

SAINT-PETERSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

**THE BALKANS IN THE OPINION JOURNALISM OF NAMIK KEMAL
(BASED ON MATERIALS OF THE “HÜRRİYET” NEWSPAPER)**

Graduate qualification work in the direction of training 46.04.01 «*History*»
master's degree program «*History and Theory of Nations and the Issues of
Nationalism*»

Completed by: Second-year student
Gençtürk Rukiye

Scientific Supervisor
Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor
Alimov Denis Evgenievich

Saint-Petersburg
2020

Content

Introduction.....	4
Chapter 1.Namık Kemal.....	11
1.1.The Biography of Namık Kemal.....	11
1.2.Namık Kemal as a Social Thinker.....	23
1.2.1.Namık Kemal's State Hypothesis.....	23
1.2.2.The Assessment Of The Ottoman Empire By Namık Kemal.....	25
1.2.3.Namık Kemal's Recommendation About Regime.....	29
1.2.4.The Concept Of Hürriyet (Freedom) According To Namık Kemal.....	31
Chapter 2. The Hürriyet Newspaper.....	35
2.1. The History Of Hürriyet Newspaper.....	35
2.2. The Contents Of The Hürriyet Newspaper.....	38
2.3. The Issue Of Authorship Of Articles In The Hürriyet Newspaper.....	39
Chapter 3. The Eastern Question in The Hürriyet Newspaper.....	41
3.1. The Definition And Historical Development of The Eastern Question.....	41
3.2. The Eastern Question According To Namık Kemal.....	45
3.3. The Non-Muslims In The Eastern Question.....	52
Chapter 4.The Crete Issue In The Hürriyet Newspaper.....	60
4.1. The Historical Development Of The Cretan Affair (1821–1866).....	60
4.2. The Cretan Rebellion Of 1866.....	62
4.3. The Refugees Issue.....	65

4.4.The Policies Of Western States In The Cretan Rebellion.....	67
4.4.1. Russia.....	67
4.4.2. Britain.....	70
4.4.3. France.....	72
4.5. Ali Pasha In The Cretan Rebellion.....	73
4.6. The Ultimatum.....	77
4.7. Paris Conference.....	79
Chapter 5. The Situation of Wallachia-Moldavia In The Hürriyet Newspaper.....	86
5.1.Wallachia and Moldavia During The Ottoman Rule	87
5.2.The 19th Century Occupation of Wallachia-Moldavia And Nationalist Revolts.....	91
Conclusion.....	98
List of Primary and Secondary Sources.....	101

Introduction

The relevance of the research theme

The Ottoman Empire called the “Sick Man” by Tsar Nicholas I of Russia, had lagged in many political, social, economic, and administrative affairs in the 19th century. The New Ottoman Society, which had great importance in Ottoman politics and press, was founded in 1865 by the young intellectuals of the 19th century, including Namık Kemal to establish the constitutional administration in the country¹. The “Hürriyet” newspaper was founded in London on June 29th, 1868 by members of the society Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha. They used the press to offer solutions to the situation of the Ottoman Empire. The newspaper is distinguished from other publications due to its content being a thought newspaper in which political and social issues are addressed rather than a news bulletin.

Namık Kemal is among the leading theorists of the modernisation efforts of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century. Namık Kemal studied the new political ideologies such as “constitutionalism”, “participation of people in administration”, “equality” and “freedom” that emerged after the French Revolution of 1789 and deemed it necessary for the Empire to modernise based on these principles. He is also one of the theorists who brought to the Empire the idea of “Holy Homeland”, which grew more influential in Europe in the 19th century² as the Empire faced nationalist uprisings in the Balkans that would endanger its territorial integrity during this period. It is possible to see the reflections of these uprisings in Crete, which leaves its mark on the first year of the newspaper, and in Wallachia and Moldavia, which were the subject of constant conflict between Russia and the Ottoman Empire. Also, Namık Kemal is one of the proponents of the “Ottomanism” idea movement, which emerged as a power project to increase the loyalty of non-Muslims which became the central element of the 19th century “Eastern Question”, to the state and to protect the Ottoman territorial integrity.

¹Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2006. Vol. 32. P. 364–365.

²Topses M. D. Niyazi Berkes’in Türk Modernleşmesine Bakışında Namık Kemal’e Yönelik Eleştirisi // Sosyoloji Konferansları. 2012. No. 46. P. 70.

Namık Kemal addressed the problems, which gained an international dimension while being an internal issue of the Empire, and in all aspects of his writings he criticised the government and its policies without hesitation when necessary.

Primary Sources

The primary source of the thesis, the “Hürriyet” newspaper, consists of 100 issues. The language of the paper, published in 1868–1870, was Ottoman Turkish. The original texts of the publication can be accessed from the “Tarık Hakkı Us”³ collection, which contains the digital archives of Ottoman periodicals⁴. The first 50 issues of the newspaper were transcribed into the Latin alphabet by Emine Bayram⁵ and 51–100 by Gülşen Yıldız⁶. The fact that most of the articles are unsigned in the “Hürriyet” newspaper led to the question of to whom they belong. Some of the items belonging to Namık Kemal were published by Ali Donbay⁷ as a master’s degree thesis under the title “Namık Kemal’in “Hürriyet” Gazetesindeki Makaleleri” (“Namık Kemal’s Articles in the “Hürriyet” Newspaper”). Another study related to the paper is the PhD thesis entitled “Hürriyet Gazetesinin Sistematiik Tahlili” (“Systematic Analysis of the “Hürriyet” Newspaper”) by Adnan Akgün⁸.

The Latin transcribed work’s first volume “Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal’ in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1) (1868-1869)”⁹ (“Opposition in Exile: Namık Kemal’s Hürriyet Newspaper” (1) (1868–1869)) edited by Selim Karlıtekin and published as two volumes, was used in the thesis. This volume contains issues 1–50 of the newspaper. The most important feature that distinguishes this work from other sources translated into Latin is that it also contains original texts written in Ottoman Turkish. The most challenging part of working on the newspaper was to

³Tarık Hakkı Us (1889-1956) was a journalist and author.

⁴<http://www.tufts.ac.jp/common/fs/asw/tur/htu/list1.html>(date of access: 01.05.2020).

⁵Bayram E. Hürriyet Gazetesi’nin 1–50 Sayılarının İncelenmesi (Metin- Değerlendirilmesi). Master’s degree thesis. Giresun, 2018.

⁶Yılmaz G. Hürriyet Gazetesi’nin 51–100 Sayılarının İncelenmesi (Metin- Değerlendirilmesi). Master’s degree thesis. Giresun, 2018.

⁷Donbay A. Namık Kemal’in “Hürriyet” Gazetesindeki Makaleleri. Konya, 1992.

⁸Akgün A. Hürriyet Gazetesinin Sistematiik Tahlili. PhD’s thesis. İstanbul, 1999.

⁹Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868-1869). Vol. I / Ed. by S. Karlıtekin. İstanbul, 2018.

simplify by not breaking the integrity of the content, which are mostly consisted of Arabic and Persian words.

The degree of scientific elaboration

The first notable biography about Namık Kemal is “Namık Kemal” written by his son Ali Ekrem¹⁰. Other biographies are Sabahattin Çankaya’s “Namık Kemal”¹¹ and Önder Göçgün’s “Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda: Namık Kemal”(“Namık Kemal: In Our Literature and Intellectual Life”)¹². The articles “Namık Kemal” by Ömer Faruk Akün¹³ and “Hürriyet” (“Freedom”) by Hüseyin Çelik¹⁴ are included in the encyclopedia which is called “Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi” (“The Islamic Encyclopedia Of Turkey Religious Foundation”). The works “Ölümünün Yüzüncü Yılında Namık Kemal” (“Namık Kemal On The Centenary Of His Death”)¹⁵ in 1988 and “Doğumunun Yüzellinci Yılında Namık Kemal” (“Namık Kemal In The Hundredth Year Of His Birth”)¹⁶ in 1993 were written to commemorate Namık Kemal. In addition, a compilation work edited by Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu entitled “Namık Kemal¹⁷” was about featuring the life, literary personality and thoughts and opinions of Namık Kemal. Another important secondary source of the thesis I referred to is Yusuf Mardin’s “Namık Kemal’in Londra Yılları” (“Namık Kemal’s Years in London”)¹⁸, published in 1974, which gives information about the years that Namık Kemal spent in London in 1867–1870.

The issues shaped by Namık Kemal’s writings about the Balkans, also supported by secondary sources. One of the sources was reported about the Balkan history is the first volume of “Balkan Tarihi 18. Ve 19. Yüzyıllar”(“The Balkan

¹⁰Bolayır A. E. Namık Kemal. İstanbul, 1992.

¹¹Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. Ankara, 1965.

¹²Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda:Namık Kemal Hayatı Eserleri, Edebi Kişiliği ve Eserlerinden Açıklamalı Seçmeler. Ankara, 2009.

¹³Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2006. Vol. 32.

¹⁴Çelik, H. Hürriyet // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1998. Vol. 18.

¹⁵Ölümünün Yüzüncü Yılında Namık Kemal. İstanbul, 1988.

¹⁶Doğumunun Yüzellinci Yılında Namık Kemal. Ankara, 1993.

¹⁷Namık Kemal / Ed. by T. Karataş and O. K. Tavukçu. Ankara, 2011.

¹⁸Mardin Y. Namık Kemal’in Londra yılları. İstanbul, 1974.

history in the 18th and 19th centuries”)¹⁹ written by Barbara Jelavich, one of the leading figures in Balkan historical research in the United States. The other one is “Balkanlar’ da Osmanlı Mirası ve Milliyetçilik” (“The Ottoman Heritage and Nationalism In The Balkans”)²⁰ written by Kemal Karpat, a giant figure in Ottoman and Turkish history which emphasized that Balkan history cannot be separated from Ottoman history. To analyse the period better, it was reported to the work “19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1789–1914” (“The 19th Century Political History 1789–1914”)²¹ written by Fahir Armaoğlu, one of the most well-known figures in the field of the political history of Turkey. Also, one of the leaders of Turkish nationalism, Yusuf Akçura’s work “3 Tarz-ı Siyaset”(“Three Types of Policy”)²² is essential as he highlighted the benefits, harms and developments of Ottomanism, Islamism and Turkism intellectual movements of the Ottoman dissolution period and developed a thesis on which were suitable for the Empire structure. How the Empire kept people of different religions, languages, races and cultures under one roof and how it formed a nation system, the functioning of the system, the process of dissolution and restructuring of the system is mentioned by Uğur Kurtaran in the article “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Millet System” (“The System of Nation in the Ottoman Empire”)²³.

As for the Eastern problem, Kemal Beydilli's article “Şark Meselesi” (“The Eastern Question”)²⁴, which addressed the historical development process of the issue, has been referenced. Also, Raif Karadağ’s work “Şark Meselesi” (“The Eastern Question”)²⁵, which details the Eastern politics of Russia, Britain, France, Austria and the Ottoman Empire, is included.

When it comes to secondary sources related to the history of Crete, one of the works that address many political, economic and social themes from the

¹⁹Jelavich B. Balkan Tarihi 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllar / Transl. by İ. Durdu, G. Tunalı, H. Koç. İstanbul, 2013.

²⁰Karpat K. H. Balkanlarda Osmanlı Mirası ve Milliyetçilik. 3rd. ed. İstanbul, 2015.

²¹Armaoğlu F. 19. yüzyıl siyasi tarihi (1789–1914). 14th ed. İstanbul, 2014.

²²Akçura Y. Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset. 6th. ed. Ankara, 2014.

²³Kurtaran U. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Millet Sistemi // Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2011. Vol. 1. No. 8.

²⁴Beydilli K. Şark Meselesi // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2010. Vol. 38.

²⁵Karadağ R. Şark meselesi. İstanbul, [s. a.].

conquest of Crete in the 17th century to the loss of the island in the 20th century is the book “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Girit Bunalımı (1896–1908)” (“Ottoman Empire and the Crete Crisis (1896–1908)”) by Ayşe Nühket Adıyeke²⁶. She has numerous English, Greek and Turkish articles and books about Crete under Ottoman rule. A master’s degree thesis entitled “Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869)” (“The Crete Issue in the Light of Ottoman Press Sources (1866–1869)”) was written by Gülşah Demirci²⁷. The works on the policies of the Great states in the Cretan affair are respectfully: “Crete and the United States, 1866–1869” by Arthur J. May²⁸, “Osmanlı’nın Zor Sınavı: Fransa’nın Tutarsız Politikaları Ekseninde Girit İsyanı (1866–1869)” (“The Uneasy Trial of the Ottoman: the Crete Rebellion in Terms of the Inconsistent French Policies”) by Bilal Karabulut²⁹ and “Britain and the Cretan rebellion, 1866–69” by Kenneth Bourne³⁰.

In Mithat Aydın’s article “Kemal’in Siyasi Yazılarında Rusya’nın “Şark Meselesi”ndeki Yeri ve Memleketeyn Meselesi” (“The Position of Russia in the “Eastern Question” and the Memleketeyn (Wallachia-Moldavia) Problem in Namık Kemal’s Political Writings”)³¹ explained Namık Kemal’s views on Wallachia-Moldavia in the newspapers “Hürriyet”, “Tasvir-i Efkar”, “İbret” and “Hadika”.

Other scholars have not previously detailed the issues addressed in the thesis in this respect.

The study aims to present Namık Kemal’s articles in the Hürriyet newspaper about the effects of increasing Balkan nationalism on the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the 19th century.

²⁶Adıyeke A. N. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Girit Bunalımı (1896–1908). Ankara, 2000.

²⁷Demirci G. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869). Master’s degree thesis. Zonguldak, 2019.

²⁸May A. J. Girit ve Birleşik Devletler, 1866–1869 / Transl. by T. Demir // Tarih Dergisi. 2010. No. 52.

²⁹Karabulut B. Osmanlı’nın Zor Sınavı: Fransa’nın Tutarsız Politikaları Ekseninde Girit İsyanı (1866–1869) // Karadeniz Araştırmaları. 2008. No. 16.

³⁰Bourne K. İngiltere ve Girit İsyanı, 1866–69 / Transl. by Y. T. Kurat // Araştırmaları Dergisi. 1963. Vol.1. No. 1.

³¹Aydın M. Namık Kemal’in Siyasi Yazılarında Rusya’nın “Şark Meselesi”ndeki Yeri ve Memleketeyn Meselesi // Erdem Dergisi. 2009. No. 53.

The Objectives of the Study are:

1. To characterize Namık Kemal's vision of the Ottomanism in relation to the Balkans.
2. To analyze Namık Kemal's thoughts on the solution of the Eastern Question.
3. To examine Namık Kemal's reaction to the Crete uprising.
4. To show Namık Kemal's attitude towards Russia during the unification process of Wallachia-Moldavia.
5. To determine Namık Kemal's position in the question of creating an Ottoman nation.

The object of the research is Namık Kemal's journalism during the 19th century in the press. **The subject of research** is Namık Kemal's attitude to the Balkans in the "Hürriyet" newspaper.

Methods of research

In this thesis, the problem-chronological method was used to analyse the incidents occurring in different periods on the Balkan territory of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century. Also, the narrative approach was reported, showing how the events were reflected in the writings of Namık Kemal in the Hürriyet newspaper, one of the primary sources of the period, and the evaluations he made. The historic-systematic method was used to indicate the role of internal and external factors in the nationalist uprisings in the Balkans and the connection between them. The logical induction method was used to present an overview of events of the period with the issues addressed.

The scientific novelty of the research: For the first time in English-speaking historiography the study of the Balkan topics in Namık Kemal's opinion journalism has been conducted.

Provisions for the defense

1. Namık Kemal considered the Eastern Question to be an artificial issue created by the Great States to share the territory of the Ottoman Empire.

2. Namık Kemal considered the principle of nationalism as a tool used by the Great States to keep the Eastern Question on the list and used this interpretation for explaining the Balkan political events.

3. Namık Kemal regarded the Russian intervention in Wallachia-Moldavia's internal affairs as an "old policy" in which the nations that Russia wanted to take into captivity revolted with the promise of freedom.

5. Namık Kemal's attitude to the Balkan political issues was determined by his Ottomanism that is his perception of the future Ottoman nation that would accept all the Ottoman subjects as equal without distinction of race, religion and language.

The theoretical significance of the research is essential for understanding the role of the Balkan nationalist uprisings in the process of creating the Ottoman nation. **The practical significance of the research** is that the conclusions of the work can allow the producing of educational and historical texts. Also, translations of articles in the Hürriyet newspaper can be the basis of publication of Namık Kemal's journalistic works in English.

The structure of the research. The first chapter is devoted to Namık Kemal's biography and his intellectual life. The second chapter addressed the importance of the Hürriyet newspaper in the history of the Ottoman press. The third chapter examines the Eastern Question. In the fourth chapter addressed Crete Issue and the fifth one is studied the situation of Wallachia-Moldavia in the Hürriyet newspaper.

Chapter 1. Namık Kemal

1.1. The Biography of Namık Kemal

Monday morning, December 21st, 1840, Namık Kemal was born in Tekirdağ. His real name is Mehmet Kemal. Namık is his pseudonym. His lineage is on Grand Vizier Topal Osman Pasha. He was martyred during the Persian wars in the era of Mahmud I. The oldest known ancestor is Bekir Agha from Konya. His mother is Fatma Zehra Hanım, the daughter of Abdülatif Pasha, the gentry of Konice who served as a Muslim judge and governor in various places from Tekirdağ to Cyprus, and Kars to Sofia. His father was Mustafa Asım Bey, who was the director of Esham and was for a time the astrologer of Sultan Abdulhamid II³². He was the greatest master of astrology at the time. Mustafa Asım Bey was a knowledgeable person. *“There are people who call me intelligent, but my father is more intelligent than me. He’s the smartest person I know in this world.”* Namık Kemal said³³. His father, who knows Arabic and Persian a little, was keen on history³⁴. The child of a family that was cultured by both mother and father and took various positions in the Ottoman administration cadres, Namık Kemal came from a well-established family in which he praised and is proud of ³⁵.

Namık Kemal stayed in Tekirdağ until the age of five. Then, in March 1845, he went to Afyon with his grandfather and stayed there for two and a half years. Abdülatif Pasha was appointed to Kütahya on the 8th of July 1848. However, he went to Istanbul first to get some work done. His mother Fatma Zehra Hanım died in 1848 while his grandfather was in Istanbul. Namık Kemal became an orphan at the age of eight. His grandmother, Mahdume Hanım, raised him as if she knew that Kemal would become a great man in the future. His grandmother was a very knowledgeable and noblewoman of her time³⁶. His grandfather, Abdülatif Pasha,

³²Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda: Namık Kemal Hayatı Eserleri, Edebi Kişiliği ve Eserlerinden Açıklamalı Seçmeler. Ankara, 2009. P. 1.

³³Bolayır A. E. Namık Kemal. İstanbul, 1992. P. 13.

³⁴Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda...P. 1.

³⁵Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi / Ed. by T. Karataş and O. K. Tavukçu. Ankara, 2011. P. 13.

³⁶Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. Ankara, 1965. P. 18.

did not leave him alone until he was seventeen, as he saw him as a sacred memory of his daughter. Thus, Namık Kemal spent his years in various parts of the country due to the civil services of his grandfather³⁷. Abdüllatif Pasha was dismissed from his post in Kütahya shortly before his daughter's death, and the family returned to Istanbul. Namık Kemal did not have a regular educational life because his family did not stay in one place for a long time³⁸.

Namık Kemal enrolled at Beyazıt secondary school when he was nine years old and remained in this school for five months. He then enrolled at Valide secondary school and studied there for three years. At the school, he had a teacher named Şakir Efendi, who had a good influence on Namık Kemal and taught him useful things. One day, Şakir Efendi said to Kemal, *"The ceremony day of our school is near. The Sultan will come to our school. I wrote a poem to praise him. You're going to read it. It is long, however, so memorise it"*³⁹. He says: *"I memorised the panegyric"* and hearing it once was enough for him. While Şakir Efendi was surprised by his sharp memory, Namık Kemal said: *"Here I memorised it; but I cannot read this poem in the presence of the sultan and so many people, I am shy."* His teacher immediately replies: *"What? Are you shy? They're all tombstones, son; they're tombstones!"* Namık Kemal said, *"The words from my teacher impressed me so much that I read the poem on the day of the ceremony perfectly with my loudest voice and without any rush as if there were tombstones in front of me. After, I didn't give any importance to the sultans and viziers from this point on in my life"*⁴⁰.

His grandfather was appointed as the governor of Kars in 1853, Namık Kemal was twelve or thirteen when he went to Kars with his grandfather. Within about one and half years in Kars, he took some private lessons from Vaizzade Mehmet Seyyid Efendi and read Nabi and Sümbülzade Vehbi's poems. Namık

³⁷Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda...P. 2.

³⁸Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi. P. 14.

³⁹Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. P. 19.

⁴⁰Bolayır A. E. Namık Kemal. P. 21, 22.

Kemal learned prosody from him and began to write his first verse attempt here with the encouragement of him. As a result, he wrote his first poem in Kars. Here it is:

“Your long-awaited letter has arrived, giving peace to my soul.

From my joy, the crown of my head rose to God.”

In Kars, he was interested in the traditional games of the region, javelin, hunting and equestrian sports. Therefore, he takes javelin and hunting lessons from a teacher named Kara Veli Agha. Namık Kemal feels the strain of the Crimean War (1853–1856) which broke out at the time, along with the soldiers who went to the front. It stated in various sources that those days in Kars played a significant role in the formation of patriotism that would appear very strongly in the later years. He was dismissed from his post in July 1854; the whole family returned to Istanbul. Ten months after returning to Istanbul, Abdülatif Pasha was appointed as the governor of Sofia in May 1855. Due to Sofia’s proximity to Istanbul and its more dynamic environment than Kars, this made a significant impact on his personal development⁴¹.

Ali Ekrem, the son of Namık Kemal, informs us that during this ten-month period Namık Kemal took private lessons in Arabic and Persian, and when he reunited with his father, they continued to study Ottoman history as they used to⁴². It is his father who gave Namık Kemal his revolutionary spirit. He didn’t want his son to be a reformist. Because there was no hope that a revolution could happen in the country, however, his father did not and could not prevent his son’s efforts to warn the nation and ensure their dominance⁴³.

He spent one and a half years in Sofia, where he started to read the old poets with the help of some poets he had met, this situation is essential in the development of his intellectual life. He attended poets’ meetings. While in Sofia,

⁴¹Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi. P. 15.

⁴²Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2006. Vol. 32. P. 362.

⁴³Bolayır A. E. Namık Kemal. P. 15.

he also began to learn French. Eşref Pasha, who visited him often, listened to all of his poems. Eşref Pasha, who liked and appreciated these poems, gives him the pseudonym “Namık”. Until then his name was Mehmet Kemal. After that day, he started to use his name as Namık Kemal. He got married to Nesime Hanım, the daughter of Mustafa Ragıp Efendi, the Muslim judge of Nish in 1856. They had two girls and a boy. Their names were Feride, Ulviye and Ali Ekrem. They returned to Istanbul again in 1857⁴⁴.

During this time, Namık Kemal did not know what to do. He, like some other young intellectuals of the period, first started working as a clerk in the translation office for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This office, which is regarded as Turkey’s gateway to the West, had become a vital state institution that raised many intellectuals who brought innovation to the Ottoman Empire. He worked here for five years. Mehmet Mansur Efendi, one of the senior clerks of the translation office, taught him French. Namık Kemal met Ziya Pasha in 1860 and had the opportunity to meet Leskofçalı Galib and Hersekli Arif Hikmet Bey, one of the well-known poets during this period. In this way, Namık Kemal, who is included in the community of poets who are considered the last representatives of Ottoman poetry, attends their meetings. Namık Kemal, the youngest of the group, had the task of reading the poems of the community poets aloud in the presence of the guests. Leskofçalı Galib influenced the young Namık Kemal’s sense of art and personality during this period⁴⁵.

Namık Kemal was only interested in human affairs until he reached the age of twenty-three. However, the person that made Namık Kemal was Şinasi. This was the turning point in Namık Kemal’s life⁴⁶. On the first day Şinasi saw Namık Kemal, he understood the young poet’s ability and advised him to study French. Namık Kemal stated that he never worked so hard on anything else before during

⁴⁴Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. P. 21, 22.

⁴⁵Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi. P. 16–18.

⁴⁶Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. P. 25.

the first year he studied French⁴⁷. “Tercüman-ı Ahval” newspaper was published by Şinasi in 1860. The most important feature about this newspaper is that it was the first independent newspaper published by a Turkish Muslim subject in the Ottoman Empire which informed the public⁴⁸. After six months, he dissolved the partnership with Agah Efendi and published the newspaper “Tasvir-i Efkar”. About four months after the publication of “Tasvir-i Efkar” in Haziran 1862, which Namık Kemal had started writing articles for were then made possible to analyse changes in the understanding of ideas and literature⁴⁹. Namık Kemal began to make translations of Montesquieu’s works, which he paid much attention to most of his ideas. There is no information about which Western writers Namık Kemal had read before Şinasi⁵⁰. Şinasi not only informed his readers with his newspapers, but also trained young people to play an important role in the life of thought such as, Namık Kemal, Ahmet Mithat and Recaizade Ekrem. Namık Kemal took Şinasi as a model and they saw the press as a tool in solving problems⁵¹.

Namık Kemal, who had previously written in a formal style, then started writing in a slightly more straightforward language. Namık Kemal, who had a wide range of Sufistic symbols and dreams in his poems before meeting Şinasi, then began to give social issues prominence as a man of the people. His first article, published in “Tasvir-i Efkar”, was a column called “Zenci”, which he translated from French⁵².

After Şinasi went to Paris in 1865, Namık Kemal took the responsibility of publishing the newspaper alone. At this time, the way he presented the topics in his articles and his analysis was of excellence that was not expected of a young writer in his mid-20s. Namık Kemal addressed the issues like opening public schools to

⁴⁷Bolayır A. E. Namık Kemal. P. 37–38.

⁴⁸Tosun H. Ali Ekrem Bolayır’ın Namık Kemal ve Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem Hakkındaki Görüşleri. Master’s degree thesis. İstanbul, 2010. P. 20.

⁴⁹Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi. P. 20.

⁵⁰Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 364.

⁵¹Güz N. Şinasi ve Namık Kemal’in Osmanlı fikir ve basın hayatına katkıları // [URL:]https://www.academia.edu/35375803/%C5%9Einasi_ve_Nam%C4%B1k_Kemalin_Osmanlı_Fikir_ve_Bas%C4%B1n_Hayat%C4%B1na_Katk%C4%B1lar%C4%B1 (date of access: 06.02.2020).

⁵²Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi. P. 20.

raise the awareness of people, girls being able to receive an education, taking severe measures against frequent large-scale fires, and establishing hospitals for women and making reforms on the economy. His writings appealed to a wide audience⁵³.

Namık Kemal's first political content column in "Tasvir-i Efkar" is the one he wrote about the death of King Leopold of Belgium. Topics such as freedom, the relationship between the government and the nation and how the ruler endears himself to people begin with this column. He began writing about foreign policy briefs under the title of "Europe." Namık Kemal's main political manner began with his articles on Wallachia and Moldavia and continued with the Cretan rebellion. After these writings, the newspaper gradually gained a political identity. His writings on Greek songs sung against the Turks in entertainment venues caused the first tension between him and the government, and he expressed his sadness about the instruction sent by the government against these writings. However, he showed his brave character with his answers. At the time of writing this article, Namık Kemal joined the "İttifak-ı Hamiyyet"(Union of Patriots) society, which was founded in June 1865 to establish the constitutional administration in the country⁵⁴.

When society emerged, foreign indebtment had increased, the Cretan rebellion had begun, and the ongoing Egyptian problem continued. The issue of granting autonomy to Wallachia-Moldavia was on the agenda, the destruction or evacuation of the Ottoman castles and outposts in the Balkans was in question. The young, who were not apathetic to the situation of the country and the developments in Europe, believed something had to be done⁵⁵.

The society was founded as a secret society by Mehmed Ayetullah Bey, one of these young people who had a dream of establishing the constitutional

⁵³Ibid. P. 21.

⁵⁴Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 364–365.

⁵⁵Korkmaz F. Yeni Osmanlılar Cemiyeti Kurucularından Mehmet Ayetullah Bey. Ankara, 2017. P. 25.

monarchy as soon as possible, hoping to solve the ongoing disasters of the Ottoman Empire and prevent the collapse. The society, which the young called “İttifak-ı Hamiyet” (Union of Patriots), then later were named “New Ottoman Society.” The greatest desire of these young people wanted to have a constitutional order. Namık Kemal was among those who joined this society and in a short time the number of members of the society reached 245⁵⁶. The society was founded by taking the example of the Carbonari Association in Italy, which worked secretly against the administration. In fact, at the first meeting of the society, Carbonari’s statement, translated into Turkish by Ayetullah Bey, was read. According to the conditions of the country at that time, changes were made considering its customs and moral values. However, when these meetings were heard by Ali Pasha, Mehmed Bey and Reşad Bey fled to Europe first. In 1867, Ziya Pasha was appointed as governor of Cyprus for the second time and Namık Kemal was appointed as the deputy governor of Erzurum. Namık Kemal’s article titled “The Eastern Question,” which did not fit the government’s politics also played a role in his appointment and angered the administration. Namık Kemal was trying to delay going to Erzurum. Nineteen days after the assignation decree, he was invited along with Ziya Pasha to the newspaper “Courrier d’Orient” in Istanbul. They were given a letter by the Egyptian prince Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, who invited them to Paris to make publications on behalf of the New Ottomans. They welcomed this letter and sailed from Istanbul to France on the 17th of May 1867⁵⁷. They reached Paris on May 30th, 1867. Thus, a new era begins in Namık Kemal’s life, where more political struggles would prevail. One month after their arrival in Paris, as Sultan Abdülaziz visited France and they had informed them that it would not be appropriate for them to be in France, so, the New Ottomans went to London (30th of June 1867). However, during Sultan’s visit to France, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha met Sultan Abdülaziz and asked the Sultan for forgiveness and received permission to return to his home country. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha called them back to Paris and, in

⁵⁶Moralı S. S. Ayetullah ve Yeni Osmanlı Cemiyeti, 1969 / [URL:] <http://earsiv.sehir.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11498/16938/001581447010.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y> (date of access: 08.02.2020).

⁵⁷Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda...P. 9–10.

line with some new decisions taken in Baden, paid each of them a stipend to publish a newspaper in London on behalf of the society⁵⁸.

There is not much information about what works Namık Kemal did in the field of literature during his stay in Europe. In these years, it can be said that he was more interested in the general structure, administrative and economic situation, law and political institutions of Europe than in art⁵⁹.

In 1870, when the government declared the amnesty on the 24th of November 1870, Namık Kemal and his friends returned home⁶⁰. Since he could return on condition that Namık Kemal would not write anything, therefore, he did not engage in writing activities during Ali Pasha's lifetime. Namık Kemal who published sometimes unsigned columns in "Diyojen" journal with the death of Ali Pasha made it possible to start publishing articles again⁶¹.

The New Ottomans were faced with a harsher and more authoritarian Abdülaziz when they returned home embarrassed, and their organisation disbanded. Apart from each other, some started to support the government, and some were appointed provincial civil servants. With the arrival of the last members of the disbanded society in Europe to Istanbul, a small group that did not intend to give up their publishing activities soon began to show their reaction. Namık Kemal decided to publish a newspaper called "İstikbal"(Independence)with Ebüzziya Tevfik who was in Istanbul and his friends such as Nuri and Reşad, who had returned from Europe after Mahmud Nedim Pasha declared a general amnesty. However, when the newspaper was not allowed to publish, the group in the "İbret" newspaper was published a declaration also announcing the newspaper's new staff and their aims in writing on the 13th of June 1872. Namık Kemal wrote his most mature articles in the "İbret" newspaper, where he was the editor-in-chief⁶².

⁵⁸Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi. P. 24–25.

⁵⁹Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 366.

⁶⁰Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. P. 29.

⁶¹Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 367.

⁶²Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 367.

The “İbret” newspaper has gained the identity of a newspaper that mentioned national issues. However, due to the article “Garaz marazdır” written by Namık Kemal on the rumours about the dismissal of Midhat Pasha from the Baghdad governorship and slamming Grand Vizier Mahmud Nedim Pasha for his role in this incident, the newspaper was closed for four months after its nineteenth issue. Afterwards, Namık Kemal was appointed as the governor of Gallipoli (September 26th, 1872). After his arrival in Gallipoli, Namık Kemal sent regular articles to the “İbret” newspaper with the signature of B.M. (*başmuharrir* – “the head writer”), and also wrote various articles with the signature N.K. to the “Hadika” newspaper published by Ebüzziya Tevfik⁶³. At that time, he published three books of the “Evrak-ı Perişan” and began writing the play “Vatan Yahut Silistre”. Three months after his appointment, on January 11th, 1872, he was dismissed and returned to Istanbul on December 25th, 1872. Again, he became the head of the “İbret” newspaper and increased his criticism of the government, especially on censorship. As a result of this, the “İbret” newspaper was closed again in its 100th issue on 6 February 1873. Namık Kemal completed his play “VatanYahut Silistre”. While this was happening, the closing period of not publishing the newspaper ended, and “İbret” began to be published again⁶⁴.

His play “Vatan Yahut Silistre” began to be staged at the Güllü Agop Theatre on the 1st of April 1873. The public was thrilled, “Long live the motherland”, “Long Live Kemal” they shouted. The people were taking to Namık Kemal on the stage and applauding him constantly⁶⁵. The “İbret” newspaper had published the event in a way that would draw attention. The government was very alarmed. They could not prevent the play from being staged. However, the order on the 6th of April 1873 closed the “İbret” newspaper completely in its 132nd issue. On the same day, Namık Kemal, Ebüzziya Tevfik, Ahmet Midhat Efendi and Nuri Bey were arrested. Namık Kemal was exiled to Famagusta by the decree

⁶³Uçman A. Kısa Bir Uzun Hikayesi. P. 27.

⁶⁴Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda...P. 12.

⁶⁵Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. P. 32.

of Sultan Abdülaziz on the 10th of April 1873 on the charge of “making harmful publications.” The fact that the play continued to be staged a month after the exile shows that the reason for the exile was not the play. Ahmet Mithat Efendi stated that “*While they being exiled, they were told that this is happening to them because of their closeness to Murat V.*” The play was even staged twice in the presence of Sultan Abdülaziz⁶⁶.

Although Namık Kemal was exiled to Famagusta, he was welcomed warmly. With the positive impact of “VatanYahut Silistre” on the audience that caused his exile and brought him fame all at once, he began to write new works here. He wrote historical books called “Kanije” and “Silistre Muhasarası” and a novel “İntibah,” plays “Akif Bey,” “Gülrihal,” “Zavallı Çocuk” and “Kara Bela,” as well as criticism books “Tahrib” and “Takib-i Harabat”⁶⁷. Through his correspondence with his friends and the newspapers being sent to him, he learned politics and literary news of Istanbul and cared about the young literati. He tried to guide some of them, among them was Abdülhak Hamid. As he was banned from writing, he published his writings unsigned or under a different name⁶⁸.

Namık Kemal’s life in exile in Famagusta lasted precisely 38 months. This situation ended with the deposed of Sultan Abdülaziz as a result of a military coup. Shortly after Murat V succeeded the throne, Namık Kemal, along with other political exiles, was pardoned and returned to Istanbul on the 19th of June 1876. However, during the reign of Murat V, which lasted 93 days, Namık Kemal was not given any official duties. Many, including Namık Kemal, had high hopes for the constitutional regime of Murat V; however, he was dethroned three months later due to a mental disorder. Instead, on the 31st of August 1876, Abdülhamid II acceded to the Ottoman throne with the promise that he would declare constitutional monarchy and *Kanun-ı Esasi* (Ottoman constitution of 1876)⁶⁹.

⁶⁶Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda...P. 13.

⁶⁷Uçman A. Namık Kemal’in Üzerine Bir Biyografi Denemesi // Ölümünün Yüzüncü Yılında Namık Kemal. İstanbul, 1988. P. 223.

⁶⁸Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 369.

⁶⁹Uçman A. Kısa Bir Ömrün Uzun Hikayesi. P. 30–31.

Namık Kemal was appointed as a member of the Council of State seventeen days after Abdülhamid's accession to the throne. Namık Kemal was elected a member of the committee formed to prepare the Constitution on November the 2nd, 1876⁷⁰. On December 23rd, 1877, the Constitution was declared. Thus, the first step was taken regarding the constitutional regime based on the parliamentary system that many patriotic intellectuals, especially Namık Kemal, had been longing for years. However, this situation does not last long; many people are uprooted from Istanbul by the Sultan under some pretext⁷¹. The Sultan ordered Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha to be taken out of Istanbul, as he heard that they spoke ill of him⁷². In February 1877, reports were made to the palace that Namık Kemal had mentioned Abdülhamid's abdication and replacing him with Murad V or the Sharif of Mecca. The next day, Midhat Pasha was dismissed as grand vizier and exiled to Europe. The following day, Namık Kemal was arrested⁷³. After two months of interrogating, it was understood that Namık Kemal was not guilty. On the 10th of July 1877, after a five-month prison term, he was released on the Sultan's will with the condition that he remain on the island of Crete. However, it was decided to send Namık Kemal to Mytilene at his request. He sailed from Istanbul to Mytilene on July 19th, 1877⁷⁴.

A new era begins for Namık Kemal there. In Mytilene, Namık Kemal was trying to carefully follow the activities of the parliament, while exchanging ideas with some representatives. He also wrote various poems, such as "Vaveyla, Vatan Mersiyesi, Murabba and Bir Muhabir Kızın İstimdadı," with the despair and sorrow of the ongoing Russian war. About two and a half years after the arrival of Namık Kemal, who was initially on probation on the island, he was appointed as governor of the island by the will of Abdülhamid II (December 1879). Namık Kemal stayed in Mytilene for more than seven years. During his stay on the island, he established

⁷⁰Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 369.

⁷¹Uçman A. Kısa Bir Ömrün Uzun Hikayesi. P. 32.

⁷²Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda...P. 15-16.

⁷³Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 370.

⁷⁴Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda...P. 16.

about 20 first primary schools and opened some schools where Muslims and Christians would receive education together⁷⁵.

Namık Kemal depoliticised and spent more time on his literary studies again and completed his play “Celaledin Harzemşah” and novel “Cezmi”. He presented this play to the Sultan. Thus, his relations with the palace improved again. Besides, he wrote “Celal Mukaddimesi,” in which he set out his views on literature. As Namık Kemal thought that Islam had been misunderstood and misjudged, he wrote: “Renan Müdafaaamesi” which was his last work in Mytilene in 1883⁷⁶.

Due to complaints and slander from the Greeks and some notables of the island along with officers, Namık Kemal was then appointed as governor of Rhodes on September 15th, 1884⁷⁷. The health of Namık Kemal, who had pneumonia in Mytilene, became even worse on the island of Rhodes. Despite this, he was always reading, writing, and trying to be productive for his country. He began writing Ottoman history there. He gave a great service to the island of Rhodes. The first high school after Istanbul was opened in Rhodes. He continued to stay in Rhodes for 3 years⁷⁸. Due to an attack on the foreign Consul’s house, he was appointed as governor of Chios at the beginning of December 1877. However, he made efforts to decisively complete the Ottoman history⁷⁹. The climate of Rhodes harmed the health of Namık Kemal. His bronchitis had returned. There was a doctor named Ornshtayn on Chios. This person, who was a native Greek, treated him with all his abilities as he appreciated the greatness of Namık Kemal. He seemed to recover⁸⁰. However, he did not stop working due to the desire of writing Ottoman history, which was most important to him. As his work was banned and collected by the palace because of a denunciation during the publishing of his work, he was left devastated and could not recover himself again. He

⁷⁵Uçman A. Kısa Bir Ömrün Uzun Hikayesi. P. 33.

⁷⁶Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda... P. 17.

⁷⁷Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 370.

⁷⁸Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. P. 37.

⁷⁹Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Hayatımızda... P. 18.

⁸⁰Bolayır A. E. Namık Kemal. P. 111.

developed pneumonia due to the sadness of his appeals not being answered by the sultan⁸¹.

On Saturday, December 1st, 1888, Namık Kemal's condition began to worsen. That night he read a chapter from Viktor Hugo's roman "Les Misérables". "*I will get some rest,*" he said. However, on December 2nd, 1888, he died at the age of 48⁸². His body was buried in the cemetery of a mosque in Chios. Namık Kemal's wish was to be buried next to Balkan Conqueror Süleyman Pasha's tomb after he died. Ebüzziya knew of his request and informed Abdülhamid II about it. After three days, his body was buried there in Gallipoli⁸³.

1.2. Namık Kemal as a Social Thinker

Namık Kemal, one of the most influential people of the 19th century Turkish intellectuals, has taken his place in history as a multifaceted thinker. Namık Kemal, who was also involved with politics, was a forward-thinker who was able to read the events of the period, the Western approach to the Ottoman Empire and its reflections in the political, social and economic fields⁸⁴. Namık Kemal, who consciously spoke about issues such as "homeland, nation, freedom, altruism and heroism" for the first time in Turkish history and laid down his life for this purpose, has been considered a national hero in this respect⁸⁵.

1.2.1. Namık Kemal's State Hypothesis

According to Namık Kemal, the state came into being as a result of the natural socialization of the individual. He believes that by nature, humans tend to harm each other and that the power to protect them from the attacks of others can only be provided by a structure created by humans. In his thoughts, it is possible to

⁸¹Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 371.

⁸²Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. P. 41.

⁸³Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 371.

⁸⁴Gümüş M. Namık Kemal'e Göre "Şark Meselesi" ve Osmanlı Devleti'ni Çöküşe Götüren Sorunlar // History Studies. International Journal of History. 2010. (Middle East Special Issue). P. 146.

⁸⁵Erdemir Ö. "Bârîka-i Zafer" Adlı Eseri Çerçevesinde Namık Kemal'in Osmanlı Tarihi ve Tarihçiliğine Bakışı. Master's degree thesis. Konya, 2016. P. 35.

see that Ibn Khaldun(1332–1406)influenced him. Ibn Khaldun explained why people need the state in the following way:

"A regulator is required to protect people against each other. Because of the animalistic urges of the human being, there is a tendency towards hostility and cruelty. The weapons they use against wild animals are not enough to prevent attacks from their kind. Because they all have the same. Then, something else is needed to protect themselves against one another. This "something else" can not be any animal, as all animals lack comprehension and capacity. In this case, the regulator must be one of the people: one who dominates all of them, one who has sovereignty over all of them so that no one should attack anyone or cheat anyone else's rights. That's what being sovereign means."

Even though Namık Kemal, like Ibn Khaldun, bases the birth of the state on a worldly cause⁸⁶, Ibn Khaldun has an organism-based understanding of the state. Just as people are born, grow and die, states go through the same process in that order, just like humans. Ultimately, with the dissolution of a state, a new one is established⁸⁷. However, Namık Kemal argues the opposite as follows:

"Should we think about these chronic diseases and give up hope in our patient's life? No, the state is a person, a spiritual person. Contrary to what Ibn Khaldun says, a state does not have a life span. If that sick man only acts as his creation requires, he will find health and strength and live until the world ends⁸⁸."

According to Namık Kemal, the state is not a structure to be considered independent of the people. Therefore, in his view, the state is an organization that exists with the people. The problem for Namık Kemal was not whether the state was necessary or not, but with what qualities the state had itself. Namık Kemal attributed the continuation of this existence to the state revising itself according to

⁸⁶Nal S. Namık Kemal'in Devlet Kuramı ve Devletin Sürekliliğini Sağlayacak Yönetim Biçimi // İnönü Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi. 2019. Vol.10. No. 2. P. 636–637.

⁸⁷Yıldız Turan E. Türk İslam Düşünce Sisteminde İbn-i Haldun'un Devlet Nazariyesi // Atatürk İletişim Dergisi. 2005. No. 9. P. 202.

⁸⁸Namık Kemal. Hasta Adam (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 24. 7 Aralık 1868) // Sürgünde Muhafet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868-1869). Vol. I / Ed. by S. Karlıtekin. İstanbul, 2018. P. 157–158.

the requirements of the period. According to Namık Kemal, the state must assure the benefit, development and progress of the people. The most important responsibility of the state is to ensure justice. According to him, justice is also a sign of reaching a certain level of civilization⁸⁹.

1.2.2.The Assessment of the Ottoman Empire by Namık Kemal

The Ottoman Empire remained between its glorious past and the European reality, which has become superior to the Empire since the 17th and 18th centuries. On the one hand, the Ottoman Empire could not leave the classical system of Mehmet the Conqueror(1451-1481) and Suleiman the Magnificent(1520-1566) periods, which the Ottomans regarded as perfect, and tried to return to this glorious past they longed for with reforms to revive it, however, they accepted the superiority of Europe. Faced with this dilemma, the Ottoman Empire could neither offer a new alternative from its system nor make a European-Ottoman synthesis. The Ottoman Empire tried to maintain their present state by adhering to the past and thus maintain their psychological superiority⁹⁰. Namık Kemal expressed this longing for the past in the following words.

“When Molla Gürani⁹¹ is in Bursa with the task of inspecting foundations, Mehmet the Conqueror sends a proclamation there, and it is read. He immediately takes the declaration from the reader. He says: “It is against the Sharia law. The Sultan cannot do anything which is against the law and we are those who keep away from what Allah has forbidden”, and tears the edict. He gets angry at the situation and then goes all the way to Egypt. Mehmet, the Conqueror, sees it as the event that would glorify his reign rather than his impressive bravery. After Molla Gürani’s humiliating act, Mehmet the Conqueror tries to give him the value he deserves and to respect his reputation, he sends gifts and money, with a request for

⁸⁹Çağan K. Namık Kemal’de Devletin Niteliği ve Temel Dayanakları // Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi. 2012. Vol. 7. No. 1. P. 270.

⁹⁰Kodaman B. Osmanlı Devleti’nin Yükseliş ve Çöküş Sebeplerine Genel Bakış // Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2007. No.16. P. 15.

⁹¹Ottoman scholar and Mufti (1408/1410–1488). See: Yaşaroğlu M. K. Molla Gürani // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2005. Vol. 30. P. 248.

him to be brought from Egypt. Several destitute heirs come to one of the grand viziers of the Köprülü era. They sue for the unlawful killing of their saint by the ex-vizier before him. After that, the ex-Vizier stood trial. The vizier applies an eye for an eye.

It was at that time the heyday of the Ottoman Empire, which had once created a great caliphate from a small tribe and made the world tremble with its power. So, what are we now? ”⁹²

By the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire had been weakened in many political, social, economic and administrative matters. The defeats on the battlefields and their repercussions on domestic affairs and foreign policies are visible. This is the case of the Ottoman Empire Namık Kemal expresses as follows:

“The term sick man who found a spiritual body in the mind of the French leaned against the most beautiful point of civilization we call Europe. Capable of living as the world turned a young, vigorous, fair and valiant man who reached out to the most critical positions of three continents are in the thick of death. The name of this poor man is the Ottoman state. ”⁹³

In Europe’s public opinion, the turmoil that the Ottoman state was in, was reported by Namık Kemal in Hürriyet newspaper:

“The other newspaper that was aware of our situation said: “It’s okay, but where’s the peace? Is it in Crete, where conflict has been going on for many years? Is it in Lebanon, whose people are armed? Is it On Mount Kozan, whose inhabitants are in revolt? Is it in Yenisehir and Thessaloniki, who were always under military surveillance? Is it in Asia, where people become miserable by tribal attacks?The people of the Ottoman Empire are in a state of complete despair. Because they are starving(in a real sense). The peace mentioned in the

⁹²Namık Kemal. Hasta Adam. P. 158.

⁹³Ibid. P. 157.

“Constitutionnel” newspaper is the silence of cemeteries. He came across a funeral in Istanbul, talking about the existence of security in the graveyard⁹⁴. ”

Namık Kemal looked at the issue from the following three views within the terms of the period:

1. The Ottoman Empire is collapsing. What are the reasons for this collapse?
2. How can the Ottoman Empire prevent the collapse?
3. What needs to be done for the Ottoman Empire to regain its former power?

Based on the thesis that states acting as required by their nature will live as long as the world stops, Namık Kemal believed that the Ottoman Empire would be freed from the situation⁹⁵.

1. Therefore, the illness, that is leading to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire should be found. Namık Kemal explained the causes of the collapse as follows:

“The cause of the disease is the scarcity of men, the lack of goods, the inadequacy of soldiers, the shortages of reasons, in short, the poverty of deficiencies, the shortage of everything. The source of this is an arbitrary administration. Why not fix this problem? Doctors are the disease itself. Doctors have joined forces with the snakes, known as Russia, who have gathered around him. If the patient moves a little, the doctors will point out, and the snakes will start stinging and swallowing.”⁹⁶

2. The answer given by Namık Kemal to the question of how to prevent this collapse is as follows:

“It is clear from the lengthy statements that if the people’s old freedom will be given back and the state becomes a government in harmony with Sharia law,

⁹⁴Namık Kemal. Avrupa Şarkın Asayişini İster (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 24. 7 Aralık 1868) // Sürgünde Muhafetlet Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 162.

⁹⁵Önberk N. Namık Kemal’de Özgürlük Fikri // Doğumunun Yüzellinci Yılında Namık Kemal. Ankara, 1993. P. 100–101.

⁹⁶Namık Kemal. Hasta Adam. P. 158.

then they will be free from their illness. We live in such a time that for our salvation, when it comes to court, the code is understood, no matter what the level of officer, the servant is understood and when it comes to people the supremacy of Sharia is understood.

*The first claim is that this patient's survival requires medical education. The second claim is "No need, and now, we are at ease due to the continuation of the disease." Let's see, if the patient starts complaining, if he says my arm hurts, we put ointment on it, if he says my head hurts, we give him a sniff of the wicker grass. So, the disease goes away, and we will not decrease our quality of life."*⁹⁷

According to Namık Kemal, to prevent this collapse was to put the Islamic Union and Ottoman nationalism into practice. Ottomanism is an ideology that will ensure the existence of the Ottoman Empire for all who live on the same land and consider themselves "Ottomans" even though they belong to different religions and speak different languages. The idea of homeland and love of homeland is a crucial element for the Ottomanism ideal to continue. He does not treat the homeland as just a simple piece of land; he establishes a different relationship between the soil of the motherland that we were born and raised in, and that feeds us⁹⁸.

After suggesting solutions for preventing the collapse, Namık Kemal called out to the doctors that are, the state administrators, of the Ottoman empire that were likened to a sick man:

"Oh, doctors of the state! This land, which is the common mother of all of us, moans in your hands. You also know that it will not be possible for a patient's health to improve without seeking help. What kind of man would it be if you, who has the same disease as the patient, were willing to resign from the foot sweat of the disease and try to remove it by stealing and selling his belongings after his mother died? Those who, for three days of comfort, have caused the collapse of a

⁹⁷Ibid. P. 158–159.

⁹⁸Uçman A. Tanzimat'tan Sonra Edebiyat ve Siyaset: Nâmık Kemal ve Ziya Paşa Örneği // Türkiye Mecmuası. 2014. Vol. 24. No.1. P. 118.

six-hundred-year-old state, their reputation will forever be cursed at the court of conscience of the universe.”⁹⁹

1.2.3. Namık Kemal’s Recommendation About Regime

Trying to find a way out of the situation in the Ottoman Empire, Namık Kemal, in the dialogue with Fanton¹⁰⁰, explained what the best regime for the Ottoman Empire moving forward as follows:

“Fanton: *Do you think it is needed for the Ottoman state to turn into the republican administration as a way of dealing with this situation?*

Namık Kemal: *The Republic has become the most popular form of government in the present century. Islam was a republic at the beginning, but this regime cannot be applied to us. In our country, no one would think of such a thought. The suitable government for us is a constitutional monarchy to be established under the rule of the Ottoman dynasty. It is necessary to imitate the European parliaments through the constitution.*

Fanton: *So, which of the Western states do you intend to take as a model?*

Namık Kemal: *The United States cannot be an example for us because it is a republic. As Britain and Germany have class differences and noblemen, we cannot take these two states as an example. Especially as in Britain, we can not leave the administration to the ministers alone by isolating our sultan from everything. When it comes to France, we can apply the provisions of France's Constitution with some changes in our empire. Imperial Edict of Reorganization (1839) (Tanzimât Fermânı) and Ottoman Reform Edict of 1856 (Islâhat Hatt-ı Hümayûnu); were not sufficient, not clearly stated like the Constitution.*”¹⁰¹

⁹⁹Namık Kemal. *Hasta Adam*. P. 159.

¹⁰⁰During Namık Kemal’s stay in Europe, he was interested in the general structure, administrative status, economic level, law and political institutions of Europe. It is known that he took law and language lessons from an Englishman named Fanton, who has different identities such as a businessman, politician and journalist, with whom he made a close friendship in London. See: Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal. P. 366–377.

¹⁰¹Mardin Y. *Namık Kemal’in Londra Yılları*. İstanbul, 1974. P. 46–47.

Namık Kemal recommended the establishment of the following assemblies in 1852, based on Napoleon III's model in France:

- a) State Council: A council that will consist of forty or fifty members, prepare draft laws and make necessary decisions for the execution of the administrative laws.
- b) Ummah Council: A council that will carry out the task of legislating the bills prepared by the first council and controlling the government budget¹⁰².
- c) Assembly of Ayan (Assembly of Notables): The third assembly that Namık Kemal wanted with the Constitution is the "Assembly of Notables". He called it the Senate. This assembly is a conciliator between the legislative assembly, which are tasked with protecting the rights of the people and the executive body. It allows the laws to come into force.

After saying that there is no need for a republic regime in an assembly process according to this order, he saw the senate as a condition for a constitutional system. There is no attitude against the Sultan in this idea. The sense of order wants to see the Sultan in his place, and the desire to glorify him is a result of the attitude taken by the Ottoman Empire towards the West¹⁰³.

Although not named, Namık Kemal claimed that there was a factual separation of powers in the Ottoman Empire before Tanzimat. In other words, Namık Kemal tried to show that the Ottoman Empire had a kind of representative government in the classical period. In the 19th century, he stated as follows that the situation was different:¹⁰⁴

"We are in a time, where the Sublime Porte legislates, the Sublime Porte makes the decisions, the Sublime Porte puts them into practice and supervises them. If we say the Sultan, the Sublime Porte is understood, if we assume the law

¹⁰²Çağan K. Namık Kemal'de Devletin Niteliği ve Temel Dayanakları. P. 273.

¹⁰³Önberk N. Namık Kemal'de özgürlük fikri. P. 110–111.

¹⁰⁴Nal S. Namık Kemal'in Devlet Kuramı ve Devletin Sürekliliğini Sağlayacak Yönetim Biçimi. P. 641.

and court, then it is so. If we say the people, they mean nothing to the Sublime Porte.”¹⁰⁵

He took the theory of popular sovereignty from Rousseau, and Locke’s ideas on the contract of society, and from Montesquieu the method of separating forces. However, he believed that this system already existed in Ottoman and Islamic societies in various aspects, the main task he was trying to do was to show that Islamic political philosophy was not outside of Western political theory. Namık Kemal would not be an imitator by proving that the core of institutions, concepts and methods from the West were Islamic¹⁰⁶.

1.2.4. The Concept of “Hürriyet” (“Freedom”) According to Namık Kemal

The Turkish word “Hürriyet”¹⁰⁷ comes from ‘hürriyya’, an abstract name derived from Arabic “hurr”. In the first sense, it refers to the opposite of the status of slavery, sometimes the exception or concession; in the second sense, it refers to the freedom of will. It was at the end of the eighteenth century that the word first began to take on a new meaning in Turkish¹⁰⁸.

The sense of the notion “hürriyet” has become more apparent with increased interaction with France. Sadık Rıfat Pasha, an ambassador in Europe, was one of the first ones to use the term. Rıfat Pasha was a statesman who led ideas to during the Tanzimat period beginning in 1839. In his work “Müntahabat-ı Asar” he introduced the libertarian ideas that developed in Europe and pointed out that the state needed freedom to be civilised¹⁰⁹. In this context, Namık Kemal was not the first person to talk about human rights and the parliamentary system in Turkey.

¹⁰⁵Namık Kemal. *Hasta adam*. P. 158.

¹⁰⁶Çağan K. *Namık Kemal’de Devletin Niteliği ve Temel Dayanakları*. P. 274–275.

¹⁰⁷Hürriyet: being free, not being captive and enslaved and anti-bondage. See: Parlâtır İ. *Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. 4th ed. Ankara, 2011. P. 663.

¹⁰⁸Sarıçoban G. *Namık Kemal ve Hürriyet Fikri* //Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2019. Vol. 23. No. 2. P. 517.

¹⁰⁹Yücel D. M. *Son dönem Osmanlı düşüncesinde hürriyet kavramının çözümlemesi* // Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2017. No. 19. P. 181.

However, Namık Kemal was the first to establish a connection between them and to express his ideas on freedom and law-based democracy openly¹¹⁰.

According to Namık Kemal, people are not born equal and cannot live equally. The law guarantees fairness for inequality. The embodied form of freedom in society is the existence of the state. If the individual is to fight for freedom, he must fight for the safety of the state, which is the guarantee of this individuals freedom, if the state faces danger, the society does too¹¹¹.

Namık Kemal describes freedom as the reason for happiness, the source of civilisation, an indispensable need of man, as “the realisation of every individual's wishes without harming the freedom of others”. According to Namık Kemal, freedom is a fundamental right. The law of the person regulating the rights and freedoms of individuals is the basis of public law, so a legal system that does not recognise the act of the person cannot be accepted. Rules formed by a single person or a community cannot be considered law; the basis of the law must be an absolute divine will. Namık Kemal states that the realisation of freedom granted by divine force is possible through reason¹¹².

Namık Kemal attributes the realisation of freedom to two principles: First, the creation of a constitution, a law in which rights and liberties are regulated with clear and precise provisions, and second, the creation of a parliament that will supervise the implementation of these laws and guide the government in the problems it faces. While the constitution and the consultancy guarantee the rights and freedoms for people, they limit the rights and powers of the Sultan and ministers, and these shall be determined within the framework of the law. The constitution will put an end to the pressure of European states on the Ottoman

¹¹⁰Sarıçoban G. Namık Kemal ve Hürriyet Fikri. P. 524.

¹¹¹Zeka S. İbret Gazetesi'nde Çıkan Yazılarında Namık Kemal'in Osmanlı Birliğine Duyduğu İnancının Sebepleri / Semih Zeka // Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi. 2017. Vol. 10. No. 48. P. 148.

¹¹²Aydoğdu N. Namık Kemal'de Hürriyet Kavramı // Namık Kemal / Ed. by T. Karataş and O. K. Tavukçu. Ankara, 2011. P. 460–462.

Empire. By constitutional regulation, the allegation of non-Muslims who claim to have been persecuted in the Ottoman Empire will also become unfounded¹¹³.

When it comes to granting rights, the freedom of people and regulating them by law, one of the issues discussed by the Ottoman statesmen is the people's ignorance. The idea that freedom can only be granted after people have been educated; otherwise, the people will use it in a way that corrupts morality and harms the administration¹¹⁴. According to Mustafa Reşit Pasha, Muslim-Christian equality should have been achieved slowly, not suddenly¹¹⁵. Namık Kemal strongly opposed this idea and recommended that the Ottoman government grant their citizens freedom without waiting for enlightenment¹¹⁶.

Namık Kemal stated these discussions as follows:

“There is no doubt that although our state seemed to be an independent government in its time, it has a democratic administration that has dramatically missed the measure of freedom.

Some say, “in order to give freedom to the people, their education must be completed first. “while others say,” liberty must be granted in stages according to the necessity of time.”¹¹⁷

Kemal's both political and social ideas are based on the concept of freedom. The poem he wrote on the 23rd of April 1872 is the best example of this:

“Oh beautiful face of freedom, what a charmer you are;

When we were freed from captivity, we became prisoners of your love.”

¹¹³Ibid. P. 469–470.

¹¹⁴Aydoğdu N. Namık Kemal'de Hürriyet Kavramı. P. 468.

¹¹⁵Armaoğlu F. 19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789–1914). 14th ed. İstanbul, 2014. P. 267.

¹¹⁶Aydoğdu N. Namık Kemal'de Hürriyet Kavramı. P. 468–469.

¹¹⁷Namık Kemal. Hasta adam. P. 158–159.

Here, Namık Kemal likens freedom to a girl with a beautiful face and points out that freedom has a charm that frees people from captivity, however, it makes people fall in love with it¹¹⁸.

It is a fact that the liberal political philosophies in Europe influenced Namık Kemal in on the issue of freedom. However, due to his synthesizer understanding, he considered the situation and belief of his society. Therefore, the individual is vital in his thought of freedom, but he is not at the centre of the theory. Freedom is an essential condition for achieving mutual harmony between the state and society¹¹⁹.



¹¹⁸Sarıçoban G. Namık Kemal ve Hürriyet Fikri. P. 516.

¹¹⁹Akın M. H. Namık Kemal'in Siyasi Düşüncesinde Temel Kavramlar: İlerleme, Hürriyet Ve Vatan [URL:] [file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Downloads/Namik_Kemalin_Siyasi_Dusuncesinde_Temel%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Downloads/Namik_Kemalin_Siyasi_Dusuncesinde_Temel%20(2).pdf) (date of access: 12.03.2020).

Chapter 2. The Hürriyet Newspaper

Namık Kemal believed that newspapers play a significant role in changing society. According to him: “The main reason why our country lagged behind Europe is the lack of press. The press is considered the primary reason for the maturity seen in today's civilizations. The task of the media is to make things become known all over the world. The newspapers have very beneficial effects on literature and public education when it is not under pressure. According to Kemal, the press is a body that controls the government. The media are as important as a parliament. Namık Kemal explained why he chose journalism as follows: *"I dedicated myself to serving the homeland. I have chosen journalism since the day my hand could hold a pen, as there is no other way to accomplish this task other than writing."*¹²⁰

2.1. The History of the “Hürriyet” Newspaper

The Hürriyet newspaper, published in London and Geneva between 1868–1870 by members of the New Ottomans society, is the second Turkish newspaper published in Europe after the “Muhbir” newspaper. The news and articles in the newspaper are closely related to the activities of the New Ottomans in Europe. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, one of the critical figures of the period, played a significant role in the events of the New Ottomans as well as in the publication of “Muhbir” and “Hürriyet” newspapers. Fazıl Pasha had been in the ministries of education and finance of the Ottoman Empire due to his reformist ideas, however, later forced to go abroad on an order which caused the inheritance of khedivate not to be left to his administration. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, who lived comfortably in France, exploited the New Ottomans, who were in opposition to the regime and the palace, to regain the right of succession, and invited them to Paris with the offer that they continue their activities freely and to pay all their expenses. Thus, in the last days of May 1867, Ali Suavi, Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha and some other New Ottomans

¹²⁰Girgin A. Türkiye’de Yerel Basın // [URL:] http://atillagirgin.net/s/2170/i/Yerel_Bas%C4%B1n_2009.pdf (date of access: 14.03.2020).

met in Paris. In the same year, Ali Suavi started publishing the “Muhbir” newspaper in London on August 31st, 1867, with the instruction of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, who had returned to Istanbul upon his pardon during Sultan Abdülaziz’s European trip¹²¹. Due to Ali Suavi’s independence from the decisions of the society and his attitude, caused deterioration of his friendship with Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha in a short time. Therefore, it was decided to publish a second newspaper for the society with the permission of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha¹²².

The first issue of the weekly “Hürriyet” newspaper was published in London on June 29th 1868. Initially, the press was under the direction of Reşat Bey and Namık Kemal was preparing his articles without revealing himself. The first issue of “Hürriyet” newspaper does not include “preface” like many other newspapers. However, the leading article in “Hubbü’l-Vatan Mine’l-iman”(Love of your country (patriotism) is a part of your faith) written by Namık Kemal on June 29th 1868 includes information about the aims of the newspaper and the policy of its publication¹²³.

In his article, Namık Kemal emphasized the importance of the love of homeland and its reasons. Namık Kemal stated that the motherland is worthy of love more than anything else in the world, and one should keep it supreme even from his own life. Namık Kemal pointed out that the New Ottomans should know more about that and their duty to serve the country than anyone else: *“This motherland, given as a blessing by Allah, is the work of the lives and the bloodshed. If the bones of our fathers, who were martyred for this purpose, were uncovered from the Earth, perhaps it could be a bulwark to protect us from enemy attack.”* he explained why the homeland is valuable.

¹²¹Çelik H. Hürriyet // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1998. Vol. 18. P. 505.

¹²²Uçman A. Kısa Bir Ömrün Uzun Hikayesi. P. 25.

¹²³Akbulut U. Osmanlı Basın Tarihine Bir Katkı: Gazetelerin Yayınlanma Amaçları Üzerine (1831–1876) // Turkish Studies. International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic. 2013. Vol. 8. No. 5. P. 48.

Namık Kemal stated that the ideas and opinions of the New Ottomans will be included in the Hürriyet newspaper, and the topic they will mainly address is the “constitutional monarchy”.¹²⁴

The newspaper, which was published in journal sizes (20/30 cm) and once a week, has changed its number of pages three times during its publication life. Issues 1–10 are printed on 4 pages, 11–63 on eight pages, and 64–100 on four pages¹²⁵.

The following letter of Namık Kemal to Kayazade Reşat Bey was published in “Hürriyet” newspaper on June 13th 1868:

My friend;

I can't tell you how pleased I am to see the issues of the Hürriyet newspaper. Our society has done more instrumental work, and it is a pleasant coincidence that such a job appeared under the name of Hürriyet and for freedom at the time of the granting of public independence in Istanbul. I hope that Hürriyet will serve to fulfil the promises of civil liberty. As I am associated with the New Ottomans, I must help your newspaper with my articles. However, when I had to leave the Tasvir-i Efkar newspaper because of the pressure on my latest article on the Eastern question, I tried to tell the truth with my writings because I did not give up the interests of the country unlike the elders wanted. You are the reason the immortality of the newspaper by accepting the service in my place! At that time, the writing was a way, and it led to castles and dungeons. Our brotherhood aside, your respect for my worthless sake has given me purpose. I have nothing to sacrifice, but to serve your newspaper, I will write as many articles as I can for each issue.”¹²⁶

¹²⁴Akbulut U. Osmanlı Basın Tarihine Bir Katkı: Gazetelerin Yayınlanma Amaçları Üzerine (1831–1876). P. 48–49.

¹²⁵Çelik H. Hürriyet. P. 506.

¹²⁶Mardin Y. Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları. P. 91–92.

From the 3rd of August 1868, Namık Kemal continued to write his articles without hiding behind the name Reşat and started to make severe criticisms against Grand Vizier Ali Pasha and foreign minister Fuat Pasha¹²⁷.

2.2. The Contents of the “Hürriyet” Newspaper

The Hürriyet newspaper is neither the first nor the last paper published by the New Ottomans. However, it is a bulletin rather than a newspaper in terms of its content. It is different from the New Ottomans’ other publications in terms of the scope and depth of the issues it deals with¹²⁸ since the “Hürriyet” newspaper is Turkey’s first thought newspaper¹²⁹.

Topics featured in the newspaper include:

1. The parliamentary system should be based on Islamic principles;
2. The viziers must be responsible for what they are doing;
3. Improvement of finance by preventing waste and foreign indebtment;
4. Saving the people from ignorance by a campaign for education;
5. Abandonment of imitation blindly;
6. Finding a solution to the situation of the ulama who were purposefully forced into misery;
7. Against the activities of the missionaries, Muslims should also protect their religion;
8. The language should be simplified;
9. There should be no compromise on the basic principles of Sharia;
10. Especially in state institutions, flattery should be abandoned, and in correspondence expressions unseemly to human dignity should not be included¹³⁰.

¹²⁷Ibid. P. 85–86.

¹²⁸[Karlitekin S. Introduction] // Sürgünde Muhafet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. X.

¹²⁹Özer A. Namık Kemal’in Mektuplarında Sosyal Ve Siyasi Meseleler. Master’s degree thesis. Karaman, 2019. P. 17.

¹³⁰Çelik H. Hürriyet. P. 506.

Besides, the state's foreign policy on Russia, Crete, Greek, Bulgarian, Wallachia-Moldavia, Egypt and Montenegro issues were criticized and offered solutions¹³¹.

Regardless of their way of life, the New Ottomans generally adhered to Islamic principles and approached almost every issue in their writings from the Islamic point of view¹³².

2.3. The Issue of Authorship of Articles in the “Hürriyet” Newspaper

Reşad Kayazade wrote the first four issues of the “Hürriyet” newspaper, the issues 5–63 by Namık Kemal and the issues 64–100 by Ziya Pasha bearing Arif's signature¹³³. The fact that all articles and letters in “Hürriyet” newspaper, are unsigned led to the question who wrote these articles. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar clarified this problem as follows: Ziya Pasha's writings were long, unnecessary and rhyming. Arabic and Persian words with combinations are mostly used to express people's suffering from the oppression of the administration in a concrete way. Unlike Ziya Pasha, Namık Kemal addressed the issues more abstractly and conceptually with a relatively simple style, used shorter sentences in his writings in a much more comprehensible language. Namık Kemal tried to discuss general issues with a polemicist style¹³⁴.

Mustafa Fazıl Pasha's increasingly improved relations with the government in Istanbul influenced the “Hürriyet” newspaper's editorial policy. Ziya Pasha's article in the first issue, which slammed the government, angered Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. After a while, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha cut off the funds due to increased tension brought relations to a breaking point. The conflict between Grand Vizier Ali Pasha and Hidiv İsmail Pasha resulted in the hope of becoming governor of Egypt again for Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. It also affected the fate of the “Hürriyet” newspaper. While rumours spread that the “Hürriyet” newspaper was being

¹³¹Donbay A. Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesindeki Makaleleri. Master's degree thesis Konya, 1992. P. 31–32.

¹³²Çelik H. Hürriyet. P. 506.

¹³³Ibid. P. 507.

¹³⁴[Karlıtekin S. Introduction] // Sürgünde Muhafet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868-1869). P. IX, XII.

provided financial support by Hidiv İsmail Pasha, Ziya Pasha wrote articles supporting İsmail Pasha, and Namık Kemal, on the contrary, slammed him. Increased tension and disharmony between Ziya Pasha and Namık Kemal led to the end of their business relations¹³⁵. Ziya Pasha did not publish Namık Kemal's letter announcing his decision to leave in the newspaper “Hürriyet”; therefore, Namık Kemal printed his letter on January 7, 1870.

*“We have no participation in the writings of the Hürriye newspaper, which have been published bearing Arif's signature. I would like this announcement to be published in the newspaper to show that there is no relationship between the Hürriyetnewspaper and us. Friends have asked me to mediate in reporting this to you because I took part in the newspaper before. Again, the command and will are yours.”*¹³⁶

Namık Kemal came to Istanbul towards the end of 1870 on the commitment given to him. Ziya Pasha moved the headquarters of the newspaper from London to Geneva, and after the 100th issue was published on June 22nd 1870, the Hürriyet newspaper ended¹³⁷.

¹³⁵Akbulut U. Osmanlı Basın Tarihine Bir Katkı: Gazetelerin Yayınlanma Amaçları Üzerine (1831–1876). P. 49.

¹³⁶Mardin Y. Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları. P. 253–254.

¹³⁷Akbulut U. Osmanlı Basın Tarihine Bir Katkı: Gazetelerin Yayınlanma Amaçları Üzerine (1831–1876). P. 49.

Chapter 3. The Eastern Question in the “Hürriyet” Newspaper

3.1. The Definition and Historical Development of the Eastern Question

Although it is considered the right approach to perceive the concept of the Eastern question as an inheritance struggle in the sense of “sharing of lands as a result of the Ottoman Empire weakening in the 19th century”, it is generally considered that the scope of this should be taken back to the Turks’ entry into Anatolia (1071). It should be noted that even within the period in which the Eastern question arises, it is expressed with different sub-definitions according to the conditions and situations. Different views are brought forward about how this question came about and its historical nature¹³⁸.

Abdulkadir Yuvalı says that according to the Europeans, the beginning of the Eastern problem dates back to the separation of the Roman Empire as a result of the Barbarian invasions. This is the end of the political existence of the Eastern Roman Empire. As the Hun Turks upset the balance of the Roman Empire, where the church was active. This is why the Europeans hated the Turks who were foreign to them and the Turks disrupted all their business. They tried to send the Turks back to where they came from, from the day they set foot on the continent of Europe. In line with this, the Eastern question has become a Turkish-European struggle, rather than an Islamic-Christian conflict¹³⁹.

In the textbooks in French schools, Charles Seignobos’ history describes the Eastern question as follows:

“Since the 18th century, Russia and Austria have tried to invade the Ottoman Empire and made their Christian subjects rebel against them. These efforts were interrupted by battles against France. In 1815, the Ottoman Empire still maintained its territorial integrity. However, Russia was threatening this

¹³⁸Beydilli K. Şark Meselesi // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2010. Vol. 38. P. 353.

¹³⁹Uluslan Ş. Şark Meselesi’nden Sevr’e Türkiye // Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2009. Vol. 8. No. 18. P. 230.

integrity. It was a matter of what the Ottoman Empire would be under threat from Russia. This issue was named after a while, and it was called the Eastern question.”¹⁴⁰

Albert Sorel (1889) points out that feelings such as jealousy and the Crusader spirit are the reason for the hostility in the formation of the negative Turkish image in the minds of Westerners:

“The Turks, as soon as they appeared in Europe, the Eastern question emerged....With the arrival of these beautiful and healthy people with their enormous victorious forces in Europe, they created a substantial effect on the unclear minds of the Europeans who freely submit themselves to the administration of priests and petty tyrants, who only drink wine and sleep, creating a disease of untreatable terror in them. The fact that the Turks put an end to Europe’s pleasure while they were napping had such a profound effect even though seven centuries had passed. However, the healthy young man has been turned into a ‘sick man’, yet the descendants of Europe have not been able to heal completely from this Turkish disease and Turkish shock.”¹⁴¹

In the Turkish Encyclopedia (1966), the Eastern question is described as follows: *“... The Eastern question became a political issue between the Great states of Europe and the Ottoman Empire. However, in the early part of the recent era, it began with Napoléon Bonaparte’s entry into Egypt in 1798. After it was named in 1815, then with the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in 1918, it was replaced by the Near East or the Middle East question, leaving it as a term and issue of history.*”¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰Seignobos Ch. Histoire politique de l’Europe contemporaine. Paris, 1897. P. 45 (quoted by: Karadağ R. Şark meselesi. İstanbul, [s. a.]P. 5–6).

¹⁴¹Quoted by: Yalçın E. Şark meselesi ve emperyalistlerin Türk politikası // Toros Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2015. Vol. 2. No. 4. P. 76.

¹⁴²Yavuz N. Şark Meselesi Açısından Ortadoğu Gelişmeleri // Gazi Üniversitesi Fakültesi Dergisi. 2003. Vol. 23. No. 3. P. 93.

According to Bayram Kocaman, it is possible to examine in two parts the “Eastern question” which started with the aim of expelling the Turks from Anatolia and then engaged Europe with different policies, especially against the Ottoman Empire. The first is the “Eastern question” between 1071–1683. At this stage, Europe’s defense was under attack from the Turks¹⁴³. After 1683, The Ottoman Empire began to leave the territories they had dominated in succession. In many classifications based on the geography (Vienna-Central Europe) reached by the Ottoman Empire and the place they retreated (Anatolia), the term Eastern question is given to the meaning of stopping the Turks in Europe and then expelling them from Europe. In this process, the systematic expression of Western states’ thoughts, aims and activities about Turks became the Eastern question¹⁴⁴.

The basis and stages of the “Eastern question” for Europe from 1071 to 1683 can be summarised as follows:

- a) to prevent Turks from entering Anatolia;
- b) Stop the Turks in Anatolia;
- c) to prevent Turks from crossing into the Balkans;
- d) avoid the conquest of Istanbul by the Turks;
- e) to prevent the Turkish advance through the Balkans towards Europe.

Despite these goals of the “Eastern question“, the Turks entered Anatolia, passed, wholly conquered the Balkans and advanced as far as Vienna. With the defeat of the Turks in Vienna in 1683, the first phase of the Eastern question was over, and the Ottoman Empire entered a period of stagnation. With that period, the

¹⁴³Şen Z. Şark Meselesi Nedir? // [URL:] <http://www.zafersan.com/sark-meselesi-nedir-zafer-sen.pdf> (date of access: 18.03.2020).

¹⁴⁴Turan M. Şark Meselesi Ve Millî Devlet Anlayışı // [URL:] http://www.mustafaturan.gen.tr/FileUpload/as799722/File/gunumuzde_sark_meselesi-turk_ocaklari_a.pdf(date of access: 19.03.2020) .

second phase of the Eastern question was opened. In the second phase of the matter was:

- a) to liberate the Christian nations in the Balkans from Ottoman rule. For this reason, by encouraging these societies to revolt, first to ensure their autonomy and then to ensure their independence;
- b) to demand reform for Christians if the above considerations do not materialise;
- c) to remove the Turks from the Balkans completely;
- d) to take back Constantinople from the Turks¹⁴⁵.

The Eastern question, which is in the terminology of political history, first gained a new dimension with the Congress of Vienna (1815), which was used by the Russian emperor Alexander I to refer to the general situation of Christians in the Ottoman Empire. After the Congress of Vienna, it became frequently used among diplomats and gained great importance among statesmen, politicians and historians¹⁴⁶.

The Congress of Vienna was convened to restore the map of Europe that Napoleon had destroyed and to establish a real and permanent balance system in Europe. Metternich represented Austria, Hardenberg Prussia, Nesselrode Russia and Castlereagh England¹⁴⁷. Although the Congress convened to organise the political map of Europe, the issue focused on the Ottoman Empire. The Great States like Russia, Austria, Britain, France and Prussia created an artificial Eastern issue to share the territory of the Ottoman Empire¹⁴⁸.

When the French Revolution took place in 1789, nationalist movements began to appear based on fundamental rights and freedom. Metternich felt the need

¹⁴⁵Kodaman B. Sultan II. Abdulhamid Devri Doğu Anadolu Politikası. Ankara, 1987. P. 106.

¹⁴⁶Yalçın E. Şark Meselesi ve Emperyalistlerin Türk Politikası. P. 81.

¹⁴⁷Erkan S. Savaş ve Barış Bağlamında XIX. Yüzyıl Uluslararası İlişkileri'nin Özellikleri // Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2010. No. 22. P. 98.

¹⁴⁸Uluslan Ş. Şark Meselesi'nden Sevr'e Türkiye. P. 232.

to warn the Ottoman Empire that the French Revolution would increase the movements of nationalism. However, the Ottoman Empire regarded the French Revolution as the domestic affairs of France. The Ottoman Empire did not attend the Congress, as they did not think that the French Revolution would put themselves in serious trouble and speed up the dissolution process¹⁴⁹.

Metternich repeated his invitation, asking the Ottoman Empire to attend the Congress. If they would not do so, he asked them to demand that territorial integrity be guaranteed.

There were several reasons why the Sublime Porte did not attend the Congress of Vienna:

1. In the Ottoman Empire's independence concept, it was not appropriate requiring territorial integrity to be guaranteed by the European states.
2. The Ottoman Empire was afraid that Russia would bring the problem of Wallachia and Moldavia to the agenda, which was the subject of constant conflict.
3. During the Congress of Vienna, the Russians tried to draw the attention of the members of Congress about Christians living under the Ottoman Empire¹⁵⁰.

The Ottoman Empire, which was neither included in the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia nor attended the Congress of Vienna, their embassies in London, Paris and Vienna at that time only observed the Congress¹⁵¹.

3.2. The Eastern Question according to Namık Kemal

Namık Kemal describes the Eastern question as follows: *“Two centuries ago, the eastern question politics is one of the most feared catastrophes that could change the shape of the earth with tremors that will erupt at an unexpected*

¹⁴⁹Turan M. Şark Meselesi Ve Millî Devlet Anlayışı // [URL:] http://www.mustafaturan.gen.tr/FileUpload/as799722/File/gunumuzde_sark_meselesi-turk_ocaklari_a.pdf (date of access: 22.03.2020).

¹⁵⁰Armaoğlu F. 19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789–1914). P. 114.

¹⁵¹Ortaylı İ. İmparatorluğun Son Nefesi (Osmanlı'nın Yaşayan Mirası). İstanbul, 2014. P. 45.

moment like volcanoes."¹⁵² Namık Kemal describes "the Eastern question" and dates it. "Two centuries ago" refers to the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca(also spelt Kuchuk-Kainarji) signed by the Ottoman Empire with the Russians¹⁵³.

On July 7, 1770, after burning down the Turkish Navy in Çeşme (Cheshme), the Russians occupied Crimea in 1771, then captured Caffa, Kerch and Yeni-kale, and the Ottoman State, which had to ask for peace, signed the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca on July 21, 1774. With Article 7 of the agreement; "Russia will have a permanent ambassador in Istanbul and could open a consulate where it deemed necessary; The Ottoman empire would protect the rights of Christians and their churches"¹⁵⁴. Russia had the opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire, and with this article, they took the Christians, who were subjects of the Ottoman Empire, under their protection. Namık Kemal's basing the "Eastern Question" on the Küçük Kaynarca agreement shows that the "Eastern Question" is not only a political issue, but also a religious one¹⁵⁵.

According to Mehmet Kaplan, the article in the Hürriyet newspaper "Europe wants the security of the East" which he thinks belongs to Namık Kemal, he mentions the concerns and the scenarios that would occur if the East came under the domination of Russia as follows:

"Europe wants the security of the East. Is there any doubt about that? Because Russia is taking advantage of the turmoil of the East every day. Russia will take advantage of these upheavals and take over that big country when Europe is busy. Europe will undoubtedly prevent such a thing from happening. However, if it continues like this, there is no doubt that the Ottoman Empire will break apart on its own like a tree being eaten by a worm, and that Russia will expand by collecting the scattered pieces one by one.

¹⁵²Kemal Namık. Şark Meselesi. Doğumunun Yüzellinci Yılında Namık Kemal. Ankara, 1993. P. 209.

¹⁵³Gümüş M. Namık Kemâl'e Göre "Şark Meselesi" ve Osmanlı Devleti'ni Çöküşe Götüren Sorunlar. P. 148.

¹⁵⁴Efe H., Kızıl M. Osmanlı'nın Kuzey Ve Doğu Politikası ve Rusya'nın "Sıcak Denizlere İnme Politikası" Kapsamında Şekillenen Doğu Sınırları // Kafkas Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi. 2018. Vol. 9. No. 17. P. 309.

¹⁵⁵Gümüş M. Namık Kemâl'e Göre "Şark Meselesi" ve Osmanlı Devleti'ni Çöküşe Götüren Sorunlar. P. 149.

Then what is happening? Is Russia giving up Europe? It doesn't seem realistic in this century to suppress all the power of Europe and fulfil Peter the Great's will to take over the world. Allah forbid, it is inevitable that if the East fall under Russia's rule, all the Great States will lose their positions compared to Russia. If Russia could find an ally from Europe and wage war, it would kill millions of people there. England would renounce all rights of India. The Mediterranean Sea, The Indian sea and the rest would come under the control of Russia. With world trade under the control of Russia alone, the banks of London and Paris would become a cornerstone bank compared to the Moscow bazaars that would be opened in Petersburg or Istanbul. In short, hundreds of millions of urbanites (because of a few tyrants and through their efforts in Istanbul and Petersburg) would be wholly deprived of the good things that their fathers and ancestors achieved by shedding blood and giving their lives for freedom."¹⁵⁶

Apart from Russia's economic interests in the Balkans, the mission of freeing their Christian brothers from the Turkish yoke has given a different dimension to Russia's approach to the Eastern question. The idea of 3rd Rome and "the placement of the cross" on the Dome of the Hagia Sophia created the driving force of the Eastern question. It was the cultural and religious factors that excited the Orthodox people living on Ottoman lands and enabled them to act together with Russia. Namık Kemal stated this purpose as follows:

*"....in confusion likely to begin in the current administration of the Ottoman state, by co-operating with the Greeks, the old Byzantine State in Istanbul was to be revived. It was to take revenge on the cruel Turks by placing church bells on the minarets of Hagia Sophia and replacing the mihrab and minbar with crosses. Protecting Christians against Muslims was a matter of honour."*¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶Namık Kemal. Avrupa Şarkın Güvenliğini İster. P. 162.

¹⁵⁷Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi- Rusya Politikası (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 12. 14 Eylül 1868) // Sürgünde Muhafet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868-1869). P. 59.

Among the issues that Namık Kemal discussed with Fanton was the “Eastern question”. The dialogue between the two is as follows:

“Fanton: *What are the factors that give rise to the Eastern problem?*”

Namık Kemal: *Due to the disagreement of religions and sects of various nations in the Ottoman Empire, Islam can't be compatible with Western Civilisation. Europe's public opinion to take the side of Christians, Whom it considers to be subjected to injustice wherever chaos happens, has given rise to the “Eastern question”.*

Fanton: *Aren't there other reasons?*

Namık Kemal: *The main reason for the problem is the current inter-governmental policy strife and the actions taken in the interests of those responsible. In other words, every state has to protect its interests or maintain such an Eastern problem to establish and publicise its influence.*

Fanton: *Explain it a little more!*

Namık Kemal: *It is known that Russia has followed the policy of dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire for two hundred years. Western states prevent the Russia's purpose. Russia wants to achieve its goal by provoking Christians into rebelling against the Ottoman state. However, the European states aim to protect the Christians who rebel against the Ottoman Empire because of Russia.*

Namık Kemal: *It is the Ottomans who caused it. With the Treaty of Paris, we have granted a right for our Christian subjects to be protected. That's why Christians get whatever they want right and wrong, and they get Europe involved.*”¹⁵⁸

Namık Kemal was well aware of the effectiveness of Ali¹⁵⁹, Fuat¹⁶⁰ and Mahmut Nedim Pashas¹⁶¹ in the Ottoman foreign policy on the Eastern question.

¹⁵⁸Mardin Y. Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları. P. 43–44.

He complains that the Sublime Porte is under the pressure of those people. Namık Kemal criticises Ali and Fuat Pashas for using France as an element of the balance policy and Mahmud Nedim Pasha for being pro-Russian¹⁶². With Ignatiyef becoming ambassador in 1867, the director of the Department of Asian affairs of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Russian Embassy in Istanbul became the centre of the committee and uprising movements in the Balkans. Ignatiyef, who influenced the Ottoman statesmen, especially influenced Mahmut Nedim Pasha¹⁶³. Namık Kemal criticises the policies of Fuat and Ali Paşas as follows: *“Ali and Fuat pasha should not have trusted France, they knew that France was involved in the contrary policies and affairs that were applied against us in the Egyptian problem and during the reign of Napoleon III. They could have co-operated with Britain. Reşit Pasha’s policy was correct. Because politics in Britain does not change with the person, it is prudent and forward-thinking due to the traditions that have been established for several centuries¹⁶⁴. ”*

Namık Kemal stated his thoughts about Fuat Pasha as follows:

Doesn’t anyone cry when looking at this terrible administration?

The one who loves his state and his nation wholeheartedly

How does anyone not cry when they look at this situation?

¹⁵⁹Ottoman Grand Vizier (1814–1871). Upon the death of his close colleague Fuad Pasha (1869), Ali Pasha also took over the supervision of Foreign Affairs and held the state administration firmly from this date until his death. Ali Pasha was also a well-known statesman in Europe. He had influence within the country and had significant control over Abdülaziz and paid great attention to the protection of the honour and dignity of the Sublime Porte. See: Beydilli K. Ali Paşa, Mehmed Emin // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1989. Vol. 2. P. 426.

¹⁶⁰Ottoman Grand Vizier (1815–1869) Fuad Pasha is one of three prominent figures of the Tanzimat era. Although he was a free-minded person, he was always against the ideas of nationalism for the benefit of the state. He feared that the Ottoman Empire, consisting of various nationalities, would subvert because of these ideas, and pursued nationalist revolts in Europe. However, he argued that these ideas could be avoided if non-Muslim subjects were treated equally. See: Köprülü O. F. Fuad Paşa, Keçecizâde // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1996. Vol. 13. P. 204.

¹⁶¹Ottoman Grand Vizier (1818–1883). Upon the death of Ali Pasha, he became grand Vizier on 8 September 1871 and immediately began a major operation in the central and provincial bureaucracy; he dismissed the Tanzimat statesmen from their posts. See: Akyıldız A. Mahmud Nedim Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2003. Vol. 27. P. 374.

¹⁶²Gümüş M. Namık Kemal’e Göre “Şark Meselesi” ve Osmanlı Devletini Çöküşe Götüren Sorunlar. P. 159–160.

¹⁶³Kara G., Toprak S. 19. Yüzyıl Sonunda Balkan Siyaseti Gölgesinde Rusya’nın Yalnızlaşması // İnsan Ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2016. Vol. 5. No. 4. P. 678–679.

¹⁶⁴Mardin Y. Namık Kemal’in Londra Yılları. P. 45.

How long have the people been suffering from Grand Vizier Fuat.”¹⁶⁵

Namık Kemal criticises the Sublime Porte’s thick-skin in this situation of the Ottoman state as follows:

“Complaints made by Bulgarians to the administration of Sublime Porte:

The reasons for the claim are against the Sublime Porte, who appointed officials that commit oppression and corruption and abuse their duty. If you ask why the Sublime Porte is doing so, the Sublime Porte is likened to the Mount Olympus imagined by the ancient Greek pagans, and there are several gods there. Their orders are sarcastic and far from questioned; the answer is given; it is over. Bulgarians are right to complain because the government is abusing its power. Because that is the cause of complaints all over the country. The Sublime Porte does not care that the Bulgarians have revolted, Crete has become an issue, the country has been devastated, and the people have been victimised. The Sultanate has no reputation, the Ottomans have collapsed, the Islamic State has been ravaged, and in short, whatever happens, let them not be disturbed.”¹⁶⁶

According to Namık Kemal, his suggestions on what to do to ensure security in the East are as follows:

“So, what is needed to ensure the safety of the East is to make the nations deal with the government and with each other. If this happens, sectarian disputes will not affect them. The realisation of this purpose depends on the elimination of reason that will cause a continuation of troubles, namely the removal of cruelty and ignorance.

Once the government begins to enforce justice, the source of disputes, with victimisation will, of course, be eliminated. If justice is realised and equality is

¹⁶⁵Namık Kemal. *Hasta Adam*. P. 157.

¹⁶⁶Namık Kemal. *Bulgar Hükümeti* (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 14. 29 Eylül 1868) // *Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869)*. Vol. I. P. 77.

regulated on behalf of the Islamic government, then the idea of disbelief about the it will be removed. There is only one thing that will cause Islam not to unite with people from different sects, and not to unite members of other denominations with Islam is bigotry.

However, the enforcement of justice naturally takes place in the parliamentary system. The parliamentary system requires, above all, the advancement of education. Because the Ottomans fully know the importance of education. If training is organised regularly, the schools will unite, the official language will advance. The indifference that now exists in the minds of nations will be eliminated. Religion will get rid of bigotry.

The people of other nations learn that the Turks are not the only ones who praised the Ottoman Ummah but also other Islamic countries, even the Greeks and Croats, they shed a lot of blood on that path. The idea of patriotism settles in the minds of all. The tribes agree to enter settled life and accordingly agriculture, commerce and art develop. Everyone feels comfortable, and everyone feels becoming part of sovereignty. Now, even some Greeks who dreamed of transforming the Greek state into an Eastern Empire begin to die for protecting the Ottoman Sultan.”¹⁶⁷ It was evident from these statements that an Ottoman nation wanted to be created. The political thought movement is to develop and design an Ottoman society as the top identity over all kinds of ethnic identities; this is called Ottomanism. "Ottoman", which is only a dynastic name, now has started to be applied as a link to integrate ethnic identities from top to bottom.¹⁶⁸

In short, a real deal must be made to keep the East safe. Otherwise, Sublime Porte's attempt to destroy who is capable and patriotic by discrediting, exiling and incarcerating them will only increase the present harms.”¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁷Namık Kemal. *Avrupa Şarkın Asayişini İster*. P. 164.

¹⁶⁸Demir Ş. *Tanzimat Döneminde Bir Devlet Politikası Olarak Osmanlıcılık // Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 2011. No. 29. P. 335–338.

¹⁶⁹Namık Kemal. *Avrupa Şarkın Asayişini İster*. P. 164.

3.3. The Non-Muslims in the Eastern Question

The social, political and legal positions of different nations in the Ottomans were shaped according to religious and sectarian attachments. In this context, the organisation and management of the communities under the rule of the Ottoman Empire based on religion or sect was called “millet system” which sometimes refers to a group that both speak a common language and also sometimes people of the same faith. The system was established after the conquest of Istanbul by Fatih, the conqueror¹⁷⁰. The millet system can neither be compared with the situation of minority nations in the colonialist empires nor with federative structures¹⁷¹.

Neither had ethnic politics until the Ottomans developed an ethnic identity in the late 19th century nor did the idea of Turkishness have any significance in Ottoman thought until this time. Therefore, a person living in the Balkans did not think of himself in ethnic terms until developing an ethnic identity. If he was asked about his ethnic identity, whether he was Serbian or Bulgarian, he would say he was Christian or Greek which means Orthodox¹⁷².

The Ottoman millet system did not exist in the same structure for a period as long as six centuries, and some deterioration occurred in this system under changing circumstances. The main reason for it is Western influence¹⁷³. One of the factors that made the millet system ineffective was the idea of nationalism emerging in Europe and the spread of this idea among the Ottoman Christian subjects through propaganda for the political interests of the European states¹⁷⁴.

Creating an Ottoman nation began to be seriously considered in the time of Mahmut II said *“I would like to see the difference in my subjects’ religions only when they enter mosques, synagogues and churches. There is no other difference*

¹⁷⁰Kurtaran U. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Millet Sistemi // Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2011. Vol. 1. No. 8. P. 58–59.

¹⁷¹Ortaylı İ. Osmanlı Toplumunda Aile. İstanbul, 2013. P. 38.

¹⁷²Karpat K. H. Balkanlarda Osmanlı Mirası ve Milliyetçilik. 3rd ed. İstanbul, 2015. P. 23–24.

¹⁷³Kurtaran U. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Millet Sistemi. P. 63.

¹⁷⁴Akça G. Osmanlı’da Millet Sisteminin Dönüşümü // Fırat Üniversitesi Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları. 2007. Vol. 6. No. 1. P. 61.

*between them. My love and justice about all of them is sound and they are all my children.”*¹⁷⁵

Ali Suavi’s article in the Hürriyet newspaper stated that what the people thought about the Sultan is as follows:

“The idea of Muslims about the Sultan: Muslims do not see the Sultan like a king. They believe in a Sultan more than a king, saying that the Sultan is sitting on the Prophet Muhammad’s hide, and he is the proxy of the Prophet. The caliph is the leader of the Islamic ummah and the protector of the religion. The Sultan is so high in the eyes of Muslims that they think the Sultan protects Islam. Therefore, if our Sultan came to mosques, went to Mimbar, invited Muslims to fight, not only his people but also Muslims in Arabia, Turkestan, India and China would be armed. In short, all of them would be on the side of the Sultan. Because the Sultan is like our imam and we are his jamaat. When the Sultan came to London, an Indian Muslim wept with joy because he saw the face of the imam of the Muslims.

*The Christians thoughts about the Sultan: The Christian people believe in the Sultan. However, they do not believe in him as much as a king who is of their lineage and sect.”*¹⁷⁶

Yusuf Akçura opposed creating the Ottoman nation, which many of the Ottoman intellectuals proposed as the development of the Ottoman Empire. He explained why the Ottoman nation could not be created: The history of the Ottoman subjects was natural history. It wasn’t spiritual. There was not and could not be a common ideal to connect these subjects now and in the future. However, neither the Turks, nor the Muslims, nor other nations, wanted to disappear within Ottoman society. Without the desire to live together, it was also an empty dream to follow the politics of establishing the Ottoman nation. Neither Muslims nor non-

¹⁷⁵Akçura Y. Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset. 6th ed. Ankara, 2014. P. 8.

¹⁷⁶Ali Suavi. Muhbir’den Mücerreden Naklolunan Makale (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 42. 12 Nisan 1869) // Sürgünde Muhafelet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 324.

Muslim subjects wanted such a thing. For Muslims, their six-century-old dominance would be legally over, and they would be on a par with the nations they tried to see under their rule for so many years. The non-Muslims, on the other hand, were not willing to be in Ottoman society, claiming they were persecuted and insulted. Even their reputation and honour had been trampled on under the Ottoman rule¹⁷⁷. Namık Kemal has criticised non-Muslims for these claims as follows:

*“The Christians once lacked any kind of rights. Then, some people showed up and put an end to this situation and gave the Christians rights back. Now again, the people of Islam desire to use Christians as prisoners by killing and plundering them, while all Christians desire to destroy the Islamic government. They pointed to the situation as evidence of what happened during the Janissaries’ period and show their actions as if they were doing a favour like removing the Janissaries’ Army. As a result, they do not know what rules the Sharia is based on, they believe themselves to be European based on knowing Turkish and reading a little in French, yet they have no form of education. However, their masters know very well that it is not the ministers who created the law of the Christians. Because there are two things the new administration has given to Christians. The first question of law is that even before them, in Sharia it was very much and fully available in practice. Second, for example, it is weird like that there are people from every level and every nation in every assembly, and we do not know whether it is appropriate to call it equality or to rate nations.”*¹⁷⁸

Unlike Yusuf Akçura, Namık Kemal believed that unity would continue despite the diversity within the Ottoman millet system and explained how this would be achieved in his dialogue with Fanton as follows:

¹⁷⁷Akçura Y. Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset. P. 6–7, 29–30.

¹⁷⁸Namık Kemal. Avrupa Şarkın Asayişini İster. P. 163.

Fanton: *“Well, Kemal, people of various nationalities live in the Ottoman Empire. Is it possible for them to live together?”*

Namık Kemal: *Despite the differences in race, language and religion, I believe that on the contrary, these differences in the Ottoman society is beneficial. Do the fingers of a hand look alike? But if five fingers are joined, sometimes it’s a punch, sometimes they hold on to something that creates progress. The whole problem is establishing and sustaining the unity of thought among these different societies. Uniting them is the work of reason and intelligence, not the sword.*

Fanton: *Kemal I agree with you, but you realise that the job is not easy. How can such a unity of thought be achieved?*

Namık Kemal: *By being aware of ourselves and introducing us to Europe.*

Fanton: *So, Kemal, how do you see the solution to this? How will you introduce yourself to the West?*

Namık Kemal: *How? The only way to introduce our true identity to Europe is if we learn the languages of Europeans and write something about ourselves in their languages. If we can reject slander in every language, the European public will not delay in learning the East and granting our rights.”*¹⁷⁹

Namık Kemal was sure that the nationalist uprisings would not affect the Ottoman Empire. He put forward that there can be no group to emerge with such a claim because of cultural diversity in regions outside Arabia, and that those living in Arabia cannot make such a demand because of religious unity. According to him, if they can maintain this unity and unite around the idea of a shared future, they can build a second Europe on the Ottoman territory¹⁸⁰.

¹⁷⁹Mardin Y. Namık Kemal’in Londra Yılları. P. 48–52.

¹⁸⁰Yalçın F. Vatan Yahut Namık Kemal // Namık Kemal / Ed. by T. Karataş and O. K. Tavukçu. Ankara, 2011. P. 444.

Namık Kemal explained the solution to the end of the nationalist uprisings in the Ottoman Empire as follows:

“Today the Ottoman Ummah is divided into some sects such as Muslim, Christian, Jewish and other Druze, and nationally divided into Arab, Turkish, Kurdish, Laz, Georgian, Circassian, Gega, Toska, Pomak, Bosniak, Armenian, Bulgarian, Greek, Jewish etc. The solution to eliminating this uprising is either to leave or to unite.

Let’s start with leaving. Now, the Sultanate in the Ottoman Empire is in the Turkish people who are from the Islamic sect. Let’s say that if those who are displeased with this situation need to leave, what will the complainants consider? Will they consider the sect or nationality? Every smart person knows that stirring up such a matter in a few different ways is nothing more than giving the enemy a weapon of victory. If any part of the Ottoman Ummah, no matter what name, is separated from the whole, they will have to come under the control of Russia. Indeed, this is not the way to unite the Eastern countries.

Now, let’s look at the uniting matter. Here is the most important and remarkable part of the subject. Those fully aware of the situation of our country know that almost all of our citizens hate the government, and some hate each other. For example, when an Arab Sheik, a Kurdish leader and an Albanian Agha raise the rebel flag, thousands of men gather and take up arms against the Ottoman Empire. In Arabia, Muslims don’t like Christians, Druze don’t like Maronites, Bulgarians don’t like Greeks. However, one’s hatred is not the same as the other. However, the government’s cruelty is to leave the people in ignorance. For example, as the downtrodden people know that Islam is based on justice, they question government officials for corrupting religious beliefs. The Turks want the end of this mismanagement, and those of other nationality want the independence of their own country. The other members of religions, on the other hand, want to get rid of this administration by basing their victimisation on religious provisions,

*due to the influence of foreign incitement and by confirming the meaningless words repeated by the Sublime Porte as “religion is hindering.” Yet all of these are just another form of people’s hatred to the government”.*¹⁸¹

Imperial Edict of Reorganization was promulgated to re-strengthen the bonds of society¹⁸². Representatives of foreign embassies, leaders of religious communities and the public came to listen to the proclamation announced by Mustafa Reşit Pasha. With this proclamation, the Abdülmecid stated that he would secure the life, property and honour of his people, that taxes would be collected according to the income of everyone by justice, and that military affairs would be reviewed¹⁸³. On the other hand, according to the proclamation, all Ottoman subjects, Christian and Muslim, would be considered equal. The reaction of the Christian issues against the Tanzimat was positive. The declaration gave non-Muslim subjects the opportunity and courage to fight for their rights. Because the Tanzimat was intended to provide a positive message, especially to non-Muslim subjects and Europeans¹⁸⁴.

The ongoing unrest and rising nationalism in the Balkans caused revolts in centres such as Vidin, Niš and VelikoTarnovo with the intervention of Russia. The Bulgarian nationalist movements reached its climax in the 1860s, both ideology and organisation. While the Bulgarians struggled to secede from the Greek Patriarchate on the one hand, on the other hand, they accelerated to organise as committees. In 1864, Mithat Pasha came to the Danube province as an Ottoman governor. In such an environment, he represented the new mentality in an old empire that is modernising and wants to keep up with the times. During his four years as governor of the Danube province, Midhat Pasha successfully fought against separatist movements and Russia’s Panislavist policies and made efforts to

¹⁸¹Namık Kemal. *Hasta Adam*. P. 163–164.

¹⁸²Kurtaran U. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Millet Sistemi*. P. 64.

¹⁸³Çadırcı M. *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentlerinin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Durumu*. 3rd. ed. Ankara, 2013. P. 173.

¹⁸⁴Hayta N., Ünal U. *Osmanlı devleti’nde yenileşme hareketleri (XVII. yüzyıl başlarından yıkılışa kadar)*. 3rd ed. Ankara, 2008. P. 125.

settle the Ottoman ideology with his reforms¹⁸⁵. Mithat Pasha was aware that all Muslim and Christian subjects should be treated equally and fairly to create a sense of unity around Ottoman subjects. In addition to external incitement, heavy taxes, unfair behaviour by civil servants, bribery and corruption were among the leading causes of ethnic riots. Because of this, he implemented many economic and social projects that would improve the welfare of the people¹⁸⁶. Despite the efforts of the Ottoman Empire, the dissatisfaction of non-Muslims was stated in the Hürriyet newspaper as follows:

“In a manner befitting the Sublime Porte administration arrangements were made to please the Christian people and Europe, and four or five years of experience in Bulgaria was applied to others as well. Even in the “Red book, it is one of the reforms presented to Europe with pride. Wouldn’t Europe be surprised now? Sublime Porte showed so much effort and generosity, making so much improvement, and the result ended up like this. Midhat Pasha is indeed a man of duty, and the arrangements made by him are of course of great benefit to Bulgaria; however, these do not satisfy Bulgarians. What will happen to the helpless people who have suffered various troubles and torture because the cities was built in Anatolia by some senile, corrupt, and irresponsible governors and even the old rules have been ruined by new regulations?”¹⁸⁷

The Western states, who considered the rights granted in 1839 inadequate and the promises made had not been kept, put forward some new demands before the Paris conference of 1856, for protecting the Ottoman Empire against Russian interference and accepting them to the family of European states. The primary purpose of the Imperial Reform Edict was to provide Non-Muslims with equality in all aspects with Muslims. Non-Muslims were also given the right to be

¹⁸⁵Çelik M. Midhat Paşa’nın “Türkiye’nin Mazisi ve İstikbali” Başlıklı Makalesi ve Üzerine Bazı Notlar // Kebikeç. 2008. No. 26. P. 38.

¹⁸⁶Söğütü İ. Türk Modernleşmesi Sürecinde Mithat Paşa // Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi. 2010. Vol. 11. No. 1. P. 107.

¹⁸⁷Namık Kemal. Bulgar Hükümeti. P. 77.

appointed to all state offices and to take part in state assemblies¹⁸⁸. In addition, the abolition of religious differences and the establishment of mixed courts initiated the process of transition to the national state, which was to declare the end of the Ottoman Empire¹⁸⁹.



¹⁸⁸Tanör B. Osmanlı- Türk Anayasal Gelişmeleri. İstanbul, 2015. P. 95–96.

¹⁸⁹Hayta N., Ünal U. Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yenileşme Hareketleri (XVII. Yüzyıl Başlarından Yıkılışa Kadar). P. 132.

Chapter 4. The Crete Issue in the “Hürriyet” Newspaper

The island of Crete, 250 kilometres long and 7,800 square kilometres wide, is the largest of the islands in the Eastern Mediterranean, after Cyprus. The island has excellent strategic and political importance along with Gibraltar, Beirut, Malta and Cyprus due to its location on the segregation point of the Mediterranean and the Aegean Sea. Crete has come under Roman, Byzantine, Muslim Arabs, Byzantine and Venetian domination in the historical process. The island, which was annexed to Ottoman territory in 1669, became an Ottoman province after 1715. The southern coast of the island of Crete consists of sharp cliffs, while the northern coast is more suitable for both settlement and trade, with its mountains and small plains gradually descending to the sea. Therefore, Heraklion, Chania, Rethymno, which are essential settlements and harbours of the island were located on the northern coast of the island¹⁹⁰.

Between 1669–1897, when Crete came under Turkish rule, a new population emerged in Crete, as well as the Greeks. These were “Turkish Cretans” or “Cretan Muslims”. However, this group did not constitute a select racial group consisting of Turks. As these were Cretans who were Islamized, not Turks. In 1697 the population of Crete was said to be around 80,000 of which 50,000 were Christians, and 30,000 were Muslims. Shortly before the revolution of 1821, there were 28,000 Greeks and 14,250 Cretan Turkish families on the island. According to the 1858 census, Greeks and Christians, in general, were 215,863 while Muslims were 62,138¹⁹¹.

4.1. The Historical Development Of The Cretan Affair (1821–1866)

During 150 years, from the conquest of Heraklion to the beginning of Peloponnese revolution, no significant incidents occurred in Crete under Ottoman rule. The increasing incitement of the Russians, which started with Peter the Great

¹⁹⁰Yıldız Ö. 19. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısı ve 20. Yüzyıl Başlarında Girit Adasında Deniz Ticareti // Tarih ve Günce Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Dergisi. 2017. Vol. 1. No. 1. P. 240.

¹⁹¹Aksoy İ. Girit ve Girit'teki Ayrılıkçı Hareketlerin Tarihi Süreci ve Kıbrıs'a Yansımaları. Master's degree thesis. İstanbul, 2006. P. 7.

and the feelings of nationalism that spread with the French Revolution, the deteriorating and weakening administration of the Ottoman Empire, as well as the desire of Christian subjects to leave the Ottoman Empire and the propaganda of Filiki Eteria¹⁹², which the Greeks established to achieve this goal, brought peace in Crete to an end¹⁹³.

Crete was in communication with the Peloponnese and other coastal regions of Greece. The effects of incidents in Greece were felt in Crete, and the impact of events in Crete was felt in Greece. In 1770, when the Greeks began to incite the Peloponnese against the Ottomans, they did not forget Crete, either. In 1821, The large-scale rebellion that began in the Peloponnese started up in Crete¹⁹⁴. The Greeks were able to control the sea with large merchant fleets. Thus, it was also challenging for the Ottoman army to reach the Peloponnese. However, the Ottoman Empire was engaged in the revolt of Ali Pasha of Tepelena during this revolt. It was also unlikely to quickly take control of incidents in the Peloponnese¹⁹⁵. The Ottoman government had to ask for help from the governor of Egypt, Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Pasha. He informed that he could suppress this rebellion, provided that the governorates of Peloponnese and Crete were given to him. The Ottoman empire had to accept these demands. İbrahim Pasha, son of Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Pasha, who entered the Peloponnese in February 1825, then, Athens in 1827 and succeeded in suppressing the rebellion. The settlement of a powerful governor on the island of Peloponnese and Crete was not appropriate for the interests of Russia and Britain, which wanted to dominate the Eastern Mediterranean. Therefore, with the Petersburg protocol on the 4th of April 1826 between Russia and Great Britain, it was decided that the Peloponnese would

¹⁹²The Filiki Eteria Society was founded in 1814 by three merchants, two Greek and one Bulgarian, in the port city of Odessa, Russia. The founders of the society were two Greeks named Skoufas and Emmanuil Xanthos, and a Bulgarian named Athanasios Tsakalov. The society aimed to spread education among the Christian subjects of the Ottomans. However, the real purpose of the society was to resurrect the Byzantine Empire. See: Günay N. Filiki Eterya Cemiyeti // Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 2005. Vol. 6. No. 1. P. 273–275.

¹⁹³Tukin C. Girit // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1996. Vol. 14. P. 89.

¹⁹⁴Karal E. Z. Osmanlı Tarihi // [URL:] file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Desktop/namık%20kemal/Karal_Enver_Ziya_Osmanlı_Tarihi_c_III.pdf (date of access: 15. 04. 2020).

¹⁹⁵Toprak S. 1821 Mora İsyanı // Tarihîn Peşinde -Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi. 2011. Vol. 6. P. 321.

become an autonomous state bound by taxes to the Ottoman Empire and that the Aegean islands should be given to Greece. After a while, Britain and Russia, with France joining, signed the Treaty of London on the 6th July 1827, the issue of Greece was brought to the agenda again. The Russian navy, with its merge with the British and French, burned the Ottoman navy at Navarino in a sudden raid on October 20th, 1827. These events caused another war between the Ottoman Empire and Russia. Greece gained its independence with the Treaty of Edirne on the 14th September 1829 signed between the Ottoman Empire and Russia. The London Protocol on February the 3rd 1830, signed between Russia, Britain and France, declared the establishment of the Greece state. In a diplomatic note on the 24th of April 1830, the Ottoman Empire had to accept the independence of Greece¹⁹⁶. Crete was the first place to be considered when determining the so-called “Megali idea”¹⁹⁷ after Greece gained its independence¹⁹⁸. As the Cretan Greeks saw that the island was not annexed to Greece, they rebelled again in 1830¹⁹⁹.

After the proclamation of the Reform Edict of 1856, important developments took place in Crete. In 1864, Britain transferred the Ionian Islands to Greece, prompting the Cretan Greeks to join Greece. Also, with Russia’s incitement, a large-scale uprising occurred for the first time in Crete in 1866²⁰⁰.

4.2. The Cretan Rebellion of 1866

A major rebellion broke out on the island of Crete in August 1866. The Greeks established a provisional government of their own, declaring Crete to be connected to Greece. The Ottoman Empire took action to suppress the rebellion.

¹⁹⁶Türkmen Z. Girit Adasını Osmanlı İdaresinden Ayırma Çabaları: Yunan İsyanını Takip Eden Dönemdeki Gelişmeler (1821–1869) // Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi. 2001. No. 12. P. 224–225.

¹⁹⁷The “Megali idea” was officially expressed on January 14, 1844 during a speech by Greek Prime Minister Ioannis Kolettis in the Greek parliament. Kolettis advocated that “with the collapse of Greece (Greek Byzantium), the Enlightenment of the West began, and now with its re-emergence, its goal is to civilise the East by Hellenizing it.” The “Megali Idea” became the motive power for the process of the modern Greek nation-building as a dream of Greater Greece, in which all Greeks (especially those living in the Ottoman lands) would be united. See: Kirli Ntokme O. Ulus Devlet Oluşturmada Yunanistan Örneği: Büyük Ülkü-Megali Idea // Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi. 2010. Vol. 12. No. 46. P. 413.

¹⁹⁸Cengiz H. A. Girit İsyanları (1866–1908). Master’s degree thesis. Edirne, 1999. P. 17.

¹⁹⁹Tukin C. Girit. P. 89.

²⁰⁰Öksüz M. Girit Meselesi’nin Belirsizlik Yılları (1908–1913) // Karadeniz Araştırmaları. 2010. No. 25. P. 95.

However, the states that founded Greece have also been involved in this situation. France and Russia proposed to the Ottoman Empire to leave Crete for Greece, or at least to give autonomy to Crete. However, this proposal was rejected by the Sublime Porte²⁰¹.

Namık Kemal explained the purpose of Greece as follows:

*“Crete island would become the territory of Greece, and then even Cyprus, Chios and other islands would come under its domination, and there would establish a stable, independent Greek state in the Mediterranean.”*²⁰²

The reason the Cretan Greeks rebelled was that some of their demands were not met. These demands are the reduction of taxes, the guarantee of their freedom, facilitating transportation by building roads and bridges, the construction of schools and hospitals...²⁰³. These were, in fact, the apparent causes of the uprising. The main reason was to mobilise the European public opinion and to gain their support in the struggle for unification with Greece²⁰⁴. In this regard, Namık Kemal responded to the claims of the Cretan Greeks about not meeting their demands is as follows:

“Crete’s tax was less than any other province, and a few indigenous wealthy people monopolised the collection of the Ashar tax, and the corruption that existed in our state was weaker in Crete than in any province. Did the Cretans rebel mainly because of the reasons they stated in their petitions, because of the taxes, collection of taxes and the injustice of officers? No, a Cretan who has a mind can’t claim that. Once upon a time, Janissaries shouted “We do not want” in front of the Topkapi Palace but didn’t know what they wanted, the Cretans did not even know what they were complaining about. For the Greeks alone, showing discontent towards the Ottoman state was because of the reputation of the bully, and they

²⁰¹Uçarol R. Siyasi Tarih (1789–1994). 4th ed. İstanbul, 1995. P. 226.

²⁰²Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi – Rusya Politikası (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 12. 14 Eylül 1868) // Sürgünde Muhafet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 59.

²⁰³Karabulut B. Osmanlı’nın Zor Sınavı: Fransa’nın Tutarsız Politikaları Ekseninde Girit İsyanı (1866–1869) // Karadeniz Araştırmaları. 2008. No. 16. P. 79, 80.

²⁰⁴Adıyke A. N. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Girit Bunalımı (1896–1908). Ankara, 2000. P. 21.

began to clamour and quarrel with excuses.”²⁰⁵ The change in the historical process of an institution such as the Janissaries, which left the significant military and social traces in the history of Turkey, shows parallelism with the changing conception of power and the transformation experienced by the state authority throughout almost an entire Ottoman history²⁰⁶. Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, one of the most influential statesmen and authors of the 19th century, describes this situation as follows: *“The state is like a clock. The breakdown of the clock hand affects the whole.”* With this interpretation, he associates the deterioration of the Janissaries with the breakdown of the general order of the empire²⁰⁷.

Greece took advantage of the rebellion in Crete and tried to take over Crete by spreading propaganda to the European public opinion that Christians had been massacred²⁰⁸. This propaganda is given in the “Hürriyet” newspaper as follows:

*“By complaining to Europe as if the Turks had so far and still been brutally torturing Christians, eating them alive and killing their wives, daughters, elders and children with various insults, every ringleader wants to get his interests.”*²⁰⁹

Greece alone was neither in a position to go to war with the Ottoman Empire on the issue of Crete nor had such power financially. Greece needed the help of European states²¹⁰. Namık Kemal stated the economic situation of Greece as follows:

“Because troops of military volunteers are re-enlisted and transported by steamers from the Şire, food and ammunition are sent. The volunteers in the advance guard were only given a few months’ cash and sent to the island, but now

²⁰⁵Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi – Rusya Politikası. P. 58–59.

²⁰⁶Elibol A. Yeniçeriler ve İktidar Bağlamında Osmanlı Sisteminin Dönüşümü // Gazi Akademik Bakış. 2009. Vol. 3. No. 5. P. 39.

²⁰⁷Güler H. Yeniçeri Ocağı’nın Kaldırılması 17 Haziran 1826 // [URL:]https://www.academia.edu/35045040/YEN%C4%B0%C3%87ER%C4%B0_OCA%C4%9EININ_KALDIRILMASI_17_HAZ%C4%B0RAN_1826. (date of access: 20.04.2020).

²⁰⁸Gümüş M. 1866–1869 Girit İsyanı ve Yunanistan: Namık Kemâl’den Tespitler // İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2016. Vol. 5. No. 1. P. 30.

²⁰⁹Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi – Rusya Politikası. P. 59.

²¹⁰Karal E. Z. Osmanlı Tarihi // [URL:] file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Desktop/namık%20kemal/Karal_Enver_Ziya_Osmanlı_Tarihi_c_III.pdf (date of access: 22.04.2020).

they are also given clothes. However, while the Greek committee organised in the Şire to help the Cretan rebellion was collecting the necessary money from the Greek trade in Europe, no money has been sent by them for two months. How do these soldiers enrol? How is the new ammunition provided? Where does this money come from?

Poor, the Sublime Porte, who continuously complain to France and Britain about the Greek cabinet asks for help to persuade the immigrants to repatriate. However, since the Greek state is incapable of paying even King Yorgi's (Georgios I) pension, let alone to help, it can be seen that they will soon liken him to the deceased King Otto to reduce their expenses."²¹¹ Despite various political crises, the most prolonged period of stability since the independence of Greece has been the reign of King Georgios I(1863–1913). He remained on the Greek throne for nearly fifty years. However, constant economic crises during the reign of Georgios made Greece more dependent on large states. The failures of the Greek governments and the growing crisis in Crete brought discontent towards the King and his surroundings. He was unable to prevent a military coup in 1909²¹². Besides, King Otto(1832–1862), who also tried to follow a policy loyal to the “Megali idea”, however, failed to do so, and created a repressive regime, was dethroned in 1862 by a rebellion²¹³.

4.3.The Refugees Issue

The rebels in Crete knew that to get aid from Greece and European states, Crete had to become a European issue. The rebels began to force their families to go to Greece. On the other hand, they have made up news that the Turks are slaughtering Christians. The French and Russian consuls on Crete protected the Greeks who pretended to be victims and carried them to Greece with their ships²¹⁴.

²¹¹Namık Kemal. Yine Girit Meselesi Tazelendi (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 24. 7 Aralık 1868) // Sürgünde Muhafet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 159–160.

²¹²Kılıçoğlu Cihangir Ç. Yunanistan'da Monarşi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme // Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi. 2016. No. 58. P. 108.

²¹³Hacısalıhoğlu M. Yunanistan // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2013. Vol. 43. P. 588.

²¹⁴Cengiz H. A. Girit İsyanları (1866–1908). P. 50–51.

The troubles refugees suffered in Greece led them to leave Greece, where they had previously desired to surrender the administration of Crete to them, and the refugees sought permission to return to the island. However, Greece had no intention of letting them go and declaring that their struggle would end in defeat²¹⁵.

When Ali Pasha was in Heraklion, two telegrams had arrived. One of them was from Russian naval officer Butakov, and the other was from Pertev Pasha, the governor of Heraklion. Butakov stated that Muslims had killed and wounded five Christians and that he had asked permission to take those who wanted to go to other countries with ships. Pertev Pasha was reporting that Christians killed five Muslims. Two telegrams for the same incident, Ali Pasha sent Charles Mismar²¹⁶ to the scene to find out the real reason for the event. Result of the probe; after the opening of the graves with the consuls of European states, it was understood that those killed were Muslims, that various tortures murdered them, and that the wounded were Christians²¹⁷. The dehumanising approach of the rebels was stated in the newspaper Hürriyet as follows:

*“Many of the Cretans who went to Greece have returned. The Greeks stabbed and wounded those who wanted to board the ferry to return. It’s very noble of them to kill the helpless.”*²¹⁸

European states have tried to resolve this situation. In mid-April 1868, France offered the European states to take the refugees back to Crete²¹⁹.

“Seven to eight months, the issue of the transfer of families from Crete to Greece has been banned by the consensus of European states. Many of those who were previously transferred have been returned and are still coming. The short

²¹⁵Bourne K. İngiltere ve Girit İsyanı, 1866–69 / Transl. by Y. T. Kurat // Araştırmaları Dergisi.1963. Vol. 1. No. No. 1. P. 269.

²¹⁶Charles Mismar went to Crete with Ali Pasha as a French translator. See: Cengiz H. A. Girit İsyanları (1866–1908). P. 52.

²¹⁷Ibid. P. 52

²¹⁸Namık Kemal. Girit’ten Tahrirat (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 17. 19 Ekim 1868) // Sürgünde Muhafetlet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 105.

²¹⁹Cengiz H. A. Girit İsyanları (1866–1908). P. 51.

period given to ensure full security reached ten months, and there was no doubt that the Grand Vizier, who took measures to keep their families transferred, would receive a favourable outcome."²²⁰

The most distinctive feature of the 1866 rebellion is the reaction of the European public opinion and the active interference of governments in this revolt. This uprising was not ordinary, as European public opinion was influenced by the propaganda which expressed the displeasure of all non-Muslims living in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the problem became a global problem rather than an internal issue of the Empire²²¹.

4.4. The Policies of Western States in the Cretan Rebellion

Since the Crete issue was part of the Eastern question and jeopardised the overall peace that had just begun to emerge in Europe, the Great states cooperated until the Turkish-Greek war. As the 19th-century trade revolution revived the Eastern and ancient trade routes, Crete's commercial and strategic importance in the Eastern Mediterranean has increased again. The dominance of any state in this region would be disadvantageous for others and would disturb the balance of Europe. The importance of the Crete issue for the Great States was that they could cause interference in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire due to the rebellions on the island and in time they would determine the fate of Crete²²².

4.4.1. Russia

Russia's foreign policy is to be influential in the Balkans and the Mediterranean. Russia aimed to achieve its goal by revolting the non-Muslim people living here. 1866 Cretan Rebellion is an example of this. Considering Russia's well-known politics in the Balkans, it was Russia's policy that brought about the Crete issue²²³. Russia wanted to establish a weak Greek dominance in

²²⁰Namık Kemal. *Yine Girit Meselesi* Tazelendi. P. 159.

²²¹Adıyeke A. N. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Girit Bunalımı (1896–1908)*. P. 22.

²²²*Ibid.* P. 227.

²²³Demirci Gülşah. *Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866-1869)*. Master's degree thesis. Zonguldak, 2019. P. 43.

Crete instead of the Ottoman rule to realise the policy of expansion more easily²²⁴. Namık Kemal stated Russia's role in the Crete rebellion as follows:

“Crete and Russia cannot be separated from each other, as Russia's policy created the Crete issue. The problem did not begin when the Greeks took up arms in Crete and went up the mountain. The spark of this event has existed for fifteen years and, exacerbated by the indifference of the current administration and the constant indoctrination of our friend Russia, erupted suddenly two years ago.” He added: *“...The Russian officers had gone on an expedition many years wandering around Greece and every other Mediterranean island, especially Crete, disguised as priests, passengers and painters. However, the officers of the Ottoman Empire were not unaware of these incitements, each reported the situation to the Sublime Porte.”*²²⁵

Following Russia's policies on the East, they tried to increase their influence on Crete by making alliances to protect themselves and prevent actions against them. Namık Kemal stated this situation in the following words:

*“By the policy on the Ottoman Empire, which had not changed for a hundred years, Russia did not forget to take precautions by allying with the three states while making many efforts until the issue of Crete arose. For this reason, Russia exploited the Greek state in his service to aggravate problems by using it as a hound to get its prey. As France was a rival to Prussia due to the Sadova victory, Prussia could need a force to prepare for a possible war in the future. Russia wanted to dominate its Eastern policy and protect its interests, they concluded a secret agreement, besides building a relationship by arranging a marriage.”*²²⁶

Namık Kemal thought that Greece alone did not have the economic power to finance the rebellion in Crete, and he was suspicious of Russia. However, he also stated that Russia did not have an adequate economy. The state that Namık Kemal

²²⁴Ünsal E. Girit'in Türk Hakimiyetinden Çıkışı. Master's degree thesis. Edirne, 2009. P. 40.

²²⁵Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi – Rusya Politikası. P. 58–59.

²²⁶Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi – Rusya Politikası. P. 59.

pointed to was the United States, and his doubts about economic alliances were justified²²⁷.

*“Let us supposed that the Russian state is under suspicion in this regard. Russia’s economic situation is deteriorating so badly that they are incapable of assisting anyone else, let alone themselves. Their armies, naval forces and war equipment, which they are trying to organise and equip are so costly that the aid did not come from Russians alone. Therefore, we believe that Russia is in partnership with the United States.”*²²⁸

So what were the reasons for America’s involvement in the Crete affair? Namık Kemal answered this question as follows:

“The Americans had survived the civil wars. Because of France and England's heart-breaking behaviour and brutality when the war broke out and during the war, America wanted to be in a position to support security in its trade relations with Europe and to intervene in events on the continent of Europe, so they endorsed Russia to achieve its goal. Russia promised to give the island to the American administration, provided that its policies on the East would be not blocked by any European states. And since then, the Americans had also struck a relationship with the Cretan rebels. The annexation of Crete to Greece was supported in American newspapers, saying that it was appropriate for justice and humanity.

*The geopolitical position of Crete and its ports with natural resources would house America’s battleships and merchant ships and therefore maintain trade with the three continents. Its primary goal was to be able to interfere in Europe’s affairs.”*²²⁹

Namık Kemal expresses America’s attitude towards Europe and taking Russia’s side in the Crete issue with the following example:

²²⁷Gümüş M. Namık Kemal’e Göre “Şark Meselesi” ve Osmanlı Devletini Çöküşe Götüren Sorunlar. P. 37.

²²⁸Namık Kemal. Yine Girit Meselesi Tazelendi. P. 160.

²²⁹Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi – Rusya Politikası. P. 59–60.

*“General Martin, who came to Istanbul, asked the Ottoman state to leave Crete to Greece as well as Dardanelles. The American ships were to be allowed in the Black Sea, even though it was agreed that no state would have battleships in the Black Sea according to the Paris Agreement signed after the Crimean war. On the 30th of August, he met Ali Pasha, who promised to allow them through. The American admiral of the Mediterranean Navy who came to Istanbul with high approval on a war steamship called Faragutki Franklin anchored in front of the Dolmabahçe Palace. Despite the fact he visited the Russian ambassador Ignatyef and Grand Vizier Ali Pasha, however, on the pretend that he is in a lousy mood, General Martin did not accept the invitation from the French ambassador Monsieur Bouree. However, he welcomed the Greeks who came to his ship to thank him for his help before leaving Istanbul. This situation has been an essential topic of discussion in newspapers all over Europe, especially France. Let’s see how it unfolds.”*²³⁰

America’s willingness to acquire a base in the Mediterranean has been criticised as follows in the Sublime Porte’s official newspaper, “La Turquie”: *“Is it surprising that a people like the Americans, who see all countries only as a refuge for their numerous fleets, or as a commercial destination for their own development, strongly desires Crete because of its position?”* The rebellion in Crete undermined the United States' policy of not meddling in the political situation of the Ottoman Empire²³¹.

4.4.2. Britain

On the 9th of January 1853, during a formal reception, Tsar Nicholas I spoke to Hamilton Seymour, the British envoy in Petersburg, stating that Turkey was a sick man, that he would soon die, but before that Britain and Russia had to agree on the question of inheritance²³². He said that if Britain recognised Russia’s rights

²³⁰Ibid. P. 60.

²³¹May A. J. Girit ve Birleşik Devletler, 1866–1869 / Transl. by T. Demir // Tarih Dergisi. 2010. Vol. 52. P. 184–185, 194.

²³²Kurat A. N. Rusya Tarihi (Başlangıcından 1917’e kadar). Ankara, 2010. P. 327.

over Ottoman lands, Britain could also annex Egypt and Crete. The envoy said he would report these offers to England, and he did so. They have flatly rejected these offers this time²³³.

In the ten years following the Paris Agreement of 1856, there was no change in Britain's Near East politics and Britain continued their policy of protecting the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Britain's Mediterranean politics are not shaped by nationalist principles, but by national interests. Britain preferred the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire to the establishment of a Greece state²³⁴. When the construction of the Suez Canal was completed, Crete, which would serve as an essential stop on the route to India, would become more critical. Therefore, Greece, which would be under Russian control, would not allow Crete to be under Britain's control²³⁵.

The inter-state correspondence showing that Britain was on the side of the Ottoman Empire in the Crete affair is cited in the newspaper "Hürriyet" as follows:

"It is a translation of a letter we received from a person who loved the Ottoman Empire, one of Britain's dignitaries. I sent a remarkable paragraph about Crete in the newspaper which is called "International".

*Is it true that the Ottoman Empire insisted on behaving in such a way that would devastate itself? If it is true, we should weep for the situation of the Ottomans, who are our allies, also for the lives and possessions we have wasted for the countries of the Ottoman State. I would be happy if you could explain to me the contrary to the rumours in the letters we received from the Ottoman Empire. I ask you to accept my superior respect."*²³⁶

²³³Sertoğlu M. Mufasssal Osmanlı Tarihi. Ankara, 2011. Vol. VI. P. 3017.

²³⁴Cengiz H. A. Girit İsyanları (1866–1908). P. 30–31.

²³⁵Demirci G. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869). P. 45–46.

²³⁶[S. a.] Bir İngiliz'den Mektup (Hürriyet Gazetesi No. 12. 14 Eylül 1868) // Sürgünde Muhafet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 57 (It is not clear whether this article belongs to Namık Kemal or Ziya Pasha).

Charles Dickson, the British consul in Chania, reports that the Cretans complained about the tax and administrative system on the island. According to the consul's reports, he was sure there would be "uprising" when complaints were not taken into account²³⁷. The "Hürriyet" newspaper reports on the confusion in Crete and Dickson's response:

"...the rebels began to attack again. It was apparent this would happen. However, our conflicts are not as described in the letters sent to the Times; they are of deception. The rebels are gathering at most seventy to eighty people, hiding behind stones, shooting from afar. The soldiers and their people are unable to react to them for fear of being exiled and punished. The reason why the rebels behave like this is to show Europe as if the island were always in turmoil.

*The rebels had recently sent a petition to Britain. The British consul on the island, Monsieur Dickson, responded to the appeal as follows: "Britain does not even need to answer for what has happened because it does not recognise both the Provisional Government and the General Assembly."*²³⁸

4.4.3.France

Although Britain and Russia had a specific policy, France had a changeable policy during the Cretan issue of 1866-68. Napoleon III sometimes followed an anti-Greece policy, but sometimes together with Russia by pressuring the Sublime Porte; they pursued a pro-Greece policy. The reason for France's policy is the German danger in the West and also in competition with Russian and British influence in the East²³⁹.

"As France is still under a tyrannical rule, according to Europe, France has made attempts indecisively on all issues and has been willing to support Russian policy to prevent the expected agreement with Prussia by ignoring Russia's ideas

²³⁷Bourne K. İngiltere ve Girit İsyanı, 1866-69. P.251.

²³⁸[S. a.] Giritten Tahrirat (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 17. 19 Ekim 1868) // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868-1869). P. 105 (It is not clear whether this article belongs to Namık Kemal or Ziya Pasha).

²³⁹Karabulut B. Osmanlı'nın Zor Sınavı: Fransa'nın Tutarsız Politikaları Ekseninde Girit İsyanı (1866-1869). P. 87.

at the beginning of the Crete issue. However, as Britain's constant policy is to protect the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, the manoeuvre tried by Russia for Europe was understood²⁴⁰. ”

4.5.Ali Pasha in the Cretan Rebellion

France, with the support of Russia, offered to send an international commission to the island to investigate the complaints and wishes of the people of Crete. However, in response to this proposal, the Ottoman Empire declared that it wanted to make completely independent decisions about the reforms to be made in Crete. However, the Ottoman Empire, under constant pressure from the European nations, agreed to declare a general amnesty in Crete on the 12th of September 1867²⁴¹.

The reaction of the Cretan rebels to this pardon was stated in the “Hürriyet” newspaper as follows:

“The Ottoman State is falling apart. Under the responsibility of a foreign state, a new Pasha was appointed to Crete to talk to the ringleader and to establish peace with each other, building schools wherever they are necessary, declaring a general amnesty, not taking taxes for ten years, rebuilding all of the destroyed churches etc. The Rebels responded by saying that they would fight for independence until the end and that those who were with the Ottoman army would shoot their wives and children and burn their property.”²⁴²

Despite the adverse reactions in the European public opinion against the Turks, some prominent statesmen such as Grand Vizier Ali Pasha and foreign minister Fuat Pasha believed that the Ottoman state could make the reforms in Crete on their own. For this reason, Ali Pasha decided to go to the island of Crete

²⁴⁰Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi – Rusya Politikası. P. 60.

²⁴¹Ünsal E. Girit'in Türk Hakimiyetinden Çıkışı. P. 44.

²⁴²[S. a.] Bir İngiliz'den Mektup. P. 57.

to settle the matter²⁴³. In October 1867, Fuad Pasha sent the reformation program to the Great states, which Grand Vizier Ali Pasha would personally go to Crete and implement²⁴⁴. Ali Pasha, who came to the island of Crete on the 3rd of October 1867, issued the Sultan's proclamation on the reforms to be made in Crete and then was granted the "Charter of the province of Crete" which was attached to the following announcement²⁴⁵. According to this charter; "Taxes will be reduced. The governor will work with two advisers, one Muslim and the other Christian; local and general assemblies will be established. Their members will be elected from Muslims and Christians; the island will be divided into a sufficient number of sanjaks, with half of their governors chosen from Muslims and half from Christians. Official correspondence of the island will be in two languages, Turkish and Greek²⁴⁶.

The following information is given in the "Hürriyet" newspaper about these reforms made by Ali Pasha:

"The declaration that the Grand vizier wrote on the reformation of public works that he applied decisively to Crete last year and presented it to the Sultan and officially reported its translation to the ally states is as follows:

*"Although I did not succeed in reporting to the Sultan that security was restored on the island of Crete, I was entrusted with responsibility by the Sultan. I assure you that my deeds will not be fruitless, although the Cretan rebellion supporters are trying to convince people both here and in Europe. With the suspension related to the transfer of the families following the orders of the Sultan will give a quick result and will be more effective in its continuation. However, the realisation of everything will be delayed for a short time."*²⁴⁷

²⁴³Türkmen Z. Girit Adasını Osmanlı İdaresinden Ayırma Çabaları: Yunan İsyanını Takip Eden Dönemdeki Gelişmeler (1821–1869). P. 235–236.

²⁴⁴Ünsal E. Girit'in Türk Hakimiyetinden Çıkışı. P. 44.

²⁴⁵Demirci G. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869). P. 61.

²⁴⁶Gemici N. Girit'e Ait 1870 Tarihli Bir Belge Girit'e Ait 1870 Tarihli Bir Belge // İslam San'at, Tarih Edebiyat ve Mûsiki Dergisi. 2009. No. 13. P. 283.

²⁴⁷Namık Kemal. Yine Girit Meselesi Tazelendi. P. 159.

The main reason why Ali Pasha went to Crete was Sultan Abdülaziz's European trip. He was the proxy of the Sultan with all his legal powers. This situation reveals both the Sultan's confidence in Ali Pasha and the political ability of Ali Pasha²⁴⁸. However, his concessive policy in Crete caused him to be slammed by his opponents, such as Namık and Ali Suavi.

Here is Ali Suavi's criticism of Ali Pasha:

"It is known that since the Crete issue came to light, the rebellious Christians have been granted various favours by the state as if they had acted to protect their homeland and were welcomed and sent back to Greece. What the bandits' chieftains deserve should be shot according to the laws. In short, they have not received such blessings from the Greeks as they had from the Ottoman Empire.

While Muslims have lost lives and property for the sake of the state, unlike the rebels, they have suffered a thousand kinds of insults and torments. While Christian ringleaders received blessings, the respectable people of Islam were exiled. While the Christians were tyrants, the Muslims were miserable. However, the aid sent by the state again allotted to the Christians, and the Muslims were forced to disguise themselves to get enough bread not to starve.

Since the explained situation is one of the measures taken by the Grand Vizier, Ali Suavi Efendi asked the following questions about this topic in issue number 27 of the "Muhbir" newspaper.

Thereupon the vizier was appointed as an officer by the Sultan. When the Muslims heard that the vizier was coming to Crete, did they not think, "We are Muslims, we have a government in this land, we have a state, we have a deputy of the Prophet who protects our religion. The government and state, we have a sultan

²⁴⁸Karabulut B. Osmanlı'nın Zor Sınavı: Fransa'nın Tutarsız Politikaları Ekseninde Girit İsyanı (1866–1869). P. 83–84.

who is the ruler of the believers, and he sent his vizier to eliminate cruelty and injustice.“

Question: Arriving in Crete, the vizier helps and respects the rebellious and tyrannical Christians and also after he handed over the administration to them which is the right of government, would the Muslims stay loyal to the caliphate and protectorate of the Sultan? While the aggrieved and oppressed Muslims await justice from the caliphate if they are obliged to look like Christians and hide that they are Muslims among the Christians and also after depriving the Muslims of the state's aid, would they stay loyal to the Sultan's caliphate and protectorate?

When the vizier arrives in Crete and gives gifts and respect to the rebellious and tyrannical Christians, would the Muslims stay loyal to the caliphate and protection of the Sultan after he has finally handed over the government which is rightfully theirs?''²⁴⁹

The “Muhbir” newspaper dealt with the Cretan issue, the most important problem of the 1860s, published for financial support to Turks in Crete, and started a fund drive to Crete by mobilising the people on this issue²⁵⁰. However, after beginning the fund drive, Ali Suavi was exiled to Kastamonu²⁵¹.

Ali Suavi advocated the Turkishness movement in response to Ottomanism, which was one of the leading political ideologies during the last period of the Ottoman empire. The example of this is that he organised the fund drive for the Turks in Crete. Ali Suavi's thoughts on Turks, Turkish language and the Turkish world made him be considered as one of the first Turkist. However, Suavi's Turkism is somewhat controversial. Şerif Mardin thought that his Islamism is predominated. Hilmi Ziya Ülken thinks that Suavi advocated Turkism as a reaction to Ottomanism and tried to awaken the consciousness of Turkishness instead of the consciousness of Ottomanism. The Ottomans effaced Byzantium and Rome. It

²⁴⁹Ali Suavi. Muhbir'den Mücerreden Maklulunan Makale. P. 324–325.

²⁵⁰Demir K. Ali Suavi'nin İktisadi Görüşleri // Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2018. Vol. 8. P. 444.

²⁵¹Akbulut U. Osmanlı Basın Tarihine Bir Katkı: Gazetelerin Yayınlanma Amaçları Üzerine (1831–1876). P. 46.

means that they gave Anatolia the name of Turkey and had it confirmed to all of Europe. He uses the definitions of Turkestan for Anatolia and the Sultan of Turkestan for the Ottoman Sultan. There is only one Turkish state in Anatolia, this state was established in the time of the Seljuks, and Osman Gazi did not establish a new state, he repaired the existing Turkish state. Like the Seljuks, Abdülaziz, who was the Sultan of his period, is from the generation of Oghuz Khagan²⁵².

Here is Namık Kemal's criticism of Ali Pasha:

*“Every issue of the Crete newspaper is full of good news that the spark of rebellion will be eliminated by the Supreme deeds and attempts of the Sultan and the ongoing work of the Grand Vizier. O! why is this still not over? O! why was there not complete security? Did Ali Pasha lie to deceive the Sultan and the world? Or did he want to hide his shame with these words when he returned to Istanbul without success during his mission, leaving things unfinished in order not to lose the viziership to someone else? As a result, however, meaningful a lie is a lie. We learnt about the situation in Crete from our informants there and the policies in Crete from European newspapers. The summary of these newspapers states that the whole island will emerge from Ottoman rule, let alone the restoration of the security of Crete.”*²⁵³

4.6. The Ultimatum

Although the Ottoman Empire granted Crete “autonomy status” by the edict on the 10th of January 1868, the Cretan issue could not be resolved²⁵⁴. Therefore, Namık Kemal reproached this situation as follows:

“At the beginning of the Cretan issue until now, some soldiers who were separated from their hometown later died in hospitals due to war. Inside the castle were the sick, old, children and women who have died from poverty and misery.

²⁵²Çalen M. K. Ali Suavi'de Türklük Tasavvuru // Türk Yurdu. 2017. No. 354. P. 65–67.

²⁵³Namık Kemal. Yine Girit Meselesi Tazelendi. P. 160–161.

²⁵⁴Toprak S. Megali İdea'ya Bir Örnek: Girit, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri // Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2012. Vol. 1. No. 1. P. 129.

The land, possessions and money of the helpless people are in the hands of the bandits. Considering the costs of the soldiers' war supplies, transportation and the costs of Mustafa Nail Pasha²⁵⁵, Hüseyin Avni Pasha²⁵⁶, Ömer Pasha²⁵⁷ and Grand Vizier Ali Pasha and the amount of tips and travel money given to the officers who went to the island every week, if we look at the outcome of this case, it is impossible not to cry for the one who has the slightest bit of compassion and humanity in their hearts and not to curse those who caused it.

How can one not cry or curse those who caused it? Both lives and so many possessions have been destroyed, and also we are losing the dominance of Crete. Also, we lost our honour and valiant reputation of the Ottoman Empire, which they handed down to us at the expense of the blood of our ancestors for more than six hundred years, and instead, we have earned such titles as the Ottomans are ruined. We had no power to remove thousands of Greeks from the island. We were also unable to prevent twenty-five pieces of warships and two Greek boats arriving at the island." The measures that the Sublime Porte took caused this."²⁵⁸

To solve the Crete problem, it was necessary to address the Greek problem first²⁵⁹. In the memo to Greece, they were asked to stop helping to the Cretan uprising. However, the Ottoman Empire did not receive a positive response from Greece, at which point they issued a 5-point ultimatum²⁶⁰.

²⁵⁵The Ottoman Grand Vizier (1798–1871). Although he was sent to Crete as governor on August 28th to suppress the revolt that broke out in 1866, he was unable to prevent the events. He informed the government with an explanatory draft of his opinion that the Greek government should be pressured to suppress the uprising. In March 1867, he was called to Istanbul and replaced by Ali Pasha. See: Hut D. Mustafa Nâilî Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2016. Vol. Ek-2. P. 329.

²⁵⁶ The Ottoman Grand Vizier (1789–1871), Hüseyin Avni Pasha was not a supporter of constitutional monarchy like New Ottomans, although he cooperated with the new Ottomans in the abdication of the Sultan. He blamed Abdülaziz for the mismanagement of the state and believed that the situation would improve with the accession of the well-meaning Sultan to the throne. See: Gencer A. İ. Hüseyin Avni Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1998. Vol. 18. P. 527.

²⁵⁷ Ottoman commander and statesman (1806–1871). He was appointed commander-in-chief to suppress the Cretan rebellions. He declared a general amnesty for the people of the island and announced that the state would take care of those who handed over their weapons and returned to their village. It gave a month and a half for members of foreign gangs on the island and those who joined them to leave the island. After the end of the military operation, he embarked on reconstruction and arrangement; however, he was soon called to Istanbul to discuss issues related to the Balkans. See: Saydam A. Ömer Lütfü Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2007. Vol. 34. P. 76.

²⁵⁸Namık Kemal. Yine Girit Meselesi Tazelendi. P. 160–161.

²⁵⁹Toprak S. Megali İdea'ya Bir Örnek: Girit. P. 129.

²⁶⁰Armaoğlu F. 19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1789–1914. P. 290.

1. The Greek government will eliminate the gangs that were created to harm the Ottoman Empire and will prevent them from being re-established in the future.
2. The Greek government will either deport three pirate ships shuttling between Crete and Greece or at least not allow them to enter Greek ports.
3. The Greek government will allow Cretan migrants to return home and take precautions to facilitate their return.
4. Those who attacked the Ottoman soldiers and their subjects will be punished according to the laws and compensation will be given to the families who have been harmed.
5. Henceforth, the Greek government will abide by the decisions of present treaties and respect human rights²⁶¹.

As the Greek government refused to accept the requests, the Ottoman Empire cut off their diplomatic relations with Greece on the 16th of December 1868. Two states were on the brink of war²⁶². The Turkish Fleet in the Mediterranean besieged the Greek coasts to prevent the Cretians from getting aid from Greece²⁶³. This dispute caused unrest among the Great European states. Because the war between the two nations would be likely to expand its sphere of influence and become the war of Europe. The Great European states decided to hold a conference in Paris to put an end to this tension between the Ottoman Empire and Greece²⁶⁴.

4.7.Paris Conference

To prevent a possible war, Napoleon III proposed that the issue be discussed at a conference in Paris again with the states that had signed the Treaty of Paris of

²⁶¹Demirci G. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869). P. 65.

²⁶²Armaoğlu F. 19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1789–1914. P. 290.

²⁶³Karal E. Z. Osmanlı Tarihi // [URL:] file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Desktop/namık%20kema1/Karal_Enver_Ziya_Osmanlı_Tarihi_c_III.pdf. (date of access: 30.04.2020).

²⁶⁴Demirci G. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869). P. 67.

1856²⁶⁵.The reason for the conference was given in the “Hürriyet” newspaper as follows:

“The states signatories of the Treaty of 1856 agreed to settle disputes between the Ottomans and Greece to avoid the threat that might arise from ending their relations, and allowed their envoys to be in the presence of the emperor of France for the conference convention.” ²⁶⁶

The conference convened in Paris on the 9th of January 1869. The states that signed the Treaty of 1856 sent their representatives to this conference. Greece did not attend the meeting as it was not one of the countries that signed the 1856 Treaty of Paris²⁶⁷.This situation is stated in the “Hürriyet” newspaper as follows:

*“In Paris on the 16th of January, the diplomats of the Great States signed a declaration that they had ended the conflict between the Ottoman state and the Greek state. Sent to Athens through count Walewski’s son to deliver to the Greek state.”*²⁶⁸

On the 20th of January 1869, the official proclamation of the Paris conference was approved. According to this declaration, the first, second and third articles of the ultimatum given by the Ottoman Empire to Greece were accepted as follows in the “Hürriyet” newspaper: ²⁶⁹

“Therefore, it is the duty of the Greek state that they should not allow groups to gather to attack the Ottoman Empire, secondly; not to encourage armed pirate ships which are equipped in the Greek ports to rebel against the Ottoman Empire. By the request of the Sublime Porte for returning of Cretans who had emigrated to Greece, the conference gave confidence that Greece, based on its

²⁶⁵Ünsal E. Girit’in Türk Hakimiyetinden Çıkışı. P. 47.

²⁶⁶[S. a.] Konferansın Kararı (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 33. 8 Şubat 1869) // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 237–238 (It is not clear whether this article belongs to Namık Kemal or Ziya Pasha.)

²⁶⁷Karal E. Z. Osmanlı Tarihi // [URL:]file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Desktop/namık%20kemal/Karal_Enver_Ziya_Osmanlı_Tarihi_c_III.pdf). (date of access: 30.04.2020).

²⁶⁸[S. a.] Konferansın Kararı. P. 237.

²⁶⁹Demirci G. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869). P. 69.

*statements on this issue, would be able to solve the problems of Cretan families who wish to return to their homeland.”*²⁷⁰

It was decided that the fourth article of the ultimatum would be accepted by making regulation. However, in the fifth article, Greece was asked to promise that from now on, they would comply with the laws and treaties²⁷¹. Greece’s attitude towards ultimatum is stated in the Hürriyet newspaper as follows:

*“As the Greek government never denied that the Ottoman state could seek its rights through the courts for their citizens’s personal losses, and also the Ottoman Empire recognized the right of the Greek courts to resort to the judgement. Therefore, the delegates did not see the need for an inspection of cases and also stated that the Athenian government should not neglect to take the necessary legal measures to avoid leaving justice. All delegates have declared their agreement on the issue reported in their assessment, and the Greek state has been given a warning not to make the complaints cited in the Supreme Porte's ultimatum.”*²⁷²

With this declaration, the Great States both made it clear that they blamed Greece for their actions and showed that they did not support Greece, the Hürriyet newspaper reported on how the Great states left Greece alone in front of the Ottoman Empire:²⁷³

*“...Besides, it is clear that Greece, like the 3 protective states and the other states that signed the Paris Agreement, will not like the ideas put forward by this examination. The conference declares that Greece is obliged to comply with the rules of each state in its relations with the Ottoman Empire and to provide the necessary conditions for the future, together with the complaints caused by the past.”*²⁷⁴

²⁷⁰[S. a.] Konferansın Kararı. P. 238.

²⁷¹Demirci, Gülşah. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866–1869). P. 69.

²⁷²[S. a.] Konferansın Kararı. P. 238.

²⁷³Uçarol R. Siyasi Tarih (1789–1994). P. 229.

²⁷⁴[S. a.] Konferansın Kararı. P. 238.

The Greece government, under pressure from the Great states, accepted the declaration on the 6th of February 1869. Hereupon, the conference declared that Ottoman – Greek relations had returned to normal. However, this situation, which was agreed upon under pressure from the Great states, was, in fact, nothing more than a temporary ceasefire agreement. Because neither the Greeks nor the Cretians were pleased with it²⁷⁵. However, as a result, European states prevented a possible war between the Ottomans and Greece.

The Greek government's response to the Ottoman ultimatum is quoted in the "Hürriyet" newspaper as follows:

"It is understood that the Greek state has repeated two of the five proposals for many years and has responded that "For a foreign state, to restrict the personal freedom of their people is not appropriate according to the Greek regulations". Good, however, the Sublime Porte was referring to the baseless of this case by showing articles from the Greek Constitution and said that it would be inappropriate for a state to have regulations that would harm the law of nations. How did Greece reject them and bring the former case to the agenda? Here it is not clear.

On the third issue, the Greek state is proving through its actions that it does not oppose the return of Cretan migrants. The migrants in question were not to interfere with militarily publicly when they would return; the Greeks beat them; they prevent them. Our duty was to ask the Greek government to protect all refugees from attacks and punish those who offended the helpless. Let the movement of the people be with the encouragement of the Greek government and perhaps at its behest. If such an unproven case is tried to be proved, of course, it will result in embarrassment.

²⁷⁵Uçarol R . Siyasi Tarih (1789–1994). P. 229.

Despite the fourth proposal, the Ottoman State claims that they were not informed their soldiers and subjects had been killed in Greece and that the killers had not been brought to justice.

In response to the fifth proposal, the Greek government is asking to which agreement they are contravening. If our ministers had opened their eyes to try and understand the truth instead of being busy with feeding their bellies, they would have seen the articles of the agreement with Greece which is in issue “number 28”. We don’t expect the Sublime Porte to do such carelessness anywhere else. If our thinking was wrong and the Greek representatives did not see this agreement, it is no wonder that those who objected would be so suited to each other.”²⁷⁶

After the conference, the criticism of the Ottoman government in the “Hürriyet” newspaper was as follows:

“So the conference’s decision was understood, and although the case was not entirely in line with the rumours, it confirmed some of the opinions that were discussed. Europe cannot take away anyone’s rights if the holder of a right has the power to prove his claim within the rules.

Yes, we repeat that the Sublime Porte is incapable of appellate law, as well as its shame and fault. If not, while the Greek state would inform the Ottoman subjects to apply to the courts for those who have suffered losses in their homeland, and this would not take part in the ultimatum.

Yes, we repeat that Western states are eager to protect the interests of the Ottomans. However, now that the damage of the Paris agreement to our nation has been revealed, after the allusions to him, “I did my best, I was not a civil servant of the Ottoman state so that I could go further in this regard.” It is understood from what he says, how we can expect to benefit from those who are incapable of understanding their rights and interests and leave them to their friends.

²⁷⁶[S.a.] Ultimatom Hakkında Makale (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 29. 11 Ocak 1869) // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 205–206 (It is not clear whether this article belongs to Namık Kemal or Ziya Pasha).

Yes, we repeat that the Sublime Porte cannot be considered an incapable government. Indeed, the Sublime Porte has endured an incredible amount of insults and damages with the Cretan and Montenegro issue²⁷⁷. Even though the Ottoman ministers think that the Sultan is cruel, ignorant and indecisive he remains innocent in the eyes of the people, because of his insistence", it's a bit much! Let us get our law unconditionally" he then proceeded to finalise the incidents.

*"Yes, we repeat that our ambassador at the conference has no power but to say yes. Had it not been so, he would not have remained silent at the meeting as Greece expressed its attack on Crete, the territory of the Ottoman Empire, as a love of Homeland."*²⁷⁸

Apart from the Hürriyet newspaper, thoughts about Abdülaziz, the Sultan of the period, are as follows: Abdülaziz's reign (1861–1876), which was dominated by intense foreign affairs, did not seem to be very successful in handling domestic issues. He did not want to deal with state affairs and believed that politicians should remedy every difficulty. Midhat and Hüseyin Avni Pashas were hostile to Abdülaziz as they considered him harmful to the state and themselves. Although reforms were carried out in the law, administration, education, economy and many fields during the reign of Sultan Abdülaziz, some Turkish intellectuals who considered them inadequate made an opposition²⁷⁹. Sultan Abdülaziz came to London at the invitation of Queen Victoria (He is the only Ottoman sultan to travel to Europe). About Abdülaziz, whom he watched from afar, Ali Suavi wrote as follows in his memoirs:

"We observed the Sultan with Kemal Bey. He was truly worthy of the throne and the state he represented by his appearance and behaviour. I wish it were

²⁷⁷Since the second half of the 18th century, Montenegrins have revolted against the Ottoman Empire many times with the incitement of Austria and Russia. However, these uprisings have been suppressed. The Russo-Ottoman and Franco-Ottoman Wars, the Greek and Serbian revolts, the nationalist movement and finally the movements of the Great States, especially Russia in the region, against the Ottoman Empire, led to the re-uprisings of Montenegrins against the empire. See: Uçarol R. Siyasi Tarih (1789–1994). P. 223.

²⁷⁸[S. a.] Konferansın Kararı. P. 238–239.

²⁷⁹Küçük C. Abdülaziz // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1998. Vol. 1. P. 180, 182–183.

complete with the consciousness of science and understanding of the period, as it is with his appearance. We are the true friends and lovers of his throne.”²⁸⁰

Here are the statements in the Hürriyet newspaper after concluding the Crete issue as follows:

*“Here, the issue of Crete is over as the siege has been taken care of and The European states didn’t swallow it, as the smart alecks thought. But the island won’t be the same in fifty years. The Greeks who are our subjects have made us miserable, why are we not being paid compensation for damages? In Damascus and Lebanon, a particular group of people did some damage to a different group of people; and those damages were paid amply. The Greeks were upset that they could not fulfil their ambitions because they had been defeated. The Cretans attribute Russia’s silence at the conference and Greece’s acceptance of the current resolution to the lack of opportunity. If they see a Greek pirate on our coast, all the rebels are ready to take up arms again.”*²⁸¹

²⁸⁰Mardin Y. Namık Kemal’in Londra Yılları. P. 38, 40.

²⁸¹[S. a.] Girit’ten Tahrirat (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 38. 15 Mart 1869) // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal’in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 289 (It is not clear whether this article belongs to Namık Kemal or Ziya Pasha).

Chapter 5. The Situation of Wallachia-Moldavia in the “Hürriyet” Newspaper

Wallachia and Moldavia are two regions, often referred to together because of their peoples’ historical and cultural bonds. In the Ottoman sources, these regions were called “Memleketeyn”, meaning two countries²⁸².

Wallachia-Moldavian countries, which spread across vast geography from the north of the Danube to the Carpathian Mountains, from the west of this river to the East to the Dniester river, together with Transylvania form the core of present-day Romania and Moldavia. The principality of Wallachia, which forms the southern part of Romania, is surrounded by the Carpathian Mountains in the north, the Danube River in the south and Moldavia in the Northeast²⁸³. Moldavia was located in the plains region between the Danube and the Black Sea²⁸⁴.

The Danube River, which runs through the land of the country, overflowed in some seasons, so the alluvium made the soil even more fertile. The river was suitable for the freshwater fishery, and the Black Sea was rich in sea products. North of Wallachia, the climate is appropriate for the cultivation of fruit trees. The Baragan Plain, which stretches from its South and southeast to the Danube, is considered one of the most fertile lands in Europe. By the yield of the soil, the export products of Wallachia and Moldavia were made up of large and small cattle, horses as well as leather, wool, oil, and salted meat were obtained from them. Timber from the forest, various fruits and wines were among the other export products. Evliya Çelebi²⁸⁵ in his travel book mentioned the 17th century’s Bucharest that its most popular products are honey, oil, beeswax and white bread called Francala²⁸⁶.

²⁸²Yüksel S. Küçük Kaynarca’dan Yaş Antlaşması’na Kadar Eflak-Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Rus Nüfuz Mücadelesi // Belleten Dergisi. 2019. Vol. 83. No. 297. P. 605.

²⁸³Heper Y. Osmanlı Devleti Ve Eflak-Boğdan İlişkileri (1574–1634). PhD thesis. Uşak, 2020. P. 14.

²⁸⁴Karaçay Türkal M. 18. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Eflak ve Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Avusturya Mücadelesine Dair Anonim Bir Eser: Vakāyi‘-i Eflak // Turkish Studies. 2017. Vol. 12. No. 9. P. 39.

²⁸⁵The Ottoman traveler (1611–1684?). See: İlgürel M. Evliya Çelebi // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1995. Vol. 11. P. 529.

²⁸⁶Kılınç A. Eflak-Boğdan ve Karadeniz’de Bal ve Balmumu // Acta Turcica. Çevrimiçi Tematik Türkoloji Dergisi. 2011. No. 5. P. 43.

5.1. Wallachia and Moldavia during the Ottoman Rule

One of the regions that the Ottoman Empire wanted to keep under control after moving forward in Europe and especially after starting to organise raids on the Danube was the present-day Romanian territory. As Wallachia was located closer to the Ottoman Empire than Moldavia, the first raids were on Wallachia. For the Ottoman Empire, Wallachia should be under control as well as Moldavia²⁸⁷. The Ottoman Empire wanted to use Moldavia as a buffer zone against Poland and then Russia to protect Turkish interests north of the Danube and the Black Sea. They also felt that these two small states would not be able to resist Poland, Austria and Russia, and would eventually be annexed. For these reasons, the Ottomans preferred to give autonomy to Wallachia and Moldavia. It was the policy that played the most crucial role in the development of the Romanian nation and in preventing the Slavs from assimilating them²⁸⁸. If Moldavia were to be taken under control, the Tatars' raids into Transylvania would be facilitated. The Tatars will raid through Moldavia to Transylvania and then on to Austria²⁸⁹.

Wallachia-Moldavia principalities had essential tasks for the Ottoman Empire. In addition to paying annual taxes, these principalities had to join the campaign with the Ottomans. At the same time, it was their duty to assist the Ottoman army during the campaign and to ensure the safety of Danube when the Ottoman ships loaded with troops and supplies would arrive. It was also to provide information about the hostile thoughts and movements of the European states against the Ottoman Empire. Because of their performance of this vital task, The governors of Wallachia-Moldavia were described as “the two eyes of the Sublime

²⁸⁷Sarğın Y. Başlangıcından 1606'ya Kadar Osmanlı Devleti İle Eflak Ve Boğdan Voyvodalıkları Arasındaki İlişkiler. Master's degree thesis. Afyonkarahisar, 2013. P. 4.

²⁸⁸Karpat K. H. Balkanlarda Osmanlı Mirası. P. 78–79.

²⁸⁹Sarğın Y. Başlangıcından 1606'ya Kadar Osmanlı Devleti İle Eflak Ve Boğdan Voyvodalıkları Arasındaki İlişkiler. P. 4.

Porte facing Europe”. Besides all these, Wallachia-Moldavia lands were also critical in terms of meeting the grain needs of Istanbul²⁹⁰.

When the Ottomans crossed into the Balkans during the principality period, they captured Edirne first and then Bulgaria soon after. The Battle of Kosovo in 1389 played an essential role in the Turkish hold on the Balkans, which is an important trade and mining region of Southeast Europe. By reaching Vidin in the north of Balkans in 1390, the Ottomans also reached the Danube river. Wallachian Principality, which had been in existence since the 1330s, and the Moldavian Principality, formed in 1359, were reigning in the region. With the influence of Byzantium, these two Romanian principalities accepted Orthodoxy and gained their independence against the Kingdom of Hungary. Ottoman rule in Wallachia was recognised in 1394. The region was connected to the empire with the status of a tributary state²⁹¹.

The Ottoman Empire’s relationship with Moldavia began for the first time in the time of Çelebi Mehmed (1413–1421) when Ottoman forces entered the Moldavian territory and besieged Akkerman. With the conquest of Istanbul, this principality became subject to the Ottoman State. This subordination was finalised with the conquest of Kiliya and Akkerman in 1484²⁹².

After falling under the control of the Ottoman Empire, Wallachia and Moldavia were not incorporated into the imperial system and were transformed into autonomous provinces with their own institutions. Therefore, the native aristocrats, the boyars, maintained their former social, economic and mostly political privileges. The relations of these provinces with the Ottoman Empire were determined by a series of treaties that granted these principalities extensive autonomy in early times. There were three centres of power in the Danubian

²⁹⁰Yüksel S. Küçük Kaynarca’dan Yaş Antlaşması’na Kadar Eflak-Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Rus Nüfuz Mücadelesi. P. 605–606.

²⁹¹Kılınç A. Eflak-Boğdan ve Karadeniz’de Bal veBalmumu. P. 41.

²⁹²Karaçay Türkal M. 18. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Eflak ve Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Avusturya Mücadelesine Dair Anonim Bir Eser: Vakāyi’-i Eflak. P. 40.

principalities: Voivode, boyars and the Sublime Porte. As the Voivode²⁹³ was not a father-to-son administrator, but an elected official, countless intrigues among these three groups happened. The Sublime Porte also regularly intervened in elections and determined the candidates. During the 17th century, power was more in the hands of boyars than Voivode. Despite these problems, both voivodeships effectively maintained their own internal administrations and engaged in direct contacts with foreign governments. As they were border regions, they were involved in the wars the ruling power fought with neighboring countries²⁹⁴.

With the Treaty of Karlowitz, the Ottoman Empire went into a period of regression, Poland lost its former influence, the Russians reached the border of Moldavia, and at the same time, the Russians assumed the protection of the Orthodox Christians, the governors of Wallachia and Moldavia began to show interest to the Russians. Constantin Brâncoveanu (1689–1714), Voivode of Wallachia, who was understood to have assisted Peter the Great in the Battle of Pruth (1711), was brought to Istanbul and executed. It was later revealed that Dimitrie Cantemir, the Moldavian governor who had a role in the execution of Brâncoveanu after complaining that he was not loyal to the Ottomans, had personally assisted Peter the Great in the battle²⁹⁵.

The Sublime Porte realised that events in Moldavia and Wallachia were not appropriate for their interests. Therefore, in 1711 they appointed Nicolae Mavrocordat as a Voivode who is a Phanariot, to Moldavia replacing Dimitrie Cantemir. His appointment to the Moldavian Voivodeship marked the opening of a whole new chapter in the history of Romania. In 1714, realising that Constantin Brancoveanu could no longer be trusted, the Sublime Porte appointed Mavrocordat to the Wallachian Voivodeship. Thus, after Moldavia, the administration of the Phanariot Greek governors began in Wallachia. The period of Phanariot Greek

²⁹³The title used for the governors of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania. See: Maxim M. Voyvoda // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2013. Vol. 43. P. 127.

²⁹⁴Jelavich B. Balkan Tarihi 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllar / Transl. By İ. Durdu, G. Tunalı, H. Koç. İstanbul, 2013. P. 109, 111.

²⁹⁵Karaçay Türkal M. 18. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Eflak Ve Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Avusturya Mücadelesine Dair Anonim Bir Eser: Vakāyi'-i Eflak. P. 40.

governors in Romanian countries would continue until 1821 when the Greek revolt broke out²⁹⁶. There is a general consensus that the period when the Ottomans appointed the Fenerians as Voivode became the worst period in Romanian history, not only because of the deterioration of the system, but also because of the uncontrolled financial imposition of the Sublime Porte in these provinces. The election of Greeks to the Voivode led to a radical change in the political position of these provinces. The new administrators were not representatives of the Danubian principalities, but Ottoman representatives sent to protect the interests of Ottoman Empire. The function of Voivodes was to protect the region from intrigue and interference of enemies and send a considerable amount of money to the Sublime Porte for military and civilian needs²⁹⁷.

After this, the Ottoman-Russian wars in the 18th century usually took place in Wallachia-Moldavia and the Russian occupation of these countries interrupted the Ottoman administration. Since the voivodes can't manage a proper administration during the occupation, they often retreated to Istanbul and instead of them, proxies or district governors would perform their duty²⁹⁸.

Russia occupied Wallachia-Moldavia during their war with the Ottoman Empire between 1768–1774. During the negotiations on the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, which ended the war, Russia tried to strengthen the autonomous position of Wallachia-Moldavia and to get concessions that could increase their influence there. With the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, Russia had the Ottoman Empire agree to free both principalities from religious affairs, the construction of new churches and to repair old churches. Russia also had the Ottoman Empire approve the permits of

²⁹⁶Karasu C. Tarihte Türk-Romen İlişkileri Ders Notları // [URL:] <https://www.Ogu.Edu.Tr/Images/Birimduyuru/2012420113010.Pdf> (date of access: 05.05.2020).

²⁹⁷Jelavich B. Balkan Tarihi 18. Ve 19. Yüzyıllar. P. 112–113.

²⁹⁸Karasu C. Tarihte Türk-Romen İlişkileri Ders Notları // [URL:] <https://www.Ogu.Edu.Tr/Images/Birimduyuru/2012420113010.Pdf> (date of access: 05.05.2020).

those who wanted to leave the principalities for a year, and not to receive taxes for two years including the reduction of jizyah²⁹⁹.

After the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca of 1774, Russia gained influence in Wallachia and Moldavia, and the Ottoman State conferred with Russia in the policy of these principalities from this time. Russia, which consolidated their authority with the Jassy Treaty of 1792, managed to take the region under their influence. When it comes to the 19th century, the Russians have started a struggle for supremacy in the area. They continued their occupation from 1806 until the mid-19th century. Wallachia and Moldavia were occupied by Russia four times, in 1806, 1828, 1849 and 1853³⁰⁰.

5.2. The 19th Century Occupation of Wallachia-Moldavia and Nationalist Revolts

Wallachia and Moldavia have felt the effects of nationalism since the 19th century. However, Romanians' national feelings were formed before this date, when they began to recognise their language and history. In the 18th century, Vlachs sent students to Rome to be raised in Catholic institutions after the establishment of the Uniate Church, which was affiliated to the Catholic Church, and they had the opportunity to learn their history there. In addition to increasing Romanians' admiration for their history, the publication of Romanian Grammar in 1780 caused their national consciousness to become stronger. In the 19th century, trade relations with the Greeks and the French were very influential in the idea of nationalism in Romania. Besides, students who were sent abroad with the financing support of Romanian merchants returned home after studying at Western universities, especially in France, and became the most prominent proponent of nationalism ideas³⁰¹.

²⁹⁹Yüksel S. Küçük Kaynarca'dan Yaş Antlaşması'na Kadar Eflak-Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Rus Nüfuz Mücadelesi. P. 607.

³⁰⁰Pala N. N. Eflak Ve Boğdan'da Osmanlı Hakimiyeti ve Fuad Efendi'nin Layihası. Master's degree thesis. Kütahya, 2009. P. 38.

³⁰¹Ibid. P. 45.

While the revolutions of 1848 caused significant incidents in Europe, it also affected Wallachia-Moldavia, which was ruled as two principalities and where there was a strong movement for the establishment of the Union of Romania. Those who wanted independence and to unite the two territories into a single state rebelled. The Voivode of Wallachia was forced to adopt a constitution on 23 June 1848 and left the country. After, a provisional government was established. This movement spread to Moldavia. Thereupon Sturdza, the Voivode of Moldavia, suppressed the uprising. However, he was unable to prevent the events in Wallachia and withdrew from the principality. As Russia did not want the incidents caused by the revolution to succeed near their borders, they sided against the Romanians and recalled their Consul General in Wallachia. Thus, Russia declared war on the provisional government. The Wallachian provisional government considered it more appropriate to adhere to the Ottoman Empire than to come under the rule of Russia³⁰². Namık Kemal expressed anti-Russian in the region as follows:

*“The provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia were privileged since they came under the Ottoman administration. Although they were united by religion with the states of Russia and Austria, they protected their interests under the rule of Ottoman Empire which has a different faith. The situation of the nations that have been under the rule of Russia, such as Poland, Crimea, Georgia and Dagestan, is known. The people of Wallachia-Moldavia, on the other hand, have not seen any pressure or bullying from the Ottoman state in the payment of bills until now. Therefore, they would rather live under Ottoman rule than live as prisoners under the rule of Russia.”*³⁰³

Austria was also one of the states trying to gain influence in the region. Therefore, the interests of the two countries conflicted this region. As a matter of fact, Austria had temporarily occupied it during the Crimean War in order to put an

³⁰²Uçarol R. Siyasi Tarih (1789–1994). P. 189.

³⁰³Namık Kemal. Memleketeyn Ahvalı (Hürriyet Gazetesi. No. 16. 12 Ekim 1868) // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868–1869). Vol. I. P. 93–94.

end to Russia's targets in Wallachia-Moldavia. Austria abandoned Wallachia-Moldavia, which they temporarily occupied on 30 March 1857. According to the Treaty of Paris of 1856, the connection of the region with the Ottoman Empire remained solely for taxing. These two principalities began to be governed by two separate assemblies. Then, the people of those two principalities, also taking advantage of the Treaty of Paris, moved to unite. The articles from 22 to 27 of the Paris Agreement were related to Wallachia and Moldavia, giving autonomy to both³⁰⁴.

Local assembly elections were held in Wallachia and Moldavia in June 1857, under the supervision of the "European Commission", which was composed of representatives of the states that had signed the Treaty of Paris. The election was won by those opposed to the unification of the two principalities. France, Russia and Piedmont opposed this result, claiming that the election was rigged. On August 5 1857, Napoleon III, through his ambassador in Istanbul, asked the Sublime Porte to renew the elections. He threatened to cut off diplomatic relations otherwise. Other pro-unification states also supported France. Thereupon, elections were repeated in September 1857. This time the elections were won by the supporters of unification. The assemblies of Wallachia and Moldavia, convened on 8 October 1857, decided to reunite the two principalities under the name of Romania and bring an European foreign prince to power as co-ruler. The Ottoman Empire objected this situation, which was contrary to the 1856 Treaty of Paris, and declared the dissolution of all assemblies. As a result, the increasing pressure of France, a conference was convened in Paris on 22 April 1858 with the participation of states that had signed the Treaty of Paris of 1856 to discuss the Romanian question. At the conference, Austria and Britain supported the Ottoman Empire³⁰⁵.

The strongest reaction against unification and the rule of a foreign prince came from the Ottoman Empire and Austria. The Sublime Porte regarded any

³⁰⁴Uçarol R. *Siyasi Tarih (1789–1994)*. P. 218–219.

³⁰⁵*Ibid.* P. 219–220.

change in the status of the provinces as a concession to their sovereign rights. The Habsburg monarchy, on the other hand, feared that a robust Romanian unity would greatly influence Transylvania, both during this period and later. The British government, however, was undecided. Eventually, this government decided that the establishment of a unified Romanian state would damage its policy of making the Ottoman Empire a safeguard against Russia³⁰⁶.

On 19 August 1858, the “convention of Paris”, belonging to the new governance of Wallachia and Moldavia, was signed. This agreement laid the foundation for the unification of Wallachia and Moldavia into an independent state. According to the provisions of the treaty, Wallachia and Moldavia were named as “Unified Wallachia and Moldavia principalities”. They would continue to recognise the high sovereignty of the Ottoman rulers. Still, these principalities, which would be completely independent in their administrations, would be governed by a Voivode and a council elected by the people, and a commission would be established to deal with the everyday affairs of the principalities³⁰⁷. Upon these decisions, the Moldavian Assembly elected Colonel Alexandre-Jean Couza, who had his education in France on 17 January 1859 and was a supporter of France, to the Voivode³⁰⁸. On 5 February 1859, Colonel Couza, who was elected to the Moldavia Principality, including the administration of the three provinces of Bessarabia, was also elected in Wallachia on 24 February. Thus, the two principalities were united, without contradicting the Treaty of Paris, which envisioned the election of a prince for both countries but did not prevent the election of the same person for both countries. Couza then came to Istanbul and visited Sultan Abdülaziz on behalf of all Romanians. Thus, Sultan Abdülaziz had to agree to the unification of Wallachia and Moldavia into a country called Romania. During Couza’s rule, a new constitution was prepared, and the political, military, economic and civil foundations of the modern state were established.

³⁰⁶Jelavich B. *Balkan Tarihi* 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllar. P. 317–318.

³⁰⁷Sertoğlu M. *Mufasssal Osmanlı Tarihi*. P. 3095.

³⁰⁸Armaoğlu F. *19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789–1914)*. P. 272.

However, when Couza wanted to dissolve the assembly the following year and start a dictatorship, he was forced to leave the principality as a result of pressure from some forces (1866) and was replaced by Prince Charles of the German dynasty under the name Carol I³⁰⁹.

Namık Kemal wrote about the situation after Wallachia and Moldavia passing to the administration of a foreign prince:

*“After the provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia were united under the rule of a foreign prince, their situations were formed differently. The people and the elites were divided into several groups, and each group argued that their own opinions should be valued to achieve their interests. For example, some of them want to strengthen their relationship with the Ottoman Empire for protection from other states’ intervention and to unite with them. Some want to end relations to gain independence and become a government in its own right. While some want the administration of Phanariots, some wish to appoint a ruler from the old dynasty of the Wallachian Moldavian people instead of a foreign prince. Except them, there are also Bulgarian communities that take advantage of the regulations of the country and, since the Bulgarians on the other side of the Danube have been advancing slowly for twenty years and have acquired many estates and lands on the Danube coast by deserting to the other side due to the persecution of the present government. After a while, the bandits who came together in Wallachia-Moldavia and crossed into the Balkans gather in their land and take up arms and then transfer them to the other side.”*³¹⁰

Namık Kemal expressed his expectations of Charles as follows:

“As Prince Charles knows that coming under the control of another country would result in harm. Those Bulgarian rebels are doing their best to bring about confusion in the East, which both the Ottoman state and Europe fear. It is, of course, a duty for the prince to be determined not to leave loyalty, and to work

³⁰⁹Özcan A. Boğdan // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1992. Vol. 6. P. 271.

³¹⁰Namık Kemal. Memleketeyn Ahvali. P. 93.

diligently to stop things that would be harmful to the country. However, since Wallachia and Moldavia are not under the rule of the prince alone, even the National Assembly and the Council of Ministers, which are composed of different communities mentioned earlier, are part of the administration. The prince doubts whether it is possible to end the current turmoil or not.”³¹¹

Romania’s allegiance to the Ottoman Empire lasted until 1878. At the insistence of Russia in the war of 1877–1878, Romania, which participated in the war, declared its independence. They became an independent kingdom with treaties of San Stefano and Berlin³¹².

³¹¹Ibid. P. 94.

³¹²Armaoğlu F. 19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789–1914). P. 272.

Conclusion

Events in the Balkans at the beginning of the 19th century signalled that there would be extensive changes in the same century. In particular, the growing nationalistic movements in the Balkans, because of the French Revolution of 1789 and the Napoleonic Wars, this had an adverse effect on the multi-national Ottoman Empire. Although the Balkans are identified with the concepts of uprisings, revolts, and revolutions in the 19th century, they became a part of the “Eastern Question”. In addition to being influenced by nationalism, their desire to come under the patronage of other states became one of the dynamics of non-Muslim subjects in the Tanzimat period³¹³. The term “Eastern Question”, used by the Russian emperor Alexander I to refer to the general situation of Christians in the Ottoman subjects, gained a new dimension at the 1815 Congress of Vienna. Non-Muslims, who were subjects of the Empire, have now become part of the Eastern question. Among the dynamics of the “Eastern Question”, Namık Kemal sees the interventions of the Great States, especially Russia, on the Ottoman lands. Another dynamic of the “Eastern Question” is Western public opinion. In the process of raising awareness of Western public opinion, articles are written by European thinkers against Turkey and Islam, information coming from the East and based on fabricated, prejudicial, and false and exaggerated news in European newspapers played an important role. Namık Kemal tried to refute these accusations³¹⁴. According to Namık Kemal, the only way to introduce the Empire’s true identity to Europe is if the Ottomans learn the languages of Europeans and write something about themselves in their languages. If the Empire can reject slander in every language, the European public will not delay in learning the East and granting our rights³¹⁵.

³¹³Özdal B., Karaca K. Diplomasi Tarihi I. // [URL:][file:///C:/Users/trh/1/Downloads/19.YUZYILDA_BALKANLARDA_YASANAN_BAZI_ON%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/trh/1/Downloads/19.YUZYILDA_BALKANLARDA_YASANAN_BAZI_ON%20(2).pdf) (date of access: 23.04.2020).

³¹⁴Gümüş M. Namık Kemal’e Göre “Şark Meselesi” ve Osmanlı Devleti’ni Çöküşe Götüren. P. 152,154.

³¹⁵Mardin Y. Ibid. P. 50, 51.

According to Namık Kemal, the Crete issue is as an extension of the Eastern question. The Crete issue is one of the most critical problems that the Ottoman Empire faced in the 19th century. One of the main reasons for the point is that Crete is under the influence of Greece. Namık Kemal states that Greece has a official policy of annexing Crete. The revolts and turmoil during the process of Greece's independence from the Ottoman Empire also played a role in the formation of a new political mindset in Crete. The revolts of 1866-1869, which had an essential place in the process that would cause Crete to secede from the Ottoman Empire, leaving the Empire facing severe political problems. The Empire's attitude and delicate situation on the Cretan issue indicate that the item has multifaceted political elements, and this caused the Empire's diplomacy to become desperate from time to time. The Greeks, who rebelled under various pretexts, wanted to draw the attention of the European states to gain results from their rebellion and tried to include the representatives of their lands to reach their goal. Namık Kemal also points out that the Cretan Christians were propagandised to the effect of the revolution and that they were trying to create public pressure in this way.

The Wallachia-Moldavia issue is one of the main topics of Namık Kemal's political writings. He provided information about the importance of the matter, its legal dimension, and its internal and external repercussions. According to him, the spark of rebellion in Wallachia and Moldavia could turn into a movement of the revolution that would engulf all the Balkans. The revolutions of 1848, which led to significant developments in Europe, also showed influence in Wallachia-Moldavia, which was ruled as two principalities and had a strong movement for the establishment of the Union of Romania. The steps taken towards the unification of Wallachia and Moldavia had entered a necessary process, which meant nothing more than the loss of Wallachia-Moldavia by the Ottoman Empire. Although unification of the two principalities gained momentum after the Treaty of Paris, the process that reduced the influence of the Empire began with the Treaty of Edirne.

However, with the Treaty of Paris, the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire was guaranteed by the European States, Russia's "Eastern policy" took a significant blow. However, with the Treaty of Paris, Wallachia-Moldova gained an autonomous status where no state could interfere in its internal affairs and this prompted supporters of unification in Wallachia-Moldavia, where the nationalist movement was developing and then led to new diplomatic problems.

Due to internal and external troubles of the Ottoman Empire, negligence appeared in the state organization and administration. Thus, problems arising from the administration caused dissatisfaction among non-Muslims. The Tanzimat Edict of November 3rd, 1839 and the Islahat Edict of 1856 were declared to re-strengthen the society which had reached the point of breaking. The proclamation brought about essential changes in terms of the nation's administration with the issues it addressed. According to Namık Kemal, another essential element of the "Eastern Question" is the reformation projects demanded by the Western states, especially about non-Muslim Ottomans. Western countries intervened in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire through these reform projects. According to Namık Kemal, the Ottoman statesmen declared these edicts to be pleasant to Europe.

To prevent the process of nationalisation of ethnic groups and to unite them around Ottoman identity, Ottomanism emerged from the first quarter of the 19th century as a political ideology aimed at preventing these developments. According to Namık Kemal, if the Empire can maintain this unity and unite around the idea of a shared future, they can build a second Europe on the Ottoman territory. However, Ottomanism lost its importance over time. While Muslims were not prepared, non-Muslims did not want to disappear within the Ottoman nation.

Namık Kemal, one of the most influential intellectuals of the period, was not indifferent to the situation of the state. Namık Kemal, who was sensitive to almost every problem that concerns the Ottoman Empire, expressed his suggestions for solutions to get rid of the problematic situation in the Empire. However, the crucial

central aspect of Namık Kemal is that he deals with all aspects of the issues, not just one point, by establishing a connection between the problems. Because he knew the historical, political, economic, and mental sides of the item, this approach of Namık Kemal was very successful in demonstrating the roles of states such as Britain, Russia and France in the issue and its repercussions on the Empire. His analysis clearly shows that he reads the period's international relations well due to his accurate conclusions.



List of Primary and Secondary Sources

Primary Sources

1. Namık Kemal. Girit Meselesi-Rusya Politikası // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 14 Eylül 1868. No. 12.
2. Bir İngiliz'den Mektup // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 14 Eylül 1868. No. 12.(it is not clear whether it belongs to Ziya Paşa or Namık Kemal)
3. Namık Kemal. Bulgar Hükümeti // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 29 Eylül 1868. No.14.
4. Namık Kemal. Memleketeyn Ahvali // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 12 Ekim 1868.No. 16.
5. Girit'ten Tahrirat. // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 19 Ekim 1868. No. 17.(it is not clear whether it belongs to Ziya Paşa or Namık Kemal)
6. Namık Kemal. Hasta Adam // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 7 Aralık 1868. No. 24.
7. Namık Kemal. Avrupa Şarkın Asayişini İster // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 7 Aralık 1868. No. 24.
8. Namık Kemal. Yine Girit Meselesi Tazelendi // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 7 Aralık 1868. No. 24.
9. Ultimatom Hakkında Makale // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 11 Ocak 1869. No. 29.(it is not clear whether it belongs to Ziya Paşa or Namık Kemal)
- 10.Konferansın Kararı // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 8 Şubat 1869. No.33.(it is not clear whether it belongs to Ziya Paşa or Namık Kemal)
- 11.Girit'ten Tahrirat // Sürgünde Muhalefet:Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 15 Mart 1869. No. 38. (it is not clear whether it belongs to Ziya Paşa or Namık Kemal)

12. Ali Suavi, Muhbirden Mücerreden Naklolan Makale // Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi. 12 Nisan 1869. No. 42.

Secondary Sources

1. Adıyeke A. N. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Girit Bunalımı (1896-1908). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2000. 367 p.
2. Akbulut U. Osmanlı Basın Tarihine Bir Katkı: Gazetelerin Yayınlanma Amaçları Üzerine (1831-1876) // Turkish Studies: International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic. 2013. Vol. 8. No. 5. Pp. 31-57.
3. Akça G. Osmanlı'da Millet Sisteminin Dönüşümü // Fırat Üniversitesi Doğu Anadolu Bölgesel Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2007. Vol. 6. No. 1. Pp. 57-65.
4. Akçura Y. Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset (6th. ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2014. 65 p.
5. Akın M. H. Namık Kemal'in Siyasi Düşüncesinde Temel Kavramlar: İlerleme, Hürriyet ve Vatan [Url: [file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Downloads/Namik_Kemalin_Siyasi_Dusuncesinde_Temel%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Downloads/Namik_Kemalin_Siyasi_Dusuncesinde_Temel%20(2).pdf)] (date of access: 12.03.2020).
6. Aksoy İ. Girit Ve Girit'teki Ayrılıkçı Hareketlerin Tarihi Süreci Ve Kıbrıs'a Yansımaları. Master's degree thesis. İstanbul: 2006. 129 p.
7. Akün Ö. F. Namık Kemal // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2006. Vol. 32. Pp. 361-378.
8. Akyıldız A. Mahmud Nedim Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2003. Vol. 27. Pp. 374-376.
9. Armaoğlu F. 19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1789-1914 (14th. ed.). İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2014. 799 p.
10. Aydın M. Namık Kemal'in Siyasi Yazılarında Rusya'nın "Şark Meselesi"ndeki Yeri ve Memleketeyn Meselesi // Erdem Dergisi. 2009. No. 53. Pp. 23-42.

- 11.Beydilli K. Şark Meselesi // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2010. Vol. 38. Pp. 352-357.
- 12.Beydilli K. Ali Paşa, Mehmed Emin // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1989. Vol. 2. Pp. 425-426.
- 13.Bolayır E. A. Namık Kemal. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992. 125 p.
- 14.Bourne K. İngiltere Ye Girit İsyanı, 1866-69 (Transl. by Yuluğ Tekin Kurat) // Araştırmaları Dergisi. 1963. Vol. 1. No. 1.Pp. 249-275.
- 15.Cengiz H. A. Girit İsyanları (1866-1908). Master's degree thesis. Edirne: 1999. 182 p.
- 16.Cihangir Kılıçoğlu Ç. Yunanistan'da Monarşi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme // Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi. 2016. Vol 15. No. 58. Pp. 99-121.
- 17.Çadircı M. Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentlerinin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Durumu(3rd. ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2013. 410 p.
- 18.Çağan K. Namık Kemal'de Devletin Niteliği ve Temel Dayanakları // Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi. 2012. Vol. 7. No. 1. Pp. 240-250.
- 19.Çalen M. K. Ali Suavi'de Türklük Tasavvuru // TürkYurdu. 2017. No. 354. Pp. 63-68.
- 20.Çankaya S. Namık Kemal. Ankara: Doğu Matbaacılık ve Ticaret Limited Şirketi Matbası, 1965. 48 p.
- 21.Çelik H. Hürriyet // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1998. Vol. 18. Pp. 505-507.
- 22.Çelik M. Midhat Paşa'nın "Türkiye'nin Mazisi ve İstikbali" Başlıklı Makalesi ve Üzerine Bazı Notlar // Kebikeç. 2008. No. 26. Pp. 37-61.
- 23.Demir K. Ali Suavi'nin İktisadi Görüşleri // Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2018. Vol. 8. No. 16. Pp. 443-464.
- 24.Demir Ş. Tanzimat Döneminde Bir Devlet Politikası Olarak Osmanlılık // Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2011. No. 29. Pp. 331-348.

- 25.Demirci G. Osmanlı Basın Kaynakları Işığında Girit Meselesi (1866-1869). Master's degree thesis. Zonguldak: 2019. 101 p.
- 26.Doğumunun Yüzellinci Yılında Namık Kemal. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1993. 280 p.
- 27.Donbay A. Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesindeki Makakeleleri. Master's degree thesis. Konya: 1992. 405 p.
- 28.Efe H. and Kızıl M. Osmanlı'nın Kuzey ve Doğu Politikası ve Rusya'nın "Sıcak Denizlere İnme Politikası" Kapsamında Şekillenen Doğu Sınırları // Kafkas Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi. 2018. Vol. 9. No. 17. Pp. 297-334.
- 29.Elibol A. Yeniçeriler ve İktidar Bağlamında Osmanlı Sisteminin Dönüşümü // Gazi Akademik Bakış. 2009. Vol. 3. No. 5. Pp. 21-40.
- 30.Erdemir Ö. "Bârîka-i Zafer" Adlı Eseri Çerçevesinde Namık Kemal'in Osmanlı Tarihi ve Tarihçiliğine Bakışı. Master's degree thesis. Konya: 2016. 191 p.
- 31.Erkan S. Savaş ve Barış Bağlamında XIX. Yüzyıl Uluslararası İlişkileri'nin Özellikleri // Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2010. No. 22. Pp. 93-115.
- 32.Gemici N.Girit'e Ait 1870 Tarihli Bir Belge Girit'e Ait 1870 Tarihli Bir Belge // İslam San'at, Tarih Edebiyat ve Mûsıkı Dergisi. 2009. No. 13. Pp. 281-287.
- 33.Gencer A. İ. Hüseyin Avni Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1998. Vol. 18. Pp. 526-527.
- 34.Girgin A. Türkiye'de Yerel Basın [Url: http://atillagirgin.net/s/2170/i/Yerel_Bas%C4%B1n_2009.pdf] (date of access: 14.03.2020).
- 35.Göçgün Ö. Edebiyat ve Fikir Dünyamızda: Namık Kemal – Hayatı, Eserleri, Edebi Kişiliği ve Eserlerinden Açıklamalı Seçmeler-. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 2009. 221 p.

- 36.Güler H. Yeniçeri Ocağı'nın Kaldırılması 17 Haziran 1826 [Url: https://www.academia.edu/35045040/YEN%C4%B0%C3%87ER%C4%B0_OCA%C4%9EININ_KALDIRILMASI_17_HAZ%C4%B0RAN_1826] (date of access: 20.04.2020).
- 37.Gümüş M. Namık Kemal'e Göre "Şark Meselesi" ve Osmanlı Devletini Çöküşe Götüren Sorunlar // History Studies: International Journal Of History. 2010. Vol. 2. No. Special edition. Pp. 145-163.
- 38.Gümüş M. 1866-1869 Girit İsyanı ve Yunanistan: Namık Kemâl'den Tespitler // İnsan Ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2016. Vol 5. No. 1. Pp. 28-41.
- 39.Günay N. Filik-i Eterya Cemiyeti // Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 2005. Vol. 6. No. 1. Pp. 263-287.
- 40.Güz N. Şinasi ve Namık Kemal'in Osmanlı Fikir ve Basın Hayatına Katkıları.[Url:https://www.academia.edu/35375803/%C5%9Einasi_ve_Nam%C4%B1k_Kemalin_Osmanl%C4%B1_Fikir_ve_Bas%C4%B1n_Hayat%C4%B1na_Katk%C4%B1lar%C4%B1] (date of access: 06.02.2020).
- 41.Hacısalihoglu M. Yunanistan // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2013. Vol. 43. Pp.586-595.
- 42.Hayta N. and Ünal U. Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yenileşme Hareketleri (XVII. Yüzyıl Başlarından Yıkılışa Kadar) (3rd. ed.). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi, 2008. 240 p.
- 43.Heper Y. Osmanlı Devleti Ve Eflak- Boğdan İlişkileri (1574-1634). PhD's thesis. Uşak: 2020. 397 p.
- 44.Hut D. Mustafa Nâilî Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2016. Vol. Ek-2. Pp. 328-329.
- 45.İlgürel M. Evliya Çelebi // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1995. Vol. 11. Pp. 529-533.
- 46.Jelavich B. Balkan Tarihi 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllar (3rd. ed.) (Transl. by İhsan Durdu, Gülşah Tunalı, Hasim Koç). İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013. 431 p.

- 47.Kara G. and Toprak, S. 19. Yüzyıl Sonunda Balkan Siyaseti Gölgesinde Rusya'nın Yalnızlaşması // İnsan Ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2016. Vol. 5. No. 4. Pp.677-689.
- 48.Karabulut B. Osmanlı'nın Zor Sınavı: Fransa'nın Tutarsız Politikaları Ekseninde Girit İsyanı (1866-1869) // Karadeniz Araştırmaları Merkezi. 2008. No. 16. Pp. 77-99.
- 49.Karaçay Türkal M. 18. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Eflak ve Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Avusturya Mücadelesine Dair Anonim Bir Eser: Vakāyi'-i Eflak // Turkish Studies. 2017. Vol. 12. No. 9. Pp. 35-54.
- 50.Karadağ R. Şark Meselesi. İstanbul: TuranYayıncılık. 170 p.
- 51.Karal E. Z. Osmanlı Tarihi [Url: file:///C:/Users/trh_1/Desktop/namık%20kemal/Karal_Enver_Ziya_Osmanlı_Tarihi_c_III.pdf] (date of access: 15.04.2020).
- 52.Karasu C. Tarihte Türk-Romen İlişkileri Ders Notları [Url: <https://www.ogu.edu.tr/images/Birimduyuru/2012420113010.Pdf>] (date of access: 05.05.2020).
- 53.Karpat K. H. Balkanlarda Osmanlı Mirası (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2015. 365 p.
- 54.Kılıçoğlu Cihangir Ç. Yunanistan'da Monarşi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme // Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi. 2016. No. 58. Pp. 99-121.
- 55.Kılınç A. Eflak-Boğdan ve Karadeniz'de Bal ve Balmumu // Acta Turcica Çevrimiçi Tematik Türkoloji Dergisi. 2011. No. 5. Pp. 40-56.
- 56.Kirli Ntokme O. Ulus Devlet Oluşturmada Yunanistan Örneği: BüyükÜlkü-Megali Idea // Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi. 2010. Vol. 12. No. 46. Pp. 401-424.
- 57.Kodaman B. Osmanlı Devleti'nin Yükseliş ve Çöküş Sebeplerine Genel Bakış // Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2007. No. 16. Pp. 1-24.

- 58.Kodaman B. Sultan II. Abdulhamid Devri Doğu Anadolu Politikası. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları. 1987. 156 p.
- 59.Korkmaz F. Yeni Osmanlılar Cemiyeti Kurucularından Mehmet Ayetullah Bey. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2017. 196 p.
- 60.Köprülü O. F. Fuad Paşa, Keçecizâde // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1996. Vol. 13. Pp. 202-205.
- 61.Kurat A. N. Rusya Tarihi: Başlangıçtan 1917'ye Kadar. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010. 511 p.
- 62.Kurtaran U. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Millet Sistemi // Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2011. No. 8. Pp. 57-71.
- 63.Küçük C. Abdülaziz // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1998. Vol. 1. Pp.179-185.
- 64.Mardin Y. Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1974. 265 p.
- 65.Maxim M. Voyvoda // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2013. Vol. 43. Pp. 127-129.
- 66.May A. J. Girit ve Birleşik Devletler, 1866-1869 (Transl. by Tarık Demir) // Tarih Dergisi. 2010. No. 52. Pp. 183- 194.
- 67.Moralı S. S. Ayetullah ve Yeni Osmanlı Cemiyeti [Url: <http://earsiv.sehir.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11498/16938/001581447010.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>] (date of access: 08.02.2020).
- 68.Namık Kemal / Ed. By Karataş T. and Tavukçu O. K. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2011. 528 p.
- 69.Nal S. Namık Kemal'in Devlet Kuramı ve Devletin Sürekliliğini Sağlayacak Yönetim Biçimi // İnönü Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi. 2019. Vol.10. No. 2. Pp. 633-649.
- 70.Ortaylı İ. Osmanlı Toplumunda Aile (14th. ed.). İstanbul: TimaşYayınları, 2013. 240 p.
- 71.Ortaylı İ. İmparatorluğun Son Nefesi: Osmanlı'nın Yaşayan Mirası. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2014. 302 p.

- 72.Öksüz M. Girit Meselesi'nin Belirsizlik Yılları (1908-1913) // Karadeniz Araştırmaları. 2010. No. 25. Pp. 93-114.
- 73.Ölümünün 100. Yılında Namık Kemal. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1988. 228 p.
- 74.Özcan A. Boğdan // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1992. Vol. 6. Pp. 269-271.
- 75.Özdal Barış and Karaca, Kutay. Diplomasi Tarihi I [Url:[file:///C:/Users/trh%20I/Downloads/19. YUZYILDA BALKANLARDA YASANAN BAZI ON%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/trh%20I/Downloads/19.%20YUZYILDA%20BALKANLARDA%20YASANAN%20BAZI%20ON%20(2).pdf)] (date of access: 23.04.2020).
- 76.Özer A. Namık Kemal'in Mektuplarında Sosyal Ve Siyasi Meseleler. Master's degree thesis. Karaman: 2019. 123 p.
- 77.Pala N. N. Eflak ve Boğdan'da Osmanlı Hakimiyeti Ve Fuad Efendi'nin Layihası. Master's degree thesis. Kütahya: 2009. 90 p.
- 78.Parlatır İ. Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü (4th. ed.). Ankara: Yargı Kitabevi, 2011. 2164 p.
- 79.Sarğın Y. Başlangıcından 1606'ya Kadar Osmanlı Devleti İle Eflak Ve Boğdan Voyvodalıkları Arasındaki İlişkiler. Master's degree thesis. Afyonkarahisar: 2013. 77 p.
- 80.Sarıçoban G. Namık Kemal Ve Hürriyet Fikri // Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2019. Vol 23. No. 2. Pp. 515- 535.
- 81.Saydam A. Ömer Lütfü Paşa // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2007. Vol. 34. Pp. 74-76.
- 82.Sertoğlu M. Mufasssal Osmanlı Tarihi (Vol.VI). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2011. Pp. 2964-3672.
- 83.Söğütlü İ. Türk Modernleşmesi Sürecinde Mithat Paşa // Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi. 2010. Vol. 11. No. 1. Pp. 101-113.
- 84.Sürgünde Muhalefet: Namık Kemal'in Hürriyet Gazetesi (1868-1869) (Vol. I) / Ed. by S. Karlıtekin. İstanbul: VakıfBank Kültür Yayınları, 2018. 395 p.

- 85.Şen Z. Şark Meselesi Nedir? [Url: <http://www.zafersen.com/sark-meselesi-nedir-zafer-sen.pdf>] (date of access: 18.03.2020).
- 86.Tanör B. Osmanlı-Türk Anayasal Gelişmeleri (25th. ed.) İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2015. 455 p.
- 87.Tarık Hakkı Us Collection [Url: <http://www.tufs.ac.jp/common/fs/asw/tur/htu/list1.html>] (date of access: 01.05.2020).
- 88.Toprak S. Megali İdea'ya Bir Örnek: Girit // İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2012. Vol. 1. No. 1. Pp. 118-142.
- 89.Toprak S. 1821 Mora İsyanı // Tarihin Peşinde: Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi. 2011. No. 6. Pp. 317-328.
- 90.Topses M. D. Niyazi Berkes'in Türk Modernleşmesine Bakışında Namık Kemal'e Yönelik Eleştirisi // Sosyoloji Konferansları. 2012. No. 46. Pp. 65-73.
- 91.Tosun H. Ali Ekrem Bolayır'ın Namık Kemal ve Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem Hakkındaki Görüşleri. Master's degree thesis. İstanbul: 2010. 264.
- 92.Tukin C. Girit // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 1996. Vol. 14. Pp. 85- 93.
- 93.Turan M. Şark Meselesi Ve Millî Devlet Anlayışı [Url: http://www.mustafaturan.gen.tr/FileUpload/as799722/File/gunumuzde_sark_meselesi-turk_ocaklari_a.pdf] (date of access: 19.03.2020).
- 94.Türkmen Z. Girit Adasını Osmanlı İdaresinden Ayırma Çabaları: Yunan İsyanını Takip Eden Dönemdeki Gelişmeler (1821-1869) // Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi. 2001. No. 12. Pp. 219-244.
- 95.Uçarol R. Siyasi Tarih (1789-1994) (4th. ed.). İstanbul: Filiz Kitabevi, 1995. 892 p.
- 96.Uçman A. Tanzimat'tan Sonra Edebiyat ve Siyaset: Nâmık Kemal ve Ziya Paşa örneği // Türkiyat Mecmuası. 2014. Vol. 24. No.1. Pp. 113-128.

- 97.Ulusan Ş. Şark Meselesi'nden Sevr'e Türkiye // Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2009. Vol. 8. No. 18. Pp. 229-256.
- 98.Ünsal E. Girit'in Türk Hakimiyetinden Çıkışı. Master's degree thesis. Edirne: 2009. 150 p.
- 99.Yalçın E. Şark Meselesi ve Emperyalistlerin Türk Politikası // Toros Üniversitesi İktisadi, İdari, Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2015. Vol. 2. No. 4. Pp. 75-104.
100. Yaşaroğlu M. K. Molla Gürani // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2005. Vol. 30. Pp. 248-250.
101. Yavuz N. Şark Meselesi Açısından Ortadoğu Gelişmeleri. Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 2003. Vol. 2. No. 3. Pp. 89-98.
102. Yıldız Ö. 19. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısı ve 20. Yüzyıl Başlarında Girit Adasında Deniz Ticareti // Tarih ve Günce: Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Dergisi. 2017. Vol. 1. No. 1. Pp. 239-260.
103. Yıldız Turan E. Türk İslam Düşünce Sisteminde İbn-i Haldun'un Devlet Nazariyesi // Atatürk İletişim Dergisi. 2005. No. 9. Pp. 197-204.
104. Yücel D. M. Son Dönem Osmanlı Düşüncesinde Hürriyet Kavramının Çözümlemesi // Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2017. No. 19. Pp.179-188.
105. Yücel M. Son Dönem Osmanlı Düşüncesinde Hürriyet Kavramının Çözümlemesi // Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2017. No. 19. Pp. 179-188.
106. Yüksel S. Küçük Kaynarca'dan Yaş Antlaşması'na Kadar Eflak-Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Rus Nüfuz Mücadelesi // Belleten Dergisi. 2019. Vol. 83. No. 297. Pp. 605-632.
107. Zeka S. İbret Gazetesi'nde Çıkan Yazılarında Namık Kemal'in Osmanlı Birliğine Duyduğu İnancının Sebepleri // Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi. 2017. Vol. 10. No. 48. Pp. 143-151.