen in the first chapter, the CUP aimed to establish the national economy based on the German model. The aims of this policy included undermining the economic domination of the non-Muslims in the economic sphere and encouraging Muslims subjects to found their own initiatives. For this aim, the state supported Muslim entrepreneurs. With the beginning of World War I, the state benefitted from war conditions and began to realize its policy of national economy. The abolishment of the capitulations can be given as an example to show the opportunities of the war. The deportation process of Armenians also gave some opportunities to the state in order to establish national economy since Armenian subjects like other non-Muslims dominated the economy and after deportations, they left their properties which were

---

<sup>76</sup> BOA/ŞFR, 69/252, from the Ministry of Interior to the governor of Kale-i Sultaniye, November, 12<sup>th</sup>, 1916 in Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı (2007), *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, Ankara, p. 379

confiscated by the state during this period. Thus, in this section, I will attempt to indicate some examples of strengthening Muslims in the economic sphere.

After the decision of Armenian deportations, the Ottoman government attempted to get information about the trade houses, real estate properties and factories belonging to Armenians. On November 1, 1915 the telegram sent by the Ministry of Interior to the various provinces and abandoned property commissions ordered to take information about whether there were any firms, houses and factories belonging to Armenians in İstanbul and in some provinces where Armenians were not deported yet. The Ministry wanted the governors to list the name of owners and record the amount and value of abandoned properties.<sup>77</sup> A day after this telegram (November 2, 1915), the new order was sent to the provinces, sanjaks and commissions about the settlement of Muslim prisoners of war (*esir*) in terms of the economic reasons. In this order, since the deportation of Armenian craftsmen resulted in an economic gap, the Muslim prisoners could be settled in the regions in order to fill the gap. The telegram also maintained that since this was appropriate with the settlement policy of the government, essential shops (*dükkan*), capitals, tools and means from the abandoned properties were distributed to these people. However, for the settlement prisoners also had to accept the citizen of the Ottoman Empire. In this respect, the Ministry wanted to take information about how many craftsmen they needed with the type crafts.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> BOA/DH. ŞFR, 57/241, from the Ministry of Interior to the provinces of Adana, Erzurum, Ankara, Bitlis, Halep, Ma'raş, Hüdavendigâr, Diyarbekir, Sivas, Trabzon, Canik, Ma'muretül'aziz, Konya, sanjaks of İzmit, Eskişehir, Niğde, Kayseri, Karahisar-ı Sahib and the administrative commissions of abandoned properties, November 1, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/496.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/496.doc)

<sup>78</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 57/261, from the Ministry of Interior to the provinces of Adana, Halep, Trabzon, Diyarbekir, Ma'muretül'aziz, Erzurum, Sivas, Hüdavendigâr, Bitlis, Ankara, Konya, sanjaks of İzmit,

The telegram sent by Talat Pasha to the various provinces and sanjaks on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 1916 was a significant document to illustrate the purpose of the government to distribute the Armenian properties in terms of creating national bourgeoisie. This telegram included the rules and aims of the distribution of properties toward Muslims. It included that the Armenian abandoned immovable properties were given to Muslim entrepreneurs in order to increase Islamic enterprise. There were some criterions about these Muslim entrepreneurs. One of them is that these people could be elected from men of honor (*erbab-ı namus*) and government (*iktidar*). The other criterion was that receipts (*sened*) could become half or one lira in order to increase the participation of Muslims and that the attention should be paid that the capital could not be possessed by the foreign hands. The main purpose was to develop the life of trade among the Muslim people.<sup>79</sup>

All these documents displayed the attitude of the government toward Armenian properties in terms of the national economy. Taner Akçam argues that the properties left by Armenians were distributed to Muslim persons or institutions with low prices or without any cost in order to create a Muslim bourgeoisie. The shops, firms and factories of Armenians were transferred to Muslims (Akçam, 2008: 227). Also, Akçam quotes a telegram which was sent to Trabzon Liquidation Commission on

---

Eskişehir, Niğde, Kayseri, Karahisar-i Sahib, Kütahya, Karesi and the administrative commissions of abandoned properties, November 2, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/499.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/499.doc)

<sup>79</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 59/239, from the Minister of Interior, Talat Pasha, to the provinces of Erzurum, Adana, Ankara, Bitlis, Haleb, Hüdavendigâr, Diyarbakir, Sivas, Trabzon, Ma'muretül'aziz, Konya, Edirne, governors of sanjaks of Urfa, Izmit, Canik, Karesi, Kayseri, Karahisar-i Sahib, Eskişehir, Niğde, Kütahya, Maraş and the Liquidation Commissions of Tekfurdağı, Adana, Cebel-i Bereket, Kozan, Yozgat, Ankara, Erzurum, Bitlis, Haleb, Maraş, Antakya, Hüdavendigâr, Gemlik, Bilecik, Diyarbakir, Sivas, Merzifon, Tokad, Samsun, Ordu, Trabzon, Konya, Ma'muretül'aziz, Izmit, Adapazarı, Eskişehir, Sivrihisar, Kayseri, Develu, Nigde, Karahisar-i Sahib and Urfa, January 6<sup>th</sup>, 1916, [Document online]; available from [ww.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/574.doc](http://ww.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/574.doc)

May 16<sup>th</sup>, 1916. This telegram ordered that the stores and shops (*dükkan ve mağazalar*) of Armenians could not be sold in a disorganized way and by paying some parts in cash or giving substantial guarantees, and that these properties could be given to young, honor hands who were eager to trade.<sup>80</sup>

### 5.2.3. Use for the Needs of the State

The state also used the Armenian abandoned properties for the needs of the state. These consisted of the needs of the people, the military and the government. Akçam claims that either some buildings were used by the military or the income gotten from the sale of the products of lands, vineyards or gardens were given to the military (Akçam, 2008: 230). For the needs of the military, a telegram was sent to various provinces on August 13<sup>th</sup>, 1915. The properties including shoes, head scarf (*yemeni*), stout leather (*kösele*), rawhide sandal (*ham çarık*) and leather (*meşin*) which were not carried by Armenians and were necessary for the military were bought by paying with receipts. After preparing special lists, the materials could be sent to İstanbul.<sup>81</sup> The other telegram was sent by the Minister of War, Enver Pasha, to the governor of sanjak of Kütahya on September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915. The telegram ordered that the goods and commodities left by Armenians which were necessary for feeding

---

<sup>80</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 60/129, from the Ministry of Interior to Trabzon Liquidation Commission, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 1916, in Akçam, Taner (2008), *Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 229

<sup>81</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 54-A/390, From the Ministry of Interior to provinces of Adana, Ankara and governors of sanjaks of İzmit, Eskişehir, Karesi, Karahisar-i Sahib, August, 13<sup>th</sup>, 1915 in Akçam (2008), *ibid*, p. 230

military were to be bought by the military commissions before they were transferred to someone else.<sup>82</sup>

Final example about this issue is the telegram of the Ministry of War to the Ministry of Interior on December 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This telegram stated that after the deportations of Armenians in Tekfurdağ (Tekirdağ), the Ministry of War wanted every kind of properties including goods, woods (*kereste*), medicines (*ecza*), clothes (*melbuşat*) and mechanicals which were necessary for the military. We understand in this telegram that İstanbul sent a table list about the properties given to the military since the Commander of the Third Army Corps complained that the abandoned property commissions did not give properties which were not included in this list<sup>83</sup>. However, the Ministry of Interior responded to this telegram on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 1916 that since these kinds of properties were included in the list, the distribution of abandoned properties continued according to this list. Otherwise, it led to confusion.<sup>84</sup>

The state also used the Armenian properties for the needs of the people. On August 29<sup>th</sup>, 1915, the telegram sent by the Ministry of Interior to various provinces displayed this kind of distribution. According to this telegram, the deportations of Armenians and the control of the abandoned properties by the government led to the hardship of supplying required needs of the people. If these kinds of properties were available among the abandoned properties, it could not be lawful to put people in

---

<sup>82</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 55-A/143, From the Minister of War, Enver, to the governor of sanjak of Kütahya, September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/392.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/392.doc)

<sup>83</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272,12,36,9,7, From the Ministry of War to the Ministry of Interior, December 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915

<sup>84</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272, 12, 36, 9, 7, From the Ministry of Interior to the Ministry of War, January 11<sup>th</sup>, 1916

trouble. Thus, the Ministry of Interior ordered that the goods which could not be supplied might be provided from the abandoned properties, and their sale at auction was seen convenient.<sup>85</sup>

Besides using the needs of the state, Taner Akçam argues that the government used the Armenian abandoned properties to meet the costs of deportations, needs of the militia organization (*milis teşkilatı*) and various needs of the government. For instance, the income gotten from the sales of animals belonging to Armenians in Aleppo were used to meet the costs of deportations and feedings of Armenians. The amount of income was six hundred thousands kuruş.<sup>86</sup> The other telegram sent by the Interior of Ministry to the governor of Ma'muretül'aziz, Sabit Bey on August 10<sup>th</sup>, 1915 included giving allotment to the militias in Dersim region from the Armenian abandoned properties.<sup>87</sup> Finally, the government used some appropriate Armenian buildings to meet the needs of schools, prisons, hospitals and police offices (Akçam, 2008: 234-235).

To sum up, between 1915 and 1917, the Ottoman government strictly controlled the Armenian properties immediately after the deportations. Besides adopting some laws and regulations, the state managed the distribution of properties through telegrams and orders. In that period, some purposes were applied to distribute the Armenian

---

<sup>85</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 55/330, From the Ministry of Interior to the provinces of Adana, Erzurum, Ankara, Bitlis, Canik, Haleb, Hüdavendigâr, Sivas, Trabzon, Diyarbekir, Ma'muretül'aziz, Konya, the governors of sanjaks of Urfa, Eskişehir, İzmit, Karesi, Kale-i Sultaniye, Maraş, Niğde, Karahisar-i Sahib and the Commissions of Abandoned Properties of Hüdavendigâr, Adana, Haleb, Sivas, Canik, Diyarbekir, Erzurum, Ma'muretül'aziz and Karesi, August 24<sup>th</sup>, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/366.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/366.doc)

<sup>86</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 57/342, from the Ministry of Interior to Aleppo Administrative Commission of Abandoned Properties, November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915, in Akçam (2008), *ibid*, p. 233

<sup>87</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 54-A/354, from the Ministry of Interior to the governor of Ma'muretül'aziz, Sabit Bey in Dersim, August 10<sup>th</sup>, 1915, in Akçam (2008), *ibid*, p. 236

abandoned properties. After the end of World War I, the CUP fell from the government and the Ottoman Empire lost the war. This led to the beginning of a new era for the Ottoman Empire since the Great Powers began to make decisions about the future of the Ottoman Empire. Also, the new governments were founded and these governments began to judge the CUP and their policies. In the next section, I will analyze the fate of the Armenian abandoned properties under this new period.

### ***5.3. Second Period: Post War Events (1918-1922)***

This period was different from the previous in terms of the fate of the Armenian abandoned properties. In spite of the expropriation of the properties during the war, in this period there were some attempts to improve the conditions of Armenians and meet the damage of them during war period. First attempt was the order sent on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 1918 to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by Ahmet İzzet Pasha as the grand vizier of the new government. According to this order, deported Armenians could return to their homes. Second, the new government abolished the laws of deportations and abandoned properties on November 4<sup>th</sup>, 1918. Final attempt was to adopt a new law about the properties of deported people on January 8<sup>th</sup>, 1920. This law aimed to return the properties to their real owners. However, until the enactment of this new law, the government gave some orders concerning the return of properties to the provinces, which illustrated the attitude of the government toward Armenian properties. I will give some examples from these telegrams.

First, an order was sent by the Ministry of Interior on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 1918. It maintained that Ottomans who were deported due to the war reasons were allowed to return to their lands. Also, the empty abandoned properties could not be settled, and



previously the properties which were given to the military and occupied by local people and officials could be evacuated in order to allocate to returnees.<sup>88</sup> Also, the government strictly controlled the return of deported people. It ordered that the provinces had to inform the government about the numbers of families who return their home. The governors had to provide security to these people during their return, and officials with corrupted practices were punished severely.<sup>89</sup>

The second telegram was sent from the Ministry of Interior to the province of Diyarbakir on October 28<sup>th</sup>, 1915. According to this order, the abandoned properties which were occupied could be evacuated when Armenians returned their homes. Also, the empty houses as abandoned properties could not be demolished. This telegram also indicated the transfer of Armenians from Mosul to the region of Bitlis, Diyarbakir and Mardin. It can be extracted from this document that the Commander of Second Army Corps was informed about the return of Armenians from Mosul and Cizre to their places.<sup>90</sup>

The third telegram was sent from the Ministry of Interior to many provinces on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 1918 about the return of holy properties to Armenians and Greeks. The order maintained that the temples, schools, houses of bishops and goods of these buildings belonging to Armenians and Greeks who were deported due to the war

---

<sup>88</sup> BCA/TiGMA, 272, 11, 11, 32, 15, October 18<sup>th</sup>, 1918

<sup>89</sup> BCA/TiGMA, 272, 11, 11, 32, 15, 18, response to the ciphered October 18, 1918, October 23, 1918

<sup>90</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 92/285, from the Ministry of Interior to the province of Diyarbakir, October 28<sup>th</sup>, 1918, [Document online]; available from

[www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0765.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0765.doc)

reasons were immediately evacuated and were given to the bishops of these communities.<sup>91</sup>

However, this decision about the return of the properties to the owners led to a problem among people who seized the Armenian properties. The telegram sent by the Ministry of Interior to many provinces on November 1918 stated that the properties left by deported Armenians and Greeks were demolished in some places. In addition, it ordered that this kind of behavior was never allowed, and the people who engaged in demolishing properties could be prosecuted.<sup>92</sup>

One response to the order sent on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 1918, as mentioned above, maintained that the decision about the evacuation of the buildings which were occupied by military, officials and local people caused worry and confusion among the immigrants and refugees who were settled in the abandoned properties. In addition, these immigrants began to leave their work and to demolish the abandoned properties. This response stated that violating the rights of these Muslim immigrants was not allowed. To solve the problem of insufficient houses, one or two families could be settled in a single house. Through this, both returnees and immigrants could be settled densely.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 93/108, from the Ministry of Interior to the provinces of Edirne, Ankara, Aydın, Erzurum, Bitlis, Hüdavendigâr, Diyarbakir, Konya, Adana, Sivas, Ma'muretül'aziz, Musul, Trabzon, Van, governors of sanjaks of İzmit, Eskişehir, Bolu, Canik, Karesi, Karahisar-i Sahib, Kayseri, Niğde, Menteşe, Çatalca, November 9<sup>th</sup>, 1918, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0771.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0771.doc)

<sup>92</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 93/31, from the Ministry of Interior to the provinces of Edirne, Erzurum, Adana, Ankara, Aydın, Bitlis, Hüdavendigâr, Diyarbakir, Sivas, Trabzon, Kastamonu, Konya, Ma'muretül'aziz, Musul, Van, the governors of the sanjaks of Urfa, İzmit, Bolu, Canik, Çatalca, Zor, Batum, Kars, Karesi, Kala-i Sultaniye, Menteşe, Teke, Kayseri, Karahisar-i Sahib, Eşişehir, İç il, Kütahya, Maraş, Niğde and Erzincan, November, 1918, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0768.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0768.doc)

<sup>93</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272,11,11,32,15, response to the ciphered October 18<sup>th</sup>, 1918, October 23, 1918

In some cases, the local governors might also prevent the return of the properties to the real owners. A letter from the Armenian Catholics from Pirkinik, district of Sivas in İstanbul can be given as an example. The Armenian Catholic Bishop of Sivas complained that deported forty families from the Pirkinik returned their homes and demanded their houses and lands. However, the local governor of Sivas did not give these properties back to their owners. This letter wanted a solution to this problem.<sup>94</sup> As a response to this letter, the Ministry of Interior ordered that if the properties were not given to these families, the province could inquire this situation and the properties had to be given to their owner.<sup>95</sup>

In that period, there are also some documents about the Armenian properties in the archives of the United Kingdom. They included some reports which discussed the issue of the return of properties to their real owners. The different attitude of the central government and local authorities can be easily seen in these reports. An Intelligence Summary of Egyptian Expeditionary Force on March 4<sup>th</sup>, 1919 included the impact of the war consequences in Turkey. About the Armenian question, this report mentioned the situation of Armenians in the Eastern regions of the country including Mardin, Diyarbekir and Urfa. It stated that “Armenian property has been made use of by the Turks, and houses which became vacant in consequences of the deportation of their occupants, have been taken, and either rented to officials and prominent Turks, or else given to Turkish exiles from other places, while in some

---

<sup>94</sup> BOA/DH. KMS, 49-2/15\_1, from the Armenians Catholics of Pirkinik in İstanbul to the Ministry of Interior, April, 19<sup>th</sup>, 1919, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0841.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/0841.doc)

<sup>95</sup> BOA/DH. KMS, 49-2/15\_1, from the Ministry of Interior to the province of Sivas, April 19<sup>th</sup>, 1919, *ibid*

cases, they have been sold by the Government”.<sup>96</sup> The report also mentioned about the return of the properties. It claimed that houses had been given to their real owners when they demanded their properties but on the other hand the local authorities rejected to evacuate their occupants. Also, the other report dated April 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 included information about conditions of Armenians in some vilayets. In Birejik, the report argues that few Armenians had returned to their place up to the middle of December 1918 despite the fact that the Turkish government gave orders that they should be allowed to re-occupy their homes. Also, in the case of Sivas, Armenians who returned to their villages faced some problems. The report stated that “some Armenians have already returned, but only to find their homes destroyed, and what remains of the wood-work being used as fuel by Turks”.<sup>97</sup>

The second document was about the restitution of property in Black Sea provinces. This report mentioned the Restitution of Property Commission which was established after the war. These commissions were formed in each province and dealt with claims of people who lost their properties during the war. According to this report, the commissions were not working well in locals due to the attitude of the local authorities. For instance, in Inebolu, there were about 100 cases about the restitution of the property but the Kaimakam was not willing to carry out these orders. Also, there were about 80 building belonging to Armenians which have not been returned to their real owners in Kerassun since unlike Inebolu, the Ministry of Interior sent orders that “no property is to be restored until the Law is in force”. However, in Ünye, the Armenian school building used as prison during the war was

---

<sup>96</sup> FO.608.108, G.H.Q Intelligence Summary, March 4<sup>th</sup>, 1919, p. 3

<sup>97</sup> FO.608.108, Supplement to G.H.Q. Intelligence Summary, April 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919

given back to the Armenian community.<sup>98</sup> Additionally, according to the report on October 19-20, 1919, in Trabzon, property questions were not investigated and “as many as 800 houses are still in Turkish hands”.<sup>99</sup> Consequently, in the period between 1918 and 1922, the Ottoman government had intention to return the properties to the real owners, and in the case of Armenian properties the government adopted decrees and orders to give back the properties. On the other hand, the locals had different stories about this issue since local authorities who might seize these properties could be reluctant to apply the orders of central government.

In this period, in British archives, there are also some documents about claims of Armenians who lost their houses and other properties during the war. After the defeat of the Ottoman Empire, Great Powers including Britain directly pressured the Ottomans about the damages of the war. In the Paris Peace Conference after the war, *Commission on the Responsibility of the Authors of the Wars and the Enforcement of Penalties* was established to follow this issue. Under this commission, the sub-commissions were formed in defeated countries. For the Ottoman Empire, Mixed Commission was founded at the British embassy in İstanbul, which directly focused on the property issue. This commission specifically had an Armenian-Greek Section. There were many claims by Armenians in this section in order to meet their damages during the war. Armenians demanded compensation for their properties which were seized and/or confiscated during the war. To exemplify this point, there was a letter sent by the Armenian-Greek Section of British High Commission about the investigated cases between March 9<sup>th</sup>, 1919 and March 31<sup>st</sup>, 1919. This letter did not

---

<sup>98</sup> FO.608.111, Restitution of Property in Black Sea Provinces, September 13, 1919

<sup>99</sup> FO.608.275, report by Captain Perring on his visit to the Coastal towns of Unieh, Fatsa, Ordu, Kerasun, Trebizond, Rize and Batoum, October 19-20, 1919, p.4

separately refer to Armenian and/or Greek properties but it used Christian term to define the cases. These cases have been investigated by this section and taken up with the Turkish Minister of the Interior. According to this document, the cases were:

“37 cases comprising in all 61 dwelling houses belonging to Christians but occupied by Turks  
22 cases comprising 34 factories and other buildings belonging to Christians but occupied by Turks  
11 cases of illegally detained furniture effects etc  
11 cases ships, sailing vessels etc. requisitioned by Turks the property of Christians  
22 cases of illegally detained prisoners (Christians)  
8 Greeks whose release has been obtained at Adrinople  
7 cases of sums of money restored to their Christian owners  
6 cases of live stock illegally detained by Turks  
2 cases of machinery stolen from Christians  
9 cases of Islamized women and children restored to their community”.<sup>100</sup>

The work of this commission was significant in this time since the Ottoman government gave an order to return the properties. After this order, many Greeks and Armenians applied to this commission to meet their damages during the war. Additionally, in the international level, the Armenian abandoned properties were discussed in conferences, treaties and congresses. In 1919, the Armenian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference presented a report about the damages of Armenians in Turkey and Caucasus.<sup>101</sup> Also, the Treaty of Sèvres signed August 10, 1920 included the separate article about the abandoned properties. The Article 144 stated:

The Turkish Government recognises the injustice of the law of 1915 relating to Abandoned Properties (*Emval-i-Metroukeh*), and of the supplementary provisions thereof, and declares them to be null and void, in the past as in the future. The Turkish Government solemnly undertakes to facilitate to the greatest possible extent the return to their homes and re-establishment in their businesses of the Turkish subjects of non-Turkish race who have been forcibly driven from their homes by fear of

---

<sup>100</sup> FO.608.110, Admiral Webb's despatch, April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1919

<sup>101</sup> Matossian, Bedross der (April 21, 2007), "From Confiscation to Appropriation: Historical Continuity and the Destruction of the Armenian Economy in the Ottoman Empire", *Armenian Genocide Insert*, v. 73: 16, URL: [http://www.hairenik.com/armenianweekly/gin042107\\_022.htm](http://www.hairenik.com/armenianweekly/gin042107_022.htm)

massacre or any other form of pressure since January 1, 1914. It recognises that any immovable or movable property of the said Turkish subjects or of the communities to which they belong, which can be recovered, must be restored to them as soon as possible, in whatever hands it may be found. Such property shall be restored free of all charges or servitudes with which it may have been burdened and without compensation of any kind to the present owners or occupiers, subject to any action which they may be able to bring against the persons from whom they derived title.<sup>102</sup>

The article also ordered the establishment of arbitral commissions including a chairman appointed by the League of Nations, a representative of Turkish government and of the community which claimed its or its members' damages. The arbitral commissions established according to the Treaty of Sèvres were authorized to change any acts over the properties after January 1, 1914. After the establishment of this commission under the League of Nations, the claims of commissions formed by Britain were transferred to this new commission. However, after the establishment of the Republic of Turkey based on the Treaty of Lausanne, this treaty became ineffective, and the Ankara government applied different policies from this period on as seen in the next part of this chapter. Before the analysis of the policies of the Republican period about the Armenian abandoned properties, I shall give an example of a private claim which was sent to the Commission in İstanbul. This example is significant to show the process which Armenians experienced during the war in terms of their loss of properties:

Chazaros Y. Tchiblakian who had a shop in İstanbul and a manufacturing house in Manchester was arrested on the third of September in 1915 and thrown into prison. After six days, he was sent to İzmit with many other Armenian prisoners. According to Tchiblakian, the only crime of them was their being born Armenians. After three

---

<sup>102</sup> For original document: [http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Section\\_I,\\_Articles\\_1\\_-\\_260](http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Section_I,_Articles_1_-_260)

days in prison, he was taken to Konya. During the en route to Konya, the gendarme who accompanied him wanted his watch to buy for five piaster. At first, he rejected to sell but the gendarme threatened him to kill. Thus, he had to sell his watch to this gendarme. At the station in Konya, he escaped and took refuge in a Greek house where he stayed for three months. He arranged another escape plan to reach his own place in İstanbul. He bribed the train offices, got into a merchandise car and came safe to his house but remained hidden. However, the police had been informed about his escape, and he was imprisoned again by the police for three days. After his wife bribed a few officers with 200 pounds, he became free. This freedom ended within a short period since Reşhad, the superintendant of the police department asked him to give a list of Armenians in return for his freedom entirely. However, he refused this offer. After three months in prison, his wife bribed officers once more with 300 pounds, and Tchiblakian was left free.

His second exile began on February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1916 when a civil officer came to his office and stated that he should pay 500 pounds to Reşhad Bey and accept the religion of Islam in order to remain in Constantinople. Although he refused to pay money and convert his religion, he was not arrested for three days. Within these three days, he sold all the goods in his shop at a very low price in order to provide money to his family. He told his wife “to give no more bribes to save my life, for nothing would help this time, I was doomed to die”.

On February 6<sup>th</sup>, 1916, he was arrested again and sent to Konia with another Armenian prescript for companion. From Konia, he was transferred to Byzantis. There, he met with the commander of the gendarmes, an Arab Muslim. He claimed



that this Arab Muslim commander treated him with very kindness. He stated that after telling his history and begging him, the commander's pity was aroused in him but Tchiblakian gave him 30 pounds to gain his freedom. Despite the fact that this commander also took his money like Turkish officials, Tchiblakian had positive attitude toward this Arab commander. Then, he became free and went to Tarsus where he worked in a grocery store as a servant under a Greek name. When he was suspected being an Armenian, he changed his place and was employed by German society as a servant in grocery until the armistice was signed. He returned to Constantinople on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 1918.

In this letter, he requested the representative of the British government that "a just compensation should be made for my losses". According to him, his losses were caused not only by his own exile but also by the fact that all his commercial relationship had been damaged on account of the proscription of all the Armenians in the different interior provinces. His letter included a list of his losses during the war. This list consisted of his capital loss in Constantinople, sale of his embroidery factory with its machinery by the Turkish government, the rent of his house occupied for four years by a Turkish officer in Büyükdere, a rent of his other house in Kerassunde, the loss of his profits for four years and the loss of his sister who lived with him. The value of these losses was 56,040 Turkish liras. Finally, his letter also included the claims about his relatives who were killed during the war in Kerassunde, his native land. He claimed that his relatives were killed during their exiles and their goods were robbed by the Turkish government and Turkish people.

His relatives were merchants, landowners and bankers in Kerassunde but his letter did not include the total worth of their losses.<sup>103</sup>

This case of Tchiblakian is significant because it gave information about the atmosphere of the deportations. Specifically, the rich Armenians who were deported faced different problems and had some chance to escape from the exile at the expense of the loss of their properties. As Admiral Calthorpe who sent this letter to the British government claimed, “Mr. Tchiblakian’s case is a typical example of the ruin inflicted on the more fortunate victims of the anti-Christian policy of the late Turkish government”.<sup>104</sup> Calthorpe also stated that he was “receiving an increasing number of petitions from Armenians and Greeks of every class who wish to register claims for losses sustained during the persecution”.<sup>105</sup> As seen above, these claims were investigated by the commissions and the Ottoman government but with the rise of the Kemalist movement, the process changed. Now, I will analyze the early Republican policies in terms of the Armenian abandoned properties.

#### ***5.4. Third Period: Republican Period (1920-1930)***

This period included the national struggle and establishment of the new state which replaced the Ottoman Empire. Unlike an imperial regime, this new state was formed as a nation-state. This is significant because the nation-state building process led to the appearance of the creation of new structures and needs which also gave new opportunities for state rulers. In this respect, Mustafa Kemal and his friends governed the state and they ruled an approximately homogenous Muslim population unlike the

---

<sup>103</sup> FO.608.245.2, Claim of Mr. Tchiblakian, March 5, 1919

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid*

Ottoman Empire. These changes affected the policies on the Armenian abandoned properties. In general, the policies of the Kemalists toward the abandoned properties were different from the İstanbul government after the CUP. Like the Unionists, Kemalists continued to liquidate and expropriate the Armenian properties but with some different reasons. In this vein, I will discuss the mechanisms of the distribution and execution of the abandoned properties by comparing with the previous periods.

#### **5.4.1. The Settlement of Immigrants in the Armenian Abandoned Properties**

In the Kemalist period, the state continued to settle the Muslim immigrants and refugees in the abandoned properties in the CUP period. The republic of Turkey was established after the national struggle which defined the national borders of Turkey. After this war, many people immigrated and took refuge in Turkey. Like the Unionists, the Kemalists settled these people in the places which were left by Armenians. In this section, I will give some examples to indicate the purposes of Kemalists concerning the settlement issue of Armenians.

First, the Council of Ministers adopted a decree about the houses which were occupied by the refugees on July 11<sup>th</sup>, 1921. According to this decree, the refugees were evacuated from their houses and they were left homeless. In order not to cause refugees trouble, the Council decided that the refugees could not be evacuated from the abandoned properties which they occupied.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> BCA/BKKG, 030.18.1.1/3.30.13, July 11<sup>th</sup>, 1921

The second document was about the demands for the settlement of the immigrants in the district of Bolvadin. This document is significant because it gives information about the purpose of the immigrant settlement, the attitude of the local governors toward settlement policy and significance of the settlement policy during the Kemalist period. The Municipality of Bolvadin district sent a letter to the Ministry of Development and Settlement (*İmar ve İskân Vekaleti*) on November 27<sup>th</sup>, 1923. This letter defined three available sub-districts (*nahiye*) in Bolvadin for the possible settlement of the immigrants. Specifically, one sub-district had available twenty five houses. It had fertile lands for cultivation and pastures for animal husbandry. There were two mills, vineyards, vegetable gardens, and mulberry grove for silkworms. The other sub-district named Karamikkaracaviran had fifteen houses, one farmer and one thousand dönüm land for the settlement. The last sub-district named Çay had eight houses and one thousand dönüm land. All these places were from the abandoned properties left by Armenians. The Municipality maintained that these abandoned properties were seized by someone who used them unnecessarily and improperly. The Municipality offered that if these abandoned properties were given to the immigrants, both immigrants and treasury could benefit. In addition, the letter stated that until now, the state did not settle immigrants in Bolvadin. Since the main aim of the local governor and inhabitants was to enrich the state, to increase the population and to provide needs for the immigrants, the Municipality wanted from the Ministry one thousand and five hundred immigrants who were craftsmen and farmers from the Drama region to settle in Bolvadin.<sup>107</sup> In the response to this letter, the Ministry decided to send immigrants to Bolvadin but due to the Armenian

---

<sup>107</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.10.2.12.8, November 27<sup>th</sup>, 1923

abandoned properties, the immigrants who did not come according to the population exchange convention were sent to settle in Bolvadin.<sup>108</sup>

As seen in this document, the new state continued settling immigrants in the abandoned properties in order to increase the state income and to meet the needs of immigrants. Additionally, the state strengthened the local regions by allowing the use of abandoned properties under its control. Some examples can be given to show the settlement of immigrants. In one example, the state decided to offer the abandoned properties left by Armenians and Greeks to the immigrants. This telegram was sent on May 1924.<sup>109</sup> The other telegram sent by Exchange, Development and Settlement Ministry (*Mübadele, İmar ve İskân Vekâleti*) on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 1924 to the province of Diyarbakir stated that the immigrants coming to Diyarbakir were allowed to rent houses from the abandoned properties.<sup>110</sup> The other telegram was for the settlement of refugees in Niğde. This telegram sent on December 23, 1926 stated that some families of the refugees from Eastern provinces (Şark illeri) could be settled in Armenian abandoned properties in Niğde.<sup>111</sup>

Finally, there was a telegram which displayed the settlement policy in abandoned properties for a different purpose. After the establishment of the Republic and beginning of the Şeyh Sait uprising, the alliances between Turkish state and some Kurdish tribes came to an end.<sup>112</sup> The Republic adopted some policies to provide the

---

<sup>108</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.10.2.12.8, the telegrams sent on December 1, 1923 and on December 2, 1923

<sup>109</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.11.21.106.11, May 1925

<sup>110</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.11.17.81.2, from Exchange, Development and Settlement Ministry to the province of Diyarbakir, April 5<sup>th</sup>, 1924

<sup>111</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272. 12.50.109.05, ...

<sup>112</sup> Mustafa Kemal made alliances with Kurds to gain independence war. Taner Akçam claims that according to letters which Mustafa Kemal sent to Kurdish leaders, the important reason for the

state power in the region. Resettlement became a significant way to satisfy this aim. Joost Jongerden claims that “during the 1920s and 1930s in Turkey, however, resettlement acquired a very different meaning based on a new objective, that of creating and molding identities” (Jongerden, 2007: 216). This means that the state internally resettled “Kurds who had rebelled against, or were somehow associated with rebellions against the state” (Jongerden, 2007: 216). In this vein, the Republic followed some policies after the Şeyh Sait uprising to prevent Kurdish oppositions. First, the state aimed to settle Turkish immigrants in the regions where Kurds lived. Second, the state resettled Kurds who had rebelled in the Western regions. Finally, alliances with these Kurdish people were established to take their consent. The Armenian abandoned properties took important part to achieve these. A telegram sent by Abdülhalik Bey, the Minister of Finance to İsmet Pasha in 1925 exemplified the importance of the Armenian abandoned properties for this issue. In this telegram, Abdülhalik Bey stated that the settlement of Turkish immigrants in the villages abandoned by Armenians was a better way to solve the Kurdish issue. Abdülhalik Bey reached this solution after his inspection and research in the region. Abdülhalik Bey offered that until the issue of the settlement of immigrants was determined in these regions, any lands which were not from the abandoned properties would not be sold in the provinces of Diyarbakir, Siirt, Bitlis, Van and Muş in order not to confiscate these lands in the future.<sup>113</sup> In the response to this letter, İsmet Pasha accepted to sell the lands which were only from the abandoned properties on August 2, 1925.<sup>114</sup> This correspondence is significant since the new state aimed to Turkify

---

Kurdish and Turkish alliance was the fear of the return of Armenians who could take their revenge from the Kurds. In addition, notables, who seized Armenian goods, were scared of returning Armenians (Akçam, 1994: 158).

<sup>113</sup> BCA/BMGMEK, 30.10.80.529.20, from Abdülhalik Bey to İsmet Pasha [see Appendix 1]

<sup>114</sup> BCA/BMGMEK, 30.10.80.529.20, from İsmet Pasha to Abdülhalik Bey, August 2, 1925

the regions where Kurds lived by settling the Turkish immigrants in abandoned properties. In addition, the date of this correspondence was important since the Şeyh Said uprising started in February 1925 and was suppressed by the state in April 1925. However, the effect of the uprising continued until late 1920s. After this uprising, the state paid attention carefully on the Kurdish population, and after the uprising many Kurds were deported to the Western provinces.

This correspondence is also significant since its aims were similar to the Eastern Reform Plan (*Şark Islahat Planı*) which was adopted by September 25<sup>th</sup>, 1925.<sup>115</sup> This plan was prepared according to the decree adopted on September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1925. This decree authorized Cemil Bey, the Minister of Interior, Mahmud Esat, the Minister of Justice and Abdülhalik Bey, deputy of Cankiri to investigate the regions where uprisings appeared and to prepare a report about the situation. This report included many articles which aimed to change all socio-economic and demographic structure of the region. Related to the topic of this study, I will focus on the fifth article of the plan which had similarities with the correspondence of Abdülhalik Bey. According to Article 5, Turkish immigrants (*muhacir*) were settled in the Armenian abandoned lands in the line between Van and Midyat. The Armenian properties in these provinces were not sold and were not rented to Kurdish people. Turks and Albanians who came from Yugoslavia and immigrants from Iran and Caucasus were settled in Elaziz-Ergani-Diyarbakir, Elaziz-Palu-Kiğı, the valley of Murat between Palu and Muş, plain of Muş, Bingöl, the basin of Van Lake and the line of Diyarbakir-Garzan-Bitlis. If the Armenian abandoned lands in which the Turkish immigrants were

---

<sup>115</sup> For original document of the Eastern Reform Plan (*Şark Islahat Planı*):  
<http://www.kurdistantime.com/?p=494>

settled were occupied by Kurdish people, these lands would be evacuated and Kurds would be sent to their former places.<sup>116</sup>

Considering the correspondence of Abdülhalik Bey and the Eastern Reform Plan, the Turkish government used Armenian abandoned properties to settle Turkish immigrants in order to prevent future uprisings of Kurdish people. This also showed the Turkification attempts of the state toward Kurdish people. This plan was applied but not completely successful. Robert Olson argues that the Muslim Albanians who immigrated from Kosovo were settled in the region of uprising. Additionally based on the report of Britain, Olson claims that the state planned to settle approximately 40-50,000 Circassian immigrants in the Kurdish territory (Olson, 1992: 186).

Also, in 1928 the state adopted amnesty for the people who joined the Şeyh Said uprising and were deported to the Western provinces. The nephew of Şeyh Sait, Fexredini Şex Tahiri who gave interview with the journal about post-uprising period argues that state offered them to give goods and lands if they did not take action against the state. In addition, Tahiri argues that his family was settled in the village of Xoşmat in Diyarbakir which was an old Armenian village (Malmisanij, 2006: 39). This shows that the Kemalist state used the Armenian abandoned properties to take consent from the Kurdish people who resisted the state before. The Armenian abandoned properties became the reward for Kurdish people to accept loyalty to the Turkish state. The state directly established alliance with these people who joined the uprising before when its capacity to apply policy in these regions was not sufficient.

---

<sup>116</sup> *ibid*



Thus, besides using coercion on these people, the state also tried to gain their consent by giving the Armenian abandoned properties as gifts for their loyalty.

#### **5.4.2. The Creation of National Economy**

Kemalists also used the Armenian abandoned properties in order to strengthen the economic initiatives. During this period, there were many joint stock cooperation firms which were supported by the state. In this process, these firms needed immovable properties including building, lands, and stores to produce. The state directly supported these firms by providing properties from the abandoned properties left by Armenians. In this section, I will display this support of the state from the beginning by giving some examples.

The first law concerning the abandoned properties was adopted by the Kemalists on April 20<sup>th</sup>, 1922 as seen in the third chapter. This law included the article regarding the immovable properties and agricultural products. This article stated that the immovable properties and agricultural products were controlled by the government, and the government had a right to manage these properties.<sup>117</sup> In addition, during this time, the state adopted special decision to manage the abandoned properties. One decision was accepted by the Council of Ministers on November 16<sup>th</sup>, 1922. This decision stated that the silkworm seed left by Armenians and Greeks who escaped with the Greek army were distributed to agriculturalists.<sup>118</sup> On the other hand, the state also paid attention to allocate the properties because in some cases, the people

---

<sup>117</sup> Original document in Kardeş, Salâhattin (2008), *"Tehcir" ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuati*, Ankara: Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, p. 97-98

<sup>118</sup> BCA/BKKK, 30.18.1.1.6.37.1, November 11<sup>th</sup>, 1922

wanted properties without cost. However, the state did not give properties without charge due to lawful restrictions. For example, Fevzi Pasha sent a telegram to the Supreme Command (*Başkumandanlık*) on December 21, 1922. Fevzi Pasha stated that Colonel İbrahim Bey, the commander of Third Cavalry Division (*Üçüncü Süvari Fırkası*), who served the nation had a forest and factory in Bozöyük in the amount of two hundreds thousand liras which were demolished by Greeks. Due to the discharge from military, he wanted to carry out business in order to meet his damages. In this vein, he demanded to take Tuzakoğlu Flour Factory from the abandoned properties in İzmir.<sup>119</sup> However, the Ministry of Finance informed that due to the abandoned properties law it was not possible to give properties without any charges (*bilabedel*).<sup>120</sup> Thus, the demand of Colonel İbrahim Bey was rejected, and he was directed to apply for meeting his damage to the peace conference.<sup>121</sup>

The second example for the support of the state to firms was that Resad Bey, deputy of Saruhan and representative of Akhisar Tobacco Bank Turkish Joint-Stock Company (*Akhisar Tütüncüler Bankası Türk Anonim Şirketi*), demanded two hundreds and twenty two dönüm lands belonging to abandoned properties in order to produce tobacco seedling (*tütün fidesi*). They asked for a store left by Kayserioğulları to use for the firm in return for paying charges. Since the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement informed that these properties were not given to immigrants, the Council of Ministries would accept this demand on September 21, 1924.<sup>122</sup> Since this decree did not include sale price of these properties to this firm, its amount was unknown. However, its sale price was determined by the local

---

<sup>119</sup> BCA/BMGMEK, 30.10.140.4.14, from Fevzi Pasha to the Supreme Command, December 21, 1922

<sup>120</sup> BCA/BMGMEK, 30.10.140.4.14, December 31, 1922

<sup>121</sup> *ibid*

<sup>122</sup> BCA/BKKK, 30.18.1.1.11.45.11

government (*mahalli meclis idaresince*). In addition, the state aimed to support the firms in accordance with its economic policies as discussed in the first chapter. Thus, it can be argued that the state sold these properties below their real prices, and the money was taken by the treasury.

The other example was about the appropriation of two buildings from the abandoned properties. The Council of Ministers adopted a decree on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 1925 that two buildings from the abandoned properties were appropriated to the İzmir Stock Exchange Administration (*İzmir Borsa İdaresi*) in order to be used as İzmir Fig Stock Exchange (*İzmir İncir Borsası*). These buildings were also given in return for paying sale price.<sup>123</sup> Also, on April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1926 the Council of Ministers decided that the Fındıklıyan Flour Factory (*Fındıklıyan Un Fabrikası*) from the abandoned properties in Edirne could be rented to the Municipality of Edirne for ten years.<sup>124</sup>

Finally, The Ministry of Economy offered the abandoned properties for the Industrial Enterprises Turkish Joint-Stock Company (*Teşebbüsât-ı Sana'iyeye Türk Anonim Şirketi*) which was established in 1925 and had a share and subscription (*hisse ve iştiraki*) in the Bank of Industry and Mine (*Sanayi ve Maadin Bankası*) in order to solve economic problems of this firm. It was stated that this firm enlightened the country with electrical power and aimed to support the state for establishing canned food, woolen textile and alcohol (*ispirto*) factories. Therefore, to support this firm, the Council of Ministers accepted to sell abandoned properties on August 5<sup>th</sup>, 1928.

---

<sup>123</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.01.013.20.12, Decree (Kararname) March 29<sup>th</sup>, 1925

<sup>124</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.01.0.18.26.9, Decree, April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1926

The value on method of sale was determined by the cabinets of ministers (*heyet vekilleri*).<sup>125</sup>

### 5.4.3. Use for the Needs of the State

During this period, the state used the abandoned properties for the various needs of the state from the national struggle to 1930s. These included the needs of the military, the needs of building for state initiatives and houses for the officials. In this section, I will attempt to give some examples to show the solution of the state for these needs in terms of the abandoned properties.

For the needs of the military, the orders of National Obligations (*Tekalif-i Milliye*) adopted on August 7 and 8, 1921 became the base. These orders were accepted in order to meet the needs of the national struggle. The supreme command published six orders but one of them directly related to the abandoned properties. It was named '*the sixth order about the abandoned properties*'. It stated that the goods and commodities which were determined in orders were controlled by the Commissions of National Obligations. These commissions were authorized to meet the needs of the military from the abandoned properties.<sup>126</sup>

The government also used the abandoned properties for the needs of state institutions. There was a decision of the Council of Ministers about this issue on

---

<sup>125</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.01.030.48.15, Decree, August 5<sup>th</sup>, 1928

<sup>126</sup> Quoted in Tural, Mehmet Akif (1995), "*Tekalif-i Milliye (Halka Borcu Kalmayan Devlet)*", *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 32(XI),  
URL: <http://www.atam.gov.tr/index.php?Page=Dergiler&icerikNo=801>

April 3, 1924. This decision stated that there was a conflict between the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement about the abandoned properties. Two buildings from the abandoned properties were wanted to be used as government residences (*hükümet konağı*) but the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement wanted to use these buildings for the settlement of immigrants. The Council maintained that since the value of rent for the government houses was not provided and these buildings were not appropriate for the settlement of families, it was proper to use these two buildings as government residences<sup>127</sup>. Also, the Council made a decision on November 11<sup>th</sup>, 1929 that the abandoned properties used as government houses were evacuated to settle the immigrants since this led to increase budget expenses. In this vein, the abandoned properties occupied by the government residences were not evacuated and not distributed to the immigrants in order to use as government residences.<sup>128</sup>

The government also distributed the abandoned properties to state officials. For this aim, the state used non-Muslim abandoned properties including Armenians and Greeks. An example for this distribution was the demand of Munib who was a scribe (*katib*) in the office of decisions (*mukerrerat*). He claimed that the house given to him was occupied by someone who could not evacuate this house. There was a correspondence between the Prime Ministry and the province of Ankara. It was stated that there were about three hundreds houses which were available for the settlement of officials in Ankara about the issue. These houses were abandoned by Greeks and missing people. The Prime Ministry decided that the house which was

---

<sup>127</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.01.09.21.4, Decree, April 3, 1924

<sup>128</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.02.6.59,5, Decree, November 11<sup>th</sup>, 1929

appropriated to Munib Bey was evacuated and given to him on August 25<sup>th</sup>, 1924.<sup>129</sup> Like Greeks, the Armenian abandoned properties were also distributed to state officials. The telegram sent by the governor of Adana on October 9<sup>th</sup>, 1924 to the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement gave information about the abandoned properties which were used by officials. This telegram included a table which showed the abandoned properties occupied by government and military officials. According to this table, the number of occupations was one hundred and fifty but except for three all houses were abandoned by Armenians and Greeks.<sup>130</sup>

#### **5.4.4. Distribution of the Abandoned Properties to Martyrs**

The Republic of Turkey adopted a law legislated on May 31, 1926, which was related to the former CUP leaders killed by the Armenian conspirators. The law stated that the properties valued twenty thousands liras from the abandoned properties were given to the families of Talat Pasha, Cemal Pasha, Cemal Azmi, Bahattin Şakir, Sait Halim, the kaimakam of Boğazlıyan, Kemal Bey, aides of Cemal Pasha and the governors (*mutasarrıf*) of Urfa and Muş. This law was important since it showed that the state used the abandoned properties for its nationalist claims. It had a symbolic meaning for nationalism because many of them were killed by Armenians, and Kemalists considered them as martyr. Also, during this time, Kemalists began to eliminate the old CUP members from the political area. With adopting this law, in addition to giving the return of honor (*iade-i itibar*) for the CUP leaders, it can also be showed that the state did not oppose to all Unionists but to

---

<sup>129</sup> BCA/BMGMEK, 30.10.27.158.4, August 25<sup>th</sup>, 1924 [see Appendix 3]

<sup>130</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.11.19.36.19, from the province of Adana to the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement, October 9, 1924

these unionists, who opposed to the Kemalist government. Finally, with this law, we can understand the attitude of the Kemalists toward deportations and the judgment of the Unionists since these people who had rights to get immovable from abandoned properties were accused of killing Armenians and seizing their properties during deportations.

On February 2, 1927, an apartment and a house from the Armenian abandoned properties which was worth twenty liras were given to Hatice Hanım, wife of Kemal Bey, the kaimakam of Boğazlıyan, to his daughters, Mezher ve Müşerref Hanım and to his son, Adnan Bey.<sup>131</sup> A house in Kir Street in Şişli, İstanbul, which was worth seventeenth thousand and five hundred liras, were given to Cenani Hanım, wife of Doctor Bahattin Şakir killed by the Armenian conspirators in 1922 and to his sons, Alp and Celasin on February 13<sup>th</sup>, 1927.<sup>132</sup> In addition to that, since this property was not worth twenty thousand liras, the government gave one third share of two stores in the street of Mahmudiye in Galata abandoned by Boğastan to these peoples in order to fill 2,433 liras gap on October 31, 1939.<sup>133</sup>

On April 13<sup>th</sup>, 1927, the government gave stores and lands to wife, daughter, sons and sister of Cemal Pasha. The 1450 meter land in Feriköy was abandoned by Biçen Hahoçyan on September 9<sup>th</sup>, 1923 and seized by Bakim Efendi, a dentist, who built stores in these lands. After giving values of these properties to Bakim Efendi, this land and stores were decided to be given to the Cemal Pasha's family. On December 25<sup>th</sup>, 1927, the government decided to give ten shares of an inn called Arnavud Hani

---

<sup>131</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.01.023.7.12, Decree, February 2, 1927

<sup>132</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.01.023.7.18, Decree, February 13<sup>th</sup>, 1927

<sup>133</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.02.8.106.13, Decree, October 31, 1939

abandoned by Bedros in Beyoğlu Asmalımesjid to the wife and sons of Nusret Bey who was the old local governor (*mutasarrıf*) of Urfa.<sup>134</sup> Finally, the government decided to give abandoned properties to the family of Talat Pasha. The wife of Talat Pasha, Hayriye Hanım appealed the government and told that Talat Pasha had a sister named Kamile Hanım who was in need of help. Thus, the government adopted a decree on September 16<sup>th</sup>, 1929 that an inn called Tashan and its stores abandoned by Avram, son of Göce were given to Kamile Hanım.<sup>135</sup>

### **5.5. Adana**

After the analysis of the execution of the Armenian abandoned properties from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey, I will specifically focus on Adana which is one of my two cases. The other is Ma'muretül'aziz. In this section, first, I will give historical background on the province of Adana in terms of the role of Armenians in this province during the Ottoman period. Then, I will focus on the fate of Armenian properties after the Armenian deportations in relation to the distribution of the abandoned properties.

In Adana, Armenians appeared as early as the fourth century but their number had increased in the seventh century, and between these years Armenians had an independent kingdom. After the invasion of Seljuks, Armenians lost their independence and were controlled by various Muslim groups.<sup>136</sup> During the era of Yavuz Sultan Selim, Adana was controlled by the Ottoman Empire but Ramazanoğullari continued being governors of Adana. In 1608, Ottoman Empire

---

<sup>134</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.01.027.70.3, Decree, December 25, 1927

<sup>135</sup> BCA/BKKK, 030.18.01.02.5.47.15, Decree, September 16, 1929

<sup>136</sup> Yurt ansiklopedisi : Türkiye, İl İl: Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını, vol.1, İstanbul: Anadolu Yayıncılık, 1981, p. 25-27; Krikorian, Mesrob K. (1977) *Armenians in the Service of the Ottoman Empire*, p.62



directly governed Adana as a province (*eyalet*) (Krikorian, 1978: 63). The nineteenth century was significant in the political and economic life of Adana. Politically, during the war between the Ottoman Empire and Egypt, Adana was controlled by Ibrahim Pasha, son of Mehmet Ali Pasha, who changed the economic structure of Adana with putting modern techniques in cotton production which was carried out in Adana through primitive techniques before the nineteenth century.<sup>137</sup> Additionally, Britain and France increasingly participated in the economic life of Adana due to the civil war in America which increased the price of cotton. Britain began to establish cotton enterprise as the first cotton gin factory was founded in Adana. This process was also directly related with the commercial agreements between the Ottoman Empire and Britain because it provided convenience taxes to the latter. The Ottoman Empire gave privileges specifically to the cotton production. These included the allocation of empty lands to cotton producers and reduction of custom duties for bringing machines and tools from abroad. All this process accelerated the mechanization of agriculture in Adana.<sup>138</sup>

Until the nineteenth century, Armenians in Adana were interested in the mining, craftsmanship and growing horses. However, during the nineteenth century their conditions changed. With the adaptation of the new Land Code of 1858 which determined the land proprietorship, Armenian landlords began to increase their lands. Related to this, the increasing impact of Britain and France in Adana gave advantages to non-Muslims, especially Armenians because of collaboration in commercial activity. Oğuz Aktan argues that Armenians could be accepted as the

---

<sup>137</sup> Yurt ansiklopedisi : Türkiye, İl İl: Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını, vol.1, İstanbul: Anadolu Yayıncılık, 1981, p. 31-32

<sup>138</sup> *ibid*, p. 32-33

first industrialist in the region since being intermediaries in the commerce between East and West led Armenians to take central part in European, Eastern and Mediterranean trade (Aktan, 2000: 119-120).

It can be argued about the role of Armenians in the economic life of Adana that some of them were engaged in the cultivation of cereals and fruits and in cattle breeding. Their popular occupations were in trades, crafts and professions. In the commerce, they were interested in manufacturing of cloth, towels, handkerchiefs, bags, carpets, earthenware, and various silver adornments (Krikorian, 1978: 65). Aktan also claims that Armenians produced industrial crops in big lands and used a special agricultural technique in the production of cotton and sesame at the same time (Aktan, 2000: 120). Mainly, Armenian traders and artisans were concentrated in towns. Armenians also participated to the public life of Adana. Armenians were a large group in the central sanjak of Adana and its headquarters. Considerable influence of Armenians in Adana could be seen in Tarsus, Saimbeyli, Kozan and Cebel-i Bereket. As a result of the millet system, two or three Armenians represented Gregorian, Catholic and Protestant Armenians on the administrative council. Krikorian argues that “from three to six Armenians were elected to the municipality of Adana while the other municipal councils had only one or two Armenian members” (Krikorian, 1978: 65).

Now, I will analyze the administrative structure of Adana through the number of Armenian population before 1915. Adana became a province in 1867 with the reform project of the Ottoman Empire which aimed to settle the nomadic tribes.<sup>139</sup> In this time, Adana had four sanjaks including Seyhan, İçel, Kozan and Cebel-i Bereket. In

---

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid*, p.31

1887 the kaza of Mersin became a separate sanjak (Krikorian, 1978: 63). According to the Ottoman census of 1894, there were about 33,000 Armenians while there were 340,000 Muslims (Karpat, 2003: 191). According to Cuinet, Gregorian Armenians were about 69,300, Catholic Armenians 11,590 and Protestant Armenians 16,600 while Muslims were 157,400.<sup>140</sup> In Armenian sources, the population of Armenians in Adana was 79,600 (Krikorian, 1978: 64). There is a difference of these figures according to various sources. Also, this difference continued in the estimation of the population of Armenians before 1915. According to the Ottoman census of 1914, Armenians in Adana was estimated 74,490. According to an Armenian source, the population of Armenians in the province of Adana including Maras was 205,000 (McCarthy, 1983: 78). There is a huge difference between the Ottoman results and that of Patriarchate. However, I use the Ottoman results to compare these regions in terms of their population of Armenians because of its consistent system of registration data (McCarthy, 1983: 54).

The Armenian deportations in 1915 deeply affected the political, social and economic life of the province of Adana. These deportations not only resulted in the elimination of Armenians in Adana but also due to the positions of Armenians in Adana, there occurred economic void in the province. Indeed even according to the estimation of Talat Pasha, 46,031 Armenians were deported in the Adana province. In this vein, I will attempt to analyze the fate of Armenian properties in Adana after 1915 to the Republic of Turkey.

---

<sup>140</sup> Quoted in Yurt Ansiklopedisi, *ibid*, vol.1, p. 41

As seen in the first section of this part, the execution of Armenian abandoned properties during World War I was carried out in Adana for the same reasons. According to some telegrams which were sent by the Ministry of Interior to various provinces including Adana, it can be argued that the state settled Muslim immigrants in Adana to replace Armenians and used the Armenian properties both to realize national economic policies and to meet needs of state and people. I will give some examples of telegrams which were specifically sent to the province of Adana about the execution of Armenian abandoned properties.

In Adana, the Ottoman government prohibited any commercial transaction of Armenians after their date of deportations. The ciphered telegram was sent by Talat Pasha to the province of Adana on September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915 in order to inform the province about transactions of Armenians. It stated that Armenians tried to sell their movable and immovable properties between the date of deportation order and deportation. In order to prevent it, any attempts of Armenians to sell their properties were forbidden.<sup>141</sup>

Also, the Ottoman government attempted to liquidate the Armenian properties in the storages of Deutsche Orient Bank. Eşref Bey, the chairman of Adana Abandoned Properties Commission, sent a telegram to the Ministry of Interior on October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 that the properties in the storages of the Bank could not be preserved for a long time since some of them might decay and the price of some might decrease. The

---

<sup>141</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR,55-A/171, from the Ministry of Interior to the province of Adana, September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/401.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/401.doc)

chairman asked which treatment to make these properties to the Ministry.<sup>142</sup> As a response, Talat Pasha ordered that for the present these properties could be preserved.<sup>143</sup> On the other hand, in this time, there appeared a conflict between the Commission and the director of the Bank. One building left by Agazaryan was rented by the Bank. This building also included some commercial goods which were entrusted by other Armenians to Agazaryan. The Commission sealed the building according to the abandoned properties law while the Director intervened in this process and broke the seal.<sup>144</sup> The ciphered telegram sent on October 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915 stated that the director of the Bank, Groyel, was interrogated by the German Consulate.<sup>145</sup> Thus, the Commission continued to liquidate the Armenian properties in the storages of the Bank with the help of the Ottoman Empire's allied state, Germany.

The Ottoman government also supported the Muslim entrepreneurs to carry out business in Adana. As mentioned before, a telegram sent to various provinces including Adana on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 1916 about supporting Muslim entrepreneurs through giving Armenian abandoned properties determined the main purpose of the distribution of the abandoned properties. Before this date, the Ministry of Interior also sent a telegram specifically to Adana about a cotton firm. There appeared a conflict between the firm and the commission about the cession of the properties. According to abandoned properties law, the commission intervened in the situation

---

<sup>142</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.12.35.7.11, from the chairman of Adana Abandoned Properties Commission to the Ministry of Interior, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915

<sup>143</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.12.35.7.11, from the Minister of Interior, Talat Pasha to the chairman of Adana Abandoned Properties Commission, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 1915

<sup>144</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.12.35.7.11, from the chairman of Adana Abandoned Properties Commission to the Ministry of Interior, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 1915

<sup>145</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 57/193, from the Ministry of Interior to the province of Adana, October 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/492.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/492.doc)

and did not allow the firm to take abandoned properties since the commission was only authorized to make transactions on the abandoned properties. However, after the complaints of firms, the Ministry of Interior ordered to the commission that the commission could not intervene in the cession process and the cotton firm could take the abandoned properties which were left by non-Muslims.<sup>146</sup> Taner Akçam claims that this firm was Anatolian Cotton Company (*Anadolu Pamuk Şirketi*) which was a front company belonging to the Unionists since there was not any record about it in the industry statistics 1913-1915. Akçam also argues that a telegram sent on November 19<sup>th</sup>, 1915 stated that the properties left by Greeks in Aydın were ceded to Anatolian Cotton Company (Akçam, 2008: 229).

Also, the Ottoman government settled the immigrants in the province of Adana. As seen before, the telegrams sent to various provinces including Adana emphasized the importance of the settlement of immigrants in the properties left by Armenians. Adana was also an important province for the settlement of immigrants since economically and socially Armenians had a significant place in Adana. Their deportations created problems for the economy. Before analyzing these problems, I will mention the telegram sent on October 23, 1916. This telegram stated that eighty five immigrants were sent to Adana in order to be settled in the province. Talat Pasha ordered that these immigrants could be settled in the provinces, and daily feeding expenses could be met.<sup>147</sup> Also, the settlement of migrants could be seen in the telegram sent by the American consul in Adana to Henry Morgenthau, American Ambassador in Constantinople on May 28<sup>th</sup>, 1915. This telegram stated that

---

<sup>146</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 56/50, from the Minister of Interior, Talat Pasha, to the province of Adana, September 16<sup>th</sup>, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/414.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/414.doc)

<sup>147</sup> BCA/TİGMA, 272.11.8.12.11, from Talat Pasha to the province of Adana, October 23, 1916

Armenians in Adana were deported, and some of them claimed that the large influx of Macedonian refugees occupied all houses vacated by their former owners.<sup>148</sup>

The settlement of such immigrants was significant since lack of Armenians resulted in void in the socioeconomic life of Adana. This was mentioned in the foreign sources. Edward Nathan, American Consul in Adana reported to Henry Morgenthau on July 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 about the consequences of deportations on the economic situation of Adana: “Apart from the misery and distress to the deported persons the effect of these measures on the province is incalculable. The loss of the best commercial element and the principal handicraftsmen is bound to injure local economic conditions. Special pleas on this basis have been made to the Government by various interests and even German financial and commercial interests notably those of the various agricultural machine companies which do business as well as the Singer Manufacturing Company and the petroleum companies will also be affected”.<sup>149</sup> In addition, the same kind report was sent on September 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915 by Edward Nathan about the effects of the deportation measures on the economic situation of Adana. It was stated that “greater part all stores and bazaars are shut and it is difficult to purchase one’s daily requirements. Most of the merchandize of Armenian merchants is in sealed stores...As the greater part of the business of this district in most lines was in the hands Armenians the consequences of their deportations are only too apparent for the future of the Adana province”.<sup>150</sup> This effect was also mentioned in

---

<sup>148</sup> NA/RG59/867.00/768, from American Consul, Edward I. Nathan to the American Consulate, on May 28<sup>th</sup>, 1915 in Sarafian, Ara (2004), *United States Official Records on the Armenian Genocide*, Princeton; London: Gomidas Institute, p. 49

<sup>149</sup> LC/HM(Sr.)/Reel 7/639, from American Consul, Edward I. Nathan to the American Consulate, on July 26<sup>th</sup>, 1915 in Sarafian, Ara (2004), *ibid*, p. 89

<sup>150</sup> NA/RG59/867.4016/200, from American Consul, Edward I. Nathan to the American Consulate, on September 27<sup>th</sup>, 1915, Sarafian, Ara (2004), *ibid*, p. 800

memoirs of local people. The memoir of Damar Arıkoğlu who was a representative of the CUP in Adana and became the Adana deputy between 1920 and 1946 stated that “after the deportations of Armenians to Syria, Adana became absolutely empty. There did not remain any bazaars, stores and craftsmen. Stores and workplaces were shut. Even the lack of tinsmith and plumber became our main problems. An apprentice school (*çırak mektebi*) was established in the yard of the Armenian Church. Turkish boys whom we gathered learnt work of plumbing and tinsmithery within short time. Finally, this few and necessary craftsmen increased and met the needs of the country”.<sup>151</sup> As seen in these telegrams and the memoir, the deportations of Armenians in Adana deeply affected the life of the provinces. The state solved the problem appeared in the economy through the settlement of immigrants in the province and through supporting Turkish entrepreneurs and craftsmen.

This process continued in the Kemalist period in Adana. During the Kemalist period, besides the settlement of immigrants in abandoned properties, some companies were also supported by the state with the abandoned properties. First, the state tried to settle three thousands and five hundreds immigrants in Kozan. The telegram sent by the district director of Adana Exchange, Development and Settlement to the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement on July 17<sup>th</sup>, 1924 stated that there were attempts to settle these immigrants in Kozan but like Adana, Tarsus and Mersin there were many complaints by immigrants. Specifically the immigrants complained about the situation of weather which they were not familiar. In addition, it was stated that there was not any problem for the settlement of immigrants in the province.<sup>152</sup> The

---

<sup>151</sup> Quoted in Yurt Ansiklopedisi, *ibid*, vol.1, p.41.

<sup>152</sup> BCA/TİGMA,272.11.11.32.15, from the Adana district director to the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement, July 17<sup>th</sup>, 1924



Ministry responded to this telegram that news was received that immigrants were not settled and that the abandoned properties were occupied by usurpers (*mütegallibe*) and state officials. The Ministry ordered that the settlement problem had to be resolved and the names of usurpers and state officials to be recorded.<sup>153</sup> Another example for the settlement of immigrants in Adana is that Resul Aga and six families from Dagestan who immigrated from Van in 1916 settled in Bızdıkyan Farm (*Çiftliği*) left by Armenians. However, after the invasion of Adana by France they had to leave their houses. Although this farm was destroyed due to the invasion, Resul Aga sent a telegram to return the farm. The telegram sent by the Ministry of Exchange, Development and settlement ordered that this land could be returned to Resul Aga since he was from the Eastern immigrants.<sup>154</sup> Final example was that on May 2, 1927, Faik and his family from Erzurum refugees was settled in a house from Armenian abandoned properties in Kozan.<sup>155</sup>

Also, the state used the abandoned properties in Adana in order to strengthen the economic situation of the province. For this purpose, some lands and stores were given to the entrepreneurs. The Council of Ministers adopted a decree on August 25<sup>th</sup>, 1924. According to this decree, a building from the abandoned properties which was appropriate for the cotton stock-exchange (*borsa*) was given for the Adana cotton market since to meet this demand was the advantageous for the country.<sup>156</sup>

Another decree adopted on May 11<sup>th</sup>, 1926 was about the abandoned building left by

---

<sup>153</sup> BCA/TİGMA,272.11.19.91.7, from the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement to the Adana district director, July 17<sup>th</sup>, 1924

<sup>154</sup> BCA/TİGMA,272.12.41.48.8, from the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement to the Adana district (mintika), April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1924

<sup>155</sup> BCA/TİGMA,272.12.53.124.34, from the Directory of Settlement of the Ministry of Interior to the province of Adana, May 2, 1927

<sup>156</sup> BCA/BKKK,30.18.1.1.10.41.10, Decree, August 25<sup>th</sup>, 1924

Armenian Bahçecioğlu Kasap Panos. Since this building in the road of Tedefiyan in Adana was appropriate for using as an office, it was given to the Directory of Industry and Mine in the district of Adana.<sup>157</sup> Finally, according to a telegram on July 24<sup>th</sup>, 1928, it can be understood that all stores from the abandoned properties were distributed. This telegram was about the demand of store by Ömer, son of Osman from Bosnian immigrants. He sent a telegram on February 28<sup>th</sup>, 1928 to the province of Adana that he was settled in a house in May 22, 1924 and he was not given any properties. In this vein, he demanded a store from abandoned properties since, as a carpenter he was an artisan.<sup>158</sup> After the investigation, the governor of Adana informed the Ministry of Interior that there were not any empty stores to give in the province and district of Adana.<sup>159</sup>

### **5.6. Ma'muretül'aziz**

The Ma'muretül'aziz was brought under the Ottoman rule during the era of Yavuz Sultan Selim. The vizier of Yavuz, Bıyıklı Mehmet Pasha conquered the region in 1515.<sup>160</sup> After this time, the independent beys began to accept the power of the Ottoman Empire. In the nineteenth century, Ma'muretül'aziz was one of the developed provinces of the Ottoman Empire. During the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire tried to control tribes through reform attempts when Reşid Mehmet Pasha was assigned governor to apply these attempts. However, these resulted in conflicts between the state and tribes. Although with Tanzimat, the Porte aimed to

---

<sup>157</sup> BCA/BKKG,30.18.1.1.19.31.2, Decree, May 11<sup>th</sup>, 1926

<sup>158</sup> BCA/TİGMA,272.12.60.169.19, from Omer, Bosnian immigrant to the province of Adana, February 29<sup>th</sup>, 1928

<sup>159</sup> BCA/TİGMA,272.12.60.169.19,from the governor of Adana to the Ministry of Interior, July 24<sup>th</sup>, 1928

<sup>160</sup> Yurt Ansiklopedisi, *ibid*, p. 2498; Krikorian, *ibid*, p. 70

impose taxes on tribes and Armenian landlords, during this time Armenians gave taxes to the tribes. This created double burden on Armenians since they had to pay taxes both to the Porte and tribes. Armenian subjects began to resist this process. This conflictual situation was accelerated by the Ottoman-Russian war of 1877-1878 since Berlin Treaty included reform attempts to be carried out in six provinces of Eastern Anatolia including Ma'muretül'aziz.<sup>161</sup> It was also the first appearance of Armenian question in Ma'muretül'aziz before 1915.

Armenians took significant part in the economic and political structure of Ma'muretül'aziz. They were engaged in cultivation of the fields and the mountains. Their interests in various trades, crafts and professions appeared in towns. Krikorian quotes from the studies of Armenians in Elazig: "Many Armenians in Kharberd [Harput] were land owners. At the beginning of the last quarter of the last century, three fourths of land belonged to Turkish aghas, but by 1908, more and more Armenians became property owners...In spite of government restrictions and blind hatred of Islam, the Armenians took advantage of any opportunity and it can be said without reservations that in the fields of economics the Armenians became more superior, and the management of real estate passed into the hands of Armenians" (Krikorian, 1978: 72). In Ma'muretül'aziz, many Armenians were engaged in textile industry dealing with imports and exports. For instance, the brothers Fabrikatorian and Kurdjian Krikor and the son Khosrov concerned with manufacturing silk textiles. Armenians were also interested in mining and iron work through cooperating with the Ottoman government. At Maden (Ergani Maden), the Ignatiosian family was occupied in copper mining while at Keban the Arpiarian family worked the silver

---

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid*, p. 2498

mines by Imperial writ (Krikorian, 1978: 72). Besides economic sphere, Armenians also participated in the public life of Ma'muretül'aziz. At the government headquarters, Armenians were occupied in the engineering department. Many Armenians were also engaged in the spheres of technical affairs, of the secretariat, education, agriculture and public health (Krikorian, 1978: 75-76).

Ma'muretül'aziz became a province in 1877. Previously, it was a sanjak of Diyarbekir province.<sup>162</sup> Ma'muretül'aziz had three sanjaks and eighteen kazas. The sanjaks were Elazığ, Malatya and Dersim. In this study, I will focus on only the sanjak of Elazığ. The Elazığ sanjak included four kazas, namely Mezre (Harput), Arapkir, Kemaliye and Keban (Keban Maden) (Krikorian, 1978: 71). According to the Ottoman census of 1881/82-1893, the Armenian population of the sanjak of Elazığ was about 51,000 while Muslims were 135,000 (Karpat, 2003: 184). According to the estimates of Cuinet, Armenians in Elazığ sanjak were 45, 348. According to Armenian sources, the population of Elazığ was 80,000 (Krikorian, 1978: 71). Again, the figures were different according to various sources as it appeared in the estimation of Armenian population before 1915. According to the Ottoman census of 1914, the population of Armenians in Ma'muretül'aziz province was 87,864 while according to the Armenian Patriarchate, this figure was estimated 168,000. Also, Ormanian estimated 111,043 Armenians in this province (McCarthy, 1983: 68).

The telegrams sent to the various provinces including Ma'muretül'aziz were analyzed to study the management of the Armenian abandoned properties. Decisions

---

<sup>162</sup> *ibid*, p. 2499

about the settlement of immigrants in abandoned properties and using them to strengthen the policy of national economy were carried out in the case of Ma'muretül'aziz. The state aimed to settle Kurdish immigrants in the villages left by Armenians but it could not achieve its aim. Like Adana, the deportations of Armenians also destroyed the economic life of Ma'muretül'aziz. These were clear in the reports of American missions and consulate which were in Ma'muretül'aziz during this time. Lesli A. Davis, American consul in Harput reported about the deportations of Armenians to Henry Morgenthau on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915. According to this report, Davis mentioned the panic situation after the date of deportations was announced. It was stated that in the panic atmosphere people tried to dispose everything they had within four to six days, and merchants did not have enough time to wind up their business affairs. At the same time looting and robbery were also undertaken: "Turkish men and Turkish women are entering the houses of all the Armenians and taking things at almost any price. As nearly half the populations are leaving they have to take what they can get. This is rarely more than five or ten per cent of the value. All the furniture in a house, costing originally one or two hundred pounds will be sold for ten or fifteen pounds. Rugs that cost five or ten pounds are sold for fifty or seventy five piasters. The people are glad to get anything at all for their merchandise or effects".<sup>163</sup> Another report prepared by Leslie Davis also stated that the government seized all money belonging to Armenians in banks and all Armenians goods which they left in their shops and houses. Committee for Abandoned Properties guarded the properties in the name of Armenians but "most of the people whose money was in their hands were killed as was undoubtedly intended by the government and none who survived ever received any money from the

---

<sup>163</sup> NA/RG59/867.4016/269, from Leslie A. Davis to Henry Morgenthau, June 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915, in Sarafian (2004), *ibid*, p.458

Committee”.<sup>164</sup> Also, in the same report, the effect of the Armenian deportations on the economy of the province was stated. It was claimed that “the effect industrially and commercially of the expulsion of the Armenians from this region [Ma’muretül’aziz] is going to be to throw it back in the middle ages. It is officially stated that ninety percent of the trade and of the business carried on through the banks is that of Armenians. Business of all kind will now be destroyed beyond the possibility of its being restored. In some trades there will be no mechanics or workmen at all”.<sup>165</sup>

In the second half of 1916, Talat Pasha carried out investigation in Eastern Anatolia and sent a telegram to the Sheriff of Mecca on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 1916. In this telegram, it was stated “I passed on Konya, Ankara, Kayseri, Sivas and Harput provinces and sanjaks of Anatolia and returned. In this journey, I was proud of seeing the self-sacrifice made by Islam. The degree of felicitous decision of the deportations of Armenians was seen here. The people of occupied area were completely settled, and by possessing the stores and goods abandoned by Armenians they began to make craft and trade in before it was not seen any craft [by Muslim people]”.<sup>166</sup> As seen in this telegram, the Armenian abandoned properties were used to create Muslim crafts and traders and told by Talat Pasha as a success. In comparison with the reports of American consul, the settlement of immigrants and the distribution of abandoned properties to Muslims were used to fill the economic void caused by the deportations of Armenians.

---

<sup>164</sup> NA/RG59/867.4016/392, report of Leslie A. Davis, February 9<sup>th</sup>, 1918, Sarafian (2004), *ibid*, p.626

<sup>165</sup> NA/RG59/867.4016/269, from Leslie A. Davis to Henry Morgenthau, June 30<sup>th</sup>, 1915, in Sarafian (2004), *ibid*, p.459

<sup>166</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR,70/180 +180-1, quoted in Kieser, Hans Lukas (2005), *İskalanmış Barış: Doğu Vilayetleri’nde Misyonerlik, Etnik Kimlik ve Devlet 1839-1938*, 2. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 485

During this time, there were some corruptions in the distribution of the properties since some officials increased their fortunes, which was against the purposes of the state. The Ottoman government did not want to increase personal fortunes and tried to prevent some personal attempts to create fortunes through seizing Armenian abandoned properties. In the case of Ma'muretül'aziz, I will give two examples about the inquiry of the officials who were corrupt in Armenian properties. First, Resneli Nazım Bey, an inspector of the CUP in Ma'muretül'aziz acquired personal fortunes during the Armenian deportations. The telegram sent to the governor of sanjak of Gümüşhane, Abdülkadir Bey on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 1915 ordered the return of Nazım Bey in order to judge him in Court Martial (*Divan-ı Harb*).<sup>167</sup> The second example was about Kaimakam of Behisni, Edhem Kadri Bey who was responsible for the Committee for Abandoned Properties. In the telegram sent on January 20<sup>th</sup>, 1916, it was expressed that there were four hundreds houses and twenty eight stores abandoned by Armenians in the sanjak but Edhem Kadri only sealed eight houses and ten stores. Since he did not preserve the properties and carried out corruption, he was sent to Court Martial.<sup>168</sup>

During the Kemalist period, the state continued applying the use of abandoned properties to settle the immigrants and to strengthen the economy of Ma'muretül'aziz. As a result of Armenian deportations, the state tried to re-establish

---

<sup>167</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 54-A/348, from the Ministry of Interior to the governor of sanjak of Gümüşhane, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 1915, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/313.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/313.doc)

<sup>168</sup> BOA/DH.ŞFR, 60/61, from Talat Pasha to the province of Ma'muretül'aziz, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 1916, [Document online]; available from [www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/578.doc](http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap/belge/2600belge/578.doc)

the province of Ma'muretül'aziz. In this part, I will give some examples to show the purpose of Kemalists on the distribution of abandoned properties in Ma'muretül'aziz.

First, the Council of Ministers adopted a decree about the settlement of immigrants in Ma'muretül'aziz. This decree was legislated on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 1925 and stated that the immigrants who would come from Georgia and Armenia were to be settled in the Elazığ. This decree ordered that in order to settle these immigrants in Elazığ, the real estates from abandoned properties could be given to them. In addition, the stores, workplaces and factories from abandoned properties which were not sold could be allocated to these immigrants in Elazığ.<sup>169</sup>

Second, the Council of Ministers also adopted a decree to support the new economic initiatives. The decree accepted on November 11<sup>th</sup>, 1925 was about the sale of the yarn factory (*iplik fabrikası*) from Armenian abandoned properties to a company. This company was founded with the capital of fifty thousands liras in order to maintain cotton market and to meet the demands of district in Elazığ. Since the sale of this factory to the company was not carried without auction according to the law legislated on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 1925, the Council decided that this factory could be sold at auction.<sup>170</sup>

Third, the state also gave Armenian abandoned properties to the committees and chambers of Elazığ which were established due to the economic and nationalist reasons. On October 27<sup>th</sup>, 1926, the Council of Ministers adopted a decree that a land abandoned by Demirciyan in Elazığ could be sold to the Elazığ Chamber of

---

<sup>169</sup> BCA/BKKK,30.18.1.1.16.79.8, Decree, December 7<sup>th</sup>, 1925

<sup>170</sup> BCA/BKKK,30.18.01.01.16.72.13, Decree, November 11<sup>th</sup>, 1925 [see Appendix 2]



Commerce and Industry in order to establish a stock-exchange building.<sup>171</sup> Another decree was adopted on September 20<sup>th</sup>, 1927 by the Council of Ministers to sell the abandoned building to the Committee of Turkish Planes (*Tayyare*). The building known as Safaonlu in Çarşı road of Elazığ was abandoned by Elbasaryan Nişan and Selboren. Its value was 7,718 lira which, and it was offered in auction. The decree stated that this building was sold to the Committee of Turkish Plane which served for the interests of the country but the Committee would pay the price within ten years through ten equal installments.<sup>172</sup>

Finally, the state also supported the committee by giving Armenian abandoned properties for the nationalist aims. For this aim, a decree was adopted on April 1, 1925, which was about the properties given to Turkish Associations (*Türk Ocakları*). It was stated that Turkish Associations aimed to serve for the development of thought and character of Turkish youth and to strengthen the national personality (*milli benlik*). In this sense, the state gave real estate, goods and lands from abandoned properties to the Associations from Elazığ and Tarsus. A hotel and coffee house (*kıraathane*) abandoned by Çolak Madrirous were given to Elazığ Turkish Association while stores and four houses left by Innkeeper Harolem were given to Tarsus Turkish Association.<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> BCA/BKKK,30.18.1.1.21.467.3, Decree, October 27<sup>th</sup>, 1926

<sup>172</sup> BCA/BKKK,30.18.1.1.25.51.16, Decree, September 20<sup>th</sup>, 1927

<sup>173</sup> BCA/BKKK,30.18.1.1.9.21.4, Decree, April 1, 1925

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

This study has concentrated on the distribution of the Armenian abandoned properties in terms of the Turkish state formation from the late Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey. After the decisions of the deportations, with the adaptation of the first law about abandoned properties, the state directly liquidated the Armenian properties called as “abandoned properties”. This legal process indicated the attempt to legalize the despoilment of the Armenian properties. During World War I, the state directly controlled the Armenian abandoned properties by establishing committees for the abandoned properties in the provinces. Through these commissions, the state achieved the liquidation of the Armenian properties. Indeed, the state used the Armenian abandoned properties for different purposes. These were the settlement of the Muslim immigrants from Balkans and Caucasus; strengthening the national economy and meeting the needs of the state and people.

After the end of World War I, the CUP lost its power, and a new government was established. This new government under the pressure of the Allied Powers, which defeated the Ottoman Empire in the war, espoused different policies towards Armenians. First, it abolished the deportation decisions and allowed exiled Armenians to return their own places. Secondly, the new government adopted an order and law which aimed to give back the properties to their real owners. However, with the rise of Kemalist movement, this attempt could not become successful, and the establishment of the Turkish Republic changed the fate of the Armenian properties. The policies of this period were similar to the policies of the Unionist government since the Kemalist state also adopted the first law on the abandoned

properties legislated by the Unionist government with minor changes. In this period, the state continued to use the Armenian abandoned properties to settle Muslim immigrants, to support the entrepreneurs in terms of national economy and to meet the needs of the state. On the other hand, the Kemalist state also used the Armenian abandoned properties for nationalist purposes.

These general policies of the Unionists and Kemalists have been analyzed in two cases, Adana and Ma'muretül'aziz in which Armenians dominated the economic sphere and included the majority of the non-Muslim population. In these cases, the state distributed the Armenian abandoned properties to settle immigrants and to strengthen the economy of both provinces. Indeed, the state used these properties to change the socio-economic and demographic structure of these regions. In the short run, the elimination of Armenians in these two regions led to the destruction of economy, but in the long run it resulted in the appearance of new social classes within Muslim Turkish population. This was also parallel to the policy of the creation of national bourgeoisie and promoting Muslim crafts and traders in terms of national economic policy. The distribution of the Armenian abandoned properties contributed to the achievement of these aims in these two cases.

This thesis challenges the studies that argue for the return of properties to their original owners.<sup>174</sup> According to these studies, the state protected the Armenian

---

<sup>174</sup> Bakar, Bülent (2007), "Malların İadesi" in Hikmet Özdemir, *Türk-Ermeni İhtilâfı Makaleler*, Ankara : TBMM Basımevi; Bayur, Yusuf Hikmet (1991), *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi vol.3, pt. 3*, Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, Halaçoğlu, Yusuf (2002), *Facts on the Relocation of Armenians (1914-1918)* , Ankara, Turkey : Turkish Historical Society

properties to give back after the end of the war with the state regulations. Both the analysis of the laws, decisions and orders of the state and the practice of them showed that the state had no intention to return the Armenian properties to real owners. Also, unlike the claims of these scholars, the legal process on the abandoned properties did not aim to preserve the properties. Rather, this process aimed to legitimize the liquidation and depredation of the Armenian abandoned properties. This study has addressed to the Kemalist period in terms of the Armenian abandoned properties and aimed to contribute the studies on Armenian issue since previous studies directly focused only on the CUP period. It attempted to establish a link between these periods and attempted to understand the state attitude towards the properties in this transition period. In this vein, this study also addressed to the similarities between the Unionists and Kemalists in terms of economic policies since the distribution of abandoned properties displayed the attitude of both periods. Indeed, both the Unionists and Kemalists used and distributed the Armenian abandoned properties for similar purposes. Finally, this study has attempted to challenge the argument that the Kemalist state adopted their policies in a top-down process. Rather, this study has advocated the interactive relations between the state and society, and has attempted to show the correlation between the top-down and bottom-up processes. In the case of the Turkish state formation, the Armenian abandoned properties were used by the ruling elites to take consent from the society in order to apply their policies.

Besides these contributions of this study, it has also some limitations and delimitations. First is the access issue to the archives. The Turkish state has closed

---

the archive of land registers (*tapu kayıtları*). Because of my research question is related to the Armenian properties, this can become an obstacle for my study. In spite of using alternative sources to solve this problem, this will remain a weakness of my study since it is not possible to show the direct transfer of the properties from Armenians to Muslim/Turkish people. Second limitation is about the cases. This study has only focused on two cases where Armenians dominated the majority of non-Muslim population and economic life of the cases. Additionally, these cases were chosen from the Eastern regions of the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, the cases which may be chosen from the Western part of the Ottoman Empire can give different stories about the distribution of the abandoned properties since the application of this process changed in different regions. Finally, there is delimitation about the method of my study. Because of the access problem to the Ottoman archives, another option could be to use oral history as an alternative method to analyze the distribution of the Armenian properties. I did not choose this method since I could not find the people, Armenians or Muslims who lived during the deportation period. I might find people who were the children of these people so that the oral history can become a method for future studies on the Armenian abandoned properties.

## Bibliography

### Archives

#### **Prime Minister's Republic Archive (Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi, Ankara)**

General Directorate of Land and Settlement Archive (*Toprak ve İskan Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi*)

Catalogue of the Council of Ministers Decisions (*Bakanlar Kurulu Kararları Kataloğu*)

Document Catalogue of General Directorate of Transaction of Prime Minister (*Başbakanlık Muamelat Genel Müdürlüğü Evrakı Kataloğu*)

#### **Public Record Office (British National Archives, London)**

Files: Records of the Foreign Office

FO 608/108-110-111-245-275 1919

#### **Atatürk Library (Atatürk Kitaplığı, İstanbul)**

BEL\_OSM\_O.811

### Published Primary Sources

Bardakçı, Murat (2008), *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi: Sadrazam Talat Paşa'nın Özel Arşivinde Bulunan Ermeni Tehciri Konusundaki Belgeler ve Hususi Yazışmalar*, İstanbul: Everest Yayınları

Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı (1995), *Armenians in Ottoman Documents (1915-1920)*, Ankara

Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı (2007), *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, Ankara

Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivleri Daire Başkanlığı (1995), *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler*, Ankara

Karakoç, Sarkis (1925-1985), *Sicilli Kavanin*, vol. 3, 1926-1927, İstanbul: Cihan Kütüphanesi

Kardeş, Salâhattin (2008), *"Tehcir" ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara: Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı

*Lozan Barış Konferansı: Tutanaklar, Belgeler*, vol. 2, no: 1, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları,

Ökçün, A. Gündüz (1997), *Türkiye İktisat Kongresi 1923-İzmir: Haberler-Belgeler-Yorumlar*, Ankara: Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu

Prime Minister Directorate General of Press and Information (1982), *Documents*, Ankara

Meclis-i Ayan Zabıt Ceridesi (1908-1918)

Sarafian, Ara (2004), *United States Official Records on the Armenian Genocide*, Princeton; London: Gomidas Institute

Türk Parlamento Araştırma Grubu (1993), *Türk Parlamento Tarihi: Milli Mücadele ve TBMM I. Dönem 1919-1923*, Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Yayınları,

Yeghiayan, Vartkes (2007), *Malta Belgeleri: İngiltere Dışişleri Bakanlığı 'Türk Savaş Suçluları' Dosyası*, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları

<http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/kitap> [Internet Source]

## **Secondary Sources**

Adanır, Fikret (2002), "Armenian Deportations and Massacres in 1915", in Daniel Chirot and Martin E. P. Seligman (eds), *Ethnopolitical Warfare: Causes, Consequences, and Possible Solutions*, Second Printing, Washington, DC : American Psychological Association

Ahmad, Feroz (1999), *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*, 2. Edition, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları

——— (2003), *Turkey: The Quest for Identity*, Oxford: Oneworld Publications

——— (2008), "The Young Turk Revolution", in Feroz Ahmad (ed.) *From Empire to Republic: Essays on the Late Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. I, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press

——— (2008), "Vanguard of a Nascent Bourgeoisie: The Social and Economic Policy of the Young Turks 1908-1918", in Feroz Ahmad (ed.) *From Empire to Republic: Essays on the Late Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. I, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press

——— (2008), "The Search for Ideology in Kemalist Turkey, 1919-1939", in Feroz Ahmad (ed.) *From Empire to Republic: Essays on the Late Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. I, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press

——— (2008), "The Political Economy of Kemalism", in Feroz Ahmad (ed.) *From Empire to Republic: Essays on the Late Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. I, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press

——— (2008), "The Late Ottoman Empire", in Feroz Ahmad (ed.) *From Empire to Republic: Essays on the Late Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol. II, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press

Ahmet Rüstem Bey (2005), *Cihan Harbi ve Türk-Ermeni Meselesi*, İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat

Akçam, Taner (2002), *İnsan Hakları ve Ermeni Sorunu: İttihat Terakki'den Kurtuluş Savaşı'na*, 2. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

——— (2004), *From Empire to Republic: Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide*, London and New York: Zed Books

——— (2008), *Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur: Osmanlı Belgelerine Göre Savaş Yıllarında Ermenilere Yönelik Politikalar*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Avagyan, Arsen and Minassian, Gaisz (2005), *Ermeniler ve İttihat ve Terakki: İşbirliğinden Çatışmaya*, İstanbul: Aras Yayınları

Bağış, Ali İhsan (1983), *Osmanlı Ticaretinde Gayri Müslimler: Kapitülasyonlar, Avrupa Tüccarları, Berath Tüccarlar, Hayriye Tüccarları, 1750-1839*, Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi

Bakar, Bülent (2007), "Malların İadesi" in Hikmet Özdemir, *Türk-Ermeni İhtilâfi Makaleler*, Ankara : TBMM Basımevi

Bardakjian, Kevork (1982, "The Rise of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople." in B. Braude and B. Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire, vol. 2*, New York: Holmes and Meier

Barkey, Karen (2005), "Islam and Toleration: Studying the Ottoman Imperial Model", *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, vol. 19, p. 5-19  
——— (2008), *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, New York: Cambridge University Press

Barlas, Dilek (1998), *Etatism and diplomacy in Turkey: economic and foreign policy strategies in an uncertain world, 1929-1939*, Leiden: Brill

Bayur, Yusuf Hikmet (1991), *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi vol.3, pt. 3*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu

Braude, Benjamin (1982), "Foundation Myths of the Millet System", in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society, vol. 1*, New York : Holmes & Meier Publishers

Braude, Benjamin and Lewis, Bernard (1982), "Introduction", in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society, vol. 1*, New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers

Bertan, Suad (1976), *Ayni Haklar: Medeni Kanununun 618-764'üncü Maddelerinin Serhi (Bu Maddelerle İlgili Kanunlar ve Eski Hükümler)*, Ankara

Bruinessen, Martin van (2004), *Ağa, Şeyh, Devlet*, 3. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları



Boratav, Korkut (2006), *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-2005*, 10. Edition, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları

——— (2006), *Türkiye 'de Devletçilik*, 2. Edition, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları

Dadrian, Vahakn N. (1995), *The History of the Armenian Genocide: Ethnic Conflict from the Balkans to Anatolia to the Caucasus*, Providence, RI: Berghahn Books

Davison, Roderic H. (1948), “The Armenian Crisis, 1912-1924”, *the American Historical Review*, vol. 53, no. 3, p. 481-505

——— (1973), *Reform in the Ottoman Empire: 1856-1876*, New York: Gordian Press

——— (1982), “The Millets as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth Century Ottoman Empire”, in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society, vol. 1*, New York : Holmes & Meier Publishers

Deringil, Selim (2009), “‘The Armenian Question is Finally Closed’: Mass Conversions of Armenians in Anatolia during the Hamidian Massacres of 1895-1897”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 51, no. 2, p. 344-371

Dündar, Fuat (2007), *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası (1913-1918)*, 3. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

——— (2008), *Modern Türkiye'nin Sifresi: İttihat Terakki'nin Etnisite Muhendisliği*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Düzceer, Ali Rıza (1994), *Kazandırıcı Zamanaşımıyla Taşınmaz İktisabı*, Ankara: Yetkin Hukuk Yayınları

Eryılmaz, Bilal (1990), *Osmanlı Devletinde Gayrimüslim Teb'anın Yönetimi*, İstanbul: Risale

Ginio, Eyal (2005), “Mobilizing the Ottoman Nation during the Balkan Wars (1912-1913): Awakening from the Ottoman Dream”, *War in History*, vol. 12, p. 156-177

Gürün, Kamuran (2007), *The Armenian File: the Myth of Innocence Exposed*, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları

Halaçoğlu, Yusuf (2001), *Ermeni Tehciri ve Gerçekler (1914-1918)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu

——— (2002), *Facts on the Relocation of Armenians (1914-1918)*, Ankara: Turkish Historical Society

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (2001), *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press

Jongerden, Joost (2007), *The Settlement Issue in Turkey and the Kurds: an Analysis of Spatial Policies, Modernity and War*, Leiden; Boston: Brill

Kaiser, Hilmar (2007), “1915-1916 Ermeni Soykırımı Sirasinda Ermeni Mülkleri, Osmanlı Hukuku ve Milliyet Politikaları”, in Eric J. Zürcher (ed.), *İmparatorluk'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye'de Etnik Çayışma*, 4. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Karpat, Kemal H. (1959), *Turkey's Politics: the Transition to a Multi-party System*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press

——— (2003), *Osmanlı Nüfusu (1830-1914): Demografik ve Sosyal Özellikleri*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları

Kazgan, Gülten (2002), *Tanzimat'tan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye Ekonomisi: Birinci Küreselleşmeden İkinci Küreselleşmeye*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları

Kepek, Yakup and Yentürk, Nurhan (2004), *Türkiye Ekonomisi*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi

Keyder, Çağlar (2007), *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, 11. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Kieser, Hans Lukas (2005), *İskalanmış Barış: Doğu Vilayetleri'nde Misyonerlik, Etnik Kimlik ve Devlet 1839-1938*, 2. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Kocaş, Sadi (1967), *Tarih Boyunca Ermeniler ve Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara: Altınok Matbaası

Koraltürk, Murat (1997), *Türkiye'de Sermaye Birikimi Sorununa Tarihsel Perspektiften Bir Bakış ve Ahmet Hamdi Başar'dan Seçmeler*, Ankara: Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu

Krikorian, Mesrob K. (1977), *Armenians in the Service of the Ottoman Empire 1860-1908*, London; Henley and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Malmisanij (2006), “Büyüklerine Söyle ‘Şex Evidirehim Asla Teslim Olmaz!’”, *Serbesti*, vol. 23, p. 55

Mann, M (1993), *The Sources of Social Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

——— (2005), *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*, New York: Cambridge University Press

Maraşlı, Recep (2008), *Ermeni Ulusal Demokratik Hareketi ve 1915 Soykırımı*, İstanbul: Peri Yayınları

Mardin, Şerif (1997), “The Ottoman Empire”, in Karen Barkey and Mark von Hagen (eds.), *After Empire: Multiethnic Societies and Nation-Building, the Soviet Union and the Russian, Ottoman, and Habsburg Empires*, Colorado; Oxford: Westview Press

Marx, Anthony W. (2002), *Faith in Nation: Exclusionary Origins of Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

McCarthy, Justin (1983), *Muslims and Minorities: the Population of Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Empire*, New York: New York University Press

McDowall, David (2000), *A Modern History of the Kurds*, London; New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers

Melson, Robert (1982), "A Theoretical Inquiry into the Armenian Massacres of 1894-1896", in *Society and History*, vol. 24, no. 3, p. 481-509

Migdal, Joel S.; Kohli, Atul and Shue, Vivienne (1994), *State Power and Social Forces: Domination and Transformation in the Third World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Olson, Robert (1992), *Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Kaynakları ve Şeyh Said İsyanı*, Ankara: Öz-Ge Yayınları

Ortaylı, İlber (1985), "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Millet", in Murat Belge (ed), *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 4, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları  
——— (1987), *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 2. Edition, İstanbul: Hil Yayınları

Öke, Mim Kemal (2001), *The Armenian Question*, Ankara: Turkish Historical Society

Pamuk, Şevket (2005), *Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadi Tarihi: 1500-1914*, 2. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Parla, Taha (1993), *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, 2. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Skocpol, T. (1985), "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research", in P. B. Evans et al. (eds), *Bringing the State Back In*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

——— (1979), *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sonyel, Salahi Ramadan (1988), *İngiliz Gizli Belgelerine Göre Adana'da Vuku Bulan Türk-Ermeni Olayları (Temmuz 1908 - Aralık 1909) = The Turco-Armenian "Adana Incidents" in the Light of Secret British Documents (July, 1908-December, 1909)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu

Sunar, İlkay (2004), *State, Society and Democracy in Turkey*, İstanbul: Bahçeşehir University Publication

Suny, Ronald Grigor (1993), *Looking toward Ararat: Armenia in Modern History*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Şaşmaz, Musa (2000), *British Policy and the Application of Reforms for the Armenians in Eastern Anatolia: 1877-1897*, Ankara: Turkish Historical Society Printing House

Tilly, Charles (Feb, 1982), "Warmaking and Statemaking as Organized Crime" *Center for Research on Social Organization Working Paper*, No. 256

——— (1992), *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell

——— (Feb, 1994), "States and Nationalism in Europe 1492-1992", *Theory and Society*, Vol. 23, No. 1, p.131-146

——— (Aug, 1998), "Social Movements and (All Sorts of) Other Political Interactions-Local, National, and International - Including Identities", *Theory and Society*, Vol. 27, No. 4

——— (1999), "Survey Article: Power-Top Down and Bottom up", *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 7, No: 3, p. 330-352

Toprak, Zafer (1982), *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat, 1908-1918*, Ankara: Yurt Yayınları

——— (1994), "Nationalism and Economics in the Young Turk Era (1908-1918)," in Jacques Thobie et Salgur Kancal (eds.), *Industrialization, Communication et Rapports Sociaux en Turquie et en Mediterranee Orientale*, Paris; L'Harmattan, p. 260-266

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer (1984), *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler Cilt III: İttihat Terakki*, İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları

——— (2007), *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler: İttihat ve Terakki, Bir Çağın, Bir Kuşağın, Bir Partinin Tarihi*, 3. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Tuncay, Mete (1999), *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi'nin Kurulması (1923-1931)*, 3. Edition, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları

Türkeş, Mustafa (1999), *Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Sol Bir Akım*, Ankara: İmge Yayınları

Uras, Esat (1987), *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları

Üngör, Uğur Ü. (2005), *The Reign of Terror: the CUP Rule in Diyarbakir Province, 1913-1923*, Unpublished MA Thesis, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, Department of History, University of Amsterdam

Yurt Ansiklopedisi: Türkiye, İl İl: Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını, vol.1, İstanbul: Anadolu Yayıncılık, 1981

Yurtsever, Cezmi (1983), *Ermeni Terör Merkezi Kilikya Kilisesi : Çukurova'da Türk Varlığının Sosyo-ekonomik esasları, Türkmen Aşiretler, Derebeylik Rejimi, Bunalımlar, 1865 Çukurova Reformu ve Ermeni Terörizminin : Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını*, İstanbul: Bayrak Yayıncılık

- Zürcher, Erik J. (2001), *Turkey: A Modern History*, New Revised Edition, London; New York: I. B. Tauris
- (2002), “Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları”, in Tanıl Bora and Murat Gültekingil (eds.), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm*, vol. 2, 2. Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- (2003), *Milli Mücadelede İttihatçılık*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- (2005), *Savaş, Devrim ve Uluslaşma: Türkiye Tarihinde Geçiş Dönemi (1908-1928)*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları

Appendix 1: BCA/BMGMEK 30.10.01.01.80.529.20

31

باسمہ وکالت  
قلم مخصوص مدیری  
عدد

باسمہ وکیل عیلت یا شاعر تکریم

T C  
BAŞBAKANLIK  
CUMHURİYET ARŞIVI

محمد

۱۱ اعدس ۱۹۸۱

۱- فیلده قالدہ کوریدہ تورتک مهاجرلری برلته بر ملک صورتیله کورده رسته نیک الای بر صورتہ  
حل اولدیله بکی عقدہ اوده ایله وقوع بولده معروضات عاجزانم ، شهادات و ترقعات اخیرہ  
ایلدہ یلک قتلہ بر صورتہ تأییدی . بانو علیہ برالردہ مهاجر الحاکف مکلس نیت ایہ یلینتہ  
دیار بکر ، سرد ، بلیس ، دانه ، موسه ولایتلر نہ اموال متذکرده اولده کویبر و قعیلر  
خا- چنده کی ارضیات صانیاس ایلدیه استملکک اجیاج قالمعه ایچونه مواضه اصیاط اولد قلمتیه  
برقیل ارضیات تأخر فرضه ایچیه ماموریه مکلم و مالیه یلیفات اجلاس منوط آسمایله  
شرف ولایتلر نیک وادایق مساعد اولمہ لقیده ماموریه و تاندان نیک چوم برلردہ هونر یایلیک  
آلامتین کوردم . بر چوم سمر میلد ایچیه بو جرفلده بولون دولت مامور لریک مسله  
آلاماس ای بر تائر بر اضایر . امگانه نسیده مرکزک معاونتک تأیید آس قیام لریه وایه  
اولدین معالفتیان عمره الیم اقدم

عبد الحانہ

قلم وکیل عیلت یا شاعر تکریم  
جواب کوریدہ تکریم صورت خیر بر رسته

جواباً یازیلجن اوراقه ، جواب اولدینی عمرالک تاریخ و نومروسنیک درس دجا اولدور.

030	10			80	529	20
-----	----	--	--	----	-----	----

3

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti

Baş Vekâlet

Kalem-i Mahsûs Müdirîyeti

### **Baş Vekîl İsmet Paşa Hazretlerine**

- 1- Ermenilerden kalan köylerde Türk muhâcirleri yerleşdirilmek sûretiyle Kürd mes'elesinin en iyi bir sûretde hal olunabileceği hakkında orada iken vuku'bulan ma'rûzât-ı acizânem, müşâhhedât ve tedkîkat-ı ahîre ile de pek kuvvetli bir sûretde te'yid etdi. Binâen aleyh buralarda muhâcir iskânı mes'elesi tesbît edilinceye kadar Diyarbekir, Si'ird, Bitlis, Van, Muş vilâyetlerinde emvâl-i metrûkeden olan köyler ve kasabalar haricindeki arâzilerin satılmaması ileride istimplâke ihtiyâc kalmamak için muvâfık-ı ihtiyât kanâatindeyim. Bu kabîl arâzinin te'hîr-i fûrahtı için me'mûrîn-i mülkiye ve mâliyyeye tebligat icrâsı menût-ı re'y-i sâmilidir.
- 2- Şark vilâyetlerinin vâridâtı müsâ'id olmadığından me'mûrîn ve jandarmanın çok yerlerde henüz mayıs maâşını alamadığını gördüm. Birçok mahrûmiyetler içinde bu taraflarda bulunan devlet me'mûrlarının maâş alamaması iyi bir te'sîr bırakmıyor. İskân nisbetinde merkezin muâvenetinin te'mîni re'y ... vâbeste olduğunu ma'-üt-tanzîmât arz eylerim efendim.


Abdülhalik

Hey'et-i vekîliye arz edilmiş ve maliyyeye havâle edilerek cevâben çekilan talgraf sûreti zîr-i ma'rûtdır.

### **Explanation**

This telegram shows the settlement of the Turkish immigrants in the Armenian abandoned properties in order to Turkify the regions where Kurdish people lived. Abdülhalik Bey, the Minister of Finance, wrote this telegram to İsmet İnönü after his investigation in these regions. In this telegram, Abdülhalik Bey stated that the settlement of Turkish immigrants in the Armenian abandoned properties was a better way to solve the Kurdish issue.

Appendix 2: BCA/BKKK 30.18.01.01.16.72.13



جمهوری اسلامی ایران  
وزارت آموزش عالی

باسمه وکالت  
المخصوص مدیرین  
هده

۷۷۷۸  
۷۷۶۸

قرارداد

۲۰ شهریور ۱۳۹۱ تاریخ و ۱۳۹۱ فروردین قرارداد شماره ۱۳۹۱  
 مالک و کارکنان هیئت مدیره موجود در تاریخ ۱۳۹۱ و ۱۳۹۱  
 حساب و اوضاعیات محاسبی تابعه ایستادگی مقصدی اهدایی از سوی هیئت مدیره شرکت فیاض تقدیری  
 صورت پذیرفته شد. این امر اول فروردین ۱۳۹۱ و همانند حساب برحاله بر لزوم امانت  
 قرارگیری، ۱۵ بهمن ۱۳۹۱ تاریخ معادل قازمه امکاناً نظراً به لزوم تکلیف نامه از سوی هیئت مدیره  
 تعیین و برقراره رهنی تکلیف اولی و تعیین اجراء و تکلیف نامه «تشریح قرارداد» تاریخ ۱۳۹۱ جماعه تعیین  
 و نیز ایستادگی موضوع بحث قرارگیری، صورت استقامه نظراً، زیاده در ضمن فروری کرده و تکلیف  
 اجرا کرده معادل ایستادگی قرارگیری «تشریح قرارداد»

تذکره هیئت مدیره  
تاریخ ۱۳۹۱

با سنده و کتب  
عده

مدیر هیئت مدیره  
عده

ناقص و کتب  
عده

مورد و کتب  
عده

مورد و کتب  
عده

مورد و کتب  
عده

13 72 016 01 01 18 980



Bâş Vekâleti

Kalem-i Mahsûs Müdiriyyeti

Aded 2778

Karâr – Nâme

30 Ağustos sene 341 tarih ve 2420 nûmerolu karâr-nâmeye zeyldir.

Mâliyye vekâlet-i celîliyesinden mevrûd 30 Eylül sene 341 tarih emlâk-ı milliye/9476 nûmerolu tezkirede, pamûk zirâatını himâye ve ihtiyâcât-ı mahalliyyeyi te'mîn eylemek maksadıyla elli bin lirâ sermâye ile El-azîzde teşekkül eden şirkete fiât takdîri sûretiyle temlîki takarrür etmiş olan Ermeni emvâl-i metrûkesinden El-azîzde kâin ve hâlen harâb bir hâlde bulunan iplik fabrikasının, 15 Nisan sene 341 tarihli muaddil kanûn ahkâmına nazaran bilâ-müzâyede temlîki mümkün olamadığı cihetle müktezîsinin ta'yîn ve bir karâra rabtı teklîf olunmuş ve keyfiyyet icrâ vekîlleri hey'etinin 11 Teşrin-i sâni sene 341 tarihi ictimâ'ında tedkîk ve tezekkür edilerek mevzû-i bahs fabrikasının, sûret-i iş'âre nazaran müzâyedeye vaz'ı zarûri görüldüğünden ona göre muâmele îfâsı takarrür etmiştir.

11 Teşrin-i sâni sene 341 [11 Kasım 1925]

Reîs-i Cumhûr Gazî (imza)

(İmzalayanlar)

Hâriciyye Vekîli, Dâhiliyye Vekîli, Bahriyye Vekâleti Vekîli, Müdâfaa-i Milliyye Vekîli, Adliyye Vekîli, Bâş Vekîl, Sıhhiye ve Muâvenet-i İctimâ'îyye Vekîli, Ticâret Vekâleti Vekîli, Zirâât Vekîli, Nâfia Vekîli, Maârif Vekîli, Mâliyye Vekâleti Vekîli.

## Explanation

This decree displays the support of the state to the new economic initiatives. It is about the sale of the yarn factory which was from the Armenian abandoned properties. The company which wanted to purchase this factory was established in order to maintain the cotton market and to meet the demands of the district in Elazığ. The decree ordered to sell this factory at auction since the law adopted on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 1925 did not allow selling the abandoned properties without auction.



ردیف	شرح	مقدار	واحد	مبلغ	توضیحات
۱	بهره علی الحساب	۴	۹۸		
۲	بهره علی حساب	۴	۶۶		
۳	خرید کتونی و کلاه	۲	۵۵		
۴	بهره علی حساب	۵	۵۶		
۵	بهره علی حساب	۲	۵۸		
۶	بهره علی حساب	۶	۶۸		
۷	بهره علی حساب	۵	۸۴		
۸	بهره علی حساب	۹	۹۶		
۹	بهره علی حساب	۷	۹۷		
۱۰	بهره علی حساب	۶	۹۹		
۱۱	بهره علی حساب	۴	۹۹		
۱۲	بهره علی حساب	۵	۹۹		
۱۳	بهره علی حساب	۶	۱۱۱		
۱۴	بهره علی حساب	۷	۱۰۶		
۱۵	بهره علی حساب	۶	۱۶		
۱۶	بهره علی حساب	۵	۱۴		
۱۷	بهره علی حساب	۵	۱۴۶		
۱۸	بهره علی حساب	۷	۱۴۷		
۱۹	بهره علی حساب	۵	۶۹		
۲۰	بهره علی حساب	۶	۶۹		
۲۱	بهره علی حساب	۵	۶۶		
۲۲	بهره علی حساب	۵	۶۰		
۲۳	بهره علی حساب	۷	۶۶		

11 19 96 19

ردیف	توضیح	مقدار	واحد	مجموعه	توضیح	مقدار	واحد	مجموعه
۱	مقدار مصرف	۴	متر	۴	۶۵	متر	۴	۶۵
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۶۶	متر	۵	۶۶
۸	تشریح	۸	متر	۸	۶۷	متر	۸	۶۷
۹	تشریح	۹	متر	۹	۶۸	متر	۹	۶۸
۸	تشریح	۸	متر	۸	۶۹	متر	۸	۶۹
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۷۰	متر	۶	۷۰
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۷۱	متر	۵	۷۱
۸	تشریح	۸	متر	۸	۷۲	متر	۸	۷۲
۸	تشریح	۸	متر	۸	۷۳	متر	۸	۷۳
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۷۴	متر	۶	۷۴
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۷۵	متر	۵	۷۵
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۷۶	متر	۶	۷۶
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۷۷	متر	۵	۷۷
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۷۸	متر	۶	۷۸
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۷۹	متر	۵	۷۹
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۸۰	متر	۶	۸۰
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۸۱	متر	۵	۸۱
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۸۲	متر	۶	۸۲
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۸۳	متر	۵	۸۳
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۸۴	متر	۶	۸۴
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۸۵	متر	۵	۸۵
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۸۶	متر	۶	۸۶
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۸۷	متر	۵	۸۷
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۸۸	متر	۶	۸۸
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۸۹	متر	۵	۸۹
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۹۰	متر	۶	۹۰
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۹۱	متر	۵	۹۱
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۹۲	متر	۶	۹۲
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۹۳	متر	۵	۹۳
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۹۴	متر	۶	۹۴
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۹۵	متر	۵	۹۵
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۹۶	متر	۶	۹۶
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۹۷	متر	۵	۹۷
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۹۸	متر	۶	۹۸
۵	تشریح	۵	متر	۵	۹۹	متر	۵	۹۹
۶	تشریح	۶	متر	۶	۱۰۰	متر	۶	۱۰۰



Kitap Adı	Yazar	Yayıncı	Yıl	Kitap No	Diğer Bilgiler
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	16	8	
İsmailî-i İzzetî	İsmailî-i İzzetî	İsmailî-i İzzetî	17	9	İsmailî-i İzzetî-i İzzetî
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	18	10	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	19	11	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	20	12	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	21	13	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	22	14	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	23	15	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	24	16	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	25	17	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	26	18	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	27	19	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	28	20	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	29	21	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	30	22	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	31	23	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	32	24	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	33	25	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	34	26	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	35	27	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	36	28	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	37	29	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	38	30	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	39	31	
İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	İzzet-i İsmailî	40	32	

DEVLET KİTAPLARI GENEL MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ  
GÖZKÜTÜP HİZMETLERİ

ردیف	تاریخ	موضوع	تعداد	ملاحظات
۱	۱۱	تجدید نظام ارتش	۷	
۲	۱۵	سلام محمد زین	۷	
۳	۲۱	توقای حسن	۸	
۴	۲۷	پیرایه عبدالرحمن	۷	
۵	۲۸	پیرایه نور بدیع	۷	
۶	۲۹	پیرایه نور علی	۷	
۷	۳۱	پیرایه صالح	۷	
۸	۳۱	محمود احمد شمس الدین	۷	
۹	۳۰	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۱۰	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۱۱	۳۱	اطحان نور محمد	۷	
۱۲	۳۱	سلام حسن	۷	
۱۳	۳۱	اطحان نور محمد	۷	
۱۴	۳۱	توقای نور محمد	۷	
۱۵	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۱۶	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۱۷	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۱۸	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۱۹	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۰	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۱	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۲	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۳	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۴	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۵	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۶	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۷	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۸	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۲۹	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۳۰	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	
۳۱	۳۱	پیرایه نور محمد	۷	

DELET ARHIVLED DELET MOBRLEED  
 DELET ARHIVLED DELET MOBRLEED

۱۳۸۲/۱۹/۲۱۱۹







٥	تعداد کتب	٤	١٠	الحه
٦	تعداد کتب	٢	٩٧	فارسى
٥	تعداد کتب	٤	٩٩	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٤	١٤	عربی
٦	تعداد کتب	٤	١٠	عربی
٥	تعداد کتب	٦	١١	عربی
٧	تعداد کتب	٤	٤٤	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٧	١٤	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٦	١٦	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٤	٧٩	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٦	٤٥	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٤	٤٦	عربی
٥	تعداد کتب	٤	٧١	عربی
٥	تعداد کتب	٤	٥٧	عربی
٥	تعداد کتب	٤	١٧	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٤	١٧	عربی
٦	تعداد کتب	٤	٦٩	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٥	١٤	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٤	٤٨	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٤	١٤	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٨	٨	عربی
٧	تعداد کتب	٤	١١	عربی
٤	تعداد کتب	٤	٥٦	عربی
٧	تعداد کتب	٤	١١	عربی

DEVLET ARSIVLERI GENEL MUDURLUGU  
CUMHURİYET ARSIVI



Türkiye Cumhuriyeti  
Adana Vilâyeti  
Aded  
27

Mübadele, İ' mâr ve İskân Vekâlet-i Celîyesine

30/6/340 tarih ve 28245 numarolu telgraf-nâme-i vekâlet-penâhîlerine cevâdır.

Me'mûrîn ile zâbitân ve mensûbîn-ı askeriyenin işgal etmekte oldukları emvâl-ı metrûke hânelerinin mikdârını mübîn Adana Onuncu Mıntıka İskân Müdîriyetince bâ-tanzîm ve tevdi' bulunan defter leffen takdîm kılınmıştır efendim.

Fi 9 Teşrîn-ı evvel 340

Vâlî  
(imza)

İskân Müdîriyetine 18

Vilâyet	Kaza Veya Mahalli	Hâne nüme rosu	Müşte melât ı	Rum veya Ermeni metrûkesinden olduđu	Şağiln isim ve şöhreti	Âile Nüf üsu	Fuzû Len veya müste 'ciren meşgul bulunduđu	Ne Zaman dan beri işgal edildiđi	mül âzâ t
Adana	İcâdi ye	98	3		Lu'be Muallimi Ahmed Efendi	4			
//	//	44	4		Polis Mustafa Efendi	3			
//	//	55	6		Zâbita Me'mûru Veysi Bey	9			
//	//	56	5		7. Fırka Emir Zâbiti Mustafa Bey	9			
//	//	58	6		Hilân-ı Ahmer Kâtibi Hüseyin Bey	19			
//	//	21	4		Telgraf Baş Kâtibi Kâmil Bey	6			
//	//	83	5		7. Fırka Hâber Me'mûru Mehmed Ali Bey	6			
//	//	96	9		Binbaşı Hâdî ve Halil Beyler	8			
//	//	97	7		Yüzbaşı Vasfî Bey	8			
//	//	99	6		Topçu Binbaşı	9			

					Cemâl Bey				
//	//	102	9		Mîralay Ali Mustafa Bey	10			
//	//	109	5		Mülâzım-1 evvel Râhîm Bey	6			
//	//	11	6		Mülâzım-1 evvel Cevdet Bey	6			
//	//	104	8		Lu'be Muallimi Nâlî Bey	7			
//	//	74	6		Muhâbere Me'mûru Saci Efendi	16			
//	//	82	4		7. Fırkadd Ali Rızâ Efendi	5			
//	//	126	2		Polis Naci	5			
//	//	127	7		Kıt'a Komiseri Kadı(?) Bey	7			
//	//	49	6		Mülâzım Hayri Bey	5			
//	Çacâ yûk (?)	3	4		Tekâüd Fahri Bey	6			
//	//	22	6		7. Fırka Emrinde Zeki Bey	5			
//	//	30	4		Polis Kemâl Bey	5			
//	//	44	3		... Kaim-makam Sâlih Bey Yüzbaşı âkif Bey	7			
//	//	45	3		Mülkiye Müfettişi Sûad Bey	4			
//	//	46	5		7. Fırka de Abdullah Bey	5			
//	//	47	3		7. Fırka Emrinde Osman Bey	3			
//	//	56	3		Yüzbaşı Bedrî Bey	8			
//	//	61	6		Yüzbaşı Zeki Bey	6			
//	//	63	4		Yüzbaşı Münir Bey	5			
//	//	64	6		Topçu Yüzbaşı İhsân Bey	8			

//	//	65	8		Binbaşı Ağâh Bey	18			
//	//	66	4		Yüzbaşı Nuri Bey	6			
//	//	68	4		... Yüzbaşı Behcet Bey	5			
//	//	78	2		Komiser Muâvini Emin Bey	3			
//	//	89	5		Polis Me'mûru Safâ Haydar Efendi	10			
//	//	96	3		7. Fırka Fâik Bey	3			
//	//	136	4		Muhâbere Me'mûru Kâzım Bey	7			
//	//	137	5		Polis Me'mûru Nu'mân Bey	8			
//	//	141	4		7. Fırka Burhaneddin Bey	5			
//	//	140	9		... Başkâtibi Tevfik Bey	11			
//	//	149	4		Telgrafdâr Cesim Bey	6			
//	//	140	4		... Mustafa Bey	3			
//	//	163	4		Harita Me'mûru Sâid Bey	6			
//	//	242	4		Mülâzım Abdülkadir Bey	7			
//	//	218	6		İskân Me'mûru Ârif Bey	5			
//	Saçlı Hamid	4	3		... Me'mûru Sâlih ve Rıf'at Efendiler	4			
//	Bucâk	15	1		... Havâle Me'mûru Feyzi (?) Efendi				
//	Çarçabuk	144	2		Yüzbaşı Şerafeddin Efendi	3			
//	//	121	4		Yüzbaşı Cemâl Efendi	4			
//	//	162	6		Muhâbere Me'mûru Seyfi Efend,	10			

//	Döşme	6	3		Muallim Hilmi Efendi	5			
//	//	28	3		Muhâbere Me'mûru Hakkı Efendi	4			
//	//	21	3		Sihhiye Me'mûru Ahmed Hamdi Efendi	4			
//	//	16	4		Tahsildâr Mes'ûd Efendi	7			
//	//	36	2		İskân Me'mûru Ali Rızâ Efendi	6			
//	//	71	4		7. Fırka Emrinde Sâlih Efendi	8			
//	//	74	5		Diş Tabibi Celâl Efendi	13			
//	//	88	4		Yüzbaşı İhsân Bey	6			
//	//	81	2		Mütekaüd Mülâzım Hüseyin Bey	5			
//	//	82	2		Belediyede Remzi Bey	2			
//	//	83	1		Muhâbere Me'mûru Nüsret Bey	6			
//	//	88	10		Kaim-makam Rüşdi Bey	17			
//	//		4		Muhâbere Me'mûru Ziyâ Bey	2			
//	//	85	9		Muhâbere Me'mûru Ali Bey				
//	//	37	3		Polis Necib Bey	7			
//	//	4	4		Sihhiye Müdürü Vasfi Bey	4	Emvâl-i metrûkeden değildir.		
//	Yüksək Dolab	4	12		Kalem Reisi Hamdi Bey	4			
//	//		11		Vâli Hilmi Bey	8	Emvâl-i metrûkeden değildir.		
//	//	16	8		Lu'be Muallimi Ahmed Ziyâ Efendi	4			
//	//		4		Divân Mubaberatından	7	Emvâl-i metrûkeden		

					İsmail Bey		değildir.		
//	//	68	3		Tahsildâr Hüseyin Bey	4			
//	Serâhân	1	4		Muhâbir Kâtibi Lütfi Bey	5			
//	Faki Durmuş	1	2		Maliye Kâtibi Ali Efendi	4			
//	//	17	3		Yüzbaşı Nuri Remzi Bey	6			
//	Hacı Faki	18	3		Mülâzım Rıf'at Efendi	6			
//	Karasûs	3	1		Telgrafcı Kerim Efendi	5			
//	//	5	5		Hükûmet Tabibi Remzi Efendi	9			
//	//	10	4		Doktor Feyzi Efendi	6			
//	//	9	4		Maliye baş Kâtibi				
//	Eski Sescrşu (?)	3	3		Birinci Müstantik Âsım Efendi	6			
//	//	8	3		Cinayet Azası Şemseddin Bey	5			
//	Eski Hamâm	10	4		Merkez Me'mûru Süleyman Bey	7			
//	//	24	2		Komiser Muâvini Celâl Bey	4			
//	//	26	2		Polis Hayati Efendi	6			
//	//	87	1		Polis Beşir Efendi	4			
//	//	5	2		Düyun-ı Umûm Başkâtibi Reşid Bey	6			
//	//	69	1		İcrâ Me'mûru Cavid Bey	5			
//	//	71	9		Nâfia Kondüktörü Naci Bey	6			
//	//	32	3		Lu'be Musiki Muallimi Hasan Efendi	8			



//	//	70	6		Hastahânedan Feyzi Bey	6			
//		33	2		Tahsildâr Abdulkadir Efendi	7			
//	//	35	2		Muallim Mehmed Efendi	2			
//	//	21	1		Telgrafcı Hüsni Efendi	8			
//	//	47	2		Polis Abdurrahman Efendi	5			
//	Merm erli	23	2		Yüzbaşı Nuri Bey	3			
//	//	37	4		Komiser muâvini Aydın Bey	4			
//	//	26	8		Yüzbaşı Sâlih Bey	4			
//	//	6	6		Mahkeme-i Asliyye Reisi Vahi Bey	1			
//	//	30	6		YüzbaşıŞerafeddin Bey	12			
//	//	64	5		Polis Müdüri Nuri Bey	9			
//	Kuru Köpr ü	12	6		İşkân Me'mûru Fehmi Bey	6			
//	//	31	2		Muallim Kâmil Bey	10			
//	//	13	6		İşkân Kâtibi Ekrem Bey	7			
//	//	24	4		Telgraf Baş Müdüri Hamdi Bey	6			
//	//	23	4		Komiser Muâvini Mehmed Ali Bey	2			
//	//	10	6		Vilâyet Yâneri Hakkı Bey	7			
//	//	6	4		Polis Arif Bey	5			
//	//	7	3		Emlâk Milliye Müdûri Yakub	7			
//	Hacı Hamî d	10	3		Posta Muhâbecisi	3			

//	//	20	3		Telgraf Me'mûru Hasib Bey	5			
//	//	22	8		Komiser Tevfik Bey	2			
//	//	31	4		Polis Kemâl Bey	9			
//	//	11	5		Polis Muhsin Bey	4			
//	//	3	3		Yüzbaşı Şevki Bey	5			
//	//	17	1		Tahsildâr Halil Efendi	4			
//	Saçlı Hamî d	17	3		Posta Me'mûru Abdürrahim Efendi	3			
//	Hıdri lyas	18	3		Telgraf Me'mûru Bayram Efendi	5			
//	Saçlı Hamî d	27	1		Polis Avni Efendi	5			
//	//	9	8		Fehmi ve ... Mehmed ve rûfekalari	34			
//	//	22/2	2		Sâbık Polis Me'mûrlarından Mehfî Efendi	5			
//	//	20	4		Polis Celâl Efendi	6			
//	//	3	4		Binbaşı Reşâd Bey	5			
//	Hıdri lyas	22	3		Telgraf Me'mûru Rahmi Bey	4			
//	//	11	4		Telgraf Sicil Me'mûru Emin Bey	3			
//	//	5	2		Baş Me'mûr Kâzım Bey	5			
//	//	2	1		Polis Latif Bey	3			
//	//	1	1		Polis Nâci Bey	3			
//	//	13	2		Zirâat Müfettişi Galib Bey	4			
//	//		5		Telgraf Müdürü Galib Bey	6			
//	//	17	5		Yüzbaşı Refik Bey	5			

//	//	10	3		Belediye ... Hayriye Hanım	11			
//	//	15	4		Muhâbere-i Husûsiyye Müdürü Refik Bey	5			
//	Bâbtâ rsûs	33	5		Polis Ali Ulvi Bey	7			
//	//	18	4		Muallim Azim Bey	3			
//	//	21	7		Sevk Me'mûru Hasan Bey	3			
//	//	7	4		Muhâsebeci Kemâl Bey	5			
//	//	17	7		Doktor Salih Yusuf Bey	7			
//	//	15	5		İskân Me'mûru Argab (?) Bey	5			
//	//	14	1		Muallim Ahmed Efendi	2			
//	Bucâ k	21	2		Baş Me'mûr Şa'bân Bey	7			
//	//	7	2		Polis Hamdi Efendi	4			
//	//	22	12		Zâbitân Yekta				
//	//	19	3		Telgraf Müfettişi Necâti Bey	3			
//	Karlı Hamâ m	23	3		Komiser Nazmi Bey	3			
//	//	26	7		Muavin Feyzullah Bey	9			
//	//	10	7		Hapishâne Kâtibi İhsân Bey	4			
//	//	25	2		Mülâzım-ı evvel Emin Bey	4			
//	//	38	3		Kaim-makam Ali Rızâ Bey	5			
//	//	5	4		Sertabib Hamdi Bey	5			
//	//	22	4		Muhâbere Me'mûr Rühfetkar (?) Efendi	5			

//	//	30	7		Nüfûs Baş Kâtibi Hüsni Efendi	6			
//	Hamâ miyy e	7	8		Doktor Ruhi Bey	7			
//	//	1	5		Telgraf Kâtibi Said Bey	5			
//	Teker minâ n (?)	3	3		Zirâat Muhâsebe-i Millisi Cafer Bey	7			
//	//	14	4		Komser Muâvini Salih Nebari Bey	17			
//	//	3	5		Sâbık Muallim Bekir Efendi	5			
//	//	7	1		Zirâat Me'mûru Hayri Bey	4			
//	...	3	3		Zirâat Me'mûru Rüşdü Bey	4			
//	Kasâ b Bekir	2	3		Mıntika Zirâat Müdiri Halil Bey	7			
//	Necâr ân	16	8		Muallime Münire Hanım	8			
//	Necâr ân	10	3		Binbaşı Şevket Bey	5			
//	Hânk arlı	47	6		İstasyon Kumandanı Vâhid Bey	6			
//	//	49	4		Nâfia komiseri Ferid Bey	5			
//	//	12	4		... Şu'be Reisi Zeki Bey	2			
//	//	30	4		Topçu Kaim- makamı Kâzım Bey	6			
//	//	31	6		7. Fırka Baytârı Fâik Bey	5			
//	//	24	4		Muhassıb-i Me'sûl Kadri Bey	7			
//	//	13	7		Müdde'î Umûmi Feyzi Bey	2			
//	Çınâr lı	36	6		Telgrafcı Said Efendi	3			

//	//	74	2		Emlâk-ı Milliyede Bekir Efendi	3			
//	//	65	6		Komiser Muâvini Hacı Mehmed Efendi	3			
//	//	36	2		Polis Muharriri	1			
//	//	71	3		Muallim Fevzi Efendi	5			
//	//	57	2		Vilâyet Odacısı Ahmed Ağa	5			
//	//	17	2		Mühendis Adil Bey	5			
//	Şa'bâ niyye	17	4		Mülâzım Hüsrev Efendi	2			
//	//	69	3		Dâr-ül-eytâm Muallimi Abdürrahim Efendi	6			
//	//	12	5		Şu'be Yüzbaşısı Tevfik Efendi	2			
//	//	28	2		Polis Ali Efendi	4			
//	//	12	1		Belediyede Hayri Efendi	4			
//	Çukur Mescîd	8	8		Cinâyet İ'tâsı Şemseddin Efendi	4			
//	//	11	4		Akif Bey	7			
//	//	56	1		Tahsildâr Ken'ân Bey	3			
//	//	93	3		Komiser Onur Bey	7			
//	Şa'bâ niyye	1	1		Tahsildâr Mehmed Efendi	3			
//	//	83	6		Kâtib-i Adlide Es'ad Efendi	3			
//	Çınârlı	15	3		Rüşdiye Süreyya Bey	5			
//	Kasâb Bekir	5	7		Yüzbaşı Sâlim Efendi	4			
//	Necârân	15	7		Muallime Münire Hânım	8	...		

//	//	16	8		Muallime Münire Hânım	8	....		
//	Çukur Mescîd	8	3		Komiser Muavini Şükrü Efendi	8			
//	//	4	6		Zirâat Baş Müdiri Cevdet Efendi	4			
//	Hânk arlı	19	3		Kozân İskân Tabibi Mustafa Efendi	5			
//	Yeni İstasyon	3	1		Polis Tefîk Efendi	3			
//	//	4	1		Tüfekci İsmâil Efendi	3			
//	//	19	1		Tüfekci Mehmed Efendi	3			
//	Bâbtarsûs	13	6		Muallim İbrahim Oğuz Efendi	10			
//	Hamâmiyye	6	2		Polis Gani Efendi	5			

## Explanation

This telegram sent by the governor of Adana to the Ministry of Exchange, Development and Settlement was about the occupations of the houses which were from the Armenian and Greek abandoned properties. The table attached to the telegram showed the number of occupations with the names and titles of the occupants. The number of occupations was one hundred and fifty but all houses were abandoned by Armenians and Greeks except for three.