

THE RECEPTION OF LIBERTY IN KONYA
SEPTEMBER 1908 – APRIL 1909

by

Ercüment Asil

Submitted to
the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts

Boğaziçi University
2005

“The Reception of Liberty in Konya, September 1908 – April 1909” ,
a thesis prepared by Ercüment Asil in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts degree at the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History.

This thesis has been approved and accepted by:

Assist. Prof. Ahmet Kuyuş _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Dr. Zafer Toprak _____

Assoc. Prof. Nadir Özbek _____

An abstract of the Thesis of Ercüment Asil for the degree of Master of Arts from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History to be taken August 2005

Title: The Reception of Liberty in Konya, September 1908 – April 1909

This thesis traces the path that led to divergences in the public opinion in Konya between September 1908 and April 1909. Following the proclamation of the Constitution, the Selanik headquarters of the CUP sent a delegation to the province of Konya, which visited various towns in order to inform the people about the Committee and the new regime. The single local private newspaper *Anadolu* highly appreciated these visits. In addition, the newspaper reflected a colorful account of one of the major blessings of liberty: political participation through elections. With the inauguration of political discussions in the Parliament the public opinion in Konya started to bifurcate. This thesis argued that the Parliament, as an institution that crystallized competing political perspectives, was significant in determining the issues around which the public opinion in Konya developed divergences. It was first divided along the actions of Kamil Pasha and then along the concept of *şeriat*. Party affiliations, especially with the Liberal Union, did not play a major role in these splits. Special attention was paid to the slowly changing perceptions of the CUP during the period in question. While the CUP enjoyed a highly prestigious position until March, afterwards minor criticizing accounts started to be seen in some newspapers.

Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Ercüment Asil tarafından Ağustos 2005'te teslim edilen tezin kısa özeti

Başlık: Konya'da Hürriyet'in Alımlanması, Eylül 1908 – Nisan 1909

Bu tez Konya kamuoyunun 1908 Eylül'ünden 1909 Nisan'ına doğru nasıl bir kırılma geçirdiğini izlemektedir. Meşrutiyet'in ilanının hemen ardından, Selanik'teki İTC Merkez-i Umumisi Konya Vilayeti'ne halkı Cemiyet ve yeni rejim hakkında bilgilendirmekle görevli bir heyet göndermiştir. Konya'nın o tarihteki tek yerel-özel gazetesi olan *Anadolu* gazetesi Cemiyet'in gezilerinden takdirle bahsetmektedir. Gazete ayrıca hürriyetin en önemli nimetlerinden biri olan halkın seçimler vasıtasıyla siyasete katılması sürecini de renkli bir şekilde yansıtmaktadır. Meclis-i Mebusan'ın açılıp siyasal tartışmanın başlamasıyla birlikte Konya kamuoyunda da kırılmalar başlamıştır. Bu tez rakip siyasi perspektifleri kristalize eden bir kurum olarak Meclis-i Mebusan'ın Konya kamuoyunda ayrılma nedeni olan konuları belirlemede çok önemli bir yeri olduğunu savunmaktadır. Konya kamuoyu ilk önce Kamil Paşa üzerinden daha sonra ise *şeriat* kavramı üzerinden ayrılmıştır. Parti bağlılıkları, özellikle *Ahrar Fırkası*, bu ayrılmalarda başlıca bir rol oynamamıştır. Tez ayrıca söz konusu süreç içinde İTC'nin algılanmasındaki değişikliğe de önem vermektedir. Cemiyet Mart ayına kadar oldukça prestijli bir konuma sahipken, bu aydan sonra bazı yerel gazetelerde küçük eleştiriler boy göstermeye başlamıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Ahmet Kuyaş for his insightful guidance during the development of this thesis. I am indebted to Barbara Pusch of the Orient-Institut Istanbul as she attracted my attention to the periphery instead of the center; I also thank her for her following support. I must express my gratitude to Şerif Mardin who kindly read this thesis and criticized it. In addition, I want to thank Malek Sharif of the Orient-Institut Istanbul for his assistance and friendship. I appreciate these and the critiques of many other friends, which I certainly could not properly respond in this work.

CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. <i>TENVİR</i> : ILLUMINATING THE PEOPLE ON THE REVOLUTION.....	7
The Way to the Revolution and the General Environment Following It.....	7
What did the People Understand from Liberty in Konya?	13
<i>Tenvir</i> : Efforts of the CUP to Explain Liberty and the Committee.....	25
Conclusion.....	38
III. THE 1908 ELECTIONS IN KONYA.....	39
A short History of Electoral Practices in the Ottoman Empire and the Importance of the 1908 Elections.....	40
1908 Elections in Konya.....	45
Electoral Activities in Konya as Reflected in <i>Anadolu</i>	55
Conclusion.....	69
IV. POLITICAL POLARIZATION IN KONYA.....	70
The Kamil Pasha Cabinet.....	71
The Uneasy Relationship between Kamil Pasha and the CUP.....	80
The Rising Divergence in Konya.....	89
Conclusion	121
V. CONCLUSION	124
APPENDIXES.....	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY	137

PREFACE

The Revolution of 1908 and the following regime of constitutional monarchy constitute a break in the political history of Turkey, which was called “proclamation of liberty” by its contemporaries. The importance of the pre- and post-Revolutionary politics has been duly recognized and studied at length by historians of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. A common characteristic of the studies on the Revolution is their interest in the politics of the capital of the Empire, which is the traditional center of the decision-making processes. This has resulted in an under-emphasis on the role of the provinces of the Empire and their position vis-à-vis the Revolution. The European provinces of the Empire constitute the major exception since it was the center where revolutionary forces were best organized and rooted. This work, however, aims to capture a picture of “liberty” as it was perceived from the province of Konya, in the heartland of Anatolia. It will try to follow how “liberty” stimulated political awareness by newspapers and elections, and how political differences in the capital were reproduced in Konya resulting in fierce discussions and gradual split of its public opinion.

I limited myself to the period that begins with the Revolution in July 1908 and ends with the short-lived counter-Revolutionary rising in 13 April 1909. Although local press activity had boomed with the proclamation of liberty unfortunately many

newspapers were not preserved until today. I was fortunate to find a pretty good collection of a private Konya newspaper, which covered most of the time period in question. In addition, following the inauguration of the Parliament two rival newspapers accompanied it. When I checked a couple issues I saw the signs that there had been pretty much political activity and exciting discussions in Konya in “the era of liberty.” I started my study without having pre-formulated questions in my mind. However, as my studies progressed there emerged problems which I believe of immense importance. One such problem concerns the definition of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), the committee that left its mark on the late Turkish history. I hope that, in addition to a closer examination of the development of local politics in Konya, this work would also contribute to get a more historical account of the CUP and the “Unionist.”

However, I must admit that the short span of the period in question poses a major difficulty in the analysis of the change of a local perception of the label of “Unionist.” In addition, this work would be more fruitful if I had the chance to go into the details of parallel discussions in the newspapers in Istanbul and determine the local nuances and peculiarities of Konya. In contrast, a comparison with another Anatolian province would help to make generalizations about politics in the Anatolian periphery. Local newspapers provide immense concrete data, especially names of local elites, which can be more fruitful with the help of other primary sources, such as state archives and archives of local chambers of commerce and religious foundations. With such data local networks and their operations can be reconstructed in order to set our understanding of the Anatolian periphery on more concrete bases.

In this work, I used three local newspapers. These were *Anadolu* (Anatolia), *Hakem* (Arbitrator), and *Maşrik-ı İrfan* (Where Knowledge Rises or the Rising Sun of

Knowledge). *Anadolu* started to be published in late August or early September twice a week, and on four pages. Until January, when the elections were completed and the Parliament was opened it had been the single private local newspaper besides the official *Konya Vilayet Gazetesi* (Provincial Newspaper of Konya). It heavily emphasized its impartiality during the election process and continued to try to hold a middle way in the bifurcation process in the Province. It ceased to be published during July or August 1909; number 93 being its last issue. The date of its end corresponds to a much earlier time than the other two newspapers.¹ Its issues from 2-54 are mainly available in the Public Library of Beyazıt. Some lacking numbers are to be find in National Library in Ankara and Atatürk Library in Taksim. Unfortunately the issues from 55-92 are not available. In this study I referred the first 54 issues, the last one dating 29 March 1909.

The four-page *Hakem* started to be published on 23 January 1909. It included literary as well as political articles. It was usually published twice a week. It held a Unionist position and published 103 issues until 18 August 1910.² All of them are available in the Public Library of Beyazıt. In this study only the first 14 issues from 23 January until 22 April 1909 are referred to.

The third one is *Maşrık-ı İrfan*. On 24 January 1909, 34 people consisting of merchants and the *ulema* (religious scholars) of Konya established a printing house called *Maşrık-ı İrfan* and began to publish a weekly four-page newspaper with the same

¹ According to Hasan Duman the last number of *Anadolu* is 93; see Hasan Duman, *Başlangıcından Harf Devrimine Kadar Osmanlı-Türk Süreli Yayınlar ve Gazeteler Bibliyografyası ve Toplu Kataloğu, 1828-1928*, vol. I, 2 vols. (İstanbul: Enformasyon ve Dokümentasyon Hizmetleri Vakfı, 2000), p. 132. Number 54 was published on 16 mart 1325 (29 March 1909). Unfortunately the issues 55-92 are lacking. From number 40 on, the newspaper tried to publish three times a week. If this was the case until the last number, I guess *Anadolu* continued to appear until July or August 1909.

² *Ibid.*, p. 346.

title of *Maşrık-ı İrfan* on 04 March 1909.³ The newspaper was under the heavy influence of the local *ulema* and published 331 issues until 1912, the longest living among the three. The first 144 issues until 25 August 1910 are available in the Public Library of Beyazıt however with frequent gaps. None of the numbers from 144 to 331 are available except four issues.⁴ In this study I referred the first 6 issues from 4 March to 5 April 1909.

This work is divided into five chapters, the first being the introduction and the last the conclusion. The second chapter begins with a brief description of the political atmosphere after the Revolution and continues with the articulation of the concept of “liberty” as the concept that denoted the post-Revolutionary era. The chapter ends with an analysis of the visits of a CUP delegation sent to Konya in order to inform the people about the Committee and the new regime. The third chapter analyzes the election period and its manifestation in the newspaper *Anadolu*. The fourth chapter examines how political bifurcation began after the opening of the Parliament, which led to the emergence of the two opposing local newspapers in Konya, *Hakem* and *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, and to the subsequent closure of *Anadolu*.

³ *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, 21 şubat 1324 (6 March 909), p. 1. The owner of the newspaper, Mazlumzade Hacı Osman Efendi, was one of the active entrepreneurs of Konya. See Zafer Toprak, *İttihat-Terakki ve Devletçilik* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995), p. 78.

⁴ Duman, p. 525.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The province of Konya is located in the heartland of Anatolia and consisted of 5 sub-provinces in 1908 – Burdur, Niğde, Teke [Antalya], Hamidiye [Isparta] and Konya itself. Its total population was about 1,250,000, more than a 100,000 being non-Muslim who were mostly concentrated in the sub-province of Niğde.¹

The integration of Central Anatolia into the world capitalist economy accelerated in the 1890s, following the construction of the Konya-İstanbul railway together with its Eskişehir-Ankara extension. The production of agricultural goods for the domestic as well as international markets boosted afterwards and compared to eastern parts of the Empire, Central Anatolia benefited more from this integration. Its economic structure was chiefly based on small and medium size of land ownership. Konya was also one of the major provinces where a “national” economy was rapidly increasing.²

¹ *Anadolu*, 29 kanun-u evvel 1324 (11 January 909), p. 4. See, Appendix A.

² Şevket Pamuk, *100 Soruda Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadî Tarihi, 1500-1914* (İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1988), pp. 216-17, 223. Also see Zafer Toprak, *Milli İktisat – Milli Burjuvazi* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995), pp. 116-19 and Toprak, *İttihat-Terakki ve Devletçilik*, pp. 76-79.

Although already a center of culture and education in Byzantine and Seljuk times, Konya acquired its late educational structure beginning in the early 18th century. Of the 49 known *medreses* (religious schools) that were built during the Ottoman period, 45 were established between the 18th and 20th centuries. In the late 19th century in the whole province of Konya there were more *medreses* than in any other province of the Ottoman Empire. Of these 45 *medreses* 38 (over 82 %) were founded by *sufi* orders and the *ulema* (religious scholars), the rest by governors and *agas* (large land owners). Whereas the *Nakşibendi* order was extremely active in the foundation of *medreses*, the *Mevlevi* order had founded only a few. *Bektaşî* and *Halvetî* orders, which were as active as the *Nakşibendi* and the *Mevlevî* in other parts of the Empire, did not show any interest to found *medreses* in the province and held only a couple of *sufi* lodges there.³ Thus *Nakşibendi* were distinguished in Konya as spiritual leaders as well as teachers and *müftüs* (religious officials).

Following the reinstatement of the Constitution in 1908, a CUP (Committee of Union and Progress) delegation visited Konya, which aimed to inform the people on the new regime and the Committee. The CUP was a product of the Young Turk movement that waged a war against the absolutist monarchy. Young Turks had their roots both ideologically and organically in the Young Ottomans that were able to institute a Parliament for two years in 1876, which was suspended by Abdülhamid II until 1908. The aim of the Young Ottomans was to establish a constitutional parliamentary regime in order to share the political power and make the execution responsible in front of the

³ Yaşar Sarıkaya, "Sufis and Gelehrte Als Medresengründer Und -Patrone Im Osmanischen Konya (18.-19. Jahrhundert)," *Der Islam* LXXIX, no. 2 (2002), pp. 201-202, and 234-235.

legislation.⁴ Whereas the Young Ottomans belonged to the classic ruling elite of the Empire, the Young Turks usually were educated in modern, western-styled schools and belonged to newly emerging professional classes such as lawyers, teachers, officers, journalists and bureaucrats.⁵ The Young Turks aimed to restore the parliamentary regime, which they saw as the most effective way to keep the disintegrating Empire intact. The CUP was the most significant of various secret committees which aimed to reinstitute the Constitution. It was established in 1889 as an underground organization in Macedonia and paved the way to the 1908 Young Turk Revolution. From 1908 to 1913 it controlled the Parliament; and from 1913 until the end of WWI it was the sole ruler.

A major problem in dealing with the CUP is to freeze and essentialize it. Şükrü Hanioglu refers to this methodological problem as the presumption of the CUP as a monolithic political organization. He argues that until 1902 the CUP had been an umbrella organization of various member groups who shared only the common agenda of dethroning the ruling absolutist monarch, Abdülhamid II. The ideology, leadership, ethnic origins and membership of the Committee had also not been fixed but subject to major transformations.⁶ Though his work mainly analyzes the pre-Revolutionary era and refers to more distinct differences within the development of the CUP, the danger of falling into the same methodological trap is valid for the post-Revolutionary era as well.

The emergence of contestation against the CUP after the Revolution is a problem which strongly relates to the definition of the CUP. It is well known that some figures

⁴ Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasî Fikirleri: 1895-1908*, 2nd ed. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1983), p. 30.

⁵ Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks: The Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish Politics, 1908-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 16.

⁶ Şükrü Hanioglu, *The Young Turks in Opposition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 4.

who were on the side of the CUP left it later on, and that some even actively engaged in founding rival political parties. Some deputies of the Province of Konya such as Şeyhzade Zeynelabidin Efendi, Mehmet Hamdi [Yazır] and Ömer Lütfi Efendi would also be among those who resigned from the CUP in February 1910.⁷ In this study, however, the problem of competition with the CUP ironically emerged as I realized that there was no mention of an opponent in the Unionist propaganda activities in Konya in October. In addition, none of the candidates who were introduced in the local newspaper identified himself with the CUP during the parliamentary elections in 1908. This thesis tried to show that it does not help much to look for rivalry with the CUP before the Parliament opened.

How an essentialist perception of the CUP relates to a search for an opposition against it should be clarified here. Concerning the early days of the Revolution, it would be appropriate to evaluate the CUP as a loosely connected conglomeration of networks that cooperated in the context of getting rid of the prevailing absolutism. Looking for a coherent Committee with a well-defined perspective on various political, social, and economic issues would be a slip of hindsight that freezes a snapshot of the activities of the Central Committee of the CUP in the post-1914 period – when it had eliminated major internal conflicts⁸ – and extends it back into the early days of the Revolution. Therefore in any analysis of the late Ottoman (and also early Republican period) it is crucial to keep in mind that the CUP was an organism which had been assuming its shape in a process of action and reaction against changing contexts such as absolutism, the Event of *31 Mart*, the Balkan Wars and WWI. This process should be seen as an

⁷ Aykut Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey, 1908-1913* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000), pp. 179-80.

⁸ Ahmad, p. VII.

ongoing process of exclusion and inclusion depending on the contexts both within the Empire and the world around it. Taking this sociological approach into account it would be premature to look for a clear contestation against a formation which did not have a clear character and included such diverse elements in terms of ethnicity, occupation and world views such as Turks, Albanians, Arabs, Armenians, officers, bureaucrats, notables, *ulema*, secular individuals, Muslims, Christians and Jews. The starting context that united these elements around the CUP was Hamidian absolutism. Yet, as the contexts changed, the Committee also changed its nature by strengthening its ties with certain elements and loosening them with others, and created rivals and opponents. The beginning of parliamentary politics was such a context which created an environment in which once personal-perceived thoughts received the chance of politicization.

The nature of parliamentary politics plays a crucial role here. It is the place where through discussion rival political perspectives came to surface, were articulated, formulated and eventually institutionalized in the form of political parties. By their crucial position in the decision and policy-making process, parliamentary discussions animated and crystallized political differences within the Committee. These political differences generally pertained to issues of modernization, such as the nature of the constitutional monarchy, nationalism, secularism, economic policies, equality of citizens, women's emancipation, etc., some of which proved to have a long-lasting nature in Turkish history.⁹

One should remember that Ottoman public opinion did not have the opportunity to engage into sophisticated political discussions through a Parliament before. The

⁹ For a detailed discussion of these issues see Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1973), especially pp. 377-413.

parliamentary experience of 1877-1878 was short-lived. It was also not comparable to the Parliament of 1908 in its representative capability due to its electoral system. In addition, the new generation of modern educated Young Turks who were going to ask for rapid modernization of the Empire in its political, economic and social outlook in the post-1908 Parliaments did not exist during the First Constitutional period. All of these point to the unique place of the Parliament of 1908 as the place where political differences within the Empire as well as inside the CUP began to come to surface for the first time in a modern institutional format.

I must also add here how the inauguration of parliamentary politics started the process of politicization and bifurcation was well materialized in Konya in the form of its local private newspapers. Following the opening of the Parliament on 17 December 1908, first *Hakem* emerged in late January and then *Maşrık-ı İrfan* in early March. They coincided with the rising debates on the Kamil Pasha Cabinet and on the compatibility of the new laws and regulations with *şeriat* (religious law), respectively.

CHAPTER II

TENVİR : ILLUMINATING THE PEOPLE ON THE REVOLUTION

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section describes major events that led to the Revolution in 23 July 1908 and tries to depict the general environment it created. The second section assesses how the terms “liberty” and “tyranny” were articulated in the local private newspaper of the province of Konya, *Anadolu*. Both terms possessed immense importance because they were commonly used to denote the constitutional and absolutist eras under the reign of Abdulhamid II. The last section describes the visits of the CUP delegation that was sent to Konya. The delegation had visited various towns in the province declaring its aim to illuminate (*tenvir*) the people on the aims of the Committee and the rights and duties of the people in the new regime.

The Way to the Revolution and the General Environment Following It

23 July 1908 is the date of the Revolution in the Ottoman Empire. It was liberal in nature, aiming to reinstitute the short-lived constitutional regime of 1876 by putting an end to the 30-year-long absolutist regime of Abdulhamid II. The Revolution was

initiated by disturbances that broke out in Macedonia and that developed into a genuine insurrection demanding that the Palace reinstitute the 1876 Constitution. Niyazi Bey from Resne and Enver Bey were the most notable of many young Unionist officers who dedicated themselves to the reinstatement of the Constitution, believing that it was the most appropriate way to hold the dissolving Empire intact. In a short time, they successfully attracted the local populations of Macedonia in rebelling for the cause of the Constitution.

The Constitution was proclaimed after a series of assassinations of personalities such as Şemsi Paşa, who had been ordered to crush the rebellion, Sadık Paşa, the Sultan's A.D.C. and Osman Hidâyet Paşa, Commander of the Manastır garrison, shot when he was reading an imperial proclamation.¹⁰ More important than the terrorism of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) was the inability, or more correctly the unwillingness of the Macedonian troops to put down the rebellion. About ten days before the proclamation of the Constitution, Hilmi Paşa, Inspector General of Rumelia, had written to the Sultan explaining the seriousness of the situation and that most of the officers in the Third Army were indeed attached to the CUP. The Sultan tried to suppress the rebellion by sending more loyal troops from Anatolia, but to no avail; they too refused to crush the rebellion.¹¹ This indicates that the activities of the CUP was not held illegitimate and Macedonian and Anatolian officers preferred to passively support the CUP in its cause. On 23 July, the Committee decided to proclaim the Constitution in various cities in Macedonia such as Manastır, Üsküp and Serez, hoping that the example would be followed throughout the Empire. Recognizing the weightiness of the

¹⁰ Ahmad, p. 10.

¹¹ Ibid.

developments, on the same day, an imperial decree was issued restoring the Constitution of 1876, which was then called “proclamation of liberty.”¹²

After thirty years of espionage and oppression, the population in the capital was hesitant to rush into the streets to celebrate the proclamation. They could not predict the response of the government against such an act. Ahmet Emin Yalman describes the reluctance of the masses and their carefulness: “the first reluctant demonstrations were no more than applauding the military detachments passing through the streets and shouting ‘long live the Sultan!’¹³” The safest way to express their enjoyment seemed to thank the Sultan.¹⁴ Two days after the proclamation, when people felt secure enough, an ostentatious celebration was held. A crowd of 50,000 proceeded first to the Sublime Port, and then on to the Ministry of War, the office of *Şeyhülislam*, and finally to the Ministry of Finance. The *Şeyhülislam* offered a prayer for the Sultan and the ministers took oaths to serve their country, to be loyal to the Sultan and the cause of liberty.¹⁵ Rıza Nur’s memoirs also indicate that people were ready to participate in demonstrations when they felt secure enough.¹⁶ In a few days, wide-ranging demonstrations were arranged in Istanbul with the full participation of the masses. Attacking those who were identified with absolutism was also a part of these events. In order to calm down the people many

¹² Ibid., pp. 12-3.

¹³ Ahmet Emin Yalman, *Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim (1888-1918)*, vol. I (İstanbul: 1970), pp. 61-2. Quoted in Kudret Emiroğlu, *Anadolu’da Devrim Günleri* (Ankara: İmge Yayınları, 1999), pp. 20-1.

¹⁴ Sina Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1987), p. 84.

¹⁵ Aykut Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908 in Turkey* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), pp. 101-2. For a visualization see Sacit Kutlu, *Didar-ı Hürriyet: Kartpostallarla İkinci Meşrutiyet 1908-1913* (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2004), especially pp. 113-118.

¹⁶ Rıza Nur, *Hayat ve Hatıratım*, vol. I (İstanbul: Altındağ Yayınları, 1967), pp. 244-9. Quoted in Emiroğlu, p. 24.

high ranking officials who were known as spies had to be fired.¹⁷ A general amnesty was declared; by July 26, all political prisoners in Istanbul were let free. What is more, the amnesty included all exiles and political fugitives, the number of which had reached 140,000, 60,000 being Muslims and the rest Armenian.¹⁸

The CUP was the undoubted champion of the Revolution and it was conscious not to let the Palace appropriate the proclamation of the Constitution. Kâzım Karabekir expresses his fear in his memoirs that liberty and the Constitution were evaluated as gifts of the Sultan. The students of the Military School were able to demonstrate in the streets the first day; however they were shouting “long live the Sultan!” In the following days, Karabekir and his fellow officers published a declaration and distributed it with the help of the members of the Committee to the students and people on the streets, which stressed that liberty was not a gift and favor of the Sultan, that it had been won by the Committee at the expense of great efforts and sacrifice. On 28 July, the declaration was also published in the newspapers. A week after the Revolution, the cry “Long live liberty! Down with tyranny!” sounded higher than anything else.¹⁹

Not all officers were patient enough as Karabekir and his fellow officers as to clarify people that the restoration of the Constitution was the result of painstaking effort. An incident in Edirne portrays how some Unionist officers felt nervous as if an injustice done to them when the Sultan was exalted, and reveals that ordinary soldiers accepted the Constitution as a gift of Abdülhamid. On July 28, people in Edirne gathered to celebrate the reinstatement of the Constitution and the proclamation of liberty. A group of

¹⁷ Kazım Karabekir, *İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti, 1896-1909* (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1993), pp. 335-7.

¹⁸ Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 103.

¹⁹ Karabekir, pp. 340-41.

Unionist officers from Selanik were also present in the celebrations. When people began to cheer “Long live the Sultan!” the group from Selanik was shocked. Captain Ruşenî Bey nervously gave a speech emphasizing that the Constitution was not a work of the Sultan, but of the Committee. He became so angry that he smashed the pro-Sultan bills with his sword. The crowd, both civilian and military, became excited and thought that the officers from Selanik intended regicide. About 350 soldiers traveled to Istanbul by train in order to see whether the Sultan was still alive. They declared to Abdulhamid that they were both supporting the Constitution and were still loyal to him. Thereupon the CUP publicly announced that it was loyal both to the Constitution and the Sultan who had reinstated it.²⁰

At first there was a reluctance and even disbelief in some cities that the Constitution had been restored and liberty had been proclaimed, but in a few days rejoicing people filled the streets celebrating “liberty, justice, equality, and fraternity.” Demonstrations were coupled with attacking the notorious government officials of the old regime, as high as governors, and forcing them to resign. Releasing political prisoners was also a common response. In the end, they were the group who deserved liberty first and foremost.²¹ Kansu argues that except in such cities as Avlonya, the Muslim Albanians were somewhat indifferent to the new regime, fearing that they would lose their privileges over the Christians. In addition to the Albanian regions, the

²⁰ Kutlu, p. 118.

²¹ Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, pp. 106-10.

Constitution was not so vigorously welcomed in the Arab provinces.²² The rest of the country celebrated the new regime with immense joy.²³

Demonstrations became so overwrought, and as they did not seem to be coming to an end, the public in Istanbul was notified on 27 and 28 July that they bring them to an end. Even the CUP decided to put an end to the demonstrations to prevent further damage by the masses to the civil rights. Karabekir wrote that the government had no power to end the demonstrations; therefore the Committee interfered, using its prestige, and published a declaration calling for an end to the demonstrations.²⁴

At the moment of the Revolution there emerged a power vacuum. The military had disobeyed the Sultan by not repressing the rebellious officers in Macedonia before the Revolution. After that, the government had proved unable to end the demonstrations without the CUP asking the people to do so. The cabinet and various administrative bodies had lost their functionalities.²⁵ It was the CUP that had the capacity to fill that power vacuum and was on the way to do so.

However, it was still the old regime that restored the Constitution. The new cabinet of Said Pasha, established on 22 July, was essentially the continuation of the previous government.²⁶ Thus the institutions and the bureaucrats of the old regime were in no way eliminated, save the most notorious ones. They were literally still legitimate

²² The appreciation of the Arab provinces as lacking in enthusiasm and understanding the significance of the change, was criticized by Ursula Campos who believes it to be an early and not duly examined conclusion. See, M. Ursula Campos, A 'Shared Homeland' and Its Boundaries (Ph.d diss., Stanford University, 2003), p. 19, especially footnote 42.

²³ Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, pp. 111-13.

²⁴ Karabekir, pp. 411-12.

²⁵ Ahmad, p. 14.

²⁶ Emiroğlu, p. 39.

and were trying to regain their prestige and power which had been snatched by the Committee in that power vacuum. In addition, the Unionists did not want to take the risk of inciting the people against the government officials, an act that could have ended in grave social turmoil and anarchy. Thus a fine and critical power-game ensued between the institutions of the old regime and the Committee. The first clear display of power by the CUP occurred due to the insistence of the Sultan on the right to appoint the Ministers of War and Navy. Since Said Pasha had drafted the imperial decree that declared to appoint the Ministers of War and Navy as an imperial right, the Committee forced him to resign in early August.²⁷

The prayer of the *Şeyhülislam* for the Sultan and the soldiers who came to Istanbul from Edirne to check whether the Sultan was still in one piece reflect the power of the spirit of monarchy, but this time constitutional. This by no means suggests that the Sultan was as strong and legitimate as before. The early hesitations to celebrate liberty imply that everyone was aware that it was an insult of the highest level against the absolutist Sultan, yet once it was felt that he was powerless against the CUP, they did not waste time in insulting him.

What did the People Understand from Liberty in Konya?

In the first instance, the reinstatement of the Constitution was welcomed under the motivation of cleansing a group of parasites which had been nourished by a system of espionage. Thus the first impact of the proclamation of the Constitution in the provinces was demonstrations mixed with demands of dismissal of the corrupt governors and

²⁷ Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 1994), p. 99.

Hamidian agents, and the release of the political prisoners as had happened in Trabzon, Bursa, Konya and various other provinces, for the cause of liberty.

“Liberty” (*hürriyet*) and “tyranny” (*istibdat*) were the words most widely referred to in order to differentiate the new era of constitutional monarchy from the old absolutist one. The logo of *Anadolu*, which was “*Mebde-i tarih-i hürriyet-i Osmaniye 10 Temmuz sene 1*” (The date of the commencement of Ottoman freedom: 23 July 1), referred the first day of the new constitutional regime as the beginning of “Ottoman freedom” and denoted it as the beginning of a new history. People very often replaced “proclamation of the Constitution” by “proclamation of liberty.” Hence, apart from the political meanings of these words, it is of immense importance to appreciate what did the people understand under these two concepts of “liberty” and “tyranny” in terms of their feelings and expectations.

Basically depending on my readings of the local newspaper *Anadolu* between August and December 1908, I will try to analyze a peripheral discourse of liberty and tyranny in Konya. The basic expectation of the people in the “era of liberty” can be summarized as justice and development. These were the good-old request of any society; however for the first time in Ottoman history, the people in Konya got the chance to raise their voices publicly, in the pages of a newspaper. They believed that their wishes would be responded. They had the expectation that their representatives would change the wrongful applications of the old “era of tyranny,” a time when they were not allowed to criticize anything.

Liberty had various meanings. For a peasant, it was being exempt from taxes; for a townsman, an end to bribery, better municipal services; and for a bureaucrat, promotion by competence. After 30 years of oppression the people had the chance to raise

their voices in a public sphere. They wrote many complaints to the local newspaper asking them to be corrected “in this era of freedom,” as it was commonly referred to. The followings illustrate some examples of them.

Justice and Development

An article written by Mehmet Vehbi Efendi of Hadim²⁸ reflected expectations from liberty. His article was written in the context of the appointment of a new governor to Konya following the Revolution; it portrayed the priorities of his day. His article started with a call to be cautious and prudent. Some people in the city of Konya put pressure on the new governor Nazım Pasha²⁹ to dismiss some bureaucrats of the old regime. Mehmet Efendi said that the new governor would certainly warn those bureaucrats who had become used to abusing their offices and if they would not correct themselves, they would be fired. Mehmet Efendi stated that although he understood the people because of the injustices committed in the era of tyranny, he asked still not to put pressure on the governor for such small, unimportant matters. There were many significant jobs waiting for the new governor. Mehmet Vehbi Efendi also made a list of four articles of these significant jobs. First, roads should be repaired and constructed. Second, there were funds for the mosques and *medreses*, where some amount of money

²⁸ Hadimli Mehmet Vehbi [Çelik] Efendi is a famous religious leader in Konya; he will become an MP in 1908, and later in the last Ottoman Parliament that opened in 12 January 1920, and in the first Grand National Parliament (1920-1923). Ahmet Atalay, *Millî Mücadele’de Konya Kuvâ-yı Milliyecileri*, vol. I, 2 vols. (Konya: Damla Ofset, 1997), p. 5 and 44. Also see Fahri Çoker, *Türk Parlamento Tarihi: Millî Mücadele ve T.B.M.M. Birinci Dönem*, vol. III, 3 vols. (Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1995), pp. 675-76.

²⁹ The new governor comes from Halep to Konya on 29 Eylül 1324 (12 October 1908). See *Anadolu*, 17 Eylül 1324 (30 September 1908), p. 1, and also 30 Eylül 1324 (13 October 1908), p. 1.

had accumulated. They should be restored with this money. Third, fountains were in bad condition and drinking water should be brought under more hygienic conditions and had to be protected from the sun. And last, the means necessary to improve agriculture and trade should be perfected.³⁰

Mehmet Vehbi Efendi ended his article by summarizing that what mattered in the “era of liberty” was the comfort of the subjects of the Sultan and preventing those who harmed others. No one should have any doubt about it, he assured, that authorities would not hesitate to take the necessary measures to realize these objectives. He hoped that complying with the *şeriat*, which ordered avoiding unfairness and preventing the oppression of the servants of God, the governor and other responsible authorities would no longer allow injustices. Therefore there was no reason for unrest and tension.³¹

Another article summarized the change that liberty brought in the perception of state and society. It explained that in the past it had been believed that individuals and society were there for the good of the state, as in Rome. However, the article continued, later it was understood that the state was there for the good of society. “The sheep is not there for the shepherd but the shepherd is there for the sheep,” a verse of the Persian poet Şirazi, was given as an example that referred to this fact.³² The Ottomans, continued the article, were not free until 23 July 1908 because until then, there were unjust courts and state agents, which were counterparts of the Inquisition that destroyed the human thought. The article encouraged the people to work hard in order to reach the

³⁰ *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2.

³¹ “Devr-i hürriyete lazım gelen bütün reyanın istirahatı ve muzır olanların ezrarını def’in çaresi aranmak emr-i ehemmi olduğunda ahad-i nasın tereddüdü yok ki evliya-i umurun tereddüdü olsun, şu halde zararı izale lâzım ve ibadullah üzerinden zulmü def’ ve ref’ vacibdir kaide-yi şerriyesine bi’r-riaye müsamaha da etmezler ümidini beslediğimiz bir zamanda kargaşalık etmemek lazıme-i haldendir.” *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³² “Koyun çoban için değil, çoban koyun içindir.” *Hakem*, 26 şubat 1324 (11 March 1909), p. 2.

honorable place of Japan because the Ottoman nation was free now having no barriers before it to attain happiness and wealth.³³

A lawyer in Konya informed the readers that there was a great deal of uncultivated land in Konya. These had fallen into the hands of usurpers in the “era of tyranny.” He asked whether, in this “era of liberty,” these lands would still fall in their hands. The lawyer said that the abuse of uncultivated public lands had been concealed until today, but that now he had brought it into light thanks to liberty.³⁴

İstibdad (tyranny), the ancient regime, had also turned the beneficial public works (*âsâr-ı nâfia ve hayriye*) into a system of profiteering by abusing office. The newspaper alleged that it was known by experts that what the water company promised to do for 19,500,000 francs – which corresponded to 926,000 liras – could be done for 300,000 liras. It also criticized the company for not working; that one of the two controllers of the company was even absent; and that the company employed Austrian workers and not local ones. The newspaper warned the water company that now that the “curtains of tyranny” had been drawn back, they would be under close observation.³⁵

There emerged also instances where the limits of liberty were discussed. A report in *Anadolu* reflected the reaction of the newspaper to the ban of playing backgammon (*tavla*) in coffeehouses in Karaman. It can be read as a snapshot of the tension between the freedom of the individual and the duty of the state to protect its

³³ Ibid., p. 2.

³⁴ “İşte şu hal şimdikiye kadar perde-i hafada iken nail olduğumuz hürriyet sayesinde meydan-ı aleniyete koydum.” *Anadolu*, ? Eylül 1324 (? September 1908) No: 10, p. 4.

³⁵ *Anadolu*, 23 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (5 November 1908), p. 2. The mentioned water company should be the German company that was constructing Anatolian railway. The company had decided to irrigate Konya expecting that the development of agricultural wealth would increase its railway traffic. According to some estimates the irrigation system would cost 21,000,000 francs. See, Charles Issawi, *The Economic History of Turkey, 1800-1914* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 229-31.

citizens' material and mental health. The newspaper said that though such games – even if they were not played with the purpose of gambling – were never advised, their ban was astonishing because “everyone is free what he wants to do provided he does not violate other people's rights.”³⁶

Liberty also created an opportunity to speak up in the military against unlawful actions of some officers who used to abuse their offices in the old era. In 16 November 1908 edition of *Anadolu* an officer³⁷ denounced that almost all officers in reserve battalions used to take “gifts” from the people under their command when they had the opportunity to do so. This was true especially for those officers stationed in Anatolia. In addition, the denunciation went on, whenever a scrupulous captain or lieutenant (*mülazım*) would raise an objection, he would be indicted for disobedience, as if superiors were always right. The officer suggested that “if it *materially*³⁸ reveals that some have still ideas appropriate to the ‘era of tyranny’ they should be transferred [from reserve] to regular battalions.”³⁹ If his suggestion were not put into practice, he argued, “those who reformed and disciplined themselves ... after the proclamation of the

³⁶ “Herkes ahirinin hukukuna tecavüz etmemek şartıyla hürdür.” *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 3.

³⁷ According to a reply to this officer published in *Anadolu*, the officer is Cemil Bey who was a captain in the fourth company of the Battalion. See *Anadolu*, 13 teşrin-i sani 1324 (26 November 1908), p. 3.

³⁸ My emphasis.

³⁹ “Şu zaman-ı hürriyette de redif ümera ve zabitanından yine devr-i istibdada layık efkar-ı sakimeye malik oldukları maddeten tebeyyün edenler bulunursa görecekları cezayı sezalarından evvel göz önünde bulundurulmak üzere heman nizamiye taburlarına nakilleri icra edilirse kabiliyetli olanlarının hem ıslah-ı nefislerini bâdi ve hem de diğerklerine de ibret olmak üzere kafidir.” *Anadolu*, 3 teşrin-i sani 1324 (16 November 1908), p. 2.

Constitution,”⁴⁰ would return to their bad habits. He added that once it was proved, any wrong-doing had to be penalized irrespective of titles.

In the eyes of this officer, tyranny referred to the misuse of the office. “Ideas which fit the era of tyranny (*devr-i istibdada layik fikirler*)” referred to abusing one’s authority for personal interest. His insistence that crimes had to be materially proven may be evaluated as a reinforcement of the respected position of justice in the Ottoman state discourse by the proclamation of the Constitution. The most striking aspect of the whole complaint, however, is that the officer dared to question the hierarchical structure of the military. The military hierarchy was not questioned per se, but in the context of the unlawful action of the superiors. Whenever this hierarchy had been questioned in the old regime due to ethical concerns, he reported, the superior had replied: “I am the superior. Wrong or right, my orders must be obeyed.”⁴¹ The effect of the perception of the new era of liberty was so powerful that the officer had felt encouraged to question the essence of the military, which is unconditional obedience to the superior. In his denunciation Cemil Bey also had a definite target which was the *kolağası* Ahmed Rüşdü. He was the representative of the major of the Sille Reserve Battalion. *Kolağası* Ahmed Bey was accused of establishing a branch of the CUP in his own service, in addition to the abuse of his office and injustices committed against the local people. For sure, the truthfulness of the mentioned accusations and complaints cannot be checked. However, these were issues which could not be publicized in the pages of a newspaper in the era of tyranny to make the responsables to take action against them.

⁴⁰ “Kanun-u esasinin ilanından sonra gerek korkularından olsun ve gerekse hamiyetleri muktezasıyla olsun her cihetle ıslah-ı nefis etmiş bulunanlardan” Ibid., p. 2.

⁴¹ “Ben mafevkim, hata sevap, benim dediğim olacak.” Ibid., p. 2.

The fictional conversation between a peasant and a townsman, written by Ahmet Rıfat, illustrated a complaint about the vagueness of the meaning of “liberty.” In this conversation, in order to explain the meaning of “liberty” to the peasant, the townsman referred to words such as happiness, felicity, and prosperity. However, the peasant was not satisfied with such explanations and asked for more concrete accounts. “After the liberty,” replied the townsman, things “will be done *in the order of law* without oppressing and tormenting people and *in full speed*.”⁴² In addition to the law and order, the answer of the townsman added a new aspect to the perception of, or more properly, to the expectations from liberty among the city dwellers. This was clearly a complaint about the slowly functioning bureaucracy. Under the banner of liberty, the citizen asked speed in bureaucratic procedures.

The same fictional discussion between the peasant and the townsman indicated that the reception of liberty was most “materialistic” and straightforward on the level of the peasants. The first expectation of the peasant from liberty was exemption from the age-old tax burden. The peasant expressed his astonishment that liberty had been proclaimed in Konya, since “oppressions and arbitrary taxes” were still in effect.⁴³ Similarly Sadı Bey, the head of the district of Seydişehir, complained that a Christian *mültezim* (tax collector) was asked by the people and *ihiyar heyeti* (council of the elderly) of a village whether it was correct that they would not have to pay taxes since there was freedom now.⁴⁴ Another interesting article sent by a peasant himself to

⁴² “Bundan sonra [hürriyetten sonra] işler *kanun dairesinde* kimseye zulm ve işkence etmeksizin *kemal-i süratle* yapılacak” ; emphasis mine. *Anadolu*, 19 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (1 November 1908), p. 2.

⁴³ “Hala eskisi gibi zulümler, keyfi vergiler duruyor da, hürriyetin Konya’da ilan olduğuna inanmıyorum.” *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁴⁴ *Anadolu*, 13 eylül 1324 (26 September 1908), p. 3.

Anadolu indicated how straightforward some peasants had appreciated liberty in the first instance and how difficult it was to communicate them the message of the new regime. It recounts how, when the *imam* of a village read articles of *Anadolu* to the peasants about the new regime, some of the peasants even thought and were happy that they themselves were going to the Parliament.⁴⁵

“Tyranny” was seen as being responsible for industrial backwardness, which was felt increasingly during the boycott of Austrian goods. İlgin *mal müdürü* (official responsible for state goods) wondered that what they would do if they could not buy Austrian goods as Konya did not have any industry, but only agriculture and livestock. He criticized the past regime, emphasizing that there was no doubt that the reason for the present backwardness was the “curtain that tyranny had drawn down in front of their eyes.” The *mal müdürü* declared that they were now in “a new era;” they should unite against Austria and establish their native industry.⁴⁶

One article linked liberty directly to “free will.” Levon Tamiz Eryan, in an article in *Anadolu*, after making a list of what had been reached with the Revolution, such as peace, justice, equality and many other “benefits,” he related liberty to the ability of using one’s free will. He wrote that the happiest time for a person was time (“time” in the sense of an era or maybe a regime) where he was able to use his free will as he wished. This was a time where there was freedom of thought and people were free from surpers, continued Levon Efendi; in order to keep this happiness people should elect honest and able deputies who would protect the Constitution.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 2.

⁴⁶ *Anadolu*, 23 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (5 November 1908), p. 3.

⁴⁷ *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2-3. For the source see Appendix E.

Along these reports where the concepts of “liberty” and “tyranny” were directly referred, elections also have to be mentioned as the natural outcome of the “era of liberty.” Elections and deputies were given utmost importance; the people set their hope on them to solve their problems. Who should be elected and what should be the features of the candidates were discussed in detail in *Anadolu*. The importance of the Constitution and the representatives in the eyes of the people and what were expected from them will be handled separately in the third chapter. It will be enough here to note that the Constitution and the representatives were expected to remedy all kinds of cruelties, inequalities, favoritisms, and underdevelopment. Therefore representatives should be elected among those who were intelligent, able, and who had a “firm grasp of the local state of affairs.” He had to know all of the administrative units of the province, comprehend their needs, and be able to decide what types of initiatives would lead to their prosperity. After the Parliament was opened the local newspapers of Konya followed the discussions in the Parliament and gave summaries of them.

Another aspect of liberty, which was given emphasis in the newspaper, was *tevsi-i mezuniyet* (extension of local authority) and the General Provincial Council (*Meclis-i Umumi-i Vilayet*). *Anadolu* welcomed the Provincial Council as a natural outcome of its constitutional right under the Article 108, which stated that the provinces would be governed according to the rule of *tevsi-i mezuniyet*.⁴⁸ Articles 109-111 arranged the duties and limits of the Provincial Councils, which basically concerned the commercial,

⁴⁸ *Anadolu*, 29 kanun-u evvel 1324 (11 January 1909), p. 2. “Madde 108 — Vilâyatın usul-ü idaresi, tevsi-i mezuniyet ve tefrik-i vezayif kaidesi üzerine müesses olup derecatı nizam-ı mahsus ile tayin kılınacaktır.” See Şeref Gözübüyük, *Türk Anayasa Metinleri, 1839-1980*, 2nd ed. (Ankara: A.Ü.S.B.F, 1982), p. 41.

agricultural, infrastructural and educational development of the Province.⁴⁹ The newspaper regarded the General Provincial Council as a sample of the Parliament, where decisions are taken to develop the province. The elected members of the General Provincial Council were expected to prepare articles that will lead to construction of roads, improvement of agriculture and trade, uprightness of officials, justice in the courts, seriousness in collecting tax revenues, fairness in the taxes, increased power in the police, and improvement of education.⁵⁰

High Expectations and Early Disappointments

High expectations from liberty to solve quickly the daily problems of the people resulted also in untimely disappointments. Beside the frustration of the peasant with the continuing taxes, the first close dissatisfaction with liberty in the pages of *Anadolu* pertained to what “development” had been achieved since the proclamation of liberty. The mentioned development related to economic investments. Concrete examples, such as bringing agricultural machines, improving roads and employing more motor vehicles in order to increase the trade volume, were given. All of these were possible and could be realized, continued *Anadolu* in order to gave hope to its reader, but what was needed was sustained effort.⁵¹

Another example of disappointment in the era of liberty, this time more vehement, was written by *Hacı Mehmet Efendizade Sadık Efendi* of Akseki in the first

⁴⁹ See, *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

⁵⁰ *Anadolu*, 23 kanun-u sani 1324 (5 February 1909), p. 1.

⁵¹ *Anadolu*, 13 teşrin-i sani 1324 (26 November 1908), p. 2.

week of December. He thought that after tyranny was destroyed, people would appreciate the value of Constitutionalism and would pursue their goals in accordance with the Constitution. Unfortunately, he cried, there were still bureaucrats who could not appreciate this blessing. In short, the *kaymakam* (official charged with governing a provincial district) of Akseki, though he had been degraded twice, had been appointed to Akseki as *kaymakam* again by the special favor of Memduh Pasha.⁵² As for the representative of the local judge, he was merely a loyal servant of the *kaymakam*. “And regarding the *mal müdürü* since he is from the local notables,” Sadık Efendi alleged, “he is, from the most influential despots whose malicious administration is impossible to describe.” He asked the governor of Konya whether they would still groan in this era of liberty as in the era of tyranny.⁵³

The Concepts of “Liberty” and “Tyranny” – Concluding Remarks

First of all, in the pages of the newspaper liberty denoted a space which was exempt from the interference of individual power-holders and usurpers. In this space citizens could criticize them. The attempts of the people to criticize and complain about the officials and usurpers indicated two things. First, they felt themselves secure of the probable subsequent harm of the criticized, and second, they had the hope that their criticisms would be heard and responded to by the authorities.

⁵² Former governor of Konya, from 1887-1889. Later, Minister of Interior for 13 years. See, Hanefi Aytekin, *İz Birakan 100 Ünlü Konya Valisi* (Konya: Ülkü Basımevi, 1994).

⁵³ *Anadolu*, 24 teşrin-i sani 1324 (7 December 1908), pp. 3-4.

The range of events categorized under the terms of “liberty” and “tyranny” was so wide that included bureaucracy, economy, infrastructure, municipal services, education, judiciary etc. The 30 years of absolutism, the “era of tyranny,” was identified as the cause of all shortcomings and injustices in these areas, which directly related to the daily life of the people. People, and especially the townsman, wanted order and speed in bureaucracy, justice in the courts, improvement in agriculture and trade, good education for their children, they simply wanted to drink hygienic water, they wanted the state to serve them and not merely vice-versa. Liberty was expected to remedy all of these. They gave great importance to elections, the blessing par-excellence of liberty, both at national and provincial levels, believing that they can solve their problems best by their own; “in this era of liberty” they wanted to govern themselves.

Tenvir: Efforts of the CUP to Explain Liberty and the Committee

The CUP Delegation in the Province of Konya

The second issue of *Anadolu* gave a detailed history of Major Mehmet Tahir Bey (1861-1925) from Bursa, who, with his friends was to visit Konya as the representative of the CUP. He had served as the director of the military schools in Manastır (between 1899-1907). In March 1907, he was appointed as major to the Alaşehir battalion in İzmir, where there was a program for constituting second class battalions. Later on, in August 1907, he was appointed judge to the Military Court in İzmir. In this one year in İzmir he had the opportunity to spread the seeds of the Committee. The newspaper referred to him several times as “one of the founders of the sacred Committee.” He had a very good

relationship with Dr. Nazım Bey – another famous Unionist – in İzmir. Many reports by Hamidian agents were written on him; he was denounced four times during his stay in Manastır, twice in Selanik and once in İzmir just a few days before the proclamation of liberty. He had published a dozen of books on history, literature and sufism. He was competent in Arabic, Persian and French.⁵⁴ Mehmet Tahir Bey's works and ideas served to the spread of Turkism later on. He was a founding member of *Türk Derneği* (Turkish Association) that was established in 25 December 1908. Tahir Bey wrote many bibliographic works mainly dedicated to demonstrate that many Turks had served to various religious and natural sciences. He also belonged to *Melamî* order and was a prominent figure of the order in Manastır. He was elected a Member of the Parliament in 1908 representing his hometown, Bursa. He did not return to politics after the Parliament was dissolved in 1912 due to some contradictions concerning the CUP, and dedicated itself to publishing bibliographic works.⁵⁵ These contradictions may concern his traditional-religious character. Smiliar to Colonal Sadık, who was a leader in *Hizb-i Cedid* (the New Party), the traditional-religious offshoot of the CUP, Tahir Bey was also a *Melamî*.⁵⁶

The CUP delegation sent by the Selanik headquarters to Konya was one of the many which were sent to the provinces to “instruct the population on the nature of its rights and duties, the Unionist program, and to assist in the selection of candidates.”⁵⁷

⁵⁴ *Anadolu*, ? ağustos 1324 (? September 1908), No. 2, p. 1-2. For a list of his books see Appendix E.

⁵⁵ Ömer Faruk Akün, "Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir," in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1992), pp. 452-54.

⁵⁶ For the New Party and Colonal Sadık see Ahmad, pp. 86-88.

⁵⁷ Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 196.

The 16 September 1908 edition of the local Konya newspaper, *Anadolu*, welcomed the delegation. The delegation was lead by Major Tahir Bey; he was accompanied by Lieutenant Faik Efendi and their secretary, Hakkı Bey.⁵⁸ They visited various towns in the province of Konya. Their target audience included peasants, religious authorities, governmental officials and minorities. Their visits functioned as election campaign as well, which will be described in detail below.

While in Konya, they gave speeches in Liberty Square in front of the local governmental building of Konya, in various churches and schools, and in the lecture room of the School of Industry.⁵⁹ Unfortunately, there is not much information on the content of these specific speeches given in Konya, the capital of the Province.

The CUP and the Cemiyet-i İlmiye in Konya

The delegation was to pay a special visit to the *ulema* in Konya. A telegraph sent by the *Cemiyet-i İlmiye* (the Society for the *Ulema*), to the İstanbul, Selanik, and İzmir branches of the CUP indicates that prior to the visit of the delegation – which was sent by the order of the Selanik headquarters – there was a disagreement in Konya. When the delegation came and clarified the message of the Committee and informed and advised the population in accordance with the Constitution and *şeriat*, especially the *ulema* were pleased. From then on, the telegraph informs, there was a general agreement in Konya.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Though not less than three the exact number of the delegation is unclear. The secretary Hakkı Bey is mentioned only once in *Anadolu*, 5 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (18 October 1908), p. 4.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁶⁰ *Anadolu*, 6 eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 4. For the telegraph see Appendix E.

There are signs that in the first instance the foundation of the *Cemiyet-i İlmiye* was considered as an alternative to the CUP. A comment on the telegraph published in *Anadolu* stated that the purpose of the *Cemiyet-i İlmiye*, which had been founded to preserve the Constitution and to improve education, was unfortunately misunderstood. It said that after the conversation among Tahir Bey, Faik Bey and the *ulema*, the truth that both committees shared the same goals came to light.⁶¹

Peasants

The delegation had immense problems in communicating with the peasants. Lawyer Mehmet Bey congratulated the delegation in an article published in *Anadolu* for their efforts to spread the message of the CUP to the peasants by their usage of simple and clear language. Yet Mehmet Bey complained that even though Major Tahir Bey tried to clarify the beneficial goals of the Committee and the new regime by using simple language and frequently repeating his message, the peasants had not fully comprehended his speech and were asking each other whether someone could give a clearer summary.⁶²

The delegation continued its visits in the province of Konya through Karaman, Ereğli and Niğde. *Anadolu* described the aim of the visits as “calling people to ask for

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 4.

⁶² *Anadolu*, 3 Eylül 1324 (16 September 1908), p. 3.

the realization of ideas related to liberty, and spreading the voice of the Committee and exalting it.”⁶³

Karaman

The welcoming ceremony of Karaman had begun already in Konya. About 80 eminent people from Karaman had come to Konya on the day of the delegation’s departure in order to welcome the delegation and accompany them on their way to Karaman. As an exception, the train company sponsored the tickets.⁶⁴ In Karaman they were appreciated brilliantly. Thousands of people came to the train station from all *millet*s (religious communities), including Armenian and Greek school boys. School boys were singing and bands were playing, the crowd was very slowly moving towards the city center shouting “long live liberty, justice, equality and the Committee!” First of all, a speech for the masses was given. Key points in this speech were that the “era of tyranny” had come to an end and “a new era of happiness” began. Emphasizing the focus on the future instead of dealing with the past, Tahir Bey advised that each one had to keep calm and be mild, and thus hearts would bond to each other and create a union.⁶⁵

Following these general points, the people of Karaman were called on to be careful in the elections of the representatives. Since there was liberty and people had obtained their free-will, the speech went on, they had to look for certain attributes in

⁶³ “Efkar-ı hürriyeti isti’mal, cemiyeti neşr ve i’la.” *Anadolu*, 6 eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 2.

⁶⁴ No number is given.

⁶⁵ “Devr-i istibdada hatime verdiğimiz ve yeni bir devre-i saadete başladığımız şu zamanda düşüneceğimiz ancak istikbalimiz olup bu hususta itidali elden bırakmayarak ibraz-ı hamiyet etmek kalbleri yekdiğerine rabt ile ittihad husule getirmek” *Anadolu*, 5 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (18 October 1908), p. 4.

their representatives. Since the newspaper did not count these attributes, they had to be more or less clichés such as knowledge, capacity, honesty, having a clean history in the past era, and grasping the local state of affairs, which will be discussed separately in the following sections. After the speech, a dinner was given in the town hall for 150 people in honor of the delegation. No information about the dinner was given, yet it is natural to expect that such a dinner must have served the delegation to explain the aims of the Committee and to discuss politics with the notables and officials.

The following day the *medrese* of the head of the *ulema* and the Armenian and Greek schools and churches were visited. After the speech in the Greek Church, Doctor Emanueldisi Efendi expressed the gratitude of the Greek *millet* in Karaman and talked about the special features and virtues of the Greek *millet*, but he used some statements which hurt the other *millets*. The newspaper emphasized that “now all of us [*millets*] are equal. As diversity in religion and sect has *in no way any effect* on our union, which is based on sharing the same fatherland, one cannot deny that *it is only natural* that such kind of ideas will be abandoned.”⁶⁶

The following day officials of the local government were given advice and later that day the delegation returned to the town hall.⁶⁷

Ereğli

⁶⁶ “Şimdi cümlemiz müsavi olup ihtilaf-ı din ve mezheb bizim ittihad-ı vataniyemize *kat’a tesir etmediğinden* bu gibi fikirlerden *vaz geçileceği tabii olduğu inkar olunmaz*” (emphasis is mine) Ibid., p. 4.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 4.

Hearing that the delegation was in Karaman, the Ottoman Club of Union and Progress in Ereğli invited Tahir and Faik Beys to Ereğli.⁶⁸ In Ereğli they were welcomed at the train station by the local Muslim and Christian communities with cheers of “long live liberty, long live justice, long live the Committee!” After the Friday Prayer, Tahir Bey gave a speech in the mosque on liberty and justice through “religious evidences.” The following day, he gave another speech for about an hour to the people who had gathered to celebrate the anniversary of the Sultan’s birth,⁶⁹ on liberty, equality, constitutionalism, parliament and the Committee.⁷⁰

The same day, on 12 September 1908, Tahir Bey gave further speeches in the town hall which most probably addressed governmental officials and probably local notables as well. Following the final and separate speeches in the Greek and Armenian churches, the delegation left Ereğli.⁷¹

Nevşehir

The activities of the CUP were not limited to the visits of the delegation sent from Selanik. Tahir Bey organized a local delegation and sent it to other nearby cities.

Lawyer Levon Efendi, a columnist of *Anadolu*, reported that he started a tour and visited

⁶⁸ *Anadolu*, 6 eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 2.

⁶⁹ Abdulhamid II was born in 16 Şaban 1258 (21 September 1842). See, Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *Osmanlı Padişahları* (İstanbul: Ana Yayınevi, 1981). The anniversary was celebrated on 16 Şaban 1326 Saturday which corresponds to 12 September 1908. This reveals that the delegation reached Ereğli in the morning of Friday, 11 September and left the day after. The news appeared in the newspaper just one week later, on 19 September, which gives us a sense of the time-lag between what was happened and what was published in the province of Konya.

⁷⁰ *Anadolu*, 6 eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 2.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

various districts of Konya such as Ereğli, Aksaray, Nevşehir, and Ürgüp “on the order and approval of Major Tahir Bey who is a founder of the blessed Committee of Union and Progress.”⁷² The aim of the tour was declared as “proclaiming liberty and warning the minds,” which could rightly be interpreted as a part of the efforts of giving the forthcoming elections a Unionist direction. Levon Efendi also wrote that during his visits he met many people who were appropriate to become representatives and gave their names.⁷³

On 19 September of 1908 this delegation, under the leadership of Levon Efendi and Refik Bey, who were entrusted by Tahir Bey, arrived in Nevşehir. İbnü’r-Rüşdü Hayri Bey of Nevşehir, in a letter to *Anadolu*, described the splendid panorama of the welcoming ceremony of the delegation: the streets were full of people, men and women, young and elderly; schoolboys were singing, and flags were waved. The crowd was so emotional that when Refik Bey gave the regards of Major Tahir Bey to them, they began weeping. Most probably the reporter was too enthusiastic in his depiction. The following day, on 20 September, the delegation visited mosques and churches and gave further speeches. Later that day, Levon Efendi addressed the public from the balcony of the municipality, and talked on the responsibilities and duties of the municipality before the people, and the people before the municipality. The speech was so fervent that nobody wanted it to end. The next day on 21 September, a special meeting was held in which civil servants, notables and merchants participated. The delegation again gave such

⁷² “İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyet-i mukaddesesi müessislerinden Binbaşı Tahir Bey hazretlerinin emir ve tensibleriyle ilan-ı hürriyet ve ikaz-ı ezhan için” *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2-3, and also *Anadolu*, 20 eylül 1324 (3 October 1908), p. 4.

⁷³ He gave three names: Müftüzade Kazım Efendi of the *ulema* in the district of Ereğli, Ali Bey in Nevşehir and Nizamettin Efendi of the *ulema* in Aksaray. See, *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2-3.

effective speeches on the “union,” the fruit of which was materialized as the Nevşehir Ottoman Union Club. There emerged “a general agreement,” wrote Hayri Bey, that everyone was embracing. During their presence, the people of Nevşehir met the delegation day and night. They bid a formal farewell on 22 September to the delegation.⁷⁴

Ürgüp

The 18 October edition of *Anadolu* gives another account of Lieutenant Refik and Lawyer Levon Efendi’s visit to Ürgüp, a town near Nevşehir.⁷⁵ Ürgüp also welcomed the delegation with extreme joy and enthusiasm. Similar to the other visits, the delegation made speeches on freedom, equality and justice. Following the public oration, Kumruzade Mustafa Efendi of the (religious) teachers in Ürgüp recited an eloquent pray for “the blessed Committee of Union and Progress, which had worked hard in order to secure the happiness of this noble Ottoman nation.”⁷⁶ Thousands of people from the different religious communities (*cemaat-i muhtelife*) cried “Amen!” full of tears at his prayer. The rather emotional scene was a snapshot describing how far the

⁷⁴ *Anadolu*, 5 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (18 October 1908), p. 3.

⁷⁵ Although the exact date of this visit was not mentioned it had to be happened close to their visit to Nevşehir (19-22 September), if they did not paid a second visit to the area until 18 October. I guess a three weeks delay (from 22 September to 18 October) of publication of the news regarding their visit to Ürgüp is more understandable than the delegation left Nevşehir on 22 September passed to another city without stopping by Ürgüp and then paid a separate visit to the city until 18 October –when the article was published. In addition the article states that the delegation visited Ürgüp by the invitation of the city which strengthens my assumption that Nevşehir and Ürgüp were visited by the delegation consecutively at the end of September.

⁷⁶ “Millet-i necibe-i osmaniyeinin temin-i mesudiyetine himmet eden İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyet-i mukaddesi” *Ibid.*, p. 2.

idea of an “Ottoman nation” had been internalized in Ürgüp, a multi-religious town in the interior of Anatolia: a Muslim religious teacher praying and other religious communities supporting him; and a non-Muslim Levon Efendi giving speeches to the masses consisting of all religious communities on liberty, equality, fraternity and justice. It would be rather naïve to explain the reason of this fraternity with merely a three-month old Revolution, yet it was a sign that the Revolution had created an environment that had gathered the different religious communities around a common cause which was expected to facilitate the construction of an all-equal Ottoman civic citizenship.

Later in the day, speeches were given concerning the duties of the municipality, how to develop industry, improve trade, and work for the progress of the fatherland. As usual, schools in the town, and churches of the various religious communities and their spiritual leaders were visited. In addition, conforming to the wishes of the delegation, a CUP club was established.⁷⁷

The All-Embracing CUP

It is important to note that the delegation did not define pros and cons of the Committee during its visits. This point is important to get a clearer and more historical conception of the CUP. Let’s summarize the message of the CUP delegation given throughout these visits; it revolved around a couple of themes: the blessings of liberty, the Committee’s struggle for the realization of liberty, the necessity of union and economic development, the rights and duties of the state against the citizen and vice-versa, and the need for the people to elect good men for the Parliament. Concerning the

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

elections, no hints were given as to who should be elected or who should be discarded. There was not even a slight implication to encourage people to elect those who were members of the Committee. In fact, in some cases a local branch was established after the arrival of the CUP delegation itself. Parallel to it, as will be analyzed in the next chapter, none of the candidates were introduced in the newspaper *Anadolu* by referring to any political affiliation. Thus, two related questions come to the front; first, why there was no rival voice to the CUP, and why the CUP delegation did not attempt to stimulate people to differentiate between pros and cons of the Committee. There were a number of reasons for this.

First, the CUP was the undoubted champion of the Revolution and more or less perceived as seeking the general good of all Ottomans. It was the loudspeaker of the discourse of liberty and was identified with the new regime. Plus, there was not even a political party of the CUP which would facilitate its labeling as a certain part in conflicting political views. Furthermore, although *Ahrar Fırkası* (Liberal Union), the single rival of the CUP, was established on 14 September 1908, it was, first an early offshoot from the CUP, and second, could not organize in the provinces. The first time that the Liberal Union received mention in *Anadolu* was on 14 December 1908, three months after its foundation and three days before the opening of the Parliament.

Second, organizationally, the CUP had started as a secret committee in Rumelia that did not have much opportunity to ramify in Anatolia, except İstanbul, Trabzon and İzmir.⁷⁸ A front page article in *Anadolu* confessed that before the Revolution “they” (possibly the people of Konya) had not known of the existence of the Committee and

⁷⁸ Şükrü Hanioglu, *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 167-72. Also see Zürcher, p. 99.

therefore had not had the honor to join it.⁷⁹ After the Revolution, however, all kinds of people had rushed into the Committee, making the water more turbid. An article in *Anadolu* on 16 September 1908 complained that everyone rushed to join the Committee, although they did not have any relation to it.⁸⁰

According to the memoirs of Hüseyin Kazım Kadri, who was one of the prominent figures of the CUP, there were no more than eleven Unionists in İstanbul before the Revolution. In order to strengthen its position in the forthcoming elections, the Committee accepted everyone who wanted to be a member of the CUP. Then it was realized that many who would normally not be welcomed in the Committee were able to infiltrate into it. Therefore the CUP decided to “purify” its branches. The task was given to Hüseyin Kazım Bey, in his words:

In the Süleymaniye branch a board was formed, which was composed of two members dispatched from each branch... I carefully examined each of the faces; there was no one among them that I knew. How could one decide upon other members in the branches, whom he does not know, depending on the opinions of others whom he does not know either? Didn't these dispatched members... also enroll into the Committee in order to pursue their own interests? ... When I told them such “purification” was impossible, they attested and confessed my point; and left. Thus the decision of “purification” came to nothing and at that time this issue was never mentioned again.⁸¹

⁷⁹ *Anadolu*, 6 Eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 1.

⁸⁰ *Anadolu*, 3 Eylül 1324 (16 September 1908), p. 2.

Third, although a revolution refers to a break in history, continuities are stronger than discontinuities, especially in social and economic realms. It seems that the delegation was conscious that the outcomes of the elections would be more or less a product of the existing socio-economic structure of Konya. Concrete negative references to specific groups such as the *ulema*, big land owners, merchants, notables or Hamidian bureaucrats would only serve to alienate them. A wiser strategy would be to establish good relationships with those who had a high possibility of election, encouraging them to form an accord with the Committee and trying to give the Parliament a Unionist color as far as possible.

The Meaning of the Visits

The visits of the delegation and mobilization of masses were important at two levels. The first one is at the systemic level (the constitutional regime) and the second one at the sub-systemic level (election campaign in the constitutional regime). On the systemic level, the visits of the CUP delegation and the extremely positive public response to it displayed a concrete symbol of the acceptance of the new regime at the public level. The masses, who were mobilized on the call of the delegation, signed the “contract” between the new regime and Ottoman society. The mass celebrations had the function of both symbolizing and reinforcing the loyalty of the masses to the Constitution. Furthermore, the celebrations welcoming the delegation served to embed the “discourse of liberty and constitutionalism” as the legitimate discourse to make

⁸¹ Hüseyin Kazım Kadri, *Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e Hatıralarım* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1991), pp. 63, 66-67. For original see Appendix E.

politics. Thus illiberal discourses felt obliged to limit or transform themselves so that they conformed to the dominant discourse of liberty and constitutionalism.

On the sub-systemic level, it was significant as a “display of power.” Power impelled the political actors to “behave themselves” in front of the Committee. By bringing out the masses, the Committee “reminded” of its existence in a concrete way. A political organization which has the power of directly reaching the masses could not be skipped over in any political calculation. The display of power pushed the limits of political bargaining for the benefit of the Committee. The powerful the CUP was perceived, the more it had the ability to subordinate inclinations which would have had an uneasy relationship with the Committee.

Conclusion

To sum up, the delegation did not define an opponent in its visits; there was no talk about the pros or cons of the Committee. Yet, the Committee enjoyed utmost prestige; it had freed the nation from the yoke of tyranny. Its ambiguous boundaries, on the one side, and its magnificence on the other, created such an environment which was too early to produce opponents and enabled it to embrace a large range of people. This fact is asserted as a reminder that later separations from the CUP should not be followed back into early days of the Revolution. Second, mass celebrations welcoming the delegation further strengthened the discourse of liberty and constitutionalism, hence the new regime. Last, in addition to an activity of political education, the visits of the CUP delegation in Konya functioned also as election campaigns.

CHAPTER III

THE 1908 ELECTIONS IN KONYA

Elections before the First World War, stresses Aykut Kansu, have not been duly discussed and were not subject to profound scrutiny in Turkish social science. “It is interesting to note,” Kansu goes on, “that nothing has been written on the 1908 elections, except for passing references to the elections in Istanbul.”⁸² If we take into account that Efdal Sevinçli had made the same complaint in 1985, the need for a more detailed study becomes clearer.⁸³ Hasan Kayalı indicates that the reason for this underemphasis may pertain to the weakness of political institutions and rumors of interventions in the elections by the CUP which might render a genuine attempt to analyze the elections no more than a speculation. Yet, although the elections may fell short of “democratic” measures, Kayalı goes on, they may help to further clarify social, political and ideological evolution of the Ottoman society.⁸⁴ The account of the 1908 election in

⁸² Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 193.

⁸³ Efdal Sevinçli, "II. Meşrutiyet Seçimleri Öncesinde İzmir'den Bir Ses," *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 9 (1985), p. 16.

⁸⁴ Hasan Kayalı, "Elections and the Electoral Process in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1919," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 27, no. 3 (1995), p. 265.

Konya, based on its local newspaper *Anadolu*, would contribute to a more detailed description of the electoral atmosphere and provide data for more profound analyses of the social and political structure of the heartland of Anatolia.

A Short History of Electoral Practices in the Ottoman Empire and the Importance of the 1908 Elections

Though limited in extent and marked by interruptions, the beginnings of popular political participation and electoral practice in Turkish history go back to 1840s. Since then there were established *meclis-i muhassılîns*, which were entrusted to supervise tax-collection. Along with officials and religious leaders these councils included elected members. At the village level 5 voters were chosen by drawing lot; at the district level, depending on the size, 20-50 “reasonable, property-owner” people would come together and elect the candidates.⁸⁵ In practice, however, the election was directed by the local notables. Nevertheless these were the first institutionalized bodies in which elected people were participated.

Another development concerning popular political participation was a result of the reorganization of the non-Muslim *millet*s, namely the Armenians, Greeks and Jews, in the early 1860s. For each *millet* a constitution was prepared, which introduced a general assembly for each that based, though in a very limited way, on popular elections. Written constitutions of non-Muslim *millet*s and their electoral practices, Roderic Davison argues, had also served a kind of repertoire providing imaginations and

⁸⁵ For the regulation see A. Vefik, *Tekâlif Kavaidi, II* (Dersaadet, 1330), p. 77 ff; Reşat Kaynar, *Mustafa Reşit Paşa ve Tanzimat* (Ankara, 1985), pp. 229-257. Quoted in Fevzi Demir, *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Meclis-i Mebusan Seçimleri (1908-1914)* (Ph.d diss, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 1994), p. 8 footnote 19.

concepts concerning constitution, national parliament, and popular representation. Namık Kemal, for instance, who had participated in the commission that worked on the 1876 Constitution, had referred to the assemblies of the Christian *millet*s as models for the Parliament.⁸⁶

In addition to *meclis-i muhassılîns*, the reorganization of the *millet*s along popularly represented bodies, suggests Davison, had a further impact on the reform of the provincial administration in which popularly elected administrative councils were instituted.⁸⁷ Although the *Hatt-ı Hümayun* of 1856 promised “freedom of voting” in the communal councils, the necessary steps had not been taken until 8 November 1864 when the Provincial Law was issued.⁸⁸ For our purposes, the importance of this law lies in the fact that it set up provincial institutions based on the principle of representation. These were basically three: the first was *meclis-i idare* (administrative council); it was attached to the administrator of each province, sub-province and district, and was of advisory nature. The second was the civil and criminal court on the levels of province, sub-province and district. The last one was *meclis-i umumî* (general assembly) established for each province and which had also a consultative function. Reduced to a consultative body, the system was far from being a democratic participation not only in its executive aspect but also in its electoral aspect as the system was basically founded on a procedure of “elimination” of the candidates who were nominated by the administrative offices; plus there were quotas for religious leaders and governmental

⁸⁶ Roderic H. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 134-5.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

officials, which, in turn, sharply diminished the influence of the electors.⁸⁹ Furthermore one had to pay a direct tax of 500 *kuruş*, which was a considerable amount but not higher than its western counterparts,⁹⁰ in order to be a member of provincial councils, 250 *kuruş* for sub-provincial, and 150 *kuruş* for district level councils. In addition, literacy, a minimum limit of age of 30 years and high esteem among local people was required. In practice, Kayalı argues, the principle of election could not overcome the weight of the religious leaders in *millet* assemblies and the central bureaucracy in administrative councils.⁹¹

Although the proclamation of the 1876 Constitution was a turning point in terms of the parliamentary regime and participation in the central decision mechanism on the part of the “people,” it could not bring about a significant change in the election practice. Because of the seriousness of national and international environment⁹² Midhat Pasha urgently wanted elections to start. A provisional electoral law, *Talimat-ı Muvakkate*, was issued on 28 October 1876 even before the draft of the Constitution was prepared.⁹³ Because of the immediacy, the provisional law assumed the members of the administrative councils as “the result of popular suffrage” and let them work as an Electoral College voting for the representatives in the Parliament. Though the electoral process of the members of the administrative councils that had been issued in 1864 was

⁸⁹ For a detailed account of the electoral procedure see *Ibid.*, pp. 147-150.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

⁹¹ Kayalı, p. 266.

⁹² There was pressure from the Great Powers asking for more concessions for Balkan Christians, Russia was preparing for war, and there was contestation within the Empire on the content of the Constitution.

⁹³ Whereas Davison and Demir give the date as 28 October, Kayalı gives it as 29 October. Compare Davison, p. 374, Kayalı, p. 266 and Demir, p. 11.

revised in 30 December 1875, the officials were still very effective on deciding on the members.⁹⁴

The Constitution of 1876 founded two chambers, *Heyet-i Ayan*, the nominated Senate, and *Heyet-i Mebusan*, the elected Parliament. The requirements for eligibility were similar to those listed in the Provisional Law of 1864; only a new requirement of owning an indefinite amount of estate was introduced and the minimum age limit was reduced to 25.⁹⁵ One important aspect of the Parliament was its fixed size of 130 members. Representatives were distributed to the provinces according to their proportion of population. However, foreign pressure resulted in larger quotas for non-Muslims than the Muslims.⁹⁶ While the Parliament was working on a new indirect two-stage electoral system, it was closed and a second election occurred in 1877 on the previous regulations, which resulted again in a Parliament the members of which were elected by administrative councils. Kayalı argues that the results of the elections would not be any different had the new electoral system been introduced, because of local patronage relations, officials' interventions, and a politically uninformed public because of the lack of political parties, free press and freedom of association.⁹⁷

30 years after the dissolution of the Parliament by Abdulhamid II in 14 February 1878, in 1908 the Constitution of 1876 was restored and the two-stage electoral system, which had been discussed in the first Parliament of 1877, was put into practice. The electoral law was altered to increase the level of representation. First of all quotas based

⁹⁴ For the change in the electoral process see Davison, p. 375 and also footnote 70.

⁹⁵ Kayalı, pp. 266-7. and Demir, p. 11.

⁹⁶ Kayalı, p. 267.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

on religion were eliminated, an act reflecting the emphasis of the Young Turks on the secular Ottoman identity.⁹⁸ Parallel to it, the fixed size of the Parliament was replaced by one representative for every 50,000 males. Although too vague to be applied, the constitutional clause requiring ability in Turkish for the representative was preserved as it was formulated in the Constitution of 1876. Basically all males older than 25 who paid “some amount of direct tax” were entitled to vote as *müntehib-i evvels* (primary voter) to elect *müntehib-i sanis* (secondary voter); nevertheless, secondary voters and candidates for representative were not required to be tax-payers. Every secondary voter, who would elect the representatives, was representing 500 primary voters.⁹⁹

Although the two-staged system was still exposed to patronage relationships and influence of the eminent people,¹⁰⁰ similar to the elections of the first constitutional period in which administrative councils had acted as secondary voters, it nevertheless displayed quite well a development in legal terms. More important, however, were elements of modern political life that accompanied the 1908 election, namely political parties and committees, such as the CUP, *Ahrar Fırkası* (the Liberal Union), their branches, and various other civil organizations; electoral activities such as campaigns and articles in newspapers, all of which helped to stimulate public opinion.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 268.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 269. For a more detailed account of the new electoral law see Demir, pp. 24-8.

¹⁰⁰ Kayalı, p. 269, also see Demir, p. 29.

¹⁰¹ Demir, p. 13.

1908 Elections in Konya

On 3 August 1908 the election law was sent to the sub-provinces giving the start for elections, which would continue about 4 months until 17 December 1908 when the Parliament was opened. The province of Konya was given 13 seats in the Parliament, 5 for the central sub-province of Konya, 3 for Niğde, 2 for Teke [Antalya], 2 for Hamidabad [Isparta] and 1 seat for Burdur. Fevzi Demir, aware of his making a generalization, guesses that during August, lists of candidates should have been prepared. Elections of secondary voters should have been continued from mid-September until the end of October, and representatives should have been elected between November and early-December. Therefore, he guesses, electoral activity reached its peak during November and December.¹⁰² In the province of Konya this time-table was compressed between August and early November, as it will be described below.

The information that is found in the newspaper does not allow easily tracing the electoral process, yet when some scattered dates are brought together, a meaningful picture may be drawn. Tahir Bey, the head of the CUP delegation to the province of Konya, and a second delegation entrusted by Tahir Bey completed their visits in September. They visited Konya (the central district), Karaman, and Ereğli in the sub-province of Konya; and Niğde, Nevşehir, and Ürgüp in the sub-province of Niğde, the details of which were described in the second chapter.

¹⁰² Ibid., 32.

The names of the candidates started to appear in the newspaper in September and continued until the elections had ended in early November. By 25 October, about two weeks before the elections had completed in the province of Konya (except two provinces), *Anadolu* reported 25 candidates who run for a seat in the Parliament.¹⁰³ The titles before the candidate's name indicated his occupational background. According to it, 7 of them have their careers in the bureaucracy excluding the judicial branch; 6 have a judicial background, one of them also well-educated in religious sciences;¹⁰⁴ 9 of the candidates have a religious background, serving as *müftüs*, religious teachers or being leaders of *sufi* orders; and 2, having no titles, may be of the notables. As the numbers indicate, the *ulema* seemed to be most willing in Konya to participate in the parliamentary politics, who were followed by the bureaucrats and judicial functionaries. 3 of the 7 candidates who had a judicial background were non-Muslims. Though no occupational clue was given, one further non-Muslim candidate was also nominated, making up the proportion of the non-Muslims to Muslims 4 to 21.

Although Konya was one of the centers of the *Mevlevi* order no *Mevlevi* leader ran for the elections. *Anadolu* mentions a *Mevlevi* leader Vacid Çelebizade Saadeddin Çelebi of the Halep *Mevlevi* Lodge as one who deserve a seat in the Parliament.¹⁰⁵ His family was originally from Konya. He was appointed to the Halep Lodge as its leader on

¹⁰³ For a list who were presented in *Anadolu* and who declared his candidacy see Appendix B and C.

¹⁰⁴ Ürgüplü Mustafa Hayri Bey, who would become the *Şeyhülislam* of the CUP government between 1914 and 1916.

¹⁰⁵ *Anadolu*, 13 eylül 1324 (26 September 1908), p. 4.

28 August 1908 replacing Âmil Çelebi who had good relations with the old regime and accused several time abusing his post for self-benefit.¹⁰⁶

The 18 October issue of *Anadolu* reported that although in many smaller cities secondary voters had been elected and the process for voting for the representatives had begun, the municipality of Konya did not elect the *heyet-i teftişiye* (the board of inspection) yet.¹⁰⁷ The board had to be elected from the members of the *belediye meclisi* (municipal council), and was charged to supervise the elections in the districts.¹⁰⁸ This delay did not consider other districts; *Anadolu* reported the delay as a defect on the part of the central district of Konya so that in some districts, secondary voters were determined and even the process for electing the representatives had begun.¹⁰⁹ Right after 18 October the board of inspection should have been elected since we drive that in the following two weeks, secondary voters were elected, and they gathered in the central district of Konya on 2 November 1908.¹¹⁰ That week in most sub-provinces elections were completed.

Towards the end of October, there spread rumors that there was an offensive preparation against the Christians. Armenian newspapers wrote a couple of incidents against the Armenians. *Anadolu* claimed that these were mere rumors, and called the Armenian fellow citizens to reply such rumors.¹¹¹ One rumor was that Christians would

¹⁰⁶ Sezai Küçük, *Mevlevîliğin Son Yüzyılı* (İstanbul: Simurg, 2003), pp. 201-03.

¹⁰⁷ *Anadolu*, 5 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (18 November 1908), 2.

¹⁰⁸ Demir, pp. 26-7. The board consisted of 4-6 members depending on the size of the population.

¹⁰⁹ *Anadolu*, 5 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (18 October 1908), p. 2.

¹¹⁰ *Anadolu*, 19 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (1 November 1908), p. 4.

¹¹¹ *Anadolu*, 12 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (25 October 1908), p. 1.

be attacked on 27 October 1908, the first day of *Ramazan* feast.¹¹² The same day, the newspaper *İkdam* wrote that, probably basing on these rumors, some improper conduct indeed had occurred in Konya against the Christians.¹¹³ Yet *Anadolu* refused the claim, and emphasized that such conducts against the Christian people did not happened even in the past era of tyranny, let alone in the new era of liberty. *Anadolu* further alleged that the Christian people themselves attested to the truth that no animosity had happened in Konya.¹¹⁴

By 8 November in all sub-provinces of Konya elections were completed except that of Niğde and Teke [Antalya].¹¹⁵ The 19 November 1908 issue of *Anadolu* reported that elections in the sub-province of Teke [Antalya] were finally over. As to Niğde, there was not a certain date mentioned; however, elections must have been completed long before 4 December 1908 when its representatives came to Konya.¹¹⁶

The election results were as follows:

Sub-Provinces of Konya	Votes
Konya	
Müderresinden Şeyhzade Abidin Efendi	164 ¹¹⁷

¹¹² *Anadolu*, 19 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (1 November 1908), p. 1.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

¹¹⁵ *Anadolu*, 26 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 4.

¹¹⁶ *Anadolu*, 24 teşrin-i sani 1324 (7 December 1908), p. 3.

¹¹⁷ *Anadolu*, 26 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 4.

Hadimli Mehmet Vehbi [Çelik] Efendi	105 ¹¹⁸
Ereğlili Müderrisinden Müftüzade Salim Efendi	80 ¹¹⁹
Meclis-i İdare-i Vilayet Başkatibi Mehmet Emin Efendi	62 ¹²⁰
Akşehirli Kürtzade Hacı Mustafa Efendi	61 ¹²¹
Hamidabad [Isparta]	
Eğirdirden Eşref Efendi	29 ¹²²
Böcüzade Süleyman Sami Bey	25 ¹²³
Burdur	
Muhaddiszade Ömer Lutfi Efendi ¹²⁴	na
Teke [Antalya]	
Ebuzziya Tevfik Bey ¹²⁵	na
Elmalı Osman Efendizade Hamdi [Yazır] Efendi ¹²⁶	na
Niğde	

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 4.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 4.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 4; İhsan Güneş, *Türk Parlamento Tarihi: I. ve II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi*, vol. II, 2 vols. (Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1998), p. 436.

¹²¹ *Anadolu*, 26 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 4.

¹²² Güneş, p. 434. Güneş indicates that Eşref Efendi was elected on 12 November, whereas *Anadolu* already reported on 8 November that he was elected.

¹²³ Güneş, p. 435. Güneş indicates that Sami Bey was elected on 12 November, whereas *Anadolu* already reported on 8 November that he was elected.

¹²⁴ *Anadolu*, 26 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 4; Güneş, 431.

¹²⁵ *Anadolu*, 6 teşrin-i sani 1324 (19 November 1908), p. 4. *Osmanlı Mebusları: 1324-1328*, ([İstanbul]: Ahmed İhsan ve Şürekası, n.d.).

¹²⁶ *Anadolu*, 6 teşrin-i sani 1324 (19 November 1908), p. 4. *Osmanlı Mebusları: 1324-1328*.

Ürgüplü Mustafa Hayri Bey ¹²⁷	na
Muhittin Efendi ¹²⁸	na
Kurtoğlu Yorgaki Efendi ¹²⁹	38 ¹³⁰

The result of the elections proved the willingness of the *ulema* to enter into Parliament having a firm base. Indeed, they became the unquestioned champions of the elections in the sub-province of Konya. By winning four of the five seats in Konya central sub-province and seven (Zeynelabidin, Mehmet Vehbi, Hacı Mustafa, Müftüzade Salim, Ürgüplü Hayri, Ömer Lütfi, Elmalılı Hamdi) of the thirteen seats in the Province, they further strengthened their prestige. Most of the deputies went through a *medrese* education. There was only one local notable (Eşref Ağa). As to the non-Muslims they could win one seat (Yorgaki Efendi) of the three in Niğde, reflecting a fair proportion, where the Orthodox Christian community constituted about a quarter of the population.¹³¹ There was one journalist in exile (Ebuzziya Tefvik Bey) and one retired official (Muhittin Efendi). The rest (Süleyman Sami and Mehmet Emin) were state officials who served in different times as teachers and members of administrative and judicial councils. Süleyman Sami had also served as mayor of Isparta. Depending on the available data, the average age was 46, the youngest being 30 (Elmalılı Hamdi), and the

¹²⁷ *Osmanlı Mebusları: 1324-1328*; Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 268.

¹²⁸ *Anadolu*, 24 teşrin-i sani 1324 (7 December 1908), p. 3; *Osmanlı Mebusları: 1324-1328*.

¹²⁹ *Anadolu*, 24 teşrin-i sani 1324 (7 December 1908), p. 3; Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 268.

¹³⁰ Güneş, p. 441.

¹³¹ *Anadolu* 29 kanun-u evvel 1329 (11 January 1909), p. 4.

oldest 60 years old (Muhittin Efendi). Brief information about the deputies is given below.

Deputies of Konya

Şeyhzade Zeynelabidin Efendi (1869-1939) was born in Bozkır, Konya. His grandfather was Mehmet Kudsi Efendi, the representative of the famous *Nakşibendi* revivalist Mevlana Halid-i Bağdadî. His father was the *şeyh* (leader) of the order in Konya. Zeynelabidin Efendi served six years as a member of judicial councils in Konya until his father's death. Becoming the new *şeyh* of the *Nakşibendî-Halidî* order in Konya he enjoyed utmost prestige. He resigned from the CUP and was one of the founders of the Peoples Party in 1910. He also was one of the members of the first parliamentary council of Entente Libérale. He was elected in 1912 for a second term.¹³²

Mehmet Vehbi [Çelik] (1862-1949) was born in Hadim, Konya. He graduated the Darü'l-Hilafe Medresesi in İstanbul, was of the *ulema* class. He was a Member of the Parliament during 1920-1923, too. He served as Minister of Religious Foundations and prepared the *fetva* (religious decree) on the dethronement of Sultan Vahdettin.¹³³

Müftüzade Salim Efendi was born in 1862 in Ereğli, Konya. Attended both *medrese* and law school, was one of the *Nakşibendi* leaders in Konya. He worked as lawyer and farmer.¹³⁴

¹³² Sarıkaya, pp. 224-25. Also see Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 267, İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Karaman Tarihi* (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1967), p. 332.

¹³³ Atalay, p. 5, 44. Also see Çoker, pp. 675-76.

¹³⁴ Güneş, p. 438. Also see *Anadolu*, 13 teşrin-i sani 1324 (26 November 1908), p. 3.

Mehmet Emin Efendi was born in Konya in 1866. He graduated the Rüştiye Mektebi. He had been working for more than 14 years as the secretary of *Meclis-i İdare-i Vilayet* (Provincial Administrative Council) when he was elected in 1908 as deputy of Konya. From his mothers line he related to Mevlana Celalettin, the founder of the *Mevlevi* order.¹³⁵

Akşehirli Kürtzade Hacı Mustafa Efendi was of the *ulema* class.¹³⁶

Deputies of Isparta

Böcüzade Süleyman Sami (1851-1932) was born in Isparta. He graduated Rüştiye Mektebi when he was 18 years old and started to work as a young official. He served in the administrative council, taught in highschools in Isparta, became its mayor in 1895. When the Parliament was resolved in 1912 he did not run for the new elections and returned to his hometown.¹³⁷ He commented in 1919 that “in this constitutional era the Ottoman state should be a nationalist-Turkist state firmly holding its national and religious beliefs”.¹³⁸

Eşref Efendi was one of the notables of Eğirdir, known as Burhanzade Hacı Eşref Ağa. He was elected in 1912 for another term in the Parliament. Süleyman Sami Bey told Eşref Efendi that he planned to propose the Parliament that the Aydın railway,

¹³⁵ Güneş, p. 436. Also see *Anadolu*, 26 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 4.

¹³⁶ See the picture in Güneş, p. 437.

¹³⁷ Süleyman Sami Böcüzade, *Kuruluşundan Bugüne Kadar Isparta Tarihi* (İstanbul: Serenler, 1983), p. 278-79.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 291.

which was going to be lengthened until Eğirdir, should pass through Isparta. Eşref Efendi answered that he was a member of the CUP and could not support such a proposal before the Committee approved it. According to Süleyman Sami Bey, Eşref Efendi thought that when the railway would not pass through Isparta, Eğirdir would become the center of the district and Isparta its sub-district. Süleyman Bey's proposal was not accepted.¹³⁹

Deputy of Burdur

Ömer Lutfi Efendi was born in 1873 in Burdur, graduated a *medrese* and served as *ilmiye encümeni*. He was one of the founders of the People's Party in 1910.¹⁴⁰

Deputies of Antalya

Ebuzziya Tevfik Bey (1849-1913) was born in İstanbul. He met Şinasi and Namık Kemal when he was young and appreciated them. He was a well-known publisher of various periodicals, newspapers, and books such as *Mecmua-i Ebuzziya*, *İbret Gazetesi*, *Tasvir-i Efkar* and *Yeni Osmanlılar Tarihi*. He was elected deputy in 1908 from Antalya when he was in exile there.¹⁴¹

Elmalılı Mehmet Hamdi [Yazır] (1878-1942) was born in Elmalı, Antalya, related to an *ulema* family. In 1895 went to Istanbul and graduated *Mekteb-i Nüvvab* in

¹³⁹ Ibid., pp. 265, 295-296. Also see Güneş, p. 434.

¹⁴⁰ Güneş, p. 431. Also see Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 267.

¹⁴¹ Güneş, p. 431. Also see İbrahim Alâettin Gövsa, *Türk Meşhurları Ansiklopedisi* (Yedigün Neşriyatı), p. 109.

the first place. He enrolled into *ilmiye* chamber of the CUP, persuaded Nuri Efendi to sign the *fetva* on the dethronement of Abdullhamid II and prapered the draft of the *fetva*. Later he resigned from the CUP and joined the People's Party.¹⁴²

Deputies of Ürgüp

Mustafa Hayri Efendi (1867-1921) was born in Ürgüp, descended from an *ulema* family. He graduated both Başkurşunlu Medresesi and the Law School in İstanbul (1897). When he was serving as the Judge of the Criminal Court at Selanik he involved in the CUP. He served in various cabinets as Minister of Religious Foundations, and from 1914 to 1916 as *Şeyhülislam*.¹⁴³ In 5 September 1908 the CUP in Selanik sent a special telegraph to Konya branch of the CUP indicating that Hayri Bey should be elected as deputy from Konya.¹⁴⁴ In addition to the first period he served as a Member of the Parliament in the second and third periods.¹⁴⁵

Muhittin Efendi was born in 1848 in Niğde, graduated a *medrese*, and worked 18 years in the Agricultural Bank. When he was retired he was elected as deputy of Niğde, he was also elected in the second, third and fourth periods.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² Yusuf Şevki Yavuz, "Elmalı Muhammed Hamdi," in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995), p. 57. Also see Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 268.

¹⁴³ Mehmet İpşirli, "Hayri Efendi, Mustafa," in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998), p. 62-63.

¹⁴⁴ *Anadolu*, ? ağustos 1324 (? September 1908), no. 2, p. 4.

¹⁴⁵ Güneş, p. 439.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 440. Also see *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, vol. II (1909; reprint, 1982), p. 12.

Yorgaki Efendi was born in 1856 in Niğde, graduated the Greek highschool. He was elected a Member of the Parliament when he was a member of the administrative council of Niğde.¹⁴⁷

Electoral Activities in Konya as Reflected in *Anadolu*

In *Anadolu* there were electoral activities of various kinds. First was general guides for the readers, which listed the qualifications that a candidate for deputy must bear. Since usually not signed, these guides were probably written by Abdurrahman Rahmi Bey, the editorial writer of *Anadolu*.¹⁴⁸ A second one was presentations of various people who were asked to declare their candidacy or who declared their candidacies. Another important part of electoral activity, one can find in the newspaper was reports on the activities of the CUP delegations presided by Major Tahir Bey, which were discussed in detail in the second chapter.

There seemed to be a general agreement among the people of Konya that elections and hence representatives would determine the fate of the Ottomans. Beginning with the first issues of the newspaper in late August, articles on the elections gradually became more frequent. The very early articles warned only that electing representatives was a vital issue where social status, influence, and wealth should be discarded. Later on it began to give detailed guides who deserve a seat in the Parliament and presentations of various candidates.

¹⁴⁷ Güneş, p. 441.

¹⁴⁸ He left the newspaper on 23 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (5 November 1908), p. 4.

A Note on the Issue of Disinterestedness of *Anadolu*

A legitimate question that occurs is whether the newspaper had a certain political position, especially a Unionist one. Though not deliberately, the newspaper identified the goals and wishes of the “the revered Committee” with the happiness of the fatherland and the nation.¹⁴⁹ Yet one should not fall into the trap of trying to reduce the newspaper into one of the two categories of pro or anti-Unionist. There are a number of reasons to argue this. First of all, as it is one of the main arguments in this thesis, one should avoid attributing to the Committee an essential character, but comprehend its making in continuously changing contexts. For the early days of the Revolution, for instance, it is extremely important to observe that the perception of the Committee as a certain political side (as opposed to another one) was rather weak. It was more the champion of the Revolution than a specific committee pursuing specific interests (or having a certain pre-defined political agenda as opposed to other agendas¹⁵⁰); more or less it was conceived as “the party of the Empire.” The Liberal Union, however, could not organize in the provinces. There was no mention of the Liberal Union, neither positive nor negative, until 14 December 1908. In addition, the Committee itself did not have well-defined boundaries, principles or criteria in order to define itself. If these two aspects are considered together, the newspaper cannot be labeled a strong adherent of a committee that had an articulate purpose or a clear character (as opposed to rival ones).

¹⁴⁹ *Anadolu*, 6 Eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 1.

¹⁵⁰ One may remember here Prince Sabahattin as a counter-example, who had a clear emphasis on decentralization in his agenda. However, although he was famous as a thinker among the educated class, he or his ideas were mentioned nowhere in *Anadolu*. This should be read as a sign of the relative weakness of the perception of that group in Konya.

Second, one should bear in mind that until late January 1909 *Anadolu* was a newspaper which was successfully able to satisfy the public of Konya. Konya was a comparatively well developed Anatolian city where mainstream intellectual-political rivalries could easily realize themselves in the form of newspapers. The success of *Anadolu* to satisfy different groups – whose infancies we trace retrospectively from their later embodiments in the forms of newspapers, parties, committees, societies, and clubs – owes more to the lack of political discussion in the capital, which is this thesis, rather than to the ability of the local columnists. Once political discussion took off in the Parliament, *Anadolu* lost its success. Two rival newspapers, *Hakem* (23 January 1908) and *Maşrık-ı İrfan* (4 March 1909), emerged reflecting the political bifurcations in the capital and *Anadolu* ceased to exist (August 1909). The process of the divergence of the public opinion in Konya will be discussed in detail in the fourth chapter. In short, it is not much illuminating to look for the opponents of the CUP in the pre-parliamentary days in Konya and hence discussing (dis)interestedness of the newspaper in terms of political parties loses its meaning.

Deciding on the Candidates

One of the fundamental and clear messages of the newspaper was that the security and continuance of the Constitution, which was the victory of the Committee, depended on the realization of the elections in an orderly way and on electing those who deserved that “exalted name of representative.” A feature of the representative was that he was nearly perceived as a holy warrior charged with protecting the Constitution. The importance given to the Constitution was immense. It was the remedy to all cruelties,

inequalities, favoritisms, underdevelopment; in short, to all kinds of perception of evils and it was the sole solution to overcome all problems. Therefore, his ability to protect the “beneficial articles” of the Constitution was a foremost quality of the representative candidate.¹⁵¹ He was the man who would put its articles into effect in order to guard the “rights of the nation”. He should be ready to sacrifice his personal interest to the public interest, should be free of any moral flaw, and of course, he should have a clean history in the previous era of tyranny.¹⁵²

The importance of the representatives were best materialized in the farewell ceremony of Konya representatives (probably on 16 November 1908). The most important people of the province, municipal commission and religious leaders were all present in the ceremony. First, the *müftü* performed an eloquent prayer. Then the governor of the province gave a much appreciated speech, and last the mayor addressed the public. All of the people were very sensitive within this touching panorama.¹⁵³

First of all, advised *Anadolu*, the candidate should be investigated for his activities in the previous era of tyranny. Various types of unlawful actions were listed which supposedly may had been appealed to by candidates in their earlier careers.¹⁵⁴ More importantly, however, the electors should be aware of the fact that those who had

¹⁵¹ In the words of Levon Tamiz Eryan: “Aziz vatandaşlarım şu zaman-ı hürriyet ve müsavatta bizim düşüneceğimiz pek çok şeyler içinde en mühimmi ruh-u kavanin olan kanun-u esasimizin ahkam-ı münifesini muhafazaya kâfil hasail-i memduha ashabından mebus intihab etmektir.” They were now “fortunate” (*bahtiyar*) and this fortune would be secured through “electing representatives who are powerful and on the right way (*muktedir ve mustakim*).” *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2-3.

¹⁵² *Anadolu*, 12 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (25 October 1908), p. 1.

¹⁵³ *Anadolu*, 6 teşrin-i sani 1324 (19 November 1908), p.1.

¹⁵⁴ *Anadolu*, 6 eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 1. For a list of the unlawful actions see the source in Appendix E.

appealed to unlawful actions may now try to present themselves as fair and honest and as striving for the well-being of the nation.

Having a clean history was necessary, but not sufficient in order to be a representative. The candidate should also know the bases of the prosperity of the fatherland. For that reason his educational career, such as schools and teachers, should be taken into account; later on, also his occupational career, both of which are indicators of his qualification and capacity (*ehliyet ve iktidar*) should be examined.¹⁵⁵

More importantly, however, the candidate should have a “firm grasp of the local state of affairs.” Therefore, he had to know all of the administrative units of the province, comprehend their needs, and be able to decide what types of initiatives would lead to their prosperity. This frequently mentioned feature of the candidate, namely grasping the local state of affairs, was to be most carefully investigated by the elector. Those who were thought to be qualified, capable and well-informed in local affairs, suggested *Anadolu*, should be obliged to give speeches or conferences through the municipality or their newspaper.¹⁵⁶

The intelligence and capacity of a representative should be another criterion. After all, in order to be elected one should not have to be a tax-payer.¹⁵⁷ This reference to paying tax reminds the reader of the difference between the elector and the elected. In this first genuine elections in the history of Ottoman Empire, electors had to be tax-payers. An elector derived the right to elect from the fact that he financially contributed to society, thus he who contributed had the right to have a say how his money was going

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁵⁷ *Anadolu*, 3 eylül 1324 (16 September 1908), p. 1.

to be spent. A representative was not required to be a tax-payer since he was not acting on his own behalf, but on that of his constituency. The implication for the newspaper-reader, namely the elector, was that he should prioritize capacity and intelligence over wealth and status. Peasants, who are “illiterate and unable to think deeply,” were also to be advised that they should not trust anyone just because he talked softly or gently.¹⁵⁸ The candidates had to be introduced to people so they could investigate their forthcoming representatives.

A Request for Decentralization of the Method of Deciding on the Candidates

Şeyhzade Ahmet Ziya Efendi (probably Şeyhzade Zeynelabidin’s brother¹⁵⁹) complained that despite the difficulties of deciding properly on a candidate, the electors did not try to look for them. He suggested that people should – as far as possible – gather in small committees, find out the names and discuss them. By doing this, however, they should not forget that it was important to ask help from those who were reliable in their judgments and opinions.

Another point that Ziya Efendi emphasized was that these committees should be small in size. Unlike great committees where not everyone has the opportunity to express his ideas freely, small committees were more apt to raise individual voices. Once some names were decided on, small committees should quickly give their

¹⁵⁸ “Okuyup yazmak bilmeyen ve derin düşünmek iktidarında olmayan köylülerimiz ve bir kısım ahalimize de nasihatler etmeli, tatlı sözlere, mülayim sözlere aldanmamalarını ihtar eylemelidir.” *Anadolu*, 6 Eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 1.

¹⁵⁹ See Sarıkaya, p. 225.

summaries to greater committees. This, concluded Ziya Efendi, was how to thank God for His blessing of freedom and to vitalize the tradition of the Prophet.¹⁶⁰

Ziya Efendi's proposal was significant by the fact that it was a genuine attempt to increase the degree of involvement on the part of sections of the society that were distant from centers that had more power to decide on the names of the nominees. His attempt to spread political participation, and thus more decentralize the election process, suggests that Ziya Efendi felt uneasy that certain groups had a power to manipulate elections. He probably thought of decentralization as a preventive measure in order to impede this process. Unfortunately, he did not give any concrete names or imply groups that would help us to check our supposition.¹⁶¹

Announcing the Candidates in the Newspaper

The newspaper introduced a number of candidates for the elections. Except for a few of them, all of the introductions were positive. The general character of these introductions was, with the exception of Ali Haydar Bey and Vayanos Efendi, that the candidates did not introduce themselves, but they were introduced by their friends or colleagues. This was supposed to be conceived as a sign of the candidate's reliability. It was often emphasized that the candidate would run for the election not by his own will but because of the pressure put on him by his fellows. This was expected to be read as

¹⁶⁰ *Anadolu*, 13 eylül 1324 (26 September 1908), p. 1-2.

¹⁶¹ A comment of him on an article published in the newspaper *Saadet* no. 51, gives us a clue on his manner of thought. He congratulates the author of the "pious article" (*makale-i dindarane*), who criticized the idea that a statue of Midhat Paşa should be built. Ziya Efendi thanks the columnist since he had invited other columnists to respect Islamic manners. See, *Anadolu*, 17 eylül 1324 (30 September 1908), p. 1.

another sign that the candidate did not pursue his own interests but ran for the elections for the sake of the people.

Favorable writings

There was no clear standard for announcing candidates. The editorial of the newspaper itself frequently introduced candidates whom they believed to be reliable. In this, it did not seem to be engaged openly with the CUP, but still, always revered its name. It should be kept in mind that until the Parliament began to function, venerating the Committee was the norm rather than a specific political position. Until then, diverse personal socio-economic views did not have a chance of institutional application. Once the Parliament began to operate as a decision-making mechanism on singling out competing socio-economic views, those “personal views” of the representatives (and also of the citizens) were no longer “tolerated,” and thus political polarizations and political discussion began. This political struggle operated over a political body that had the power to institutionalize *one* of the mutually exclusive or competing political views. The key point here is the power to institutionalize. It would be naïve to argue that competing socio-economic views emerged or were not discussed before the Parliament; surely they had predated it. Yet they remained as personal professions of faith rather than references to party programs, and they did not have the chance of execution at the national level, and thus were “tolerable” on that personal level. This toleration and the absence of such a body which would translate political discussion into politics enabled the CUP to contain a wide range of different political views. Once parliamentary politics

began, the CUP began to lose its all-encompassing character; polarizations started and subsequent splits emerged.

This short reminder that veneration of the CUP in an Anatolian newspaper such as *Anadolu* should not be over-read is important. Otherwise it would not be easy to explain how these men who would one day be in opposing parties, such as Major Tahir Bey, Ebuzziya Tevfik Bey, the future Unionist *Şeyhülislam* Mustafa Hayri Bey, Şeyhzade Zeynelabidin Efendi, Müftüzade Hoca Salim Efendi, Mehmet Vehbi [Çelik] Efendi, were all praised in the same newspaper.

Back to the introductions in the newspaper, they were brief and do not contain much information except the places of birth and occupations. For example, the newspaper introduces Selanik court inspector Galib Bey of Konya and the lawyer Levon Efendi of Konya, who was a columnist of the newspaper as well, as candidates who were believed to deserve seats in the Parliament; however, it reserved that the benefit of the fatherland required further investigation of those names. The reservation helped the newspaper preserve its patriotic and disinterested image.¹⁶²

Besides many brief introductions such as the one above, were others more detailed. For instance, Konya *Bidayet Hukuk Mahkemesi Azasından* Vayanos Efendi wrote a long article in which he discussed in detail, though superficially, the problems of the country related to finance, justice, and education. He concluded that it was the coming Parliament that would reflect on the mentioned needs of the country. He asked for votes and added his hopes that the Parliament, which would gather from all corners and all elements of the country, would meet the needs of the country without bothering

¹⁶² *Anadolu*, 6 Eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 1.

itself with small issues.¹⁶³ *Anadolu* commented that Vayanos Efendi was skilled in the “contemporary sciences” and that as a representative he would make serious service to the country.¹⁶⁴ Another type of introduction was written by İlyas Ceha Efendi for his brother, Petraki Efendi. He described such details as his brother’s education, linguistic competence, and career.¹⁶⁵

Kazım Efendi of Ereğli, the son of the former *müftü* of Ereğli, asked the newspaper to present Ebuzziya Bey and Hayri Bey of Ürgüp. He explained that the nation was aware of the importance of the elections and sought highest qualifications in a candidate. However, Ereğli had exaggerated these qualifications. The representative was expected to be a patriot who was devout and morally upright, knowledgeable about the administration and politics of contemporary modern states as well as the Ottoman State, conversant in western languages, and cognizant of the public style of thought and customs, and experienced to a certain degree in public offices. He found these qualifications a bit excessive. Kazım Efendi wrote in a sarcastic tone that the representative should be “a historian in history, a *müctehid* in Islamic jurisprudence, ... an Aristotle in judgment, [and hence] each one should be a prophet (*nebiy-yi mürsel*)!”¹⁶⁶ He alleged that there were not many people in Konya who had such

¹⁶³ With “small issues” Vayanos Efendi probably means various kinds of favoritisms that a Member of Parliament can do for his clientele and struggles of personal political appetites.

¹⁶⁴ *Anadolu*, 17 Eylül 1324 (30 September 1908), p. 3-4.

¹⁶⁵ *Anadolu*, 28? Eylül 1324 (11? October 1908), No. 10, p. 2.

¹⁶⁶ *Anadolu*, 5 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (18 October 1908), p. 3.

attributes. Consequently, he asked to see the names of Ebuzziya Tevfik Bey and Hayri Bey of Ürgüp in the newspaper.¹⁶⁷

The most interesting type of proposal for a candidate was that of residents of the sub-district of Kadın Han. This time a group of people came together and decided to propose Şeyhzade Zeynelabidin Efendi, who was one of the best-known local *ulema*, as a candidate for the elections. Through the newspaper they asked Abidin Efendi to declare his candidacy. In addition, the people of the Kadın Han requested from their fellow “sons of the fatherland” nominate important people like Şeyhzade Zeynelabidin Efendi.¹⁶⁸ Zeynelabidin Efendi was elected representative of Konya with 164 votes, more than one and half times of the second and twice as much as the third representative elected from the central sub-province of Konya.¹⁶⁹ His being nominated, however, should not be over-read as a manifestation of initiative on the part of local people, as he was one the foremost local *Nakşibendi* leaders in Konya.

Another example of a collective nomination was of judicial officials (probably of central sub-province of Konya since there is no indication of place). The officials argued that a representative should be aware of whether a law proposed in the Parliament was compatible with the Constitution or not. It was also vital to be knowledgeable in law in order to preserve the rights of the people. Hence, the judicial officials politely requested *İstinaf Başkatibi* Hüsamettin Efendi, “whose experience in judicial affairs is well-established,” to declare his candidacy and he did so.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁶⁸ *Anadolu*, 13 Eylül 1324 (26 September 1908), p. 3.

¹⁶⁹ *Anadolu*, 26 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 4.

¹⁷⁰ *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 4.

The mayor of Ereğli, Ahmet Tahir Bey, presented Müftüzade Salim Efendi, another *Nakşibendi*.¹⁷¹ The mayor indicated that Salim Efendi had deep insight into the province's state of affairs. In addition, he was competent in feeling the public's desires and common political longings, and had the power and capacity to be successful in politics and in the realization of the "true" interests of the public. Hence, considering his capacity, knowledge, and morality he was one of the most prominent among his peers.¹⁷² Müftüzade Hoca Salim Efendi was elected in 1908 as the third of the five representatives of the central sub-province of Konya with 80 votes.¹⁷³

Critiques of some Candidates

The newspaper also published articles which had a criticizing and even a denigrating language. On one occasion, it quoted from the *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* (Spokesman for the Truth) (10 October 1908) that Nazif Sururî Bey had been ordered to be appointed to the Palace (*mabeyn*). The newspaper severely criticized this decision. The critique was not for its own sake, but because of the fact that Nazif Bey had run for elections in Konya as well. *Anadolu* alleged that there was no one who had not known that Nazif Sururî Efendi had served as a *mabeyn* (palace) spy and harmed many people

¹⁷¹ Salim Efendi held a well-appreciated speech in the *Nakşibendi dergâh* in the Sublime Porte when the Representatives of Konya reached the capital. See, *Anadolu*, 13 teşrin-i sani 1324 (26 November 1908), p. 3.

¹⁷² "Efendi-i mumaiyleh vilayetimiz ahval-i tabiiyye ve iktisadiyesine bir muhit-i irfan ile âmâl-i umumiye ve siyasiyeyi teşhis ve tenfide ve siyaset ve menafi-i hakika-i milleti tevfiqa iktidar ilmi ve ahlakıyla beynel akran mütehayyizan-ı fuzeladan olup" *Anadolu*, ? eylül 1324 (? September 1909), no: 10, p. 4.

¹⁷³ *Anadolu*, 26 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 4.

in the previous era.¹⁷⁴ *Anadolu*, dated 5 November 1908 (23 teřrin-i evvel 1324), reported that Nazif Sururî Bey had been removed to his hometown of İbradi in Akseki, Antalya.¹⁷⁵

Discussions of some names such as Kazım Efendi also appeared in the newspaper. There was an interesting polemic over the candidacy of Kazım Efendi of Ereęli, son of the former *müftü* of Ereęli. Both he and his father were of the *ulema* class. Pharmacist Süleyman Asaf wrote to support his candidacy saying that he was an expert both in the religious and modern sciences. Unfortunately, he continued, Kazım Efendi had been removed from Ereęli to Seydişehir (another town in the province of Konya) because of some malicious imputations on him. He warned the electors that the one who had been responsible for Kazım Efendi's removal, was running for the elections and was propagandizing against him¹⁷⁶

Two weeks later, a member of the Administrative Council of Hamidiye, Nięde el-Hac Ahmed Hilmi, wrote against Süleyman Asaf's supportive letter of Kazım Efendi. He accused Asaf Bey of concealing the reason of Kazım Efendi's exile and not reminding that his father was a former *müftü* who had been removed from his post. Ahmed Hilmi himself did not give the reasons behind the exile and removal but formulated his accusations in such forms of questions as if there could not be any satisfying answers to them.¹⁷⁷ *Anadolu* should have published the article of Ahmed Hilmi Bey risking the deterioration of its relations with Kazım Efendi for the reason that

¹⁷⁴ *Anadolu*, 1 teřrin-i evvel 1324, (14 October 1908) p. 2.

¹⁷⁵ *Anadolu*, 23 teřrin-i evvel 1324 (5 November 1908), p. 4.

¹⁷⁶ *Anadolu*, 12 teřrin-i evvel 1324 (25 October 1908), p. 3.

¹⁷⁷ *Anadolu*, 26 teřrin-i evvel 1324 (8 November 1908), p. 3.

Kazım Efendi was, first, the agent of the newspaper in Ereğli and, second, both he and his father were from the local *ulema*.¹⁷⁸ However, if the elections were the issue, the criticisms of Kazım Efendi did not make much sense since they were already over on 8 November 1908 when the article was published. However, the polemic still continued after the elections. Asaf Bey, in his reply to Hilmi Bey on 23 November, argued that el-Hac Hilmi had only been a middleman, whose utmost desire had been to preserve his membership on the Administrative Council. According to Asaf Bey there had been another man, whose name Asaf Bey did not want to disclose, behind el-Hac Hilmi Ağa – this time the title was *ağa* not *efendi*. Asaf Bey’s criticism also stated that *ağas*, not only in smaller towns and cities, but also in the great provinces, were poorly educated and open to manipulation to preserve their official positions.¹⁷⁹ The discussion gives us clues how complex might had been the relations between the notables, *ulema*, education and elections. It was claimed that El-Hac Hilmi Ağa could not guarantee his post in the Administrative Council without taking a specific position towards the candidates. Since the candidate for deputy Kazım Efendi was from the *ulema* class, probably his rival was as well. If so, we can infer hints concerning the cooperation between an *ulema* (the rival of Kazım Efendi) and an *ağa* (who wrote against Kazım Efendi); probably the former provided the latter immaterial and the latter provided the former material support. The continuation of the discussion on him might also concern his ideological tendencies, since Kazım Efendi’s perception of *şeriat* was more compatible with secular laws.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324, (14 October 1908), p. 4. The list of the agents of *Anadolu* indicates both the importance of the newspaper and its infancy, since none of the agents are professional newspapermen and still all of them are elites of their communities. For the list see Appendix D.

¹⁷⁹ *Anadolu*, 10 teşrin-i sani 1324 (23 November 1908), p. 4. For the source see Appendix E.

¹⁸⁰ See Chapter IV, section “*Şeriat* and *Nizam*.”

Conclusion

The election of 1908 was the first genuine elections in the history of the Ottoman electoral practice. It institutionalized the more democratic measures that had been discussed during the first Parliament in 1876, yet which could not have been legislated and had not got the chance of application. More important, however, were the components that contributed to the essence of a more democratic election, which were political organizations and the press. They were essential in creating a public space for discussion. The local Konya newspaper *Anadolu* reflects how a newspaper did guide his readers to elect those who would serve the country and protect the Constitution. It is important to note that none of the candidates indentified themselves with the CUP. However, the general atmosphere always revered its name. The existence of a rival party of the CUP, namely the Liberal Union, was never mentioned by the newspaper during the election period. Elections were completed successfully; however, sometimes tension occurred between the Muslim and non-Muslim communities.

CHAPTER IV

POLITICAL POLARIZATION IN KONYA

The 1908 elections in Konya were completed without incident. Until the opening of the Parliament on 17 December 1908 there no indication emerged that might have lead one to suspect any polarization. However, the opening of the Parliament and the respective discussions on various issues and different perspectives on government affairs accelerated the process of decomposition of the apparently unified public opinion in Konya and compositions of rival perspectives concerning such critical issues as the Kamil Pasha Cabinet, the Liberal Union and decentralization, the domination of the CUP, and *şeriat*, which were debated in the capital as well. Some of them were subject to fierce discussion in Konya newspapers. These will be employed as indicators to delineate the major contesting views in Konya, which started to manifest in Konya newspapers in February. There seems to have been three major approaches to these issues, two contesting and one that sought a kind of middle-way, which, however, in the long run was unable to maintain.

The Kamil Pasha Cabinet

Following the Revolution in 23 July 1908, a cabinet by Said Pasha was formed. The first tension between the Said Pasha cabinet and the CUP emerged over the imperial decree drafted by Said Pasha and issued on 1 August 1908. The decree attempted to summarize what had happened to the Constitution and clarified some of its articles. Clause 10 of the decree declared that the right to appoint the Ministers of War and Navy belonged to the Sultan. However, the Sultan was granted the right to appoint only the *Şeyhülislam* and the Grand Vezir. Although Article 27¹⁸¹ of the Constitution did not openly restrict the Sultan to appoint the Ministers of War and Navy, as it did not conform to principles of parliamentarianism, Said Pasha met immense reaction from the CUP.¹⁸² Furthermore, it was not a mere constitutional issue; the CUP did not want to give the control of the army and the navy to the Sultan. With a strong grip on the army and the navy, he could undermine the basis of the CUP, who had many young supporters and sympathizers there. On 3 August, a CUP delegation visited the Grand Vizier in order to force him to make a radical change in the cabinet. They also visited Kamil Pasha and the Sultan, ultimately convincing them to form a new cabinet. There were also ministers who considered the clause an attempt to undermine the Constitution. *Şeyhülislam* Cemaleddin Efendi sent his resignation to the Sultan, which, however, was

¹⁸¹ “Madde 27 — Mesned-i Sadaret ve Meşihat-ı İslâmiye taraf-ı Padişahiden emniyet buyurulan zatlara ihale buyurulduğu misillü sair vükelânın memuriyetleri dahi ba-irade-i şahane icra olunur.” The article was clarified on 3 August 1909 as “Madde 27 — Mesned-i Sadaret ve Meşihat-ı İslâmiye emniyet buyurulan zevata ihale buyrulduğu misillü teşkil-i vükelâya memur olan Sadrıazamın tensip ve arzı ile sair vükelânın memuriyetleri dahi ba-irade-i şahane icra olunur.” See Gözübüyük, p. 30 and 77.

¹⁸² Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 85.

refused.¹⁸³ A number of ministers also decided to resign, which ultimately led to the fall of the Said Pasha cabinet on 5 August 1908. The press also played an important role by questioning the Grand Vizier about various issues to which he had shut his eyes during the very early days of the Revolution.¹⁸⁴ As *Anadolu* started to be published in late August its views on the fall of Said Pasha cannot be assessed. However, there was one reference to the fall of the Said Pasha Cabinet, which alleged that it had fallen on the general wish of the nation.¹⁸⁵

On 6 August, Kamil Pasha was appointed Grand Vizier with the duty of forming a new cabinet. The CUP, through the press, declared that it supported the cabinet. Thus, with the cooperation of the CUP and the Porte, namely the ministers, the Palace was forced not to interpret the Constitution contrary to its parliamentary spirit.

Conforming to the will of the CUP, the new Kamil Pasha cabinet included Recep Pasha as the Minister of War, and Commodore Arif Pasha as the Minister of Navy. Recep Pasha had cooperated with the men of Prince Sabahattin in Tripoli to arrange a coup-attempt against Abdülhamid.¹⁸⁶ Unfortunately he died on 16 August. Ali Rıza Pasha was appointed in his place.¹⁸⁷ However, the cabinet included many non-Unionist

¹⁸³ Ahmad, pp. 19-21.

¹⁸⁴ Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, pp. 123-26.

¹⁸⁵ *Anadolu*, 29 kanun-u evvel 1324 (11 January 1909), p. 1.

¹⁸⁶ Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 89.

¹⁸⁷ Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908*, p. 130.

ministers.¹⁸⁸ Political power was now in the hands of the Porte whereas the CUP played the role of the guardian of the Constitution.¹⁸⁹

On 12 September 1908 *Anadolu* published a telegraph dated 10 September 1908 sent by the Grand Vizier Kamil Pasha. The telegraph had been sent to all the provinces and complained that the number of “Union and Progress” committees under the name of “branch” were amplified. These committees, claimed Grand Vizier’s telegraph, pressured government officials and even coerced members of councils and judiciary officials to obey the will of the branches.¹⁹⁰ These were signs that Kamil Pasha wanted to keep the Committee under control and impede its further organization within the Empire.

Anadolu restricted the Grand Vizier’s general use of “branch” to committees which were “spontaneously founded and run after personal interest” (*kendiliklerinden teşekkül eden ve menafi-i şahsiyelerini düşünen cemiyetler*) and assured that there was no relationship between those committees and the CUP branches in İstanbul and Selanik. By using the attribution “spontaneously founded,” the newspaper tried to distinguish between those committees which officially were not linked to the CUP but claimed to be so and those committees which were welcomed – at least by the newspaper – such as Ottoman Progress Clubs in Konya, Niğde and Ereğli.¹⁹¹ However, *Anadolu*’s explanation was not based on clear criteria that differentiated between the two kinds of

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 128-29.

¹⁸⁹ Ahmad, p. 21.

¹⁹⁰ *Anadolu*, 30 ağustos 1324 (12 September 1908), p. 1.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 1.

committees, because, in fact, all of the clubs had been spontaneously founded. The CUP had not had an established organization in Anatolia before the Revolution.

It was true that Unionist clubs – as they claimed themselves to be – had a certain degree of impact on local government offices. The Niğde Progress Club, for instance, notified the local government (*Makam-ı Mutasarrafı*) on various issues such as education, municipal facilities, commerce and cheatings, which received immediate and due response.¹⁹²

According to Feroz Ahmad, there was a delicate balance of power game being played. Ahmad does not see a heartfelt cooperation between the CUP and Kamil Pasha. On the contrary, their relationship was based on political expediency. He identifies three parties in this game: the Palace, the Porte and the CUP. In his words, “the Committee, unable to take control openly, needed someone independent of the Palace and at the same time liberal in outlook, to rule instead. Kamil was willing to tolerate the Committee while it continued to neutralize the Palace.”¹⁹³

Broadly speaking his analysis is correct, especially when Istanbul is taken into account. However, as will be discussed below, *Anadolu* reflected a group which supported the CUP in most of its decisions and initiatives and was still pro-Kamil Pasha, especially due to his ability in handling the Austro-Hungarian and Bulgarian crises.

¹⁹² *Anadolu*, 3 Eylül 1324 (16 September 1908), p. 2-3.

¹⁹³ Ahmad, p. 27. Akşin also share a similiar view, see Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 110.

Crises in Foreign Relations and the 1908 Boycott

The optimistic atmosphere following the formation of the new cabinet was disturbed by Bulgaria's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire on 5 October 1908. The declaration of Austria-Hungary to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina and Crete's one-sided decision to unite with Greece blew in the next day.

According to the Berlin Treaty of 1878, Bosnia-Herzegovina would be under nominal Ottoman sovereignty although it would be occupied and governed by Austria. The same treaty granted Bulgaria – excluding Eastern Rumelia and Macedonia – a semi-autonomous Bulgarian principality, again under nominal Ottoman sovereignty. Bulgaria, by declaring its independence, and Austria, by annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina, violated the treaty which resulted in the outbreak of a general boycott throughout the Ottoman Empire against the goods of these two countries. The boycott continued for about five months, until the end of February.¹⁹⁴ Along with various organizations dedicated to coordinating the boycotts such as the *Harb-i İktisadi Cemiyeti* (Society for Economic War) and *Bosna-Hersek Cemiyet-i Hayriye-i Osmaniyesi* (Ottoman Society for Bosnia-Herzegovina), local CUP cadres in the peripheral towns and cities helped the movement to be more successful.¹⁹⁵

Konya followed the developments about Austria and Bulgaria with utmost seriousness. Almost every issue of *Anadolu* – and from 23 January on also *Hakem* –

¹⁹⁴ Y. Doğan Çetinkaya, *1908 Osmanlı Boykotu : Bir Toplumsal Hareketin Analizi* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2004), pp. 97-98.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 302, 326, 379.

referred to developments in foreign relations, and published related official documents. The local CUP branches organized the boycott and encouraged and even threatened the merchants to conform to it. The Cretan question, however, was not given much importance, similar to the case in the capital;¹⁹⁶ only some passing references were made to it.¹⁹⁷

The Akşehir Ottoman Club, which was the Akşehir branch of the CUP, threatened merchants who continued to buy and sell Austro-Hungarian and Bulgarian goods using a very harsh language. In an article published in *Anadolu*, the club declared that trading with Austria and Bulgaria was to serve the enemy. “Henceforth, in the name of Ottoman dignity, it is advised to all of our merchant brothers not to bring Austro-Hungarian and Bulgarian goods to our city. We announce that those who would dare to behave to the contrary will be perceived as traitors and be seen as abhorrent by the nation.”¹⁹⁸

These threats, however, did not seem to have a strong effect. Whereas *Anadolu* from time to time continued to give examples of the patriotism of some merchants, the incentives to make holes in the boycott were rather strong. Two weeks later the Akşehir Ottoman Club made a second announcement. This time it complained that some merchants not only were against the boycott but also were seeking to benefit from the emerging conditions of a black market. It said that if they were determined to make such

¹⁹⁶ Ahmad, p. 30.

¹⁹⁷ For instance, *Anadolu*, 1 kanun-u sani 1324 (14 Januar 1909), p. 2. For a statistical data pointing on its national importance see *Maşrik-i İrfan*, 23 mart 1325 (5 April 1909), p. 2.

¹⁹⁸ “Fimaba’d gerek Avusturya Macaristan gerek Bulgarya emtialarının şehrimize celb edilmemesi bilcümle tüccar ve esnaf kardaşlarımıza hamiyet-i Osmaniye namına tavsiye ile aksi harekete mücaheret edeceklerin hain-i vatan ve menfur-u millet nazarıyla görülecekleri ilan olunur.” *Anadolu*, 20 teşrin-i sani 1324 (3 December 1908), p. 2.

a loathsome business as trading with the enemies, at least they should not go into black market business and raise prices.¹⁹⁹ This was not the case only for Akşehir, there were general complaints in *Anadolu* that trading with Austria and Bulgaria could not be stopped, and announcements were published encouraging merchants to register with the *Boykotaj Sendikası* (Boycott Union) in order to save themselves from the accusations of the people.²⁰⁰

The Bulgarian independence brought also a military operation onto the agenda, which resulted in further mobilization of the people. In the Ottoman Club in Konya, which was the central provincial branch of the CUP in the province of Konya, a sub-committee of forty people was established in order to aid the soldiers in terms of clothes. An amount of 409 lira was raised.²⁰¹ If we take into account that the highest ranking police officer in Konya earns twenty lira a month,²⁰² their efforts had a considerably outcome. In addition, in order to encourage the campaign, *Sanayi Müdürü* Tevfik Efendi and Faik Efendi, Inspector of Primary Schools, were enrolled as volunteer soldiers.²⁰³ This, however, should not be perceived as belligerent behavior on the part of the CUP. A pro-war attitude would be a very weak possibility because of the still fresh memories of the short lived parliamentary experience under Abdülhamid II three decades earlier, which had come to an end with the suspension of the Parliament with the Russo-Ottoman War as an excuse.

¹⁹⁹ *Anadolu*, 4 kanun-u evvel 1324 (17 December 1908), p. 4.

²⁰⁰ *Anadolu*, 11 kanun-u evvel 1324 (24 December 1908), p. 3-4.

²⁰¹ *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2.

²⁰² *Anadolu*, 13 teşrin-i sani 1324 (26 November 1908), p. 2.

²⁰³ *Anadolu*, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2.

Towards mid-October, a meeting was held in Konya, attended by thousands of people. Lokman Efendi of the local *ulema*, Mehmet Efendi, the Chairman of the Administrative Council and lawyer Levon Efendi, who was also a columnist at *Anadolu*, gave speeches to the gathered people. According to *Anadolu* their common message was that if there did not emerge a very firm compulsion, going into war was insane, and provoking war was a betrayal of the fatherland.²⁰⁴ The main argument, which was expressed to calm down the people and to preserve the self-respect of the nation, was that by violating the Treaty of Berlin not only were Ottoman rights injured but also those of the co-signing Great Powers. In any case, in order to protect Ottoman rights and freedom, and to avoid a general war (*harb-i umumi*), the transgressions of Bulgarian and Austrian governments would be responded to calmly.²⁰⁵

It is vital to note here that protecting “Ottoman freedom” (*hürriyet-i Osmaniye*) did not refer to the liberation of Ottoman soil, which had been occupied by Austria and Bulgaria but to the newly established regime. The logo of *Anadolu*, which was “*Mebde-i tarih-i hürriyet-i Osmaniye 10 Temmuz sene 1*” (The date of the commencement of Ottoman freedom: 23 July 1), referred the first day of the new constitutional regime as the beginning of “Ottoman freedom.”

It was apparent that a military operation could endanger the new regime. Sina Akşin alleges that the meeting held in İstanbul in 8 October 1908 by the conservatives asking for war, aimed to obstruct elections, since in a state of war everyone would

²⁰⁴ “Bir mecburiyet i katiye olmadıkça harbin eser-i cinnet olduğuna ve harbe teşvik ve tahrikin vatana bir hiyanet bulunduğuna” *Anadolu*, 28? eylül 1324 (11? October 1908), No. 10, p. 1-2.

²⁰⁵ “Ve her halde hukuk ve hürriyet-i Osmaniye muhafaza edilmek ve bir harb-i umumiye meydan verilmemek üzere Bulgaristan ile Avusturya hükümetlerinin tecavüzleri sükunet ve suhuletle berteraf edileceği” *Anadolu*, ? eylül 1324 (? October 1908), p. 2.

follow along the Sultan as the symbol of unification.²⁰⁶ Supporting Akşin's point, *Anadolu* warned that the issue of Austria and Bulgaria should not encourage those who were for absolutism; they should not dream of gaining more influence and power by using the present state as an excuse. The Ottomans, the newspaper continued, had decided to solve the issue carefully, without losing their temper.²⁰⁷

The importance of the meetings throughout the Empire, the news and articles in the newspapers is well-indicated by Feroz Ahmad. He points to the success of the Unionists in mobilizing the masses for a national cause. "The very idea of mobilizing the masses was revolutionary for the politics of the Empire"²⁰⁸ Before the Revolution the absolutist regime had conceived mass mobilization always as a threat which had the potential to be transformed into a counter-regime uprising.

The activities of the local CUP branches in this boycott and asking ordinary people to donate money for the military were most important as tools of enforcing a national sense of Ottoman identity. The 6 January 1909 issue of *Hakem*, for instance, told the good news that according to the estimates, Austria had lost 80 million francs, which was a good example of the steadfastness and union (*sebat ve ittihat*) of the Ottomans. The incorporation of ordinary people into political activity through mass mobilization was continued further during the Italian and Balkan wars and was reflected once more in the demonstrations against Britain when it commandeered the two battleships built for the Ottoman Empire.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁶ Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, pp. 93-94.

²⁰⁷ *Anadolu*, 19 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (1 November 1908), p. 3.

²⁰⁸ Ahmad, p. 162.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

The Uneasy Relationship between Kamil Pasha and the CUP

Kamil Pasha was an experienced, however outdated, Ottoman statesman who had problems adapting himself to the new kind of politics where institutional bodies instead of personal ties played a more effective role. He was not ready to take into account the CUP, which was an extra-cabinet organized center of power involving in execution. The CUP was based on more or less institutionalized and rapidly organizing bodies in the capital as well as in the provinces, and a young generation of professionals who desired involvement in politics. In fact, the political system as a whole was not sophisticated enough to incorporate a politically active and powerful group, a condition that forced them to recourse by-pass the existing political patterns. In the long run, a political system that did not meet the social reality might have helped to transform the CUP into a more centrally directed body where other voices were silenced in order to cope with, so to say, the outdated superstructure. From a retrospective perspective we see that the lack of parliamentary culture and party discipline, a last generation of Ottoman pashas who were accustomed to rule under absolutism were major barriers that forced the CUP to play a more monocolour and despotic role in the long run.

During the Tanzimat era the Porte had become relatively independent and superior to the Palace until Abdulhamid II successfully concentrated political power in his own hands in Yıldız Palace. The new constitutional era was a new opportunity for some independent and ambitious Porte pashas like Kamil Pasha to regain this power. Kamil Pasha considered the CUP as a power which could function to balance the Palace,

which did not necessarily mean to recognize it as a legitimate opposition or at least as a kind of a civil-societal institution whose requests and complaints should be taken into account and accorded response. Although retrospective in method, attempts to explain the rigidity of political actors as a result of structural deficiencies and/or the infancy of political institutions may bear more fruit than analyses of agencies of rival camps. At least the role of structural deficiencies in shaping political agency should be added into analyses of political actors, a project shaped during this work but not applied here.

The CUP continuously proposed ministers to Kamil Pasha, which legally was the responsibility of the Grand Vizier. It sometimes used a denigrating language as well. By early November the press in the capital was divided into pro-Kamil and pro-Unionist camps.²¹⁰ During the elections Kamil Pasha decided to cooperate with the Liberal Union, a party that was established on 14 September 1908 and turned into the spokesman of all the dissatisfied with the CUP. The Liberal Union could not show any success in the 1908 elections except for one seat from Ankara.

However, the CUP did not decide to overthrow Kamil Pasha yet. Kamil Pasha had liberal ideas, was experienced, respected by everyone and actively supported by Britain, the power on which the Young Turks leaned most.²¹¹ On the other hand, Kamil Pasha decided to change the cabinet on 30 November 1908, noting the rising success of the CUP in the elections. In the change of the cabinet, the Unionist Manyasizade Refik Bey entered the cabinet as Minister of Justice. The Minister of Interior became Hüsyin

²¹⁰ Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, pp. 110-11.

²¹¹ Ahmad, p. 32.

Hilmi Pasha, who had had good relations with the Young Turks when he had been the Inspector-General of Macedonia.²¹²

During November and December *Anadolu* was preoccupied with the elections and the opening of the Parliament. It never mentioned a tension between the CUP and Kamil Pasha. The 17 December 1908 issue, however, reported that the present cabinet would certainly fall when the Parliament convened. As reported by trustworthy sources, the Minister of Interior Hilmi Pasha would be entrusted to form the new cabinet.²¹³ This information was probably based on the rumors that Rahmi Bey had visited the Sultan in order to convince him to dismiss Kamil Pasha and appoint Hilmi Pasha as Grand Vizier instead.²¹⁴

Anadolu followed the discussions in the capital and in the Parliament, and gave detailed summaries of them in each issue. On 11 January 1909 it reported that the most hotly discussed issue in the capital was whether the cabinet of Kamil Pasha would fall or not. By the initiative of Hüseyin Cahid Bey, who was the editor of *Tanin* – the well-known Unionist newspaper – and an ardent critic of Kamil Pasha, the Parliament decided to interpellate Kamil Pasha on domestic and foreign issues. According to *Anadolu* this would bring the discussions about the Grand Vizier to an end by either a vote of confidence or non-confidence.²¹⁵

Anadolu openly assumed a pro-Kamil Pasha position. It argued that Kamil Pasha had been able to handle all problems until this time. He continued friendly relations with

²¹² Ibid., p. 31, and also Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 111.

²¹³ *Anadolu*, 4 kanun-u evvel 1324 (17 December 1908), p. 2.

²¹⁴ Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 111-12.

²¹⁵ *Anadolu*, 29 kanun-u evvel 1324 (11 January 1909), p. 1.

Britian. His manner of handling the Austro-Hungarian and Bulgarian questions was well-appreciated even among many European diplomats. Today, *Anadolu* continued, there were only two candidates for the position of Grand Vizier (*baş vekalet*), namely the Minister of Interior Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha and the late Grand Vizier Said Pasha. It was also questionable that these candidates could be as successful as Kamil Pasha. According to *Anadolu*, while Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha was a political genius (*deha-i siyasiye*) and an experienced statesmen it could not be denied that he needed more knowledge in foreign relations. As for Said Pasha, since his recent fall had been the outcome of the general wish of the nation (*arzu-yu umum-u millet üzerine*), his being appointed as the Grand Vizier would not be met with much pleasure.²¹⁶

In the same issue, *Anadolu* also published the heartfelt desires of Kamil Pasha that he had released to *Matin* on the occasion of the New Year. According to it, Kamil Pasha's first desire was that the Eastern Question be brought to an end. Second, he hoped that the Parliament would interpret his style of politics, which was somewhat long and burdensome, in a positive way. He also discussed his plans for the future. The Ottoman nation was now living as a free nation. The aim of this free nation was to create a power that would be spent in the way of justice and humanity. In this respect, the Ottomans would follow France. They would promote, as France did, the fraternity of nations (*uhuvvet-i akvam*) and the respect of the rights of others (*hukuk-u saire*) among the Eastern Muslims. What he most desired, however, was the unification of the Ottoman nation with its Sultan. There could not be any doubt that the Sultan always wished the best for his nation. Therefore Kamil Pasha wished that his Sultan be one of

²¹⁶ Ibid., p. 1.

the most constitutionalist monarchs of Europe, that he establish a politics of civility between the elements of the nation by participating in public life. He also asked that the rulers of Britain, France and Germany visit Turkey as they did among themselves. According to Kamil Pasha, if all these things happened, Turkey would become a respected European state and a pillar of peace and civilization.²¹⁷

On 13 January 1909, when Kamil Pasha read his statements on administrative reforms, expenditures and foreign affairs, he received an informal vote of confidence, with the deputies cheering with excitement in his favor.²¹⁸ *Anadolu* acclaimed the event not only as a success of Kamil Pasha, but also as a success of the constitutional regime. By his coming into the Parliament, the responsibility of the government in front of the Parliament was accepted for the first time.²¹⁹

On 23 January 1909, a somewhat critical voice concerning Kamil Pasha emerged in Konya. In its first issue, *Hakem* discussed the vote of confidence that Kamil Pasha had received ten days earlier. *Hakem* acknowledged that foreign relations were improving, however it did not find the conditions of the mutual agreements with Austria and Bulgaria, or Kamil Pasha's explanations of the interpellation satisfactory. Although, it went on, the deputies had listened to his explanations in absolute silence and the western media had appreciated his promises for the future, there were still some objections on the mentioned agreements.²²⁰ *Hakem's* position is important since it was the first sign that it was a more politically committed newspaper than *Anadolu*

²¹⁷ Ibid., p. 3.

²¹⁸ Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, pp. 36-38.

²¹⁹ *Anadolu*, 5 kanun-u sani 1324 (18 January 1909), p. 2.

²²⁰ *Hakem*, 10 kanun-u sani 1324 (23 January 1909), p. 2.

considering the CUP. Second, it reflected that in the provinces there were newspapers that took less than positive positions against the vote of confidence that Kamil Pasha had received.

Gaining an almost unanimous vote of confidence Kamil Pasha decided to dismiss the Ministers of War and Navy on 10 February 1909 without having discussed, or even informed, his ministers. He also attempted to send the battalions that served as a military support for the CUP back to Rumelia.²²¹ On 11 February the Parliament decided to call Kamil Pasha for an interpellation on the 13 February session. On 12 February there emerged a rumor that the CUP had decided to dethrone Abdülhamid and replace him with Yusuf İzzettin Efendi by skipping Reşad Efendi. The same day the Minister of Interior Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha, and the Minister of Justice, Manyasizade Refik Bey, resigned in protest of the manner of the dismissals; they were followed by the resignations of some other ministers.²²²

On 13 February the Parliament assembled to interpellate Kamil Pasha on the sudden change of the cabinet. Kamil Pasha, however, did not appear in the Parliament. Instead he replied to the Parliament that since the dismissal of the Minister of War had been due to foreign complications, he could not respond to the will of the Parliament at the moment and wanted the interpellation to be postponed to 17 February. The CUP considered the request of postponement as a maneuver to gain time in order to prepare a positive public opinion. The Parliament, unsatisfied with the excuse of the Grand Vizier and with his following two messages, passed a vote of no-confidence by 198 to 8 votes,

²²¹ *Anadolu* mentioned this as a rumor where he regularly gave summaries of parliamentary discussions with a week time-lag. See *Anadolu*, 6 şubat 1324 (19 February 1909), p. 3.

²²² Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, p. 50. Ahmad, pp. 33-34. Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 113.

and 53 abstentions. The next day Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha was appointed Grand Vizier to form the new cabinet.²²³

Anadolu responded to the fall of the Kamil Pasha government with much sorrow. According to *Anadolu*, relations with Austro-Hungary and Bulgaria had come to a peaceful conclusion thanks to Kamil Pasha. Whereas it was hoped foreign relations would normalize within a couple of weeks, domestic problems had come to a state of anxiety. Basra and İzmir were complaining about bandits. There were rumors that Muslims in Erzurum, Kayseri and Sivas were about the rise against Christians, in addition to many other complaints about provincial and local governors and judges. This “unsuccessful” Minister of the Interior was none other than Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha, who was asked to stop to talk in the Parliament and show some progress in the provinces.²²⁴ The article was written with some anger. *Anadolu* considered the fall of Kamil Pasha a strange thing. Instead of this disgrace, taking the existing conditions into account, Kamil Pasha deserved the gratitude of the nation. The appointment of Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha to the post of Grand Vizier was mentioned only briefly.²²⁵

In the following week, Kamil Pasha’s fall continued to be discussed in Konya. *Anadolu* thought that Kamil Pasha had been overthrown in a mysterious crisis. His way of politics during the last six months had won the approval of the deputies; and there had been great optimism that some important issues would be put in order. *Anadolu* certainly had foreign relations in mind. It insisted that no new foreign policy be started but that

²²³ Ahmad, p. 35. Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 114.

²²⁴ *Anadolu*, 2 şubat 1324 (15 February 1909), p. 2.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Kamil Pasha's policies be continued.²²⁶ As if it intended to show *Anadolu* that the new cabinet was as good at foreign relations as the Kamil Pasha Cabinet, a week later *Hakem* quoted an article by Hüseyin Cahit, in which he praised the new cabinet's success with the Bulgarian question in its first ten days.²²⁷

Anadolu also published an interview by Richard von Mach, reporter of *Kölnische Zeitung* in İstanbul, with Kamil Pasha. According to it, Kamil Pasha claimed that the CUP had intervened in the government, which was contrary to the constitutional regime. The dethronement of the Sultan and the sending back of the *avcı* battalions had been mere fabrications. He explained the dismissal of Ali Rıza Pasha, the Minister of War, with the argument that he had functioned as a tool of the CUP enabling it to use force in the army. Arif Pasha, the Minister of the Navy had already tendered his resignation.²²⁸

Contrary to *Anadolu*, *Hakem* celebrated the day of the fall of Kamil Pasha with great joy. It quoted passages from foreign newspapers. Most of them published a brief history of the service of the new Grand Vizier to his country. Some reported that the Young Turks had handled a dangerous situation with great skill and given the world a lesson in politics. Another one wrote that the number one pillar of reaction (*irticanın bir numaralı hamelesi*) had been eradicated.²²⁹ Today, *Hakem* wrote, the representatives, our respected holy-warriors, renewed and confirmed the confidence of the nation by giving Kamil Pasha a vote of no-confidence. "Today is a new day, a new date. Tyranny, with its all supporters and pillars, with its Prime Minister [Kamil Pasha] flew into non-

²²⁶ *Anadolu*, 6 şubat 1324 (19 February 1909), p. 3.

²²⁷ *Hakem*, 14 şubat 1324 (27 February 1909), p. 3.

²²⁸ *Anadolu*, 10 şubat 1324 (23 February 1909), p. 1.

²²⁹ *Hakem*, 7 şubat 1324 (20 February 1909), p. 2.

existence. There is no chance for its recurrence anymore... now we can say that constitutionalism, freedom of thought and press is rooted.” However, some virtuous people, *Hakem* claimed, loathed his fall because they had developed a great interest in restoring the old house of tyranny.²³⁰

There were also allegations that Kamil Pasha had not come to the Parliament to give an explanation on that day because he had already known that his fall had been decided upon in advance; he did not want to be insulted there.²³¹ *Anadolu* did not want to believe that the fall of the cabinet had already been decided upon because if this was true, it argued, then the first vote of confidence a month earlier had been an “artificial” one. This meant, *Anadolu* explained, there had been no sincere confidence between the cabinet and the Parliament.²³² *Anadolu*’s concern was important since it was a sign that the Representatives had not attained political maturity. The Parliament was so immature that it could give a vote of no-confidence to a Grand Vizier whom it had exalted with cheers a month earlier. The opposite was equally disappointing; if the Parliament had been sincere in its vote of confidence a month earlier, this meant that it had been politically so immature as not to know Kamil Pasha’s real character. In any case, this radical shift of the Parliament, as Sina Akşin indicates, may have encouraged those who

²³⁰ “Bu gün yeni bir gün, yeni bir tarihtir, istibdad a’van ve erkanyla, baş vekiliyle ademistan-ı hiçahiçe karışmış, aks ve nüks ihtimalleri kat-ı rabıta-i alem-i şuhud etmiştir... artık şu vesile ile şimdi diyebiliriz ki: meşrutiyet, serbesti-i efkar, matbuat, kökleşmiştir.” See *Ibid.*, p. 1.

²³¹ *Anadolu*, 10 şubat 1324 (23 February 1909), p. 1.

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 1.

thought that a coup attempt would not be resisted much by such an immature Parliament.²³³

Hakem seems to have emerged as the organ of the CUP in Konya. It is clear that *Anadolu* did not represent the Unionist point of view on the question of Kamil Pasha. As opposed to *Hakem*'s strict Unionist anti-Kamil Pasha stance *Anadolu* preserved a certain distance from the CUP and sincerely supported Kamil Pasha. As the section on the Liberal Union below will demonstrate, its pro-Kamil Pasha position did not mean that *Anadolu* was a genuine Liberal Unionist newspaper.

The Rising Divergence in Konya

The first clear expression of divergence in Konya appeared in the 19 February 1909 issue of *Anadolu*, following the fall of the Kamil Pasha cabinet. The newspaper noted that since the proclamation of freedom the general atmosphere in Konya had been declining because of the dissent and lack of harmony. *Anadolu* found it unnecessary to recall the importance of union and fraternity. According to it, if Konya had not reached the level of development it deserved this was due to the present “discord and opposition (*nifak ve tezat*)”. *Anadolu* called on the *ulema* and the high ranking bureaucrats (*rüesa-yı hükümet*) to cure the “discord,” to gather the people, especially the leaders of these “two or three parties” and make them embrace each other.²³⁴ The newspaper expressed much sorrow about the divergence; however, it did not identify these “two or three parties.”

²³³ Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 115. Also see Sina Akşin, *31 Mart Olayı* (İstanbul: Sinan Yayınları, 1972), pp. 380-81.

²³⁴ *Anadolu*, 6 şubat 1324 (19 February 1909), p. 1.

The divergence in Konya should have reached an important level by early March. Mecid Efendi, the Chairman of Finance in the Council of State (*şura-yı devlet maliye reisi*) and his assistant Nihat Bey came to Konya to inspect accusations about Nazım Pasha, the Governor of Konya.²³⁵ Mecid Efendi attempted to eliminate the disagreement in Konya by advising and admonishing the parties' "union." He commented that the Province lagged behind in public works, explaining its sole reason being this disagreement. Mecid Bey also warned that if the "discord" was not eliminated the reforms and improvements would only stay on paper. *Anadolu* considered the opposition among the Muslims a shame at a time when two Christians did not complain about each other, let alone to struggle with each other. If there were people who were exposed to injustice they should not doubt that the government would redress it. In any case, it added, the quarrel had to be prevented from spreading among the people.²³⁶ The nature of the "discord" was not clarified; however, as the newspaper emphasized to hinder its spread among the people, it probably was one strongly felt among the elite, which had the inclination of gradually spreading among the people.

Whereas *Anadolu* conceived of itself as non-partisan and shouldered the responsibility of reconciling the opposing parties, the newspaper *Hakem* did not mention the existence of any disagreement whatsoever. However, as was demonstrated in the previous section, *Anadolu* and *Hakem* held opposite views on the issue of Kamil Pasha. As the issue was the most significant one among many others manifested in the newspaper, one can derive that opposite views on Kamil Pasha must have ignited a

²³⁵ *Anadolu*, 30 kanun-u sani 1324 (12 February 1909), p. 3.

²³⁶ *Anadolu*, 17 şubat 1324 (2 March 1909), p. 4.

process of polarization in Konya that continued to intensify during March and early April.

On 24 January 1909, about a month before the first complaint of *Anadolu*, the printing house of *Maşrik-ı İrfan* was established by the local *ulema* and merchants. They started to publish a newspaper on 4 March 1909 with the same title of *Maşrik-ı İrfan*. The decision of the *ulema* of Konya to publish a separate newspaper should be considered as a result of their dissatisfaction with the other two newspapers. Each newspaper reflected a different intellectual-political tendency in Konya, *Maşrik-ı İrfan* reflected the established *ulema* and conservative merchants and notables. Until *Maşrik-ı İrfan* emerged there had been one major discussion in Konya, namely that about Kamil Pasha. The emergence of *Maşrik-ı İrfan* paralleled the rising debate on *şeriat* and *nizam* (religious law and secular law) in the capital, thus another major discussion began between *Hakem* and *Maşrik-ı İrfan* on *şeriat*, which *Anadolu* preferred to abstain from taking part in.

Another major indicator that is useful to illustrate the divergence in Konya is the different perspectives on the Liberal Union and the CUP. However, these were not subject of mutual discussions as in the cases of Kamil Pasha and *şeriat*. The following sections examine the opposing perspectives on the Liberal Union, the domination of the CUP, and the discussion on *şeriat* and *nizam*.

The Liberal Union and the CUP

The Liberal Union was founded on 14 September 1908 in İstanbul. Although he had never been an official member of the party, there was a consensus on Prince

Sabahattin Bey as its unspoken leader. The ideas of Sabahattin Bey were some of the most sophisticated of his time in the Ottoman Empire. His importance lay in the fact that his conception and analyses of society were based on a philosophy of the human being. The Liberal Union accepted his ideas and emphasized individualism, private initiative, political and economic liberalism, and decentralization. His criticism of the state and civil servants were too radical in a society where a large number of the elite were civil servants. Though sophisticated in his analysis of the Ottoman society, the translation of social scientific analyses and projects into a political agenda proved to be problematic.²³⁷ During the 1902 Young Turk congress in Paris, the Young Turks had split into two groups, that of Ahmet Rıza Bey and Prince Sabahattin Bey. The first one had established the Committee of Progress and Union and the second one the League of Private Initiative and Decentralization. This conflict would affect the competition for political power during the Constitutional period.²³⁸

The Liberal Union participated in the 1908 elections as the single opponent party of the “sacred” CUP. It was able to organize only in İstanbul but gained one seat from Ankara thanks to Mahir Sait Bey’s personal efforts. Though unsuccessful in the elections, some deputies, such as İsmail Kemal Bey, Zohrap Efendi and Dr. Rıza Nur, transferred to the party. Its supporters were revealed more clearly in the discussions on Kamil Pasha’s fall. Decentralization, as the Party’s major policy, and its close cooperation with the non-Turkish elements of the Empire especially Greeks and Albanians, was subject to harsh criticism by the CUP, which even accused the Liberal

²³⁷ Mardin, pp. 210-18.

²³⁸ Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler*, 2nd ed., vol. I, 3 vols. (İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları, 1988), p. 21.

Union of separatism.²³⁹ The party tried to make use of the Event of *31 Mart* and encouraged it to strengthen its weak position in front of the CUP, a mistake that prepared its end.²⁴⁰

Anadolu's Perception

The first time that the Liberal Union received mention in *Anadolu* was on 14 December 1908, three months after its foundation and three days before the opening of the Parliament. The tone of the article was that of astonishment and anger. The Liberal Union was depicted as a party that was against this “just regime.”²⁴¹ It was accused of following a wrong political way by promising the Greeks more privileges. This was against the principles of freedom and equality. It was known, *Anadolu* wrote, that the Party had tried to get some of its men elected into Parliament in order to spread their ideas there.²⁴²

However, this harsh criticism of the Liberal Union left its place to a more moderate, even a positive conception of the Party during the discussions on Kamil Pasha Cabinet. As discussed above, *Anadolu* defended Kamil Pasha as the most suitable person for the post of Grand Vizier. In an article on 11 January 1909, which praised the competence of the Pasha, *Anadolu* gave the good news that in the Parliament there had

²³⁹ Ibid., pp. 143-47.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 148, 153.

²⁴¹ The term used was “*idare-i adile*” which literally means “just administration.” Yet, it was referred as something that the whole world accepted, which turns out to be the constitutional regime.

²⁴² *Anadolu*, 1 kanun-u evvel 1324 (14 December 1908), p. 2.

begun to be established political parties similar to those in the “civilized European states.” According to the newspaper, there was no doubt that when two opposing parties contested their perspectives, the one that would serve the nation best would prevail. “In every issue, the glitter of the truth comes into existence through the collision of ideas” (*her meselede barika-i hakikat müsademe-i efkardan hasil olur*) was the motto.²⁴³ Though the names of the parties were not mentioned there is no doubt that these were the CUP and the Liberal Union.²⁴⁴ In this radical shift in the appreciation of the Liberal Union by *Anadolu*, the importance of Kamil Pasha as the Grand Vizier in the eyes of the newspaper no doubt played an important role.

Although the Liberal Union was not successful in the elections, nevertheless it had close relationships with the 40-50 deputies who were on the way to forming an opposition nucleus. In addition, newspapers such as *Serbestî*, *İkdam*, *Osmanlı*, *Sada-yı Millet*, *Sabah* raised an anti-CUP and pro-Liberal Union voice.²⁴⁵ On 26 January 1909, the Liberal Union organized a reception in the Pera Palas Hotel to celebrate the 610th anniversary of the Ottoman dynasty. Kamil Pasha, still the Grand Vizier then, attended the dinner. Ahmet Rıza Bey, the president of the Parliament, attacked Kamil Pasha of doing wrong in attending the reception personally. *Serbesti* considered the reception as the harbinger of a strong opposition party in the Parliament.²⁴⁶

²⁴³ *Anadolu*, 29 kanun-u evvel 1324 (11 January 1909), p. 1.

²⁴⁴ According to Tarık Zafer Tunaya the first time that the name “Liberal Union” was openly referred to in the Parliament was on 3 March 1909, which seems to be a rather late date. Tunaya, *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler*, p. 144 footnote 9.

²⁴⁵ Tefik Çavdar, *İttihat ve Terakki* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991), p. 46.

²⁴⁶ Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, pp. 43-44.

Anadolu argued that the contradiction between the CUP – to whom the nation was grateful for the restoration of the Constitution – and the Liberal Union was not a serious issue. The Prophet himself had taught that conflict of opinion within his *ümmet* was a mercy of God. Nonetheless, *Anadolu* wanted to state some reservations concerning the two parties. The Committee’s resort to the use of force to intervene into governmental affairs was unnecessary after the Parliament was opened. As for the Liberal Union, *Anadolu* considered “decentralization” as a project the consequences of which were not well thought out. Decentralization should be understood and applied as *tevsi-i mezuniyet* (extension of local authority), which was bestowed by the Constitution.²⁴⁷ Because of the emphasis of the Liberal Union on decentralization, the nature of the administrative system became an issue of discussion. *Anadolu* did not prefer decentralization; nevertheless, it considered *tevsi-i mezuniyet* as a vital constitutional right of the Province. Reports on the General Provincial Council (*Meclis-i Umumi-i Vilayet*) of Konya covered a considerable amount of place in the local newspapers in Konya, especially in *Anadolu*.

In order to get a sense of the meaning of *tevsi-i mezuniyet* it will be appropriate here to quote a 1911 Ottoman textbook of administrative law which explained the related terms of centralization, decentralization, *tevsi-i mezuniyet*, and deconcentration. It started with a justification of decentral administrative systems. A summary of the ideas of the author are presented in the following: In constitutional regimes the aim of the existence of the government was to ensure the general well-being of the people. The general well-being of the people necessitated their participation in administrative issues.

²⁴⁷ *Anadolu*, 10 şubat 1324 (23 February 1909), p. 1

Yet the Parliament alone could not guarantee national progress. Therefore, in local issues people also needed to have a say.

According to the textbook, centralization meant that local issues were to be handled directly by the central government without giving any authority to the provinces. The positive aspect of centralization was that it secured the political unity of the country and the negative was that the central government cannot properly grasp local needs. Decentralization was of two types. The first one was political decentralization and the second was administrative decentralization. Political decentralization meant that the provincial government had absolute autonomy in all kinds of local issues. Switzerland was given as an example of this. Administrative decentralization meant to increase the degree of participation of the local people into those particular issues which did not relate to the public and political life (*hayat-ı umumiye ve siyasiye*) of the whole country and extending the authority of local officials in those issues. Administrative decentralization was called *tevsi-i mezuniyet* as well. This administrative system was accepted and encouraged by the Ottoman Constitution.²⁴⁸ However, the present Ottoman *tevsi-i mezuniyet* corresponded to a simple level of administrative decentralization. In a fully functioning administratively decentralized system all local officials and bureaucrats were locally appointed and elected. Such a system was not legitimized by the present Constitution. Deconcentration was a more limited form of *tevsi-i mezuniyet*. In a deconcentrated system the authority of local officials were extended as well. However, local population did not participate in local administration through such bodies as

²⁴⁸ “Madde 108 — Vilâyatın usul-ü idaresi, tevsi-i mezuniyet ve tefrik-i vezayif kaidesi üzerine müesses olup derecatı nizam-ı mahsus ile tâyin kılınacaktır.” Gözübüyük, p. 41.

Provincial Councils with an elected membership.²⁴⁹ The author Adil Bey, who was also the rector of the Selanik Law School, believed that the most proper administrative system for a state such as the Ottoman Empire was *tevsi-i mezuniyet* because the Empire was so vast and consisted of various ethnic elements.²⁵⁰

Back to the discussion in *Anadolu*. In spite of Kamil Pasha being among the leaders of the Liberal Union, his political thoughts and his former policies, alleged *Anadolu*, were not in accordance with the idea of decentralization of the Liberal Union. This reservation about Kamil Pasha can be read as a sign indicating that *Anadolu*'s appreciation of the Liberal Union was conditional for the reason that it did not agree with the party on its most basic principle. As for Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha, the new Grand Vizier, *Anadolu* accused him of violating *tevsi-i mezuniyet* in the name of opposing decentralization and under the veil of patriotism. *Anadolu* probably thought decentralization an administrative system that was to pave the way to autonomy or self-government and gradually to separation. One should recall the separatist movements, especially in Macedonia among the Albanians. This is why opposing decentralization was thought to be a patriotic attitude. Hilmi Pasha was also accused of giving too many promises, but not attaching enough importance to the provinces.²⁵¹

Anadolu attached utmost importance to *tevsi-i mezuniyet* and the General Provincial Council. It reported with much pleasure that based on the *tevsi-i mezuniyet* clause of the Constitution, the General Provincial Councils had been ordered to

²⁴⁹ M. Adil, *Mukayeseli Hukuk-u İdare Derstleri: Birinci Kitap* (Selanik: [Rumeli Matbaası], 1327 [1911]), pp. 336-40.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 444.

²⁵¹ *Anadolu*, 10 şubat 1324 (23 February 1909), p. 1

assemble.²⁵² It was regarded by the newspaper as a sample of the Parliament, where the important articles necessary to improve the province were prepared. Roads within the province, agriculture, trade, uprightness of officials, justice in the courts, activity in the municipalities, seriousness in collecting tax revenues, fairness in the taxes, increased power in the police, extension of the authority of the Governors, and order in education, all these would be realized through the General Provincial Council.²⁵³

Towards mid-March *Anadolu* seems to have had a more anti-Liberal Union position. It argued that it was somewhat absurd that the Liberal Union, without having done anything concrete to prove its existence, challenged the CUP. The foremost business of the Liberal Union, alleged *Anadolu*, had been to turn public opinion against the CUP. Therefore it looked for occasions that it could utilize against the CUP. One such occasion, according to *Anadolu*, was the official communiqué of 25 February that limited public meetings.²⁵⁴ According to the rumors the Liberal Union was to organize a meeting asking Kamil Pasha to be re-appointed as Grand Vizier. Thereupon, there had appeared in the newspapers of İstanbul an official communiqué that announced that the police had to be notified 24 hours in advance of any demonstration.²⁵⁵ The case was taken to the Parliament by İsmail Kemal Bey, who was one of the leaders of the Liberal Union and famous for his anti-Unionist position,²⁵⁶ where he argued that the regulation was unconstitutional. He demanded an interpellation of the Grand Vizier who appeared

²⁵² *Anadolu*, 29 kanun-u evvel 1324 (11 January 1909), p. 2.

²⁵³ *Anadolu*, 23 kanun-u sani 1324 (5 February 1909), p. 1.

²⁵⁴ The date is given by Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, p. 59.

²⁵⁵ *Anadolu*, 27 şubat 1324 (12 March 1909), p. 2.

²⁵⁶ Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*, p. 151.

on 3 March 1909 in the Parliament. The Grand Vizier defended his decision, which was accepted in the Parliament by 150 deputies to 49.²⁵⁷ Though it mentioned that the press in İstanbul was debating the legality of this limitation, *Anadolu* acknowledged Hilmi Pasha to be right in his defense. *Anadolu* added that those regulations did not contradict the Constitution for the reason that the people were inclined to go to excess at the meetings and were amenable to manipulation.²⁵⁸ *Hakem*'s tone was more pro-government reporting that the government had the right to make regulations in order to preserve public order until the related laws would pass in Parliament.²⁵⁹

To summarize, while *Anadolu* sympathized with the CUP, it did not feel subservient to it. Its pro-Kamil Pasha stance was very clear and firm. Its evaluation of the Liberal Union was circumstantial, basically determined by the issue of Kamil Pasha. Its preference of the CUP became more evident when the Liberal Union's attacks against the CUP intensified.

Hakem's Perception

Hakem was a Unionist newspaper. A positive appreciation of the emergence of the Liberal Union as in *Anadolu* even under the banner of the diversity of opinions in Parliament never appeared in the pages of *Hakem*. The newspaper did not make its own direct comments on the Liberal Union, nonetheless quotations from Unionist newspapers

²⁵⁷ Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, p. 61.

²⁵⁸ *Anadolu*, 27 şubat 1324 (12 March 1909), p. 2.

²⁵⁹ *Hakem*, 21 şubat 1324 (6 March 1909), p. 4.

describe its attitude towards the party. On 12 March 1909²⁶⁰ a dinner party was given in honor of the CUP, the army and the navy in the Pera Palas Hotel. The Grand Vizier, the President of the Senate, the President of the Parliament and many other ministers, senators, representatives and high ranking officers were also present. Speeches were given exalting the CUP for its service in securing the freedom of the nation and in handing the authority to the Parliament. The speech of Ahmet Rıza Bey, the President of the Parliament, was the most important.²⁶¹ *Hakem* recounted his speech as one that attracted some wicked persons' resentment. Ahmet Rıza Bey's speech emphasized that although there was a cabinet that was capable of both appreciating and putting the new regime into effect the general outlook was not well. He argued that those who had benefited from the old regime were not happy and that they either wished to return to the old regime or wanted to have freedom unrestricted in order to be able to reach their aims through other ways. These were the people, he added, who worked to set the *ulema* and the non-Muslim communities against the CUP, and these were the people who complained of the domination of the CUP and asked that it be dissolved. According to Ahmet rıza, 32 years earlier, if there had been a CUP consisting of the *ulema*, military officials and all diligent Ottomans, the Constitution could have not been abolished.²⁶² His speech accused the Liberal Union of desiring to return to the era of tyranny by the fact that it was opposing the CUP.

²⁶⁰ The date is given in Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, p. 64. However Akşin gives the date as 13 March 1909, see Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, p. 122.

²⁶¹ Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, p. 64.

²⁶² *Hakem*, 5 mart 1325 (18 March 1909), p. 4.

Hakem's negative evaluation of Kamil Pasha was already discussed in the previous section. The newspaper quoted *Tanin*'s claim that Kamil Pasha was leading the Liberal Union. *İttihad* accused the pro-Liberal Union *Serbesti* of being a newspaper that continuously lied.²⁶³ Accusations became gradually harsher towards early April. A last quotation of the pro-Committee *Şura-yı Ümmet* charged the Liberal Union almost with betrayal of the fatherland. On 27 March 1909 the Parliament had fervently discussed the manner of *The Levant Herald*, *Proodos*, and *Neologos*, which attacked the police, the army and the nation.²⁶⁴ *Şura-yı Ümmet* wrote that independent of the differences between the parties in the Parliament, in issues concerning public well-being and national dignity all parties supposed to be of one opinion. However, *Şura-yı Ümmet* added, the Liberal Union – which, thanks to God, had only a few members – could not comprehend the importance of the issue, unwilling to call it disloyalty (“*hamiyetsizlik demeye dilim varmıyor*”). *Şura-yı Ümmet* alleged that the Liberal Union had tried to defend an issue that was damned almost unanimously in Parliament. According to the newspaper, it should not defend those “rags,” instead it should join the CUP in order to drive them out of the country. It asked whether the Liberal Union would continue to display a similar manner on other issues concerning the interests of the fatherland.²⁶⁵

A well-organized and theoretical analysis of political parties in Europe also emerged in the same issue of *Hakem*. The article began with a reference to the bifurcation in Ottoman society as “new and old ideas” (*efkâr-ı atîka ve efkâr-ı cedîde*). This was also the case in Europe, noted *Hakem*. However, since they had been diverging

²⁶³ *Hakem*, 12 mart 1325 (25 March 1909), p. 3.

²⁶⁴ Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, p. 66.

²⁶⁵ *Hakem*, 19 mart 1325 (1 April 1909), p. 4.

for a long period they were more distinct in Europe, which was not the case among the Ottomans. These two ideas, wrote the newspaper, further split in their attitudes towards politics, religion, ethics, and social intercourses. In the article only political parties (*idare fırkaları*) were handled. Five basic categories were made: first, conservatives who were for absolutism; second, conservative liberals (Tories), who were for constitutional monarchy; third, liberal parliamentarians (Whigs), who were also for constitutional monarchy, but with a more powerful Parliament; fourth, democrats or radicals, who were for republic; and lastly socialists and communists, who aimed to do away with the inequality and poverty among people. The article excellently summarized the basic ideas, aims and social bases of these parties. However, it did not make any implications concerning the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, it is important to note the concurrence between the rising tension between the Liberal Union and the CUP and an article that informs about diverse regimes and parties in a local newspaper.²⁶⁶

Maşrık-ı İrfan's Perception

On 12 March 1909, a month after the fall of the Kamil Pasha Cabinet, Dr. Rıza Nur, a well-known anti-Unionist, wrote an article in *İkdam*. He complained about curses in the newspapers, tyrannical inclinations, misuse of authority, the new regulations governing the press and meetings, and the CUP interfering in government affairs and being an *imperium in imperio*. He also asked whether the CUP constituted a cabinet which was not responsible to Parliament. Rıza Nur considered the CUP to be the main

²⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 1.

cause of all wrong things and suggested that the Anatolian and İstanbul branches of the CUP be dissolved; it had to be confined to Manastır and Selanik.²⁶⁷

The most important point of his complaints was that the CUP was a government within the government. Similar complaints about the CUP's interference into governmental affairs and its use of force were also published in *Maşrık-ı İrfan*. Its 26 March 1909 issue reported that a quarrel between the CUP and the provincial government on the members that would be elected to administrative and judicial councils of the province had emerged. Because of the quarrel the decision had not been reached.²⁶⁸ In the same issue *Maşrık-ı İrfan* also wrote that questions had been raised about some individuals who participated in the discussions of the General Provincial Council, who were not elected members of the Council. This time the name of the Committee was not mentioned by the newspaper. However, since the two reports emerged in the same column, it is likely they were Unionists.

The Grand Vizier Hilmi Pasha sent a telegraph to all provinces that was reprinted in *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, but not in *Hakem* or *Anadolu*. The telegraph was about the CUP and its intervention into governmental affairs. According to the telegraph the CUP, which had been established to restore the Constitution, had continued to preserve it until the Parliament was opened. However, argued the telegraph, once the Parliament – the sole institution that was responsible for the future of the nation – was inaugurated, the CUP had been transformed into a party, which in reality only happened in 1913. The Committee itself warned its branches not to intervene into government affairs and

²⁶⁷ Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, pp. 121-22. Also see, Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, pp. 63-64.

²⁶⁸ *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, 13 mart 1325 (26 March 1909), p. 4.

demanded the government penalize those who would intervene. In spite of this, the telegraph continued, the government was informed that some people who claimed to be members of the CUP intervened into the appointments and dismissals of members of various committees and intervened into public affairs. They also forced local governments by giving written or oral notifications. In response, some officials felt reluctant to do their jobs for the sake of getting along with the CUP members. The telegraph ordered that those who did such acts be penalized and warned the officials never to follow their orders.²⁶⁹

On 15 April 1909 a report on the before mentioned quarrel between the CUP and the provincial government appeared in the pages of *Hakem*, which was quoted from *Tanin*. According to the report, the quarrel was also noted in *Serbesti* on 5 April 1909. Thereupon, on 7 April 1909, the government sent a telegraph asking the provincial government whether there was indeed such an intervention into the election process by the Committee. The government replied the day after, stating that the CUP had never intervened into the elections of members of councils and courts or into other governmental affairs.²⁷⁰ It is interesting that a Konya newspaper quoted an İstanbul newspaper on an issue concerning Konya itself. However, this report was published two days after the *31 Mart* Event (the coup attempt of 13 April). The 15 April 1909 issue of *Hakem* was rather self-possessed. The newspaper did not take a clear position against the coup attempt. However, it was so deliberate an attempt to publish a quotation that underlined that the Committee did not intervene in governmental affairs, which was one

²⁶⁹ *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, 23 mart 1325 (5 April 1909), p. 1.

²⁷⁰ *Hakem*, 2 nisan 1325 (15 April 1909), p. 2.

of the major justifications of the coup. The coup-makers had even argued that it was just a party movement against the CUP.²⁷¹

Conclusion

Although somewhat blurred, a weak split along party lines in Konya can be observed in the Konya newspapers. *Anadolu* was pro-CUP, but not subservient to it. It welcomed the Liberal Union for the sake of a multiplicity of ideas, nevertheless its support was circumstantial. *Hakem* was Unionist, and being its organ, it criticized the Liberal Union. *Maşrik-ı İrfan* was the only newspaper that dared to publish reports that criticized the domination of the CUP. There was no information available in *Maşrik-ı İrfan* to evaluate its perception of the Liberal Union.

Şeriat and Nizam

The second major discussion in Konya, after that of Kamil Pasha, considered the new laws and regulations which were referred to then as *kavanin* and *nizam*. The fall of the Kamil Pasha Cabinet mobilized the opposition against the CUP. Demonstrations were planned in front of the house of Kamil Pasha and the British Embassy. The *ulema* was an unavoidable element of any successful operation. In order to oppose the CUP the *ulema* and the students of religion should be incited. Especially *medrese* students were open to provocation as their former privilege of exemption from conscription was being

²⁷¹ Kansu, *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, p. 88.

debated. *Medrese* students protested the proposal through demonstrations, newspaper articles and organized around the Society of the Students of Religious Sciences (*Talebe-i Ulum Cemiyeti*).²⁷² High expectations from the Constitutional regime and the respective frustration increased a provocation along a religious discourse. *Volkan*, which started to be published on 11 December 1908, became the focal point of this discourse. The publisher of the newspaper, Derviş Vahdetî, also established a political party, the Mohammedan Union, on 5 April 1909. Vahdetî was responsible for the agitation of the public and the rank and file soldiers in the *31 Mart* Event.²⁷³

Beginning in early March, discussions on religion, religious leaders and officials gradually increased in Konya. The longest and fiercest debate in Konya occurred on the issue of *şeriat* between *Hakem* and *Maşrık-ı İrfan*. *Anadolu* did not enter into the debate and preferred to make simple reconciliatory comments. *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, being the organ of the established *ulema*, defended the supremacy of *şeriat* as such and opposed to alternative “heterodox” interpretations of it.

The first issue of *Maşrık-ı İrfan* on 19 February 1909 began with an analysis of the obstacles of development. Among several accounts, the article ended with a sorrowful note concerning the inclination of the decision-makers (*büyüklerimiz*) to import *kavanin* (laws) and *nizamât* (regulations) from Europe. According to *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, Islam was the birth-place of civilization and Europe had learned civilization from Islam. Therefore one had to learn *şeriat* thoroughly and did not need to covet to anything

²⁷² Akşin, *31 Mart Olayı*, p. 39.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41, 48, 323-326.

else.²⁷⁴ This was one of the classical arguments of the Islamists. The cause of the present underdevelopment of the Muslim world was not the religion of Islam but the disobedience of Muslims to the principles of Islam. Imitation of political and social systems of foreign philosophies was considered to be one of the major problems concerning the Ottoman Empire, along with ignorance, laziness, and economic dependence.²⁷⁵

In the context of the limitations on meetings that was issued on 25 February 1909, *Anadolu* gave an example to justify the decision of the government. A group of *hocas* in Eyüp collected seals for a petition to the Parliament, which asked the forthcoming laws to totally correspond to *şeriat*. *Anadolu* expressed sorrow that such irresponsible men agitated people.²⁷⁶

An article in *Hakem* discussed the role of some *hocas*, arguing that some people presented themselves with their religious costume as religiously knowledgeable when they were totally unaware of the essence of religion, of religious politics (*siyaset-i şeriyeye*), the history of Islam, and the present social reality. The article complained that as these *hocas* were the teachers of the credulous common people, they had not been given much importance (by the government); consequently they dealt a blow to the Islamic civilization and national development unaware of what they were doing. *Hakem* added that since they were themselves ignorant they did not allow people to ask questions as if the defects of Islam would come to surface by scratching it up. Poor people! They believed everything these *hocas* told them to be orders of the *şeriat*. Some

²⁷⁴ *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, 19 şubat 1324 (4 March 1909), pp. 2-3.

²⁷⁵ Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Cereyanı* (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1962), pp. 5-11.

²⁷⁶ *Anadolu*, 27 şubat 1324 (12 March 1909), p. 2.

did not send their children to modern schools due to the discouraging comments of some *hocas* on the natural sciences and because of their depiction of the sciences as being blasphemous, when the real reason for their discouragement was their own inability to understand these sciences. Part of the present trouble was due to such *hocas*. Depicting a certain type of religious official, the article ended with their uneasy relationship with constitutionalism. According to *Hakem*, these *hocas* had first thought to reject constitutionalism on the grounds that it was religiously illegitimate. However, as they realized that it was impossible to resist it, they approved its legitimacy, without having any insight of religious arguments whether they were pro or anti-constitution.²⁷⁷ *Hakem's* implication was that Islam as a religion did not contradict development, modern sciences, modern schools, or constitutionalism. However, there were some ignorant *hocas* who opposed these and added to the present turmoil.

The Grand Debate: Do the Laws Conform to *Şeriat*

This section will trace the hot debate between the two opponent views on the relationship between *şeriat* and *nizam*. The two conflicting views of Hoca Kazım and Musa Kazım, both from the *ulema* class, constituted the bulk of the debate. Hoca Kazım defended that there was no contradiction between the laws and *şeriat*, and he tried to show that *şeriat* was open to change. Contrary to him, Musa Kazım and some other *medrese* students argued that some laws and regulations were in conflict with *şeriat*.

²⁷⁷ *Hakem*, 26 şubat 1324 (11 March 1909), p. 1.

Hoca Kazım Efendi from the district of Ereğli, who was the son of the former *müftü* Hacı Osman Efendi. Hoca Kazım Efendi was an interesting person. He and his father were famous for their knowledge of religion.²⁷⁸ He was from the *ulema* class, served as an agent of the newspaper *Anadolu*, ran for the elections but was unsuccessful. He was also among the few about whose candidacy a debate appeared in *Anadolu* during the elections. His article in *Hakem* on 11 March 1909 was also a sensational one which would be discussed by the local *ulema* of Konya for more than a month. All of these articles appeared in this debate were technical articles, consisting of claims based on Koranic verses and the *hadis*' of the Prophet. Nevertheless, a thematic analyses of the discussions helps to understand the power of religious discourse and the firm stance of the local *ulema* on the monopolization of its possible interpretations.

The article of Hoca Kazım Efendi was a response to those who asked for religious law, as it was formulized in the motto “we want *şeriat*, not *nizam*.” Literally meaning order and regulations, *nizam* denoted laws passed in the Parliament, which could well be understood as secular laws, in the sense that they were emerging through a secular process that in practice did not guarantee compatibility with *şeriat*. Thus the motto pointed to the inherent instability of the new system, namely what was guaranteed by the Constitution – compatibility with *şeriat* – was not guaranteed by the parliamentary process itself.

Kazım Efendi's basic argument was that “the foundation of all laws and regulations is ethical and judicial sciences, and the source of these sciences is the exalted

²⁷⁸ İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Konya Ereğlisi Tarihi* (İstanbul: n.p., 1970), p. 433.

şeriat.”²⁷⁹ Therefore, he went on, there was no need to complain about laws, which would be passed in a Parliament where there were also so many *ulema*, like Mustafa Asım, for instance. In practice, the most important issue seemed to be that religious criminal law called *had* punishments. These ordered executing the murderer, stoning the adulterer to death (*recm*), cutting the hand of the thief, giving a beating to a Muslim who drank alcohol, executing the Muslim who changed his religion, retaliating in kind (*kıyas*), etc. Hoca Kazım Efendi argued that changing *had* punishments were allowed by the *şeriat*.

In addition, according to Kazım Efendi, there were obstacles to implementing these punishments. First of all, there were no fully developed judges who were sophisticated enough in the religious sciences to implement such extreme punishments. Second, people were not reliable any more; witnesses could be purchased by paying a small amount of money. Depending on such witnesses, one could not execute others. Third, half of the Ottoman population consisted of non-Muslim elements. Fourth, Ottoman dignity among other nations should be also taken into account. He continued with a radical call to the people, stating that they were all free and equal now, and that they had to investigate the arguments of those who got used to threaten people with religious prohibitions. His call shook the clerical establishment to its foundation. The article ended with a warning that *şeriat* not only allowed but also encouraged the education of both boys and girls in all kinds of sciences. On this issue, people should not let themselves be misled by ignorant people.²⁸⁰

²⁷⁹ “Kavanin ve nizamatin cümlesi ilm-i ahlak ve ilm-i hukuk esaslarına müstenid ve bu ilimlerin mehazı şer-i şeriftir.” *Hakem*, 26 şubat 1324 (11 March 1909), p. 1.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

The article was subject to fierce attack in *Maşruk-ı İrfan*. Its third issue²⁸¹ was almost exclusively dedicated to responding to the article of Hoca Kazım Efendi. Beşkazalı Bekir of the *medrese* students in Konya first quoted the complete article of Kazım Efendi and then criticized it.²⁸² The second response again came from a *medrese* student, Nazif from Bozkır, accusing Kazım Efendi of being deaf to the cries of the people who yearned for *şeriat*.²⁸³ The newspaper stated it was happy that *medrese* students were so capable of responding to Hoca Kazım Efendi.²⁸⁴

The reaction against Hoca Kazım Efendi was so strong that *Hakem* itself opened its columns to a counter-argument article of Musa Kazım [Onar],²⁸⁵ another *medrese* student. The proposal, which recommended the conscription of *medrese* students, should had ignited their willingness to retort. Musa Kazım argued that the Kuran alone was enough to meet worldly and otherworldly needs; that history proved that the level of development of Muslims was proportional to their level of obedience to the orders of the Kuran, and since the Ottomans had given up obeying the Kuran they had come to the point of losing their political existence. According to Musa Kazım, people hated “temporary laws” (*muvaqqat kanunlar*) and therefore they cried “we want *şeriat* not *nizam*!” The bulk of his article, however, was devoted to disproving Hoca Kazım’s main argument that “the foundation of all laws and regulations is ethical and judicial sciences,

²⁸¹ No date available, probably 17 or 18 March 1909.

²⁸² *Maşruk-ı İrfan*, 4? mart 1324 (17? March 1909), p. 1-2.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 2-3.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁸⁵ Born in 1879 in Hadim, Konya. Graduated the İrfaniye Medresesi and Law School in Konya in 1911. Deputy of Konya 1919-1930. Minister of Religious Affairs in 1923, resigned the same year from the post upon his insistence on the law of prohibition of alcoholic beverages that was about to be abolished. See Atalay, pp. 99-105.

and the source of these sciences is the exalted *şeriat*.” Musa Kazım did not accept that *şeriat* was the sole source of jurisprudence, which, for instance, accepted natural law as one of its fundamentals. He also argued that *had* punishments could not be an issue of interpretation. Hoca Kazım’s arguments that there were no capable judges and that witnesses were cheap to buy, were insults against the whole Ottoman nation. His last objection was that non-Muslims did not constitute an excuse for the lack of *şeriat* since *şeriat* did not treat non-Muslims unequally.²⁸⁶

Musa Kazım’s article was followed by a quotation from *Tanin* that quoted *Beyanülhak*, the official organ of the Society for *Ulema* in İstanbul. *Tanin* argued that the article in *Beyanülhak* had revealed the true aims of those who wanted disorder and concealed themselves behind the “just request of *şeriat*.” According to *Beyanülhak*, the Commission for the Change of Constitution in the Parliament had decided to add into the Constitution that laws would be derived from Islamic jurisprudence. This had been met with gratitude in the Parliament. Three deputies had decided to express this joy in a “letter of thanksgiving” (*teşekkürname*) with two hundreds seals. In two days, continued *Beyanülhak*, suddenly this initiation spread to various places and was transformed into a request asking for *şeriat*. According to *Beyanülhak*, although the initiative had originally been an outcome of goodwill, as it had been an attempt to “get what was already in hand” (*hasılı tahsil*), it was unnecessary. *Beyanülhak* also emphasized that the Parliament considered the needs and the well-being of the country in every aspect and would act accordingly. Basing on the account of *Beyanülhak*, *Tanin* asked the people not to get involved in such useless initiatives.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁶ *Hakem*, 5 mart 1325 (18 March 1909), p. 4.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Hakem no doubt intended by this quotation from *Beyanülhak* to undermine the former article of Musa Kazım, which argued that there were contradictions between the present laws and *şeriat*. Thus, the Unionist newspaper tried to prevent the article serving as an ideological instrument that legitimated mobilization in the name of *şeriat*. Its inability to refuse to publish the article demonstrated simply the power of religious response in Konya.

Nevertheless, in its next issue on 25 March 1909, *Hakem* published the defense of Hoca Kazım Efendi to the attacks in *Maşrık-ı İrfan* and that of Musa Kazım in *Hakem*. The article began with an attack on those “respected personalities who are asking for *şeriat*, which is already preserved in our hands, assuming it non-existent... You poor people, who have been bearing the cruelties of the government for years, and submitting to its wicked laws instead of the laws of Allah!.. If the “Sacred Committee” *that we want to hate now* [my emphasis], would not make the Constitution be proclaimed, who knows how long we would bear that yoke of tyranny, which conforms neither to *şeriat* nor to civilized regulations?” The article asked where the *ulema* were in the era when the *şeriat* was not appreciated, or whether they consider that the injustices conformed to *şeriat*.²⁸⁸

Hoca Kazım Efendi argued that the difference between *şeriat* and the laws and regulations that had been decided to be passed in the Parliament had been exaggerated. Their difference was limited only by criminal law. The deputies, however, he noted, had not begun to improve the criminal law yet. He assured his readers that in the improvement process the clear orders of the Kuran and the necessities of time and place would be taken into account. The rest of the article was allotted to his defense of his main argument by referring to history and the religious sciences. The ethical and judicial

²⁸⁸ *Hakem*, 12 mart 1325 (25 March 1909), p. 1. For the source see Appendix E.

sciences that the Ottomans had imported from Europe, he argued, had originally belonged to the Muslims. Historically, the light of knowledge had passed to Europe, which had then been sunk in darkness, and also to other nations through Basra, Samarkand, Damascus, Egypt, Morocco, Cordoba, and Granada. This had been admitted by the French Minister of Education. Hoca Kazım argued that jurisprudence as a science had started with Islam, its source was *şeriat*. Islamic jurisprudence (*ilm-i fıkıh*), jurisprudence (*ilm-i hukuk*) and ethical sciences (*ilm-i ahlak*) were all the same thing since they all aimed to ensure the happiness of the human being.²⁸⁹

It is important to note that Hoca Kazım's argument went beyond the classical Islamist argument that glorified the Islamic past as a stage in history that should be referred to in order to revitalize Islamic societies. He argued that historically European judicial and ethical sciences had their sources in *şeriat*. Second, he emphasized that European and Islamic jurisprudence shared the same goal of human happiness. A logical outcome of the two points was the needlessness of the discussion about laws and regulations because they were historically and in their purposes based on *şeriat*. In addition to history and a rational perspective based on purpose and goal – which were supposed to be insufficient evidences to convince the *ulema* – Hoca Kazım referred to religious evidence and tried to prove that *şeriat* did allow some of its orders concerning criminal law to be interpreted in different ways under different circumstances.²⁹⁰ His article covered another four columns in the next issue of *Hakem*, basically arguing that *şeriat* was open to laws and regulations. *Hakem* was happy with the arguments of Hoca Kazım Efendi and advised its readers and Musa Kazım Efendi personally to read the

²⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 1-2.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 1-2.

articles of İsmail Hakkı Efendi²⁹¹ of Manastır in the respected periodical of *Sırat-ı Müstakim*.²⁹²

Towards the end of March 1909 the language of *Maşrık-ı İrfan* became significantly harsher. The 26 March issue of *Maşrık-ı İrfan* started with a poem attacking *Hakem*. Written by an unnamed individual in İstanbul of the *ilmiye* class, the poet encouraged *Maşrık-ı İrfan* to keep on illuminating people against those who were howling against the religion of Islam.²⁹³ Watch-seller Rıfat Efendi,²⁹⁴ who was the editor of *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, accused Hoca Kazım of attacking those who asked for *şeriat* and said that he was going astray, an accusation of highest level in an Islamic society. In the same issue Musa Kazım continued to criticize Hoca Kazım, especially his encouragement of the people to “investigate statements of those who threaten us with religious permissions and prohibitions.”²⁹⁵ The issues of *Maşrık-ı İrfan* on 1 April and 5 April also contained long articles attacking Hoca Kazım. Rıfat Efendi in particular attacked Hoca Kazım’s personality to a certain extent and ordered him to control his anger and guard *şeriat*. He also threatened that the faithful would fight those who defamed *şeriat*.²⁹⁶ Another article, again written by a *medrese* student, compared Hoca Kazım’s articles to the howling of

²⁹¹ Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı was an Islamist who supported the CUP in his preaches and harshly criticized after the 31 Mart Event those who asked for *şeriat*. See İsmail Kara, *İslâmcıların Siyasi Görüşleri* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1994), p. 55, 67.

²⁹² *Hakem*, 19 mart 1325 (1 April 1909), pp. 1-2.

²⁹³ *Hakem*, 13 mart 1325 (26 March 1909), p. 1. For the poem see Appendix E.

²⁹⁴ Nuri Efendizade Saatçi Mehmet Rıfat Efendi. Born in 1869, graduated Konya Medresesi, a successful merchant, very good in Mathematics, expert in banking, one of the founders of İktisad-ı Milli and Ticaret Banks and head of their executive committees. Joined the CUP and actively participated in its local branches. Ran for the elections in 1908 but unsuccessful. Deputy of Konya through 1920-1923. See Çoker, p. 674.

²⁹⁵ *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, 13 mart 1325 (26 March 1909), pp. 1-2.

²⁹⁶ *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, 19 mart 1325 (1 April 1909), p. 1.

dogs, arguing that barks against *şeriat* were always there but had never been effective.²⁹⁷ The split along the discourse of *şeriat* became so severe that *Meşrik-ı İrfan* warned its readers not to attend to the conversation of those who were ignorant of their religion.²⁹⁸

Hoca Kazım continued to defend his position that *şeriat* was not in contradiction to laws and regulations, and its application could be changed depending on the time, place and nation. He added that they should not take offense at freedom of thought and religion, which was also within the constitutional rights.²⁹⁹ Although *Hakem* had disclosed its stance in this debate it accepted the response of Musa Kazım in the same issue.³⁰⁰ Interestingly enough, the issue of 15 April 1909 of *Hakem* included one last article of Musa Kazım, but not of Hoca Kazım, in which Musa Kazım alleged that Hoca Kazım – without mentioning his name though – seemed to be a supporter of *şeriat* in appearance, but was a supporter of Europe in fact, and accused him of disturbing the belief of the common people (*milletin itikadını bozmak*).³⁰¹ This was, however, two days after the *31 Mart* Event broke out and the attitude of *Hakem* was deliberate enough not take a clear stance towards anyone, especially towards a discourse that justified a coup attempt.

²⁹⁷ *Maşrik-ı İrfan*, 23 mart 1325 (5 April 1909), p. 2.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²⁹⁹ *Hakem*, 26 mart 1325 (8 April 1909), p. 1.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³⁰¹ *Hakem*, 2 nisan 1325 (15 April 1909), p. 3.

Anadolu's Stance

Last, I want to depict *Anadolu's* stance in this debate of “we want *şeriat* not *nizam*.” *Anadolu* did not directly enter into the debate and did not take a clear side. An article in its last available issue on 29 March 1909 – three weeks after the *şeriat-nizam* debate manifested itself in Konya newspapers – presented the general self-possessed attitude of the newspaper. It admitted “the good-will of those who asked for *şeriat*.” However, *Anadolu* noted, the issue was being debated in a very simple form. In order to discuss the issue properly three points had to be taken into account: the international position of the Ottoman State, its various ethno-religious elements, and the level of education of its people. According to the analysis of *Anadolu*, the Ottoman Empire was very weak compared to the Great States. It was just able to free itself from tyranny, as a result of which from disintegration as well. In addition, it was chained by the economic privileges (capitulations) given to the European states. In return, it could not benefit from the privileges which the European states provided each other, because the Ottoman Empire was not a Christian state. As to the second point, the Ottoman State consisted of various ethno-religious elements. None of the elements was privileged. However, *şeriat* recognized the different chiefs and books (*amir ve kitap*) of each element. As to the level of education, the restoration of the Constitution and freedom did not guarantee justice. For a small amount of money there were false witnesses and corrupt officials to buy. Under these circumstances, one could easily instrumentalize courts to have one's enemy's hand cut. Yet *Anadolu* assured that *şeriat* would be the base for the laws and there would be a committee of *ulema* in the Parliament which would work to make the laws to conform to *şeriat* as far as possible. In this way the discontent of the people and

their complaints could be stopped. As a matter of fact, retaliation in kind against premeditated murder (*müteammiden katil olanların kısası*) and beating vagrants (*serserilerin darbı*) was decided to be applied, as it was ordered by *şeriat*.³⁰²

The law proposal on the vagrants and suspects (*serseri ve mazanna-i su' eşhas*) was discussed for three months in the Parliament.³⁰³ Especially clause 12 that ordered beating of vagrants was severely criticized by some deputies on the basis that it was against human dignity. The critiques were perceived to be against *şeriat*. The deputies of Konya were splitted. Mehmet Emin Efendi, the former member of the Provincial Administrative Council in Konya, proposed that the beating clause should be removed. Ebuzziya Tefvik Bey, the aged journalist and Yorgaki Efendi, the Greek deputy supported him. Mehmet Vehbi [Çelik] defended that the Koran ordered beating for certain crimes. Zeynelabidin Efendi, Hacı Salim Efendi, Mehmet Hamdi [Yazır] Efendi, Ömer Lütfi Efendi, Hacı Eşref Bey, and Hayri Bey supported him. All of them were of *ulema* except Hacı Eşref Bey. Within the *ulema* Hayri Bey proposed that beating should be included in the law however the judge should decide on wheter to implement beating, or imprisonment, instead. The beating clause was accepted by 123 against 52 deputies on 8 April 1909, while the law passed on 8 May 1909.³⁰⁴

³⁰² *Anadolu*, 16 mart 1325 (29 March 1909), p. 2.

³⁰³ For a detailed analysis of this law see Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet, 1876-1914* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), especially pp. 92-114.

³⁰⁴ For the position of Konya deputies on the beating clause see *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, pp. 672, 679, 685, 698-699.

Hoca Kazım: A Marginal within the *Ulema* of Konya

As the *ulema* were natural affiliates of Islamism, the discussion on *şeriat* and *nizam* in Konya should be evaluated in the context of Islamism and Islamization. In the words of Prince Said Halim Pasha, Islam was a social religion that embraced religion and world, materiality and spirituality. Islamization meant then, “to interpret the Islamic systems of belief, ethics, society, and politics in a way that conforms best to the needs of time and place.” Islamized individuals or states derived their social and political rights and duties, their regimes, freedoms and justice from Islamic principles.³⁰⁵ According to Tunaya, modernization in the Islamic world gave birth to two movements: a “real” rational one that separated religion and state, and a “limited” rational one. Islamism was limited in its rationality because while it accepted the Kuran and *sünnet* (the tradition of the Prophet of Islam) as dogmas, it sought to interpret them to meet contemporary needs.³⁰⁶ Its rational aspect was manifest in the fact that such concepts as *meşveret*, *şura*, *uhuvvet*, *ittihat* (consultation, fraternity, union), which were all deduced from Islamic sources, had never reached in the history of Islam their high respect and broad meaning as they had acquired during the periods of the Tanzimat and Constitutionalism.³⁰⁷ It was the rational pressure of the “needs of time and place” which forced the Islamists to seek these Islamic concepts.

Hoca Kazım had three major arguments. His main argument was that “the foundations of all laws and regulations are the ethical and judicial sciences, and the

³⁰⁵ Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Cereyanı*, p. 12.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

³⁰⁷ Kara, *İslâmcıların Siyasi Görüşleri*, p. 39.

source of these sciences is the exalted *şeriat*.”³⁰⁸ He tried to support it with an historical account of the transfer of these sciences from the Islamic centers of education to Europe. And last, he emphasized the common goal of religious and European (namely secular) jurisprudence. Taking all his arguments together it becomes evident that he practically diverged from the limited rationalism of the *ulema* in Konya. For Hoca Kazım, *şeriat* was totally compatible with secular jurisprudence because historically the source of European secular jurisprudence was *şeriat* and shared the same goals that *şeriat* aimed to realize. It does not mean much that Hoca Kazım had articulated his ideas in an Islamic discourse, for the reason that the sole legitimating discourse of the day was nothing but Islam, especially for the *ulema*, of course. Though speaking within an Islamic discourse, Hoca Kazım’s perspective, in its results, seemed to help pave the way for modern secular laws and regulations, what Tunaya called “real” rationalism. This should be the reason why *Hakem* welcomed Hoca Kazım’s ideas while *Meşrik-ı İrfan* felt insecure about it.

Conclusion

All three newspapers talked within the legitimate discourse of Islam; at least they respected it. However, each preferred a different approach towards the debate on *şeriat* and *nizam*. *Anadolu* was critical of religious agitation, preferred *nizam*, yet proposed that it should conform to *şeriat* as far as possible. It did not take a side in the debate, but pointed out that there was a middle way between the two positions. In spite of the fact

³⁰⁸ “Kavanin ve nizamatin cümlesi ilm-i ahlak ve ilm-i hukuk esaslarına müstenid ve bu ilimlerin mehazı şer-i şeriftir.”

that *Hakem* published the articles of both sides there is no doubt that it supported the idea that the present laws and regulations totally conformed to *şeriat* and preferred the perspective that was more open to secular jurisprudence. It also published articles against some *hocas* though differentiated them from their colleagues by the adjective of “ignorant.” *Maşrık-ı İrfan*’s position in this debate was the sharpest and clearest. It defended *şeriat* as such without any reservations and argued that some of the new regulations contradicted it. The newspaper did not feel reluctant to use the harshest attacks against its opponents.

Conclusion

This chapter shows that the pro-Committee atmosphere of Konya started to crackle with the inauguration of parliamentary politics. The split was well materialized in the timing of the establishment of new local newspapers. The Unionist *Hakem* was established on 23 January 1909, when the dissatisfaction of the CUP with Kamil Pasha was rising; *Meşrık-ı İrfan*, the newspaper of the *ulema*, was established on 4 March 1909, when discussions on *şeriat* started to intensify. I used three major indicators that were frequently referred to in these newspapers in order to take a picture of the polarization in Konya. These indicators are the different perspectives on the Grand Vizier Kamil Pasha, the existent political parties, and *şeriat*.

In the discussion on the fall of Kamil Pasha Cabinet there were two clear and opposing positions. Whereas *Anadolu* supported Kamil Pasha as being the most appropriate person for the post of Grand Vizier, *Hakem* considered him to be one of the

main pillars of the absolutist regime. *Maşrık-ı İrfan*'s position is unavailable because it was not published then.

In general, the CUP was respected by all of these newspapers, as it had freed the Ottomans from the yoke of tyranny. However, their degree of affiliation with the CUP varies. Whereas *Hakem* deserved the title Unionist, *Anadolu* was a pro-Committee newspaper having some reservations on the issue of Kamil Pasha. The single newspaper that criticized the CUP was *Maşrık-ı İrfan* concerning the willingness of some members of the Committee to intervene into governmental affairs.

Anadolu's perception of the Liberal Union depended on the conjuncture. At first, it ran down the party because of its principle of decentralization, and its promises to the Greeks for more privileges. During the period when the debate on Kamil Pasha intensified, *Anadolu* appreciated it as contributing to a multi-party parliamentary system. However, when the Kamil Pasha debate was over *Anadolu* criticized the Liberal Union for its vilifying the CUP. *Hakem* never welcomed the Liberal Union, wrote against it and the pro-Liberal Union newspapers. *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, however, did not mention its name at all.

The most fervent discussion in Konya, following the one on Kamil Pasha, was that on the compatibility of laws and regulation with the *şeriat*. *Maşrık-ı İrfan* complained that the Parliament was resorting to European laws and regulations which did not conform to *şeriat*. *Hakem*, in response supported the view that *şeriat* did not contradict the regulations and laws in their essence. Nonetheless, *Hakem* felt itself obliged to publish both perspectives, probably fearing that the newspaper would be perceived as having an anti-*şeriat* position. *Anadolu* was critical of religious agitation.

However, it did not enter into the discussion between *Maşrik-ı İrfan* and *Hakem* and argued that the two perspectives could be reconciled in practice.

Kamil Pasha and *şeriat* emerged as two major issues along which a clear split had emerged in Konya. The “sacred” CUP as such had been immune from direct attacks except criticism arguing that some members tried to interfere with government affairs. However, the level of party loyalties of the newspapers changed, *Hakem* being most and *Maşrik-ı İrfan* least loyal to the CUP. The Liberal Union did not emerge as a determinant factor in the split in Konya. It had a secondary position.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This work tried to trace the path that led to divergences in the public opinion in Konya between August 1908 and April 1909. It argued that the Parliament, as an institution that crystallized competing political perspectives, was significant in determining the issues around which the public opinion in Konya developed divergences. With the opening of the Parliament, the public opinion in Konya was first divided along the actions of Kamil Pasha and then along the concept of *şeriat*. Party affiliations, especially with the Liberal Union, did not play a major role in these splits. Special attention was paid to the slowly changing perceptions of the CUP during the period in question. The three local newspapers in Konya, *Anadolu*, *Hakem*, and *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, constituted the basic sources of this study.

After the Revolution, Konya was united around the ideals of constitutionalism, freedom, equality, fraternity and justice. The CUP was perceived as the undisputed champion of the Revolution and its guardian; it was the “sacred Committee.” Thus, it nearly symbolized the new regime itself. In this early days people rushed to join the Committee. The Committee, however, did not have a clear self-definition. Its boundaries

were not clearly defined in terms of both organization and ideology. Therefore, in the early days of the Revolution, the label “Unionist” covered a very large scale of people whose common denominator was to get rid of the absolutist regime, raise their voices in a parliament, and attain a certain degree of self-rule at the provincial level. Some of these Unionists would leave the CUP in the future as the Committee gradually assumed a Turkist, centralist and secular character. It should not be forgotten that the labels “Unionist” or “the CUP” also have their own history, having in different temporal contexts different denotations.

Following the Revolution, a delegation was sent to Konya by the Selanik headquarters of the CUP to illuminate the people on the CUP and their rights and duties in the new regime. The delegation was led by Tahir Bey who was welcomed everywhere as “one of the founding members of the sacred Committee.” Huge gatherings of excited people rushed to listen to the delegation and thus displayed the mass support for the Committee and the new regime. In the meetings of the delegation the Committee and constitutionalism were venerated side by side. Mass celebrations of the delegation were important at two levels, the systemic and the sub-systemic. The systemic level denotes the level of the constitutional regime; the sub-systemic level denotes the level at which the election campaign of a quasi-political party functioned. At the systemic level, the absolutely positive response of the people to the visits served to the stability of the whole system; it functioned as a welcoming ceremony for the new regime and reinforced the discourse of liberty and constitutionalism, symbolized the new social contract between the Ottoman citizens and the new regime. At the sub-systemic level, the visits functioned as an election campaign. Mass celebrations served to exhibit the prestige that the CUP enjoyed in the eyes of the people. The prestige of the CUP whetted the appetite

of political actors to benefit from the Committee and encouraged them to establish good relations with the CUP. In other words, its prestige helped the political actors to “behave themselves” in front of the CUP.

The nature of the visits of the CUP-delegation should be more clarified here, because it gives us clues about the nature of the CUP itself and helps us to portray a more historical account of it. In its visits, the delegation in Konya attempted neither to define an opponent nor to divide the public as the pros and cons of the Committee. Its high prestige among the people, on the one hand, and its indistinct character and loose organizational structure on the other, enabled the Committee to embrace any group. Therefore the delegation could neither specify the “men of the Committee” nor call the people to vote for them. As it is one of the main arguments of this thesis, crystallization of the public opinion in Konya along competitive political perspectives mainly started with the inauguration of the Parliament. As described in the fourth chapter in detail, the first criticisms of the Committee in Konya coincided with the hotly debated *şeriat* and *nizam* discussions. Thus, the beginning of political discussion also started the process of the delineation of the Committee’s boundaries. The Liberal Union, the political party that also ran for the elections, however, could not organize itself in the provinces; it received no mention, neither positive nor negative, in Konya. Therefore its existence should not have played a significant role in the shaping of the perception of the CUP before the Parliament opened.

As to the outcomes of the elections, the socio-economic structure of Konya would play a more significant role in the outcomes than the guidance of the delegation. The delegation was also aware of this fact; it encouraged the local prominent in the feasts, which were given in honor of the delegation, to establish CUP branches if they

were not established yet. The delegation established loose relations with local prominents and encouraged them to accord with the Committee. Introductions of the candidates in the newspaper *Anadolu* further support the early all-embracing and loose character of the CUP. None of the candidates were introduced with any party affiliation in the newspaper. Instead, patriotism and competence were major features that were supposed to be sought in a representative. In short, the conditions were too unripe to produce opponents of the CUP. Even in March, when the public opinion was pretty much polarized in Konya, the Committee as such did not become a clear object of direct attack, save some criticisms of *Maşrık-ı İrfan* regarding the intervention of some CUP members in governmental affairs.

Once the Parliament opened and political discussion started divergences in the public opinion of Konya also started. The local newspapers reflected two major public debates in Konya, first on the Grand Vizier Kamil Pasha, and second on the compatibility of laws and regulations passed in the Parliament and employed by the government. Concerning Kamil Pasha, *Anadolu* and *Hakem* advocated totally opposite views. *Anadolu* appreciated Kamil Pasha as a talented statesman who had governed the country fairly well during the absence of the Parliament and as a diplomat who successfully managed the Austro-Hungarian and Bulgarian crises. *Anadolu* excused Kamil Pasha's refusal of the interpellation of the Parliament, on the claim that the fall of the Cabinet was already decided upon. *Hakem* portrayed him as one of the pillars of the old regime of tyranny. According to *Hakem*, the new regime was fully rooted with the fall of the Kamil Pasha Cabinet. *Maşrık-ı İrfan* was not established yet, when this issue was debated.

Its anti-Kamil Pasha and anti-Liberal Union stance proved *Hakem* to be the most Unionist newspaper. *Anadolu* displayed a somewhat reluctant character towards the CUP. Even though it never took an opposite position to the CUP – even by implication – it did not submit itself to the will of the CUP either. When the fall of Kamil Pasha Cabinet was in question *Anadolu* held a positive stance vis-à-vis the Liberal Union. However, once the question was over, it resumed its pro-CUP position and harshly criticized Liberal Union’s attacks on the CUP.

The second major discussion in Konya was on the compatibility of the laws and regulations with *şeriat*. *Maşrık-ı İrfan*, the newspaper of the local *ulema*, argued that European laws and regulations that were borrowed by the Parliament did not conform to *şeriat*. The laws and regulations in question mainly concerned the *had* punishments, such as executing the murderer, stoning the adulterer to death, cutting the hand of the thief. *Hakem*, however, supported the argument that *şeriat* was open to change considering these punishments and added that historically European laws themselves were based on *şeriat*. Both laws and *şeriat*, continued the argument, shared the same goal to serve humankind, thus there was no contradiction between the two in essence. Although *Hakem*’s preference was clear, it felt itself obliged to publish the two contesting perspectives in its pages, which is a sign of the power of the traditional religious discourse in Konya. *Anadolu* did not take a clear side in the debate on *şeriat*. Instead, it tried to reconcile the two opposing groups arguing that the good-will of those who were asking for *şeriat* should be admitted and that the Parliament should conform to *şeriat* as far as possible; on the other hand, its argument went on, *şeriat* should not become a tool for agitating the people. It reminded that the Parliament had already changed some laws so that they conform to *şeriat*.

During these debates loyalties to political parties did not constitute a line of clash between different groups in Konya. They played a secondary role. The CUP was respected by all. The CUP did not become a subject of direct attack neither during the debate on Kamil Pasha nor on *şeriat*. In late March only some criticisms emerged in the pages of *Maşrik-ı İrfan* against the CUP. As for the Liberal Union, the support for it proved to be circumstantial, depending on the issue of Kamil Pasha.

For the sake of simplification, the three local private newspapers of Konya can be categorized according to their primary loyalties, *Hakem's* being to the CUP and *Maşrik-ı İrfan's* to traditional Islam. *Anadolu's* position is difficult to reduce because of its support of Kamil Pasha; however, it would not be wrong if we state that *Anadolu* was concerned for the ideals of the parliamentary regime and its provincial interests. *Hakem* preferred a modern-secular state trying to limit the role of religion there. *Anadolu* preferred also a modern state, however, did not want to directly oppose the religious establishment. *Maşrik-ı İrfan* wanted the Parliament to obey *şeriat* in its legislative activities, as it was traditionally understood by the established *ulema*. In this process of bifurcation in Konya *Anadolu* proved to be the shortest lived newspaper among the three, while the other two continued to represent two opposite views for a while.

APPENDIXES

A - The Population of the Province of Konya in 1908³⁰⁹

Foreigners		Citizens			
Non-Muslim	Muslim	Non-Muslim	Muslim	Total	
3,193	7,379	16,672	478,427	505,671	Konya
377	1,812	9,836	144,415	156,440	Isparta
2,229	2,969	8,718	222,310	236,226	Antalya
1,095	585	57,347	212,572	271,999	Niğde
145	10,45	36,25	72,105	76,928	Burdur
7,043	14,190	96,202	1,129,829	1,247,264	Total

³⁰⁹ *Anadolu*, 29 kanun-u evvel 1329 (11 January 1909), p. 4

B - Names Presented until 30 September 1908 in *Anadolu* as People who Deserve

Candidacy³¹⁰

1. Ispartalı Selanik Adliye Müfettişi Galib Bey
2. Konya'dan Dava Vekili Levon Efendi
3. Konya Bidayet Hukuk Mahkemesi Azasından Vayanos Efendi
4. Konyalı Ali Beyzade Esad
5. İlyas Ceha Efendinin Biraderi Petraki Efendi
6. Sivas Valisi Hazim Bey Efendi Hazretleri Niğdeli
7. Maliye Müşaviri Mahmud Esad Efendi Hazretleri Seydişehirli
8. Haleb Mevlevi Şeyh Lahikı Vacid Çelebizade Saadeddin Çelebi
9. Şeyh Abidin Efendi Hazretleri Konyalı
10. Isparta Birinci Ceza Mahkemesi Reisi Hayri Bey Efendi Ürgüplü
11. Mearif Nezareti Meclisi Baş Katibi Halil Edib Bey Efendi
12. Niğde Selanik Ziraat Mektebi Muhasebecisi Ali Haydar Bey Konyalı
13. Meclis İdare Azasından Sarafyim? Efendi Konyalı
14. Dava Vekili Arap Kastî Efendi Konyalı
15. Konyada Mukim Dava Vekili Levon Tamiz Eryan Efendi Halepli

C - Candidates Nominated until 25 October 1908³¹¹

1. Meclis İdare Başkatibi Mehmet
2. Mektubî Sermüsveddi Ali Galib
3. Nafia Memurîn-i Sabıkasından Cemal
4. Konya Merkez Bidayet Hukuk Mahkemesi Azasından Vayanos
5. Akşehir Müderrislerinden Kürtzade Hacı Mustafa
6. Selanik Merkez Bidayet Mahkemesi Birinci Ceza Reisi Ürgüplü Hayri
7. Adana Merkez Ticaret Mahkemesi Reisi Nevşehirli Falin Oğlu Ananyas³¹²

³¹⁰ Though they were presented in the newspaper as reputable people who deserve a seat in the Parliament, not all of them necessarily accepted candidacy.

³¹¹ See *Anadolu*, 12 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (25 October 1908), p. 1.

8. Karaman Kazasının Berloğunda? Karyesinde Hamidiye Müderrisi Hacı Abdülbaki
9. Akşehir Belediye Reisi Haydar
10. Defter-i Hakani Nezareti Muhavelat İdaresi Tahkik Memuru Mehmet Ragıp
11. Ulemadan Müsevvid Mehmet
12. Rüşdü Efendi zade Tevfik
13. Nuri Efendi zade Mehmet Rıfat
14. İstinaf Başkatibi Hüsamettin
15. Kırşehir Naib-i Sabıkı Tekeli zade Rıza
16. Ereğliden Osman Efendizade Kazım
17. Akşehirli Feregin? Mescan?
18. Ulemadan Şeyhzade Abidin
19. Meclis İdare Azasından Hacı Hüseyin
20. Konya Dersiamlarından Lokman
21. Konya'da Atabey Medresesi Müderrisi Ağazade Bekir
22. Karamanda Mukim Kasbalı Arif
23. Mekteb-i Hukuk Mezunlarından Silleli Sulistirus?
24. Fücane Ceza Reisi / Ermenekli Ceza Reisi Hüseyin Sıdkı Bey
25. Konya Dava Vekili Levon Tamiz Eryan

D – Agents of Anadolu in the Province of Konya

Akşehir (Konya): *Nakibü'l-Eşraf* Haydar Bey

Isparta (Isparta): *Eşraftan* Böcüzade Süleyman Efendi (who was also member of the 1908 Parliament from Isparta)

Karaman (Konya): Regie Director Cemal Efendi

Ereğli (Konya): *Ulemadan* Müftüzade Kazım Efendi (also candidate for the 1908 elections, but unsuccessful)

Niğde (Niğde): Mayor Müfid Bey

³¹² Greek, Independent. Elected in the 2nd and 3rd Parliaments. See, Feroz Ahmad and Dankwart A. Rustow, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Meclisler : 1908-1918." *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 4-5 (1976), p. 274.

Nevşehir (Niğde): Şevket Efendi
Ürgüp (Niğde): *Ulemadan* Ahmed Naim Efendi
Avanos (Kırşehir, Ankara): *Mülazım* Cafer Bey
Burdur (Burdur): *İdadi Muallimlerinden* Emin Efendi
Arabsun (Niğde): *Belediye Reisi* Yaşif? Efendi
Koçhisar (Konya): *Tüccardan* Anesti? Efendi
Aksaray (Niğde): *Mahkeme Azasından* Karabet Efendi
Anadolu, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324, (14 October 1908), p. 4.

E – Originals of Some References and Quotations

Footnote 47:

“Aziz vatandaşlarım şu zaman-ı hürriyet ve müsavatta bizim düşüneceğimiz pek çok şeyler içinde en mühimi ruh-u kavanin olan kanun-u esasimizin ahkam-ı münifesini muhafazaya kâfil hasail-i memduha ashabından mebus intihab etmektir. Madem ki hürriyet-i fikriyemiz var, madem ki bir takım mütegalloplerin asar-ı nüfuzundan artık kurtulduk, madem ki ulviyet-i osmaniymizi istirdad ettik... artık irade-i cüziyyemizi istimal edebileceğiz. İnsan için en mesud zaman kendi iradesini istediği gibi kullanabildiği bir zamandır.”

Anadolu, 1 teşrin-i evvel 1324 (14 October 1908), p. 2-3.

Footnote 54:

- “ 1- Türklerin Ulûm ve Fünuna Hizmeti (İkdam Matbaası’nda)
2- Tercüme-i Hal ve Fezail-i Şeyhu’l-Ekber
3- Kibar-ı Meşayih-ı Ulemadan On İki Zatın Tercüme-i Hali
4- Meşayih-ı Osmaniyyeden Sekiz Zatın Teracim-i Ahvali
5- Ulema-i Osmaniyyeden Altı Zatın Tercüme-i Hali

Bunlar da Kütübhaneye-i İslam ve Askeride

Müverrihin-i Osmaniyeden Ali ve Katib Çelebinin Teracim-i Ahvali (Selanik'de Sanayi Mektebi'nde)

Derdest tab bulunan asarından bazıları:

- 1- Müntehabat-ı Mesari' ve Ebyat-ı Osmaniye
- 2- İlm-i Tefsir ve Müfredat-ı Kuran'a Dair Malumat-ı İcmaliye
- 3- (Osmanlı Evrakı Erbab-ı Kemal Muarini?) Yedi Fasıldır
- 4- Mecmua-i Tahir (Muhaberattan İbaret Beş Fasıldır)
- 5- Menakıb-ı Harbiyye-i Osmaniye'den Bir Nebze

Daha da kitabları vardır. Kendileri (bibliyograf Otoman) yani Osmanlı ilm-i ahval-i kütübî mütehasıslarındandır. Arabça, Farsça, Fransızca lisanlarına vâkıftır.”

Anadolu, ? ağustos 1324 (? September 1908), No. 2, p. 1-2.

Footnote 60:

“Konya’da bulunan Cemiyet-i İlmiye tarafından Dersaadet, Selanik, İzmir Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetlerine keşide kılınan telgraf suretidir:

Selanik merkez-i umumiyesinin emriyle Konya’mıza gönderilen Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti mebuslarından Binbaşı Tahir Bey’le Mülazım Faik Efendi burada fikr-i cemiyeti tamamıyla izah ve ahaliye kabul edilen kanun-u esasiyle şer-i şerife muvafık suretde nesayih-i lâzime icra eylemiş ve bu suretle ahaliyi ve bahusus ulemamızı memnun etmiş olduklarından teşekkürâtımızı bi’t-takdim Konya’mızda artık bir ittifak-ı umumî husule geldiğini arz eyeriz.”

Signatures: *müfti-i belde* and names of eleven *ulema*.

Anadolu, 6 eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 4.

Footnote 81:

“Süleymaniye Kulübünde, her kulüpten gönderilen iki zattan teşekkül eden bir heyet toplandı. Merkez-i Umumi’den gönderilen ve bize vazifemizin mahiyetini bildiren kağıt okunduğu sırada orada hazır bulunan adamları birer bire tetkik ettim; içlerinde tanıdığım bir tek adam yoktu. İnsan, tanımadığı kimselerle bilmediği adamlar hakkında ne gibi bir tetkikatta bulunabilirdi? Bâhusus başkalarının evsâf-ı ahlakıyye ve ictimaiyyelerini öğrenmek ve ona göre Cemiyet’te kalıp kalamayacakları hakkında bir karar vermek

üzere toplanan bu adamlar da bir külâh kapmak fikriyle Cemiyet'e intisap etmemişler miydi? Bu işin müşkilatından ve daha doğrusu bizim için bu tarzda bir "tasfiye"de bulunmak kabil olamayacağından bahs eder etmez hepsi bunu tasdik ve itirafa mecbur oldular; ve çıkıp gittiler. "Tasfiye" kararı da suya düştü ve o sırada bir daha bu meseleden bahsedilmedi!"

Kadri, pp. 66-7.

Footnote 154:

"Mebusluğa intihab edilecek zatta evsaf aramalıdır. Harekatını efalini tecessüs ve tahkik eylemelidir. Ehliyet ve iktidarını, ahval-i mahalliyeye vukufiyetini öğrenmelidir. Harekat ve efalini tecessüs eylemeli. Yani geçen külâh kapmak devrinde rüşvet yiyip yemediğini, fukaranın kolu ve kuvveti kısa olanların mallarını, topraklarını ellerinden alıp almadığını. Nüfuz ve itibar-ı siyasiyesinden taallukatını, taraftarlarını memuriyetlere, işlere geçirip geçirmediğini; taahhüt ve iltizam suretiyle yol, aşar ve sair şeyler alıp hükümeti, fukarayı, köylü vatandaşlarımızı zararlara sokup sokmadığını; itibarını muhafaza etmek yahut artırmak için büyük memurlara dalkavuklukta bulunup bulunmadığını; memurîn-i hükümete para çalmaları hususunda yol gösterip göstermediklerini, fukaranın köylülerin çektikleri sıkıntıları görmeyerek sefahat alemlerinde yuvarlanıp yuvarlanmadığını, hususiyle şu esnada mebus olmak için kullandığı dolapları suret-i haktan gözüükerek ve güya vatana, millete nâfi teşebbüsât-ı ciddiyyede bulunduğunu göstererek çevirdiği fırıldakları tahkik ve tecessüs eylemelidir. Ehliyet ve iktidarını ve ahval-i mahalliyeye vukufunu da öğrenmelidir."

Anadolu, 6 Eylül 1324 (19 September 1908), p. 1.

Footnote 179:

"İmzasını kendinize siper ittihaz ettiğiniz el-Hac Hilmi Ağa yahud Efendi, değil kazalarımızda hatta ekser vilayatımızda olduğu gibi imzasını atmaktan aciz – mührünü ters basmamak için üst tarafına kertik yapan - ağavattan olduğu netice-i tahkikatımızdan anlaşılmışdır. Biçare ağa dünyada en ziyade meftunu olduğu azalık sandalyesini muhafaza için herkesin şu sıralarda keyfine tab'iyyete kendini mecbur görmüş olmalı ki bu makaleyi de evrak-ı resmiye sırasında imza ediyor muşdur. Muhatabımızın kim

olduđu bizce malumdur... kendinize güveniyorsanız buyurun sahife-i matbuat saye-i ahrarda açıktır, perde arkasına gizlenerek öyle onun bunun nîk-ü-bed'ini temyizden aciz olan bir takım biçarenin imzasıyla iş görmeyiniz. Maskenizi çıkarınız, isminizi meydana atınız!”

Anadolu, 10 teşrin-i sani 1324 (23 November 1908), p. 4.

Footnote 288:

“Yedimizde mahfuz şeriat-ı ahmediyeyi yok farzedip de yeniden isteyen zevat-ı muhteremeye deriz ki: Senelerden beri hükümetin zulmüne katlanan ve hududullaha bedel vaz edilen kavanin-i meşuşeye boyun eğen ey biçareler! Bugün teyidine çalıştığımız meşrutiyet eđer şimdi nefret etmek istediğimiz mukaddes ‘cemiyet’ tarafından ilan ettirilmiş olmasa idi o boyunduruđu ne şeriata ne medeni nizamlara uymayan istibdadın saye-i mehalikinde kim bilir ne kadar sürtüyecektik?”

Hakem, 12 mart 1325 (25 March 1909), p. 1.

Footnote 293:

“Vah vah ey koca Konya sende de mi geldi zuhura nale-yi feryad
Aşıkardır. Din aleyhinde avave ve levleve-i kelb edenler hep namerd
Durma dinle tenvir-i alem eyle zira sen maşrık-ı irfansın
Öyle bed-maye olan olan hükm-ü hakemle olmaz bu din berbad
Fi 7 mart 325

Dersaadet ilmiye efradından bir zat.”

Hakem, 13 mart 1325 (26 March 1909), p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Anadolu.

Hakem.

Maşrık-ı İrfan.

Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi. vol. II, 1909. Reprint, 1982.

Books and Articles

Ahmad, Feroz. *The Young Turks: The Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish Politics, 1908-1914.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Ahmad, Feroz and Rustow, Dankwart A. "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Meclisler : 1908-1918." *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 4-5 (1976).

Akşin, Sina. *31 Mart Olayı.* İstanbul: Sinan Yayınları, 1972.

———. *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki.* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1987.

Akün, Ömer Faruk. "Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. VI.

İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1992.

- Atalay, Ahmet. *Millî Mücadele'de Konya Kuvâ-yı Milliyecileri*, vol. I, 2 vols. (Konya: Damla Ofset, 1997)
- Aytekin, Hanefi. *İz Bırakan 100 Ünlü Konya Valisi*. Konya: Ülkü Basımevi, 1994.
- Berkes, Niyazi. *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1973.
- Böcüzade, Süleyman Sami. *Kuruluşundan Bugüne Kadar Isparta Tarihi*. İstanbul: Serenler, 1983.
- Campos, M. Ursula. A 'Shared Homeland' and Its Boundaries (Ph.d diss, Stanford University, 2003)
- Çavdar, Tevfik. *İttihat ve Terakki*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991.
- Çetinkaya, Y. Doğan. *1908 Osmanlı Boykotu: Bir Toplumsal Hareketin Analizi*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004.
- Çoker, Fahri. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi: Millî Mücadele ve T.B.M.M. Birinci Dönem*. vol. III, 3 vols. Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1995.
- Davison, Roderic H. *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Demir, Fevzi. *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Meclis-i Mebusan Seçimleri (1908-1914)* (Ph.d diss, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 1994)
- Duman, Hasan. *Başlangıcından Harf Devrimine Kadar Osmanlı-Türk Süreli Yayınlar ve Gazeteler Bibliyografyası ve Toplu Kataloğu, 1828-1928*. vol. I, 3 vols. İstanbul: Enformasyon ve Dokümantasyon Hizmetleri Vakfı, 2000.
- Emiroğlu, Kudret. *Anadolu'da Devrim Günleri*. Ankara: İmge Yayınları, 1999.
- Gövsa, İbrahim Alâettin. *Türk Meşhurları Ansiklopedisi*. n.p: Yedigün Neşriyatı, n.d.
- Gözübüyük, Şeref. *Türk Anayasa Metinleri, 1839-1980*. 2nd ed. Ankara: A.Ü.S.B.F, 1982.

- Güneş, İhsan. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi: I. ve II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi*. vol. II, 2 vols.
Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1998.
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü. *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . *The Young Turks in Opposition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Issawi, Charles. *The Economic History of Turkey, 1800-1914*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- İpşirli, Mehmet. "Hayri Efendi, Mustafa." In *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. XVII.
İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998.
- Kadri, Hüseyin Kazım. *Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e Hatıralarım*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1991.
- Kansu, Aykut. *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey, 1908-1913*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000.
- . *The Revolution of 1908 in Turkey*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Kara, İsmail. *İslâmcıların Siyasi Görüşleri*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1994.
- Karabekir, Kazım. *İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti, 1896-1909*. İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1993.
- Kayalı, Hasan. "Elections and the Electoral Process in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1919."
International Journal of Middle East Studies XXVII, no. 3 (1995).
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. *Osmanlı Padişahları*. İstanbul: Ana Yayınevi, 1981.
- Konyalı, İbrahim Hakkı. *Konya Ereğlisi Tarihi*. İstanbul: n.p., 1970.
- . *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Karaman Tarihi*. İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1967.
- Kutlu, Sacit. *Didar-ı Hürriyet: Kartpostallarla İkinci Meşrutiyet, 1908-1913*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2004.

- Küçük, Sezai. *Mevlevîliğin Son Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: Simurg, 2003.
- M. Adil. *Mukayeseli Hukuk-u İdare Dersleri: Birinci Kitap*. Selanik: [Rumeli Matbaası], 1327 [1911].
- Mardin, Şerif. *Jön Türklerin Siyasî Fikirleri: 1895-1908*, 2nd ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1983.
- Osmanlı Mebusları: 1324-1328*. İstanbul: Ahmed İhsan ve Şürekası, n.d.
- Özbek, Nadir. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet, 1876-1914*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.
- Pamuk, Şevket. *100 Soruda Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadî Tarihi, 1500-1914*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1988.
- Sarıkaya, Yaşar. "Sufis and Gelehrte als Medresengründer und -Patrone Im Osmanischen Konya (18.-19. Jahrhundert)." *Der Islam* LXXIX, no. 2 (2002).
- Sevinçli, Efdal. "II. Meşrutiyet Seçimleri Öncesinde İzmir'den Bir Ses." *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 9 (1985).
- Toprak, Zafer. *İttihat-Terakki ve Devletçilik*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995.
- . *Milli İktisat – Milli Burjuvazi*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995.
- Tunaya, Tarık Zafer. *İslâmcılık Cereyanı*. İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1962.
- . *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Vol. I. İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları, 1988.
- Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki. "Elmalılı Muhammed Hamdi." In *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. XI, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995.
- Zürcher, Erik J. *Turkey: A Modern History*. New York: I. B. Tauris, 1994.