L. SANCAK METU 2019

THE ISLAMISM OF ABDULHAMID AND ITS OPPOSITION IN THE LAST PERIOD OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

LÜTFULLAH SANCAK

SEPTEMBER 2019

THE ISLAMISM OF ABDULHAMID AND ITS OPPOSITION IN THE LAST PERIOD OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

LÜTFULLAH SANCAK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF MIDDLE EAST STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 2019

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name : Lütfullah Sancak

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE ISLAMISM OF ABDULHAMID AND ITS OPPOSITION IN THE LAST PERIOD OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Sancak, Lütfullah
M.S. Department of Middle East Studies
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Derya Göçer Akder

September 2019, 145 pages

Islamism is a concept that has occupied a central place in the political and intellectual life of the Muslim World since the 1860s. With different actors and varying methodologies and objectives, Islamism as a political movement has been practiced in various formations. This multiplicity has led to several conflicts among different Islamist actors. The conflict between Abdulhamid II and the Ottoman Islamist intellectuals is one of the central conflicts in Islamist political thought. Although both sides were Islamist, this commonality did not lead to cooperation among these actors. This thesis explores the commonalities and divergences between the Islamism of Abdulhamid and that of the intellectuals, through the examination of the regional and international conditions, actors, and discourse of each Islamist group. The last part of the thesis analyzes what changed in the context of Islamism from the time of the Ottoman Empire to the post-Ottoman Middle East.

Key words: Abdulhamid II, Islamism, pan-Islamism, Revivalism, Middle East,

ÖZ

OSMANLI SON DÖNEMİNDE ABDÜLHAMİD VE MUHALEFETİN İSLAMCILIĞI

Sancak, Lütfullah
Yüksek Lisans, Ortadoğu Araştırmaları
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Derya Göçer Akder

Eylül 2019, 145 sayfa

İslamcılık 1860'dan beri İslam dünyasının siyasi ve entelektüel yaşamının merkezinde olan bir kavramdır. Farklı aktörler ve değişen metotlarla İslamcılık, siyasi bir hareket olarak birçok farklı formatta karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Bu çeşitlilik farklı İslamcı aktörler arasında bazen çatışmaya da yol açmıştır. Abdülhamid ve Osmanlı son dönemi İslamcıları arasındaki halen önemini koruyan çatışma da buna bir örnektir. Her iki taraf İslamcı olsa da, kavramsal ortaklık pratikte ortak hareketi getirmemiştir. Bu tezde Abdülhamid'in İslamcılığı ile ona muhalif olan İslamcılar arasındaki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar ele alınacaktır. Bu konu bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlar, farklı aktörler ve söylemler alt başlıklarında incelenecektir. Tezin son kısmında ise Osmanlı son döneminden çağdaş Ortadoğu'ya geçişte İslamcı hareketlerdeki değişim ve devamlılıklar incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: II. Abdülhamid, İslamcılık, İttihad-ı İslam, Ortadoğu, İhya Hareketleri

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii

ABSTRACT iv

ÖZ v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

CHAPTER

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Significance of the Topic 1

1.2. Research Question 2

1.3. Methodology 2

1.4. Thesis Plan 4

1.5. Literature Review 6

1.6. What is Islamism and who is an Islamist? 11

THE ISLAMISM OF INTELLECTUALS 18

2.1. International and Regional Context 18

2.1.1. Discussion of "Civilization" 22

2.2. Actors 27

2.2.1. The Young Ottomans 28

2.2.2. Revivalist Movements 32

2.2.3 Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani 37

2.2.4. Islamists of the Second Constitutional Period Gathered around the Journals of *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan,* and *Beyan'ül Hak* 42

2.3. The Discourse of Intellectual Islamism 46

2.4. Conclusion of the Second Chapter 54

HAMIDIAN STATE-CENTERED ISLAMISM (1876-1909) 57

3.1. International and Regional Context 57

3.1.1. The Rise of the Caliphate 57

3.1.2. The Effects of Hamidian Rule (1876-1909) on Intellectual Life 59

3.1.3. The Young Turks and the Emergence of the Constitutional Period 61

3.2. Actors 66

3.2.1. Abdulhamid II 67

3.2.2. Other Actors 75

3.3. Abdulhamid's Islamist Discourse 79

3.4. Conclusion of Chapter Three 82

WHAT CHANGED IN THE CONTEMPORARY MIDDLE EAST? 84

4.1. Regional and International Context 85

4.1.1. Turkey 86

4.1.2. The Arab World 91

4.1.3. Indian Muslims and the Khilafat Movement (1918-1924) 94

4.2. Actors 98

4.2.1. Muhammed Abduh (1849-1905) 98

4.2.2. Said Nursi (1877-1960) 102

4.2.3. Hasan El-Benna (1906-1949) 107

4.2.4. Sayyid Abu al-A'la Mawdudi (1903-1979) 110

4.3. The Discourse of Contemporary Islamists 114

4.4. Conclusion of the Fourth Chapter 119

CONCLUSION 120

REFERENCES 128

APPENDICES

A. TURKISH SUMMARY/ TÜRKÇE ÖZET 136

B. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM 145

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Significance of the Topic

In this thesis, I will analyze the relations between Abdulhamid II and different actors of Islamism in the last period of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, I will also look at Islamism after the removal of the caliphate in 1924, mainly in comparison with the previous period.

Islamism has been one of the most important ideologies in the Middle East of the last 150 years. From its emergence in the 1860s until the liberal environment of the Second Constitutional Revolution in 1908, it was the dominant ideology in the Ottoman Empire and it was directly adopted as the state ideology by Abdulhamid II (1876-1909). However, the preference for Islamism in the state apparatus and among intellectuals did not always bring cooperation among different Islamist actors; indeed, in the case of Abdulhamid and his contemporaries, there was strong confrontation, even hatred. This animosity reached such a level that it still antagonizes some of today's Islamist actors in Turkey, when some Islamists try to delegitimize Said Nursi, Mehmet Akif Ersoy, and many other Islamists due to their opposition to Abdulhamid. Furthermore, after the foundation of the Turkish Republic, both Abdulhamid and these intellectuals became very influential over some Islamist communities. While Abdulhamid became a symbol of Islamism, the intellectuals that were against the Hamidian regime became the ideologues of Islamism in the Republican period. However, the dynamics of such relations are unclear.

My main argument is that Islamism is a broad concept that covers a long period, a broad geography, and a long list of intellectuals with different, sometimes conflicting, motivations. Sometimes those who were accepted as Islamists did not fit the definition of Islamism, and sometimes even those who were important Islamist actors might not show Islamist characters in each of their action.

The denomination of those actors as Islamists is an *a posteriori* process. Therefore, the Islamism of those actors, the role of complementary ideological motivations, and the influence of social and political conditions on their preferences need to be examined.

On the other hand, many of the analyses of contemporary Islamist movements trace the emergence of Islamist movements to the 1920s. Although there is a great rupture in Islamism from the Ottoman Empire to the contemporary Middle East, this rupture does not make these two periods incomparable. As mentioned above, Islamists of the Ottoman time are still influential on today's Islamist movements. Therefore, analyzing the changes and continuities of the Islamist movements in terms of the dynamics of the Ottoman period, is crucial in order to better understand the evolution of Islamism in the contemporary Middle East.

1.2. Research Question

In this thesis I will answer the questions: Who were the Islamist actors in the Ottoman period and what were the commonalities and divergences between the Islamism of those actors and Abdulhamid? What changed in the contemporary Middle East in the context of Islamism?

1.3. Methodology

This thesis is designed as a qualitative research, and it is evaluated in an interpretivist approach. Scholars approach the topic with their own definitions of terms, and include different names and groups under the heading of Islamism in accordance with their definitions. Therefore, before passing to the main body of the thesis, I will start with a theoretical evaluation of Islamism and create definitions that will be used in the whole work. Secondly, the intellectuals and Abdülhamid will be analyzed in the context of regional and international conditions, the different actors of each group, and their discourses. Thirdly, since there is a broad secondary literature on each issue under discussion in this thesis, it deals mostly with secondary sources on Islamism written in Turkish and English. Evaluation of the primary sources will

be limited. Throughout the thesis, I will use journal articles, academic books, biographic studies of the Islamists, and encyclopedia articles.

In this thesis, I will try to create a map of Islamism in a period that covers one hundred years from the emergence of Islamism as a modern phenomenon in 1860s until the 1950s, which is the period in which most of the Islamist actors of today emerged. While creating this map I will clarify several points concerning Islamism.

First of all, there are several studies on the relations between Ottoman intellectuals and Abdulhamid. These studies have mostly examined this relation in the context of the demand of oppositional intellectuals for the constitution and the assembly. Furthermore, there are also studies focusing directly on the relations between Islamist intellectuals and Abdulhamid. However, these works only include the Islamists of the Second Constitutional Period. In this thesis these Islamists will be taken as only one group among many others, such as Revivalists and non-Ottoman Islamists. In other words, the evaluation of this group alone cannot give us the general attitude of Islamist intellectuals. In addition, since these Islamists' motivations were not different from other intellectuals of the time, these studies give general information about the general intellectual trend in the Ottoman Empire. Existing studies on the relations of Ottoman intellectuals with Abdulhamid did not give adequate explanation about many other aspects of the relations, specifically with the Islamist intellectuals.

Secondly, while examining the Islamism of the Ottoman Empire, the problem of the literature is the inclusion of many conflicting actors under the umbrella of the same concept. However, until the end of the empire Islam played a central role in the state apparatus and the society, so ignoring this role of Islam in Ottoman politics and intellectual life leads to anachronism in the literature. Any actor that demonstrated some aspects of Islamism is labeled an Islamist. However, although a secular understanding started to emerge from the beginning of the Tanzimat period, the ethos of that time showed Islamist characters. Therefore, I will look at the differences among the so-called Islamist actors and reveal the role that they played in the context of Islamism.

The third point that our approach would serve is to provide a connection about the distinct Islamist actors of today**.** Today's Islamist actors are distinguished by the

regional and international differences which is not the case for the first Islamist formations. I am well aware of the differences among Islamist groups in today's Muslim World, but not of the connections among them. When I analyze the changes and continuities from the empire to the contemporary Middle East, I will show the origins of different actors and also one dimension of the similarities of today's distinct Islamist actors.

Furthermore, there is also a deep rupture in the literature of Islamism stemming from conceptual differences. Until the beginning of the twentieth century, the concepts of *Ittihad-ı Islam* in Turkish literature and pan-Islamism were used to denominate Islamism. Concerning contemporary Islamism, new concepts like fundamentalism, political Islam, radical Islam, and moderate Islam have emerged and created their own literature. Although these concepts allow us to understand different parts of the broad concept of Islamism, they also prevent us from understanding the changes and continuities in the evolution of Islamism since the 1860s. For example, many studies concerning contemporary Islamism date its emergence to a series of events in the 1920s. However, as will be shown in this thesis, most of the Islamists of today, are parts of the same tradition. Therefore, through the creation of a map of Islamism, I will reveal the origins of the many Islamist movements of today and the similarities of seemingly distinct Islamist actors.

1.4. Thesis Plan

The first chapter of the thesis will be dedicated to the intellectual Islamism that corresponds to the period from the 1860s to the end of the empire. This period will be evaluated under three different titles: the regional and international context, the actors, and discourse. These three titles will be preserved in all of the subsequent chapters. Under the first title of the chapter I will depict the conditions that led to the emergence of Islamism, and discuss the concept of universal Western "civilization" which had an intense pressure on Islamists. In this chapter, although intellectual Islamism had many different groups and many of the members of a group are worth studying separately, because of the limitations of the thesis these actors will be evaluated under four groupings: Young Ottomans, Revivalists, Jamal ad-Din al-

Afghani, and Islamists of the Second Constitutional period. The reason for analyzing Afghani personally stems from his idiosyncratic attitude.

The second chapter will be dedicated to the evaluation of the Islamism of Abdulhamid. Since the regional and international context of Abdulhamid's Islamism was not so different from the context of the intellectuals, it will suffice to mention the specific points of Abdulhamid's position. The actors of Abdulhamid's Islamism, in addition to his personality, relied on the post of the caliphate and the sultanate, the Muslim masses inside and outside of the Empire, pro-state *ulema* and intellectuals.

The third chapter of the thesis analyzes what changed in the modern Middle East in the context of Islamism. Since after World War I and the abolition of the caliphate the Islamic World lost its seeming unity, in the first part of the third chapter different parts of the Islamic World will be evaluated. Turkey, the Arab World, and the Indian subcontinent are assessed separately. Parallel to that, four Islamist actors are evaluated in this chapter: Muhammed Abduh (1849-1905) and Hasan El-Benna (1906-1949) from the Arab world, Said Nursi (1878-1960) from Turkey, and Sayyid Abu al-A'la Mawdudi (1903-1979) from India. Beside their regional distribution, each of these Islamists had specific ideas in terms of Islamism. Although Abduh was the contemporary of the Ottoman intellectuals, because of his role in the transition to the contemporary Middle East and his effect on the methodologies of the post-Ottoman Islamists, I will consider him in this part. Benna and Mawdudi are the two most important Islamists of the two most important regions of the Islamic World. They are also seen by several scholars as the beginning of modern Islamism. Finally, Said Nursi is the most effective Islamist of Turkey, as most Islamists either reconciled with the Kemalist regime or had to leave the country. His position and methodology in this period and his place in the Revivalist tradition made him essential to be examined. In general, while choosing these names, their position in the transition from the Ottoman time to the modern era will also be considered. Therefore, the two other important actors, Shi'a and Wahhabi Islamism, will not be considered as much as these four actors. In terms of discourse, in addition to an overall evaluation, the main concentration will be on the "Salafi" discourse, which is the dominant discourse of twentieth century Islamism.

1.5. Literature Review

During the early period of the Turkish Republic, since the mental concentration of the state was on the formation of a new nation and there was strict state ideology, academic circles abstained from discussing Islamism. However, in English and French literature it has been studied continuously.[1] In Turkish literature, the first series of qualified academic works can be seen in the 1960s with *İslamcılık Cereyanı*[2] (the Movement of Islamism) by Tarık Zafer Tunaya, and, although they are not directly focused on Islamism, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (History of Contemporary Thought in Turkey) by Hilmi Ziya Ülken[3] and *the Development of Secularism in Turkey* by Niyazi Berkes[4] both reserve an important part for Islamism.

However, as the scholars of the 1980s also criticized, in some of the works of the previous period, the effect of the state ideology is highly visible. To demonstrate this, Ismail Kara, in the preface of the published version of his Ph.D. thesis, criticizes the usage of the term *"irtica"* (reactionism) for the 31 March Incident[5] in an academic work, and claims that such an evaluation inhibits to understand different dimensions of the "Incident" in the context of Islamism. Kara sees the usage of this word as an

---

[1] Dwight E Lee, "The Origins of Pan-Islamism," *The American Historical Review* 47, no. 2 (Jan., 1942): 278-287; Nikki Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism," *The Journal of Modern History* 41, no. 1 (Mar., 1969): 17-28; Rahman, *Islam & Modernity.*

[2] Tunaya, *İslamcılık Cereyanı.*

[3] Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*.

[4] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism.*

[5] 31 March Incident was an "insurrection against the domination of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) that resulted in deposition of Abdulhamid II." Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire* (Lanham, Maryland, and Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2003), 244.

ideological concept more than an academic term.[6] Even though Kara does not mention a name, through a review of the literature it is clear that Tarık Zafer Tunaya is the addressee of this critic. In the preface of his *Islamcılık Cereyanı*, Tunaya glorifies the Turkish revolution, and in the introduction, he pejoratively uses the term "*irtica*" when referring to the 31 March Incident.[7]

The 1980s were the turning point for literature on Islamism. Starting in 1990, a series of Ph.D. theses were defended in qualified universities, and today these theses constitute a significant part of the literature on Islamism. The set of Ph.D. theses which also form the major part of our research that were defended in the 1990s chronologically starts with Mümtaz'er Türköne's *İslamcılığın Doğuşu* (The Genesis of Islamism) with the question of "when, where, by whom, and with which intentions Islam is transformed into a mass ideology." He comes to the conclusion that "Islam is transformed into an ideology between 1867-1873 by a group of Ottoman intellectuals to oppose the challenge of the modern world."[8] The second thesis is Azmi Özcan's *Indian Muslims and the Ottomans (1877-1914): A Study of Indo-Muslim Attitudes to Pan-Islamism and Turkey*, which is a reference book for the international dimension of the Islamism and pan-Islamism of Abdulhamid II.[9] The third thesis is Cezmi Eraslan' *II. Abdulhamid ve İslam Birliği*[10] (*Abdulhamid II and Pan-Islamism*) which evaluates the Islamism of Abdulhamid on different levels. The fourth thesis is İsmail Kara's *İslamcılara Göre Meşrutiyet İdaresi 1908-1914*[11] (*The Rule of the*

---

[6] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I*, 7.

[7] Tunaya, *İslamcılık Cereyanı,* VII and 3.

[8] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 13.

[9] Özcan, *Pan-İslamism.*

[10] Cezmi Eraslan, *II. Abdulhamid ve İslam Birliği* (İstanbul: Ötüken, 1992).

[11] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I.*

Constitutional Monarchy According to Islamists, 1908-1914), which concentrates on the political views of the Islamists and also their relations with other power groups.

Beside these theses, the 1980s and 1990s was a fertile period for the study of Islamism, and the Islamism of Abdulhamid II. Firstly, Ismail Kara's *Türkiye'de Islamcılık Düşüncesi I*,[12] first published in 1986 with a second edition[13] first published in 1987, is an anthological work focusing on the writings of the Islamists of the late Ottoman period, especially on political issues. Secondly, Jacob Landau's *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization* published in 1990 covers the period from the Hamidian era to the end of the 1980s.[14] Besides these works, there are also studies concentrating on the Islamism of the intellectuals, journalists, and bureaucrats. Şerif Mardin's *Religion and Social Change in Modern Turkey: The Case of Bediuzzaman Said Nursi,* first published in 1989, is a sociological and historical analysis of the conditions of the environment that Said Nursi raised. In this work, he also evaluates the role of the *tarikat*s, especially the Revivalist *Nakshibendis,* in society at that time, and shows the link between Islamism and traditional Islam.[15]

In the 2000s, new works were added to the literature. *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State* by Kemal Karpat concentrates "on the social, cultural, and political modernization and ethnic transformation of the Ottoman state, and the role of Islam and Sultan Abdulhamid II."[16] Like Şerif Mardin, Kemal Karpat concentrates on the role of the revivalists. *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought* by Cemil Aydın, is a comparative study that

---

[12] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I.*

[13] İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi II* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2017).

[14] Jacob M. Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

[15] Şerif Mardin, *Bediüzzaman Said Nursi Olayı Modern Türkiye'de Din ve Toplumsal Değişim* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002).

[16] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam.*

brought a new perspective to the study of Islamism, especially pan-Islamism, through concentrating on the reactionary dimension of Islamism and its commonality with other Pan-Asiatic reactions to imperialism.[17]

In the evaluation of the transition period from the Ottoman Empire to the contemporary Middle East, the articles of Nikki Keddie[18] are crucial. Especially in "Pan-Islam as Proto-nationalism," she analyzes the connections between the ideology of Islamism and nationalism, which are the dominant ideologies in the contemporary Middle East. Mehdi Mozaffari's article "What is Islamism? History and Definition of a Concept,"[19] provides the broadest chronological evaluation of Islamism that I have encountered. Even though it concentrates on the Arab intellectuals, Albert Hourani's *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age: 1798-1939*[20] provides beneficial information on Islamism especially before the 1920s. In addition to these works, the articles of the TDV Encyclopedia [21] about different actors and concepts provide compact information prepared by qualified experts on related topics such as Azmi Özcan's article on "*Islamcılık,*" (Islamism), Mehmet Ali Büyükara's "*Vehhâbîlik*" (Wahhabism), and Sait Özervarlı's "Muhammed Abduh."

In the last ten years, Islamism has continued to be academically studied. In addition to his book *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia* published in the 2000s,

---

[17] Cemil Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought (*New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).

[18] Nikki R. Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism," *The Journal of Modern History* 41, no. 1 (Mar., 1969) 17-28; Nikki R. Keddie, "Intellectuals in the Modern Middle East: A Brief Historical Consideration," *Daedalus* 101, no. 3, Intellectuals and Change (Summer, 1972): 39-57; Nikki R. Keddie, "The Revolt of Islam, 1700 to 1993: Comparative Considerations and Relations to Imperialism," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 36, no. 3 (Jul., 1994): 463-487.

[19] Mehdi Mozaffari "What is Islamism? History and Definition of a Concept"

[20] Albert Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age: 1798-1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[21] Mehmet Ali Büyükkara, "Vehhâbîlik," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol. 42 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2012); M. Sait Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol. 30 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2005); Özcan, "İslamcılık."

Cemil Aydın's recent articles and book chapters[22] constitute an important place in the literature. Contrary to the other studies, he analyzes Islamism in a broader regional and historical context with a comparative methodology. Mehmet Ali Büyükkara's *Çağdaş İslami Akımlar* (*Contemporary Islamic Movements*) can be regarded as the second important study.[23] In this book, Büyükkara examines modern Islamist movements from the 1860s onwards when Islamism emerged as a modern phenomenon. The last crucial work about Islamism in the last period of the Ottoman Empire is *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi ve Hareketleri* (*Islamist Thought and Movements in Turkey*) which is the compilation of the symposium notes organized in May 2013 by the Zeytinburnu Municipality in which many important scholars who worked on Islamism like İsmail Kara, Cemil Aydın, and Mümtazer Türköne had participated.[24]

Although there are also theses on Islamism and the Islamism of Abdulhamid defended in reputable world-class universities, they do little to advance the literature. The thesis of Rashed Chowdhury titled *Pan-Islamism and Modernization During the Reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II, 1876-1909*[25] is a weak thesis that is not much more than a summary of the literature on Islamism in English. Hatice Yentürk's thesis titled *Ittihad-ı Islam and its Conceptual History with a Particular Focus on the Young Turk Press before 1908*[26] is also no more than an ordinary summary of the literature on

---

[22] Cemil Aydın, "Imperial Paradoxes: A Caliphate for Subaltern Muslims," *Reorient*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Spring 2016): 171-191; Cemil Aydın, "Globalizing the Intellectual History of the Idea of the "Muslim World," in *Global Intellectual History,* ed. Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013); Cemil Aydın, "The Emergence of Transnational Muslim Thought, 1774–1914," in *Arabic Thought Beyond the Liberal Age: Towards and Intellectual History of the Nahda*, ed. Jens Hanssen and Max Weiss (Cambridge: Cambridge Universtiy Press, 2016.)

[23] Mehmet Ali Büyükkara, *Çağdaş İslami Akımlar* (İstanbul: Klasik, 2015).

[24] İsmail Kara, and Asım Öz, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi ve Hareketi: Sempozyum Tebliğleri,* (İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2013).

[25] Rashed Chowdhury, "Pan-Islamism and Modernization During the Reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II, 1876-1909" (Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 2011).

Islamism and Abdulhamid II. However, Akın Kiren's thesis on Ottoman-Iranian relations in the context of pan-Islamism is a good thesis that fills a gap in the literature.[27]

The pan-Islamism of Abdulhamid, the genesis of Islamism, and the ideas of Islamists in general and in the biographical level, are frequently studied topics in the literature. Relations between Abdulhamid and the intellectuals are mostly analyzed in a broader format, in the context of the Young Turks. However, although Islamists were acting together with the Young Turks, since the Young Turks cannot be denominated as Islamist, these studies do not clarify the role of Islamism in the conflict.

On the other hand, these studies analyze only some of the Islamist actors, many of which seem to be disregarded especially while analyzing the Islamists' relations with Abdulhamid. However, almost every Islamist actor had a connection with Abdulhamid on some level. Therefore, not to be restricted to the evaluation of Islamists who were among the Young Turks, the conflict of Abdulhamid with Islamist intellectuals should be considered separately and these actors should be included in the analyses of it.

Finally, I start to the evaluation of the topics by looking at what is Islamism and who is an Islamist.

1.6. What is Islamism and who is an Islamist?

According to Ismail Kara, Islamism in its broader format is

> a movement that covers all the political, intellectual, and scientific studies, research, suggestions, and solutions which has predominantly activist, modernist, and eclectic features; which aims to re-make Islam holistically (belief, prayer, morality, philosophy, politics, law, education) dominant, through a rational methodology to save the Muslims and the Islamic world

---

[26] Hatice Yentürk, "*Ittihad-ı Islam* and its Conceptual History with a Special Focus on the Young Turk Press Before 1908" (Ph.D. diss., Wien University, 2016).

[27] Akın Kiren, "II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Pan-Islamist Uygulamaları Ekseninde Osmanlı-İran İlişkiler" (Ph.D. diss., İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2013).

> from western exploitation, tyrannical and despotic rulers, captivity, superstition, mimesis… to civilize, unify, and develop the Muslim World.[28]

In a more straightforward definition by Şerif Mardin, though as large as Kara's definition, Islamism is "the name of the construction of a conscious movement toward the end of the nineteenth century, from the social movement that emerged before, of aspiration and searching in the Muslim societies."[29] As it is seen from the definitions by Ismail Kara and Şerif Mardin, two prominent scholars on Islamism, Islamism is a Pandora's Box that may contain hundreds of variables in different levels of analysis. Actors, activities, and the discourse of Islamism vary according to the perspective that the researcher is approaching. In this thesis, I will use the concept of Islamism in this broadest sense.

Islamism is an umbrella concept that includes pan-Islamism, *Ittihad-ı Islam* (Union of Muslims), Revivalism, Muslim modernism, and Islamization (*islamlaşmak*). It is important to note that although these concepts have been used in different levels of Islamism, there are no clear lines between them, and they are mostly used interchangeably in the literature. According to Azmi Özcan, in the Ottoman context Islamism was first used in 1913 by Ziya Gökalp in an article titled *"Üç Cereyan"* (Three Movements). In 1914, the prominent Islamist Babanzade Ahmed Naim disapprovingly uses this concept in his famous essay *"İslam'da Dava-yı Kavmiyet"* (The Ideal of Nationalism in Islam).[30]

"Islamism" is an *a posteriori* denomination of scholars. Islamists do not refer to themselves as Islamists. In his article about the history of the concept, Mehdi Mozaffari states that the term *Islamiyyun* (the Arabic version of Islamist) was not used by any of the Islamists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such as Afghani (1838-1897), Abduh (1849-1905), Rashid Rıza (1865-1935), Hasan al-Banna (1906-1948), Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966), Mawdudi (1903-1979), or Khomeini (1902-1989).

---

[28] İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2017), 17.

[29] Şerif Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017), 23.

[30] Azmi Özcan, "İslamcılık," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol.23 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2001), 63.

Instead, the Quranic denomination, Muslim, is preferred.[31] In the beginning of the twentieth century, *Islamlaşmak* (Islamization) was also used to refer to the Islamists' attempts.[32] Islamism was used in French and English in the previous centuries by Voltaire, Tocqueville, and Renan, but these usages referred to Islam, not to a separate ideology.[33]

In the 1860s and 1870s *Ittihad-ı Islam* and pan-Islamism were the concepts that corresponded to Islamism. According to Mümtaz'er Türköne, although pan-Islamism conceptually emerged later in the foreign literature, since there are references to other "pan" movements in Turkish articles about *Ittihad-ı Islam*, *Ittihad-ı Islam* can be taken as the Turkish version of pan-Islamism.[34] According to Karpat, Islamism refers to the internal, while pan-Islamism and *Ittihad-ı Islam* refer to the international dimension of the same movement.[35] The last point about the nature of the concept that may lead to confusion is whether Islamism is an ideology or a movement. However, there is no separation in the literature, and they are used interchangeably.

Another important point is the difference between Islam and Islamism. Islamism emerges in the form of an ideological version of Islam as a result of the combination of the Western ideological mentality and traditional Islamic values.[36] Islamism is a "European-type movement of liberation and change" that emerged out

---

[31] Mehdi Mozaffari, "What is Islamism? History and Definition of a Concept," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 8, no. 1 (March 2007): 19.

[32] Ziya Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, Islamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Ankara: Akçağ, 2010).; Said Halim Paşa, "İslamlaşmak." *Buhranlarımız ve Son Eserleri* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012).

[33] Mozaffari, "What is Islamism?" 17-18.

[34] Mümtaz'er Türköne, *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994), 197-198.

[35] Kemal Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State (*New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 18.

[36] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 25.

of Islam.[37] While Islam considered other religions as rivals, Islamism considered the nineteenth century schools of philosophy, such as positivism, as rivals rather than other religions.[38] Different from traditional Islam, the legitimization or justification process of Islamism is bound to rationality and the new paradigms of the contemporary world. In Islamism, otherworldly affairs retreated into the background and religion became gradually more secular.[39] Furthermore, the topics of the long-lasting discussions of traditional Islam were no longer on the agenda of Islamism, which instead dealt with the questions that were mostly posed by Orientalists.[40] Finally, in the context of the Ottoman Empire, Islamism was an ideology among other ideologies such as Ottomanism, nationalism, and Westernism, and was not perceived as a religion among others.

Islamism began to gain strength at the end of the 1860s. There are different claims about who used the concept first. According to Mümtaz'er Türköne, it was first used by Namık Kemal in an article in *Hürriyet* published in 1869.[41] According to Şerif Mardin, it was first used in Ziya Paşa's article in *Hürriyet* published in 1868, in which he does not use the term *"Ittihad-ı İslam"* but mentions the importance of the unity of Muslims.[42] It is essential to notice that both of these articles were published while the Young Ottomans were in London. After 1872 Islamism began to be widely

---

[37] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 18.

[38] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 28-29.

[39] Ibid., 26-27.

[40] İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2017), 17 and 21.

[41] Azmi Özcan, *Pan-İslamism: Osmanlı Devleti, Hindistan Müslümanları ve İngiltere (1877-1914)* (İstanbul: TDV İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi Yayınları, 1992), 50; Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 199.

[42] Şerif Mardin, *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1998), 72.

discussed among Ottoman intellectuals,[43] which is why some scholars accept 1872 as the date of the emergence of Islamism.[44]

On the other hand, Fazlur Rahman regards the Indian intellectual Sayyid Ahmed Khan as the earliest Islamist, and he states that Ahmed Khan's Islamism starts after his brief stay in London in 1860s, which corresponds to the date that the Young Ottomans were in London.[45] Although I could not find information about who is the pioneer of Islamism, the role of Sayyid Ahmed Khan seems more accurate. It is possible that under the conditions following the 1857 Rebellion in India, Sayyid Ahmed Khan realized the necessity of a change before the Young Ottomans. According to Azmi Özcan, after 1857 Indian Muslims were "pessimist as much as not to be able to adapt to new conditions, offended as much as not to make an objective evaluation, and returned to the past in a level that prevents them from making a plan for the future."[46] These are the same conditions that are depicted as valid for the emergence of the Ottoman Islamism, which will be evaluated later.

In addition to this reasoning, according to Hayreddin Karaman,[47] Afghani had Islamist sentiments before leaving India in 1869. Contrary to the claims of Mümtaz'er Türköne that Afghani took his Islamist ideas from the Young Ottomans when he came to Istanbul in 1869,[48] Islamist/ Pan-Islamist sentiments already existed among Indian Muslims. As will be mentioned later, while the emergence of Islamism was one of the consequences of the *Islahat* Edict (1856) especially in 1860s, during the Great Indian

---

[43] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism*, 42; Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 18; Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 199.

[44] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 18.

[45] Fazlur Rahman, *Islam & Modernity* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982), 50.

[46] Özcan, *Pan-İslamism*, 29.

[47] Hayreddin Karaman, "Efgânî, Cemâleddin," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol.10 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994).

[48] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 36.

Revolution the Revivalist movement had already united the Muslim population in India. However, in terms of the emergence of the concept, it is hard to do more than speculate about who the pioneer of Islamism was and who affected whom. What is certain is that Islamism gained strength in the 1860s, making this period widely seen as the period of the genesis of Islamism.

After being adopted as the state ideology by Abdulhamid (1876-1909), Islamism entered into its second phase in which state-centered Islamism prevailed over the intellectual one. With the power adopted from the recognition of the role of the caliphate over all Muslims by the constitution of *Kanun-ı Esasi* (1876), Abdulhamid II applied the principles of Islamism internally and externally.[49]

The third phase of Islamism started with the Second Constitutional Revolution in 1908. For some scholars like Ismail Kara, we can speak of Islamism from this time onward. According to Ismail Kara, Islamism began to show characteristics of being an intellectual movement after 1908.[50] Although conceptually Islamism emerged at the end of the 1860s, there was no strict theory of Islamism or Turkism during the Tanzimat period.[51] During Abdulhamid's despotic period, intellectuals were compelled to relinquish politics and inclined to non-political, cultural, and philosophical questions that led to the creation of the Islamist theory and the formation of an intellectual movement.[52] This intellectual contemplation on non-political issues is also the reason for the discussion of whether the Young Ottomans (especially Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa) can be taken as Islamist or not. The final point about periodization is that we cannot identify strict ruptures between these phases. They were the consequences of different social and political conditions, and therefore while analyzing these periods I will surpass these lines.

---

[49] Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), 268.

[50] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 29; Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *İslamcılık Cereyanı: İkinci Meşrutiyetin Siyasi Hayatı Boyunca Gelişmesi ve Bugüne Bıraktığı Meseleler* (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1962), 19.

[51] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2017), 70.

[52] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 289.

The last point is about who these Islamists were. Although Islamism is seen as an ideology, it does not completely fit into the scope of a modern ideology. Its boundaries and principles were not determined, soit is hard to identify who was an Islamist and who was not.[53] On the other hand, as mentioned in the previous paragraphs, Islamism can be evaluated under three periods: the period lasting until the reign of Abdulhamid II (1876-1909), the period during his reign, and the period after the Second Constitutional Revolution. In each period the social, political, and intellectual conditions changed. Moreover, the backgrounds of the people who were seen as Islamists changed. While the early Islamists were bureaucrats and journalists, the Islamists of the Second Constitutional era were mostly from the *ulema* class.[54]

Another point is that the Islamists of the earlier period, such as Namık Kemal and Ali Suavi, as well as being the pioneers of Islamists, were also the precursors of nationalists, Westernists, and even the secularists and laicists.[55] This is a crucial point to be aware of because it may lead to confusion while evaluating the literature. However, although the labeling of an intellectual as Islamist depends to a large degree on the definition and the periodization of the scholar, in its general form these names can be mentioned: Namık Kemal (1840-1888), Afghani (1839-1897), Sayyid Ahmed Khan (1817-1898), Emir Ali (1849-1928), Şehberderzade Ahmed Hilmi (1865-1914), Said Halim Paşa (1865-1921), Mehmet Akif Ersoy (1873-1936), Mustafa Sabri (1869-1954), Said Nursi (1877-1960) and other intellectuals who gathered around the journals of *Sebiür-reşat, Sırat-ı Müstakim, Volkan, Beyan'ul-hak,* and *Islam Mecmuası.*

---

[53] Özcan, "İslamcılık."

[54] Ibid., 62.

[55] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I,* 24; Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 94.

CHAPTER 2

THE ISLAMISM OF INTELLECTUALS

The focus of this chapter is on the Islamism of intellectuals of the late Ottoman period. Although there are changing connotations around the definition of intellectual, I will take the definition of "intellectual" in its broadest form, as any "person whose life or work centers around the study or use of ideas, such as in teaching or writing."[56] Therefore, I will include journalists, *ulemas*, or state elites who had ideas about Islamism in our analysis.

In this chapter, our primary concern is to show the attitudes of different Islamist actors toward Abdulhamid. In order to show the background of these motivations I will surpass the chronological limitation of the Hamidian Period. In this chapter I will look at the regional and international conditions that led to the emergence of Islamism. In this part I will look at four different Islamist actors/groups: the Young Ottomans including Namık Kemal, Ziya Paşa, and Ali Suavi; the Revivalist movements which are also known as Mujaddidi Nakshibendi; Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani; and the Islamists of the Second Constitutional period. Although many of the intellectuals in these groups are worth analyzing individually, because of the limitations of the thesis I will analyze them under these groups, especially in terms of their attitude toward Abdulhamid.

2.1. International and Regional Context

In its history, Islam has encountered several crises and was able to overcome them. Firstly, during the Abbasids State (750-1258), the crisis resulted from the first

[56] Cambridge Dictionary, "Intellectual," accessed June 18, 2019, https://dictionary.cambridge.org/tr/s%C3%B6zl%C3%BCk/ingilizce/intellectual

encounter of the Islamic World with Greek philosophy, but the power of the belief system and political will prevented this crisis from expanding. Secondly, there was the political threat during the Mongol invasions in the 13th century. However, while the political institutions collapsed, the crisis was avoided owing to the power of the intellectual and cultural base. However, in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, the Islamic world and especially the Ottoman Empire experienced a total downfall of faith, mentality, and politics as a result of different internal and external dynamics.[57]

The first external factor was the foundation of a new international system and its effects on the structure of the Ottoman State. After the Congress of Vienna (1815), a new global order was founded which sought the protection of the "balance of power" dynamic. For the Ottoman Empire, to face the challenges of the time, especially from Russia and Europe, there was no other option except to be part of this balance.[58] The attempts to be a part of the concert of Europe brought a series of reforms, mostly demanded by the foreign powers as an assurance, especially on the issue of minorities. Therefore, the Tanzimat (1839) and Islahat (1856) edicts, which promised a single legal system for all subjects in the state ideology, became the two main pillars of the period. These reforms demonstrated a profound change in the state ideology, which created a duality in the state that would endure until the end of the empire between the "traditional centrality of Islam and the nondenominational ideological basis of the state."[59] These reforms emerged as a solution to a crisis, but the solution created a new crisis in internal and external affairs.[60]

The second factor related to the position of the non-Muslim communities that began to receive support from foreign powers in their internal affairs with the Ottoman

---

[57] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I*, 20.

[58] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 23-28.

[59] M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (New Jersey and Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press, 2008), 73-74.

[60] Carter Vaughn Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity: A History, 1789-2007* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2010), 78.

center from the early nineteenth century. In the minority issue, 1856 held an important place because of the events that were triggered by the Crimean War (1853-56) in the region and the international arena. Using the dispute over the representation of the Orthodox in Jerusalem, which led to the Crimean War, European powers demanded further reforms to the status of Christian subjects. This led to the declaration of the Islahat Edict with the direct intervention of the foreign powers. However, almost no-one was content with the edict, including non-Muslims.[61] Firstly, the edict eliminated the official superior status of Muslims, which was the last motivation of the Muslims toward the unequal physical conditions among the Ottoman subjects.[62] Moreover, Christian citizens not only gained equal rights with the Muslims, but they were also allowed to keep their existing rights from the previous system, such as exemption from military conscription.[63] Secondly, several articles of the edict created discontent among some non-Muslim groups. For instance, the Greeks declared that they accepted the superiority of Muslims but did not accept their equality with the Armenians and the Jews.[64] The third disaffected group was some of the bureaucrats and soldiers, who started to criticize the *Bab-ı Ali* in its relations with foreign powers.[65]

In the 1860s a series of events concerning minorities caused conditions for the Ottoman Empire to deteriorate and gave pretexts for further interventions by foreign powers in internal affairs. In addition to the external pressure on the *Bab-ı Ali* for the implementation of the *Islahat* Edict, growing trade relations with the Europeans, increasing missionary activities in Ottoman territory, and strengthening national and

---

[61] Ufuk Gülsoy, "Islahat Fermanı," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol.19 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1999), 185.

[62] Eraslan, *II. Abdulhamid ve İslam Birliği,* 37.

[63] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 38.

[64] Gülsoy, "Islahat Fermanı," 188.

[65] Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought* (USA: Syracuse University Press, 2000), 18.

political consciousness among the non-Muslim population created demands for further rights. Consequently, they revolted to obtain further rights in the 1860s.[66]

An additional reason for the revolts of the minorities in the Balkans is the factor of Russia. After the defeat of the Crimean War the Russians turned to pan-Slavic propaganda in the Balkans. Furthermore, since it had been stopped on the Ottoman border, Russia directed its expansionist policy toward the Central Asian Khanates.[67] Consequently, the 1860s and especially the 1870s are the period of recurrent revolts in the Balkans. As a result of these revolts, a famine occurred in Anatolia (1873-1875), causing Istanbul to be flooded with Muslim refugees while the state became financially bankrupt (1875-1881).[68] The effects of Russia's expansion into Central Asia will be evaluated later.

During the 1870s, the balance of power in the international arena that had been founded after the Congress of Vienna started to break down. After their respective unifications, Germany and Italy had joined in the rivalry. After that time, the British policies in favor of the Ottoman Empire during the Tanzimat period began to change. For this reason, the Ottoman Empire lost the protection over its territorial integrity and state sovereignty that was guaranteed by the balance of power. The first result of this vulnerability was seen in the Russian aggression toward the empire during the 1870s, which resulted in the traumatic Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, which led to Russian annexation or independence of the majority of Ottoman territory in Europe.[69] However, the change in the international arena was not only the Ottoman Empire's vulnerability to the Russian political and military expansion. The period from the 1880s to the 1890s saw the peak of the Great Powers' expansionist policies.[70]

---

[66] Ibid., 14.

[67] Eraslan, *II. Abdulhamid ve İslam Birliği,* 39.

[68] Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity,* 83.

[69] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 40.

[70] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 44.

In addition to the loss of the Russo-Turkish War, Tunisia was occupied by France in 1881 and Egypt by Britain in 1882, which were crucial events for the spread of Islamism.[71]

2.1.1. Discussion of "Civilization"

In addition to the political and social developments, there was also an intellectual background to the "balance of power" and its reflections on the Ottoman Empire. The concept of civilization constituted the central part of intellectual discussions from the Tanzimat Period to the beginning of the twentieth century. Moreover, Islamism as an alternative ideology emerged while the principles of Western civilization dominated the minds of intellectuals. Therefore, understanding what changed in the nature of the intellectuals, where Islamism stood in this intellectual environment, and what the attitudes of the Islamist actors toward these principles were would provide us with a broader perspective while analyzing the Islamism of intellectuals.

The concept of "civilization" symbolized the moral basis of the balance of powers after 1815, and it was the main framework of Ottoman intellectual life. The first reactions of the Tanzimat elites to the power politics of the Ottoman Empire, which was to be part of the "Concert of Europe," and to the intellectual discussions about "civilization," which was the moral base of the balance, appeared in the form of radicalization and the universalization of the concept of civilization.[72] In this environment, the West without any reference to the Christianity began to be perceived in universal form which provided the only model of reforms not only to the military but also to politics, the economy, culture, and society for the future of the Ottoman Empire. For the Muslim reformers, since the values, institutions, and international

---

[71] Nikki R Keddie, "The Pan-Islamic Appeal: Afghani and Abdülhamid II," *Middle Eastern Studies* 3, no. 1 (Oct., 1966): 48.

[72] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 40.

norms of the new system were perceived as universal and not specific to Christianity, the Christianity of the West did not pose a problem.[73]

In the 1860s, the Muslim population started to interpret the demand for the reforms of the Western powers as an act in favor of the Christian community. Muslims began to ask why, if the demanded reforms in the *Islahat* Edict were universal, the Muslims who lived under the rulership of the Great Powers in Central Asia and India did not benefit from the same rights.[74] However, this was a reaction from the lower classes of the Muslim world. As it will be analyzed later, most of the Muslim intellectuals who lived in the Ottoman Empire continued to believe in the universality of Western civilization until the 1880s. However, in the 1860s, they devised an alternative methodology to gain the support of the general population for their vision of reform.[75]

In the 1880s, the discourse on the universality of civilization turned into the "uncivility" and inferiority of the Muslims. The Prime Minister of England William Gladstone's (1809-1898) constant remarks about the incivility of the Ottoman Muslim elites created friction with the attempts of Ottoman diplomats to be in close relations with the leaders of the Concert of Europe, such as Metternich and Palmerston, to attain universal principles of civilization. Contrary to the universality of the principles of the Western civilization, according to Gladstone "the success rate of non-Western reforms, non-Christian and non-white nations would never perfectly fulfill all the required standards of civilization because of defects in their racial makeup, religious dogmatism, or cultural character."[76]

There was also the claim of a French intellectual, Ernest Renan (1823-1892), from a speech made at the Sorbonne in 1883. In addition to Gladstone's claims of Islam's religious dogmatism, he defined Islam as "the biggest obstacle to the process

---

[73] Ibid., 23-28.

[74] Ibid., 28.

[75] Ibid., 47.

[76] Ibid., 45.

of science in Muslim Societies." With reasoning based on the Aryan race theory, he positioned Muslim backwardness as a more profound incompatibility.[77] Both Gladstone's and Renan's statements about the role of Islam in impeding progress created a sentiment among the Muslim intellectuals of being ostracized. The change in Western discourse, especially Renan's statements, created a strong reaction among the intellectuals of the Muslim World. Inevitably, the universality of the civilizational discourse started to be questioned among Muslim intellectuals. The new attitude of the West was seen as discourse for the legitimization of increasing Western imperialism in the Muslim World.[78]

As a result of the exclusionary trend of the West toward Muslims, despite their respect for European civilization, almost all intellectuals of that time began to see international events as a global conflict between the Christian and Muslim worlds. They interpreted the conditions as "a dangerous encirclement of Muslim populations by an aggressive Christian West." However, the expansionist policies of the European powers continued to be evaluated in the framework of the discourse of civilization and interpreted as the violation of the standard of civilization.[79] Afterward, since the realization of universal Western civilization became impossible for Muslims, an alternative conception of Islamic civilization began to emerge.[80]

This civilizational discussion was not a baseless scrimmage that based on the prejudices of the Western intellectuals. Orientalists of the nineteenth century made in-depth research on the history, anthropology, linguistics, and theology of the Islamic world. In addition to their political and intellectual superiority, Islamists had to struggle with questions that were revealed by the Orientalists about Islam, such as the rationality of religion, the relationship of religion and state, the accuracy of the *Ayahs* and *Hadiths*, criticisms of the character of prophet Muhammed, and the impact of the

---

[77] Ibid., 51.

[78] Ibid., 51-52.

[79] Ibid., 63.

[80] Ibid., 56.

Romans, Byzantines, Persians, and Indians in the development of the Islamic tradition. Evaluations of these topics focused on the invalidation of the Islamic principles.[81] Unlike the struggles of the traditional *ulema* in the previous periods, Islamist intellectuals had to confront Western intellectuals in an environment that was shaped by their counterparts. The platform of the discussion, the methodology that was accepted, and the questions that were asked were determined by Western intellectuals. Consequently, the output of the Islamist intellectuals was highly dependent on the Orientalists.[82]

Additionally, the Orientalists were not the only actors standing in front of the Islamists. The arguments mentioned above were also accepted by some Ottoman Westernist intellectuals, especially among the Young Turks. The superiority of Western civilization had been defended seriously on different levels. Since almost all intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire were Westernists in some sense, Hilmi Ziya Ülken's classification of the Westerners under four categories eases our understanding of the divergent positions toward the West.

The first category was the Westerners of the Tanzimat period who wanted to implement the principles of the Western civilization in a way that did not contradict Ottoman-Islam traditions, and who intended to protect Ottoman unity. Their main method was the reform of education.[83] They legitimized their methodology with the reasoning that since the material superiority of the West had passed from the Muslims, there was no problem in adopting the principles that had already given form to Islamic civilization.[84] The second group, headed by Prens Sabahattin, saw the main problem of the state as the lack of producers and entrepreneurs with private investments. The third group was the positivist group that considered Westernization as the only option. They did not reject Islamic civilization but did not find it necessary to look at the East.

---

[81] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I*, 21

[82] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I*, 19.

[83] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş bankası, 2017), 287-290.

[84] Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), 296.

The last group was the radical Westerners headed by Abdullah Cevdet. They rejected everything that came from the East and the past. They opened for discussion topics that were considered radical for their time, such as women's rights, the modernization of the family, and the change of alphabet.[85] A statement by Abdullah Cevdet very well summarizes the mentality of this group: "there is no second civilization: civilization is the European civilization, we have to take it with its rose and thorn."[86] The views that this group advocated were highly influenced by the materialism of the rationalism and positivism of Western philosophy and later also constituted the dynamics of the secular Turkish state. Therefore, they created new threats from inside toward the Islamists that they had not seen before.[87]

The last point of the regional and international conditions of intellectual Islamism is the change in the characteristics of intellectual life in the last century. In the nineteenth century, the major questions that occupied the minds of Ottoman intellectuals revolved around what was going wrong in the empire, the reasons it had fallen behind the West, and what to do to save it. When it comes to 1900s, the nature of the questions changed and turned to questioning the nature of the entity that they wanted to save.[88] Until the end of the nineteenth century, Islam was the main body of the state ideology, but from that time onward it started to lose its unquestioned status.[89]

To show the emergence of the question of identity, Bernard Lewis compares two intellectuals, Akif Efendi (1822) and Yusuf Akçura (1904). Concerning the problems of the Ottoman Empire and Muslim society, according to Akif Efendi there

---

[85] Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi,* 287-290.

[86] Bernard Lewis, *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu,* trans. Boğaç Babür Turna (Ankara: Arkadaş, 2002), 318-319.

[87] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 57.

[88] Lewis, *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu,* 315.

[89] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 190.

were three options: the first was defending the existing Ottoman provinces at any price; the second was to withdraw from those provinces and shrink back to Anatolia; and the third was accepting slavery. Eighty years later, concerning the same questions, Yusuf Akçura mentioned three different options: Ottomanism, pan-Islamism, and pan-Turkism. According to Akif Efendi, identity or loyalty was not considered a problem, but for Akçura, the main concerns of the state were the nature of the society that the country would deal with.[90]

Through the chronological evaluation of the concept of "civilization" I have shown the major discussions of intellectual life in the Ottoman Empire from the 1840s to the beginning of the 1900s. By doing so, I illustrated the evolution of the intellectuals' agenda and where Islamism stood in this evolution. Islamism as an alternative ideology had emerged while the universal principals of Western civilization dominated the minds of intellectuals. While evaluating the Islamism of the various actors, I also looked at intellectuals' approaches to the principals of universal Western civilization. In the complexity of Islamism, approaches to the concept of civilization will provide perspective while analyzing the ideological nature of the intellectuals.

2.2. Actors

As discussed in the first chapter, Islamism is a broad subject that covers a long period, a wide geography, and different groups. Therefore, it is not possible to talk about a unique Islamist ideology represented by a stable group with a defined agenda. For this reason, while giving descriptive information for each actor and their relation with the Hamidian Regime, they will also be evaluated in terms of the similarities and differences among themselves. In this part of the chapter concerning the Islamism of the intellectuals, four different actors will be assessed: The Young Ottomans, the Revivalist movements, Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani, and the Islamists of the Second Constitutional period. Although Muhammed Abduh was also an effective Islamist of that period, due to his role on the formation of the contemporary Middle East, he will

---

[90] Lewis, *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu,* 440-442.

be included to the third chapter of the thesis that is about the Islamism of the contemporary Middle East.

2.2.1. The Young Ottomans

In this part of the chapter, the earliest representatives of Islamism in the Ottoman Empire will be analyzed. Although in the context of Islamism primarily Namık Kemal and then Ziya Paşa can be mentioned, in order to position the movement in Ottoman intellectual and political life, instead of looking at Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa as individuals, I prefer to look at them as the Young Ottomans. Aside from being the pioneers of Islamism in the 1860s and 1870s, the Young Ottomans were still effective in political and intellectual life in the beginning of the Hamidian Period. Furthermore, after their deaths their writings continued to influence oppositional intellectuals including the Islamists who played central role in the confrontation with Abdulhamid.

The Young Ottomans is the name of a group formed in opposition to the Tanzimat authorities, especially Âlî Paşa and Fuad Paşa. It was secretly founded among Ottoman intellectuals in 1865 and continued to be active until 1876. Members of the group, especially Namık Kemal, Ziya Paşa, and Ali Suavi, are the first modern ideologues of Muslim society in the Ottoman Empire. In the context of Islamism, it is hard to talk about an intellectual homogeneity in the group but Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa were in the forefront. The main common ground of the society was antagonism toward Âlî Paşa and Fuat Paşa, and seeing the declaration of a constitution as an elixir for the detrimental conditions of the state and the Muslim communities.[91]

Their opposition was also partially toward the sultan as well. However, because of the strong Sunni jurisdiction that legitimizes loyalty to almost any kind of state authority, in their political struggles the Young Ottomans could not directly attack the sultan. Because of the influence of Âlî Paşa and Fuat Paşa on the sultan

---

[91] Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought,* 80.

over state affairs, the Young Ottomans directed their critics toward the *Bab-ı Âli*, not to the sultan, except for Ali Suavi who directly attacked the sultan.[92]

In addition to their criticisms of exogenous reforms, the Young Ottomans were prominent intellectuals who re-interpreted and ameliorated the intellectual trend of the Tanzimat period.[93] Therefore, the genesis of most of the modern concepts in the Ottoman context, including Islamism, date back to the members of the Young Ottomans, especially Namık Kemal, Ziya Paşa, and Ali Suavi.[94]

In the 1860s, Ottoman intellectuals had to encounter the challenges of modernism simultaneously with society. They felt the need to protect the Ottoman and Islamic tradition under the detrimental conditions resulting from the Tanzimat reforms, which also aimed to overcome the challenge of the modern world.[95] However, although they felt the necessity to protect the Ottoman and Islamic tradition, they were not so different from the Tanzimat elite in terms of their attitude toward Western style reforms. This contradiction was the stronger version of the duality in the minds of the Tanzimat elites, which resulted from the acceptance of the universality of the principles of Western civilization. This duality was the co-existence of conflicting worlds such as the new and the old, and the East and the West.[96] Therefore, their views about social and political reform emerged as a mixture of traditionalism, reformism, Westernism, and Islamism.[97]

According to İlber Ortaylı, in the 1860s Ottoman intellectuals had not yet decided the exact nature of their political ideology and their program. Therefore, three

---

[92] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu*, 124.

[93] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 41.

[94] Kara, İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri 1, 24.

[95] Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire,* 104.

[96] Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi,* 278.

[97] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 289.

prominent intellectuals of the 1860s who were also part of the Young Ottomans, had quite different views: Şinasi (1826-1871) was secular-nationalist, Namık Kemal (1840-1888) was modernist-Islamist, and Ali Suavi (1838-1878) vacillated between Islamism and Laicism, and between Ottomanism and Nationalism.[98] This ideological complexity is the reason why these ideologues are seen as the pioneers of several ideologies. In the subsequent periods, seemingly conflicting groups referred to these intellectuals.

The primary role of the Young Ottomans on various intellectual movements, not only on Islamism, was to create an intellectual environment that revolved around two concepts: "liberty" and "fatherland." These concepts spread in the Hamidian period despite heavy censorship. With their courage and intellectual productivity, they aroused the potential for opposition to Abdulhamid.[99] The Young Ottomans provided an ideological basis and guidance to subsequent intellectuals, especially to the Young Turks.[100]

To determine the Young Ottomans' position among the Islamists and their relations with Abdulhamid, they should be evaluated in the context of the 1860s and 1870s. As mentioned above, the discontent in the Muslim society that resulted from deteriorating conditions for themselves, made Islamism the only base for a possible movement toward Tanzimat reforms and rulers in the Muslim society. Islamic discourse provided legitimacy for the opposition and supplied power driven by the population. When these conditions are considered, the Young Ottomans could be seen as an opposition movement toward the Tanzimat authorities more than pioneers of Islamism. Although they increased their focus on pan-Islamism during the 1870s, until the reign of Abdulhamid II, their primary concern was the modern political reforms and the adoption of constitutionalism.

---

[98] İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı* (İstanbul: Hil Yayın, 1983), 189.

[99] Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought,* 80.

[100] Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi,* 119-120.

Islamism camouflaged the Young Ottomans' reformist intentions. For example, in their writings the Young Ottomans used the concepts of traditional Islamic political theory such as "*adl*" (justice), "*biat*" (contract of investiture), "*icma-ı ümmet*" (consensus of the community), and "*meşveret*" (consultation).[101] However, as Türköne has pointed out, although these were old concepts, they were used with new meanings taken from modern political philosophy.[102] *Ayahs* and *hadiths* were interpreted following the meanings of modern concepts.[103]

Furthermore, according to Ismail Kara in the Islamic intellectual tradition these concepts were used for discussions of morality, and it is hard to derive political or institutional meaning from these concepts as the Young Ottomans did.[104] Finally, the Young Ottomans' Islamism was a pragmatist policy to win the support of the Muslim society, the *ulema*, and Sufi orders in the political struggles against the Tanzimat rulers. They used Islamic literature as a tool of legitimacy for their oppositional and reformist agenda.[105] For example, in the constitutional struggles, the Young Ottomans repeatedly argued that the *Shariah* is the constitution of the Muslims. However, even though Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa were on the commission for the preparation of the Constitution in 1876, they preferred to look at the Belgian Constitution of 1831 and the Prussian Constitution rather than the *Shariah*.[106]

The Young Ottomans defended the self-improvement of Muslim society through the implementation of some aspects of Western civilization. They did not

---

[101] Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought,* 81.

[102] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu*, 102.

[103] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu*, 116.

[104] Kara, İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri 1, 39.

[105] Ibid., 22.

[106] Ercüment Kuran, "Devlet Adamı Olarak Cevdet Paşa," in *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa: Vefatının 100. Yılına Armağan,* 3-7 (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1997), 5.

have an aggressive discourse toward the principles of Western civilization except for the interference of foreign powers in Ottoman sovereignty through the manipulation of the concept of civilization.[107] Even during the emergence of the discourse of Islamic civilization at the beginning of the 1880s, in his critique of Renan Namık Kemal did not use anti-Western discourse and did not make references to Christianity. Instead he addressed materialistic atheism in his answer to Renan.[108]

As far as the abovementioned points are considered, I conclude to the conclusion that although the Young Ottomans were the first actors that began mentioning Islamism/pan-Islamism, Islamism did not play a central role in their agenda. This was an oppositional movement toward the Tanzimat rulers and they were within the limits of the general Western trend among Tanzimat intellectuals. The superficial inclination toward an Islamist agenda was the result of their pragmatism. In 1860s, the Muslim community felt humiliated in front of the non-Muslim subjects and Islam was still the major legitimizer. Therefore, the Young Ottomans wanted to legitimize their agenda though Islamic principles and to win the support of the discontented masses. In terms of the conflict of intellectuals with Abdulhamid, the role of the Young Ottomans was to create the intellectual atmosphere for the intellectuals of the Hamidian period, and to provide an ideological base for those intellectuals, especially the Young Turks.

2.2.2. Revivalist Movements

Revivalist movements were important actors of Islamism both during the Ottoman Empire and after it collapsed. Although Islamism as a modern ideology began to emerge in the 1860s, Revivalist movements had silently played the roles that would later be picked up by Islamists in many parts of the Muslim World, and they continued to play this role in the contemporary Middle East. Furthermore, although it is not frequently mentioned in the literature, Revivalists had deep impacts on different

---

[107] Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought,* 61.

[108] Ibid., 70.

actors of Islamism. Therefore, it is included among the actors of intellectual Islamism and will be analyzed in this part of the chapter.

According to Carter Findley, in the downfall of the Muslim World two trends emerged. The first trend, which was widespread among the ruling elites, was a desire to to know about the outside world. As mentioned before, the reaction of the Tanzimat elites to the empire's attempts to be part of the Concert of Europe was the universalization of the principles of Western "civilization" which was the moral basis of the new international system founded after 1815. This universalization sparked the interest in knowing the outside world. The second trend was Revivalism, which aimed for the greatest Islamic awakening within Muslim society in reaction to deteriorating conditions for Muslims.[109]

This movement had a long tradition going back to seventeenth-century India. Ahmed Faruki el-Sirhindi, better known as Imam Rabbani in the Muslim World, is the founder of this branch. Imam Rabbani had struggled with the eclectic approach of the Mongol Emperor Akbar in his way of creating a different religious understanding by combining different principles of Islam and Hinduism. In this environment, Imam Rabbani created the Revivalist (Mujaddadi) movement. This movement gained legitimacy from a general belief of traditional Islam that Allah sent to his servants a renewer of religion at the beginning of each century.

In the nineteenth century, the representative of the *Mujaddiyya Nakshibandi* branch, Khalidi Bagdadi (1776-1827) created a movement for religious and political renewal based on traditional Revivalism. Different from the classical otherworldly *tarikat*s or the anti-Ottoman Wahhabism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, this movement concentrated on worldly affairs for the sake of religion. In the nineteenth century, Baghdadi was able to spread this movement through most parts of the Muslim World in many levels of society.[110]

The Revivalist movements of the nineteenth century mobilized Muslim populations and them brought to the political arena. They used the power of this mobilization for many aspects of the changing conditions. They created resistance

---

[109] Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity,* 69.

[110] Ibid., 70.

movements against imperialist expansion. They resisted non-religious reforms within the states, as in the case of the Kuleli Incident, and confronted supporters of the reforms from the *ulema* class. Finally, they also used this power to discredit the ordinary *ulema* who did not concentrate on the conditions of ordinary people and those who were accused of remaining on the surface of the religion.[111]

The main objective of the Revivalist movements was to return to the Qur'an and the *Sunna.* However, more than twenty revivalist movements, led by self-designated leaders in the nineteenth century, became resistance movements against foreign occupations in Central Asia, the Caucasus, India, and North Africa.[112] Shaykh Shamil, who resisted Russian imperialism in the Caucasus, and Shaykh Ahmed, who established the first rebellion attempt against the Tanzimat reforms that is known as the Kuleli Incident (1859), were parts of Revivalism.[113] Revivalists also played an important role in the mobilization of Indian Muslims under the chaotic environment following the collapse of Mughal rule in the 1850s, and prevented the Muslim community from dispersing.[114]

The weaknesses of the central states played a crucial role in the emergence and spread of Revivalists movements in the Muslim World. When the expansionist policies of the Great Powers first started in Muslim lands, it started in the periphery of the central states. The revivalist revolts like those in India and the Caucasus (the 1850s), in Central Asia and China (1860s), and in Egypt and Sudan (1880s), emerged in the absence of powerful states. Revivalists created their own armed resistance toward imperial expansion based on tribal leaders and fighters.[115]

---

[111] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 20-21.

[112] Ibid., 20-21.

[113] Şerif Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017), 12.

[114] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 92.

[115] Keddie, "The Revolt of Islam," 482.

Parallel to the emergence of armed resistance from local communities, new types of leaders and intellectuals also emerged. The collapse of the old social system and the pressure of foreign occupation removed the power of the existing political elites over the Muslim population. Therefore, Muslim communities were deprived of the support and guidance of the state, and began looking to create their own intellectuals and religious sources to pursue their cultural and religious survival.[116]

As Kemal Karpat writes, "where the state had disappeared, Muslims tried to reform society or community; where the state survived, elites sought to reform the state."[117] Therefore, the role of the Revivalists in the Ottoman context was different from in the rest of the Muslim World. As mentioned above, in the periphery of the Muslim states, Islamism took the form of a revival of religious principals in society because the society was alone while dealing with the challenges. In the Ottoman Empire, since political unity continued until the beginning of the twentieth century, the effect of the Revivalists was limited compared to the Islamism of the intellectuals within the Young Ottomans and the Islamists of the Young Turk period.

The resistance of all local Revivalist forces was inadequate to stop the strong foreign expansion into Muslim lands. In this case, it became vital to create a broader mobilization with other Muslims to overcome these challenges.[118] As far as these dynamics are concerned, it is possible that the intellectuals who looked for the realization of pan-Islamism in the 1860s were affected by this consciousness for mobilization that the Revivalists created. To illustrate this, I can give two possible examples. First, as mentioned before, Sayyid Ahmed Khan, who was one of the pioneers of Islamism, first mentioned Islamism after the failure of the Great Indian Revolt (1857) in which the Revivalists had played crucial roles in the mobilization of the Indian Muslims. Secondly, it is possible that the community that the Young Ottomans were addressing in their journals and relying on in their political struggles were those that the Revivalists had awakened and brought into the political arena.

---

[116] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 22.

[117] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 3.

[118] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 11-12.

On the other side of the need for broader mobilization is the promotion of the post of caliphate. The call for cooperation among Muslims increased the prestige of the Caliph as an already existing sublime leader over the Muslim world. The public consciousness for the worldwide unification of Muslims by the Revivalists would also affect the policies of Hamidian rule in the latter period. This point will be mentioned in detail in the third chapter on the Islamism of Abdulhamid. Finally, what the Revivalist did profoundly affected the methodology and agenda of the other Islamist actors.

Another important point about the Revivalist movements is their role in the emergence of nationalisms in the Muslim World. As Karpat writes, "Revivalist groups, representing folk Islam and using the Sufi *tarikat* (paths) inadvertently upheld local, ethnic, and cultural ties while still considering themselves to be part of the universal *ümmet*."[119] As mentioned in the previous pages, Revivalist movements had immediate problems to overcome, in particular foreign expansion. Therefore, any potential ties among the Muslim masses were important for the Revivalists. As will be mentioned below, this kind of pragmatism also existed in the methodology of Afghani. Although he was looking for the broadest unification of Muslims, he began by supporting local unifications. The revivalist actors' usage of local, ethnic, and cultural ties in the creation of resistance in the absence of state power can be seen as the basis for the proto-nationalist sentiments mentioned by Nikki Keddie.[120]

The last point about Revivalism relates to its relationship with Abdulhamid. As can be understood from the dynamics mentioned above, Revivalist movements had good relations with the Hamidian rule and generally supported the Islamist policies of Abdulhamid.[121] In their resistance to foreign powers, Abdulhamid was the most capable leader in the Muslim World and also held the title of Caliph over the Muslims.

---

[119] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 20.

[120] Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism."

[121] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 203.

Finally, as shown in the previous paragraphs, Revivalist movements were crucial actors in many levels of Islamism. Since they began to be active before the emergence of Islamism in the 1860s, they established the social base for the other Islamist actors through the mobilization of the Muslim community against internal and external threats. Before the Young Ottomans and intellectuals like Sayyid Ahmed Khan and Afghani had emerged, the Revivalists had already created the consciousness of the need for a broader mobilization of the Muslim World. Abdulhamid's willingness to cooperate with the Revivalists was also highly dependent on their role in the periphery of the central Muslim states.

2.2.3 Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani

Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani (1839-1897) was one of the prominent Islamists who reinterpreted the traditional Islamic understanding in response to the challenges of the nineteenth century toward Islam and Muslim populations. Similar to the Young Ottomans but in a broader geography, Afghani is seen as the pioneer of different ideological trends in the Islamic world, such as the Islamic liberalism of Muhammed Abduh, the conservative Islamic Revivalism of Rashid Rida, and different types of Middle Eastern nationalisms including Turkish Nationalism.[122] Therefore, he is included among the actors of intellectual Islamism.

As much as Abdulhamid, Afghani had a controversial reputation in his time and later. As he indicated in his notes, "The English People believe me a Russian. The Muslims think me a Zoroastrian. The Sunnis think me a Shi'i. And the Shi'is think me an enemy of Ali…"[123] There are long-lasting discussions on Afghani's nationality, sect, and birthplace. One of the prominent views on the identity of Afghani is that he was born in Asadabad close to the Hamedan province of Iran as an Iranian Shi'ite. For another view, mostly supported by his Arab followers, he was born in Afghanistan

---

[122] Nikki R. Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1972), 1-2.

[123] Ibid., 54.

as a Sunni. Until he was eighteen, according to one view, he remained in Kabul and received his education from the famous scholars of Afghanistan. For those who claim that he was an Iranian Shi'ite, he passed his adolescence in Qazvin, Tehran, and Najaf, and took courses from the famous Shi'ite scholar Shaykh Murtaza el-Ensari.[124]

After that time he went to India where he improved his reformist thoughts. When Muhammed A'zam gained power in Afghanistan in 1863, he made Afghani his grand vizier. However, because of the interference of Britain, this governance lasted only a short time and Afghani had to return to India. Toward the end of the 1860s, the British authorities worried about the public attention toward him and asked him to leave India. According to Hayrettin Karaman, before leaving India, he made encouraging speeches to the Indian Muslims for an anti-British movement.[125]

After he left India he went to Istanbul, where he was welcomed and respected by the intellectuals of the time. At the opening ceremony of the *Darülfünun-ı Osmani* (the Adobe of Practical Science— that is a university)[126] in February 1870 he made a speech. Since the *medrese* scholars were opposed to the *Darülfünun* and Afghani personally disturbed some scholars, his comparisons between art and the prophethood were exaggerated and turned into a widespread discussion. Afghani had to leave Istanbul in 1871 and moved to Cairo. In his eight-year stay in Cairo and he began to deal with political issues. To pursue his political agenda, he joined different Masonic lodges. This relationship with the Masonic lodges still makes him the target of accusations. Because of the power that he gained in Egyptian political life, he had to leave Cairo in 1879 under pressure from the British authorities. For the third time he went to India, but upon his incitement of the Indians against British rule during the Urabi Revolt in Egypt in 1882, he was deported from India. After that he first went

---

[124] Hayreddin Karaman, "Efgânî, Cemâleddin." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol. 10 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994).

[125] Ibid.

[126] Somel, *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire,* 70.

first to Britain and then to Paris. Between 1886-1889 he stayed in Russia, before returning to Istanbul in the early 1890s, where he remained until his death in 1897.[127]

Compared to the Young Ottomans, Afghani had a more versatile personality. Although it sometimes seems confusing, Afghani's main methodology was to speak according to the position of his audiences. In his first visit to Istanbul his main topic was the reform of education because the general trend of the time in the Ottoman Empire was towards reforming the education system. Furthermore, contrary to his attitude in India, he did not make any negative reference to Anglo-Ottoman relations. At that time Âlî Paşa and Fuat Paşa were still effective in governance and Anglo-Ottoman relations had not yet deteriorated at the state level.[128] On the other hand, while he was speaking to people with mixed religious affiliations in India and Egypt, he used an anti-imperial and nationalist discourse to unite people against foreign expansion.[129]

However, despite the complexity of his discourse, Afghani's primary reaction to the challenges of the time was the reform and revival of pure Islam.[130] Therefore, Afghani can be seen as an Islamist more so than the Young Ottomans, because, in the case of the Ottoman Empire, Islam remained the ultimate legitimizer of intellectual life. Therefore, the main component of the ideology of the empire until 1923 was Islam under the Sultan-Caliph, even though it began to change in 1908.[131] Therefore, as mentioned before, the Islamism of the Young Ottomans was not a choice but the nature of Ottoman intellectual life. On the other hand, when the whole life of Afghani

---

[127] Karaman, "Efgânî, Cemâleddin."

[128] Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani,* 62.

[129] Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism," 23.

[130] Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani,* 62.

[131] Feroz Ahmad, "Politics and Islam in Modern Turkey," *Middle Eastern Studies* 27, no. 1 (Jan., 1991): 3.

is considered regardless of the environment in which he lived, his pan-Islamist and reformist attitudes are visible.

According to Afghani, the independence of the Muslims from imperial pressure was the precondition for the revival of Islam and gaining a respectable position in the international arena.[132] Therefore, what Afghani wished from Islamic reform was the revival of the military and political power of the Muslims.[133] Compared to Abduh and other subsequent Islamists, Afghani concentrated mostly on political issues. However, similar to the relations between the "balance of power" and the concepts of "civilization," "imperialism," and the "incapability of Muslims" to be civilized, Afghani's political attitudes were not totally separate from intellectual contemplations. Besides the priority of political and military issues, Afghani also concentrated on intellectual issues. According to Afghani, Islam is not only a faith but also a civilization, with the potential to be a world power.[134]

Afghani's attitude toward the Ottoman Empire, including Abdulhamid II, was always positive. His relationship with the Ottoman Empire started with his first visit to Istanbul between 1869-1871. Although he had to leave the state upon his speech at the opening of *Darülfünun*, Afghani saw Istanbul as the center of power and modernization in the Islamic World. For Afghani Istanbul was the foremost capital of the Islamic World.[135]

Afghani's concentration on pan-Islamic appeals corresponded to the time of the increase in imperialist expansion in the 1880s, which also triggered Abdulhamid to implement Islamism as the state ideology. Afghani was looking for a capable monarch to unify Muslims, similar to the Germans' Bismarck or the Italians'

---

[132] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 53.

[133] Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism," 23.

[134] Keddie, "The Pan-Islamic Appeal," 50.

[135] Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani,* 59.

Cavour.[136] Afghani appreciated the role of a charismatic leader for pan-Islamic purposes similar to the role of those powerful leaders over the unification of Germany and Italy.[137] Although he thought that republicanism and constitutionalism were the best political system, he also mentioned the possibility of enlightened despotism. According to Nikki Keddie, Afghani's mention of the possibility of enlightened despotism was made either because of the fear of censorship, or the thought that the actions of a government are more important than its form.[138]

In the search for a charismatic leader, Abdulhamid was the best leader for Afghani. He wanted to be in cooperation with the court, and in his writings in the 1880s, especially in *al-Urwa al-Wuthqa*, he praised Abdulhamid with the intention of attracting the sultan's attention for a collaboration.[139] However, the relations initiated by Afghani with Abdulhamid did not result as Afghani expected. He was invited to Istanbul by Abdulhamid but was not employed as a foreign policy adviser. Instead the sultan kept Afghani in Istanbul with limited duties. Abdulhamid's suspicion about Afghani's good relations with Wilfrid Blunt, who propagated the Arab caliphate, prevented a possible cooperation.[140] Blunt was an ex-diplomat and British agent in Egypt who spread the view that "the Caliph of the future, in whatever city he may fix his abode, will be chiefly a spiritual and not a temporal king and will be limited in the exercise of his authority by few conditions of the existing material kind." This view was elaborated by Abd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi during the 1890s in a manner that undermined the Islamist propaganda of the Ottoman caliph.[141] Furthermore, I can also

---

[136] Keddie, "The Pan-Islamic Appeal," 50.

[137] Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani,* 139.

[138] Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani,* 108.

[139] Keddie, "The Pan-Islamic Appeal," 47.

[140] Keddie, "The Pan-Islamic Appeal," 64; Tufan Buzpınar, "The Question of Caliphate under the Last Ottoman Sultans," in *Ottoman Reforms and Muslim Regeneration,* ed. Itzchak Weismann and Fruma Zachs (London, New York: Tauris, 2005), 28.

[141] Buzpinar, "The Question of Caliphate," 20.

add the suspicious character of Abdulhamid toward any kind of powerful personality in the Ottoman lands, which can also be seen in the prevention of Islamist organizations in Ottoman territory. This point will be mentioned in detail in the subsequent parts.

Another aspect of Afghani is the effects of the Revivalists on his methodology in later periods. As mentioned before, the Revivalist movements were highly effective in India in the 1850s and 1860s, and Afghani stayed in India in this period. Furthermore, when foreign invasions and Western style reforms discredited the existing elites of the Muslim societies, the Revivalists who led Muslim society looked for the creation of their own elites/*ulema*. Lastly, Afghani's methodology in terms of the mobilization of Muslim communities in different parts of the world highly resembles that of the Revivalists.

As it is mentioned above, Afghani with his complex Islamist vision was a crucial actor of intellectual Islamism. Like the Revivalists, he was open to any form of cooperation with other Islamist actors. His vision of reform in Islam and the realization of pan-Islamism affected several intellectuals in his time and latter. In terms of his relationship with Abdulhamid, his willingness did not bring the cooperation that he expected. Instead, in the last few years before his death Abdulhamid forced him to stay in Istanbul with a few symbolic missions.

2.2.4. Islamists of the Second Constitutional Period Gathered around the Journals of *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan,* and *Beyan'ül Hak*

The genesis of Islamism corresponds to the 1860s. It became the state ideology and was extensively implemented during the reign of Abdulhamid, but it emerged as a distinct intellectual movement among the Westernists and nationalists under the liberal conditions of the Second Constitutional Revolution (1908).[142] Therefore, according some scholars like Ismail Kara and Tarık Zafer Tunaya, Islamism was taken seriously from this time onward. Furthermore, these Islamist were among the main actors in the conflict between intellectuals and Abdulhamid that ended with the

[142] Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I*, 28.

deposition of Abdulhamid. Although the many intellectuals gathered around the Journals of *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan,* and *Beyan'ül Hak* had certain differences, and each of them is worth being evaluated individually, because of their similarities in terms of their relationship with Abdulhamid they will be analyzed as a group.

Although Abdulhamid appealed to Islamist policies in many levels of the state apparatus, throughout the Hamidian Period Islamist intellectuals could not find an opportunity to express their views. Together with other intellectual movements, they were strongly affected by the censorship of Abdulhamid, who therefore became the primary issue of their agenda. They either formed independent opposition groups or joined other groups opposed to Abdulhamid. In these intellectual groups the greatest consensus was over the despotism of Abdulhamid. After the revolution Islamists found the chance to express their views about Islamic unity and reformation, just like advocates of other views were also able to express their ideas freely. However, after the revolution they lost the basis for the realization of Islamists ideas.[143]

Since Islam had been seen as the main legitimizer in the intellectual and political arena, Islamism/pan-Islamism had been the dominant ideology in the empire from the 1870s until 1908. Under the liberal environment of the Revolution, every intellectual tendency found an opportunity to express and spread its views. On the other hand, during the Hamidian period, the intellectuals' main concentration was on the despotic rule of Abdulhamid. This position overshadowed the essential differences among different intellectual tendencies. Furthermore, since Islamism had already been adopted as a state ideology and Abdulhamid had prevented any alternative political or intellectual Islamist organization, Islamist intellectuals could not form a separate intellectual movement. They had to mostly remain under the umbrella of the other oppositional intellectual groups.[144] Under the liberal environment of the Revolution, the pseudo alliance of the previous period collapsed. Unclarity on the discursive and contextual differences disappeared, and each ideology intensified its boundaries.

---

[143] Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 29.

[144] Özcan, "İslamcılık."

The period of revolution was an intellectually prolific period. Compared to the Islamists of the previous period, they deepened their contemplations about many points concerning the challenges of modern times for the Muslim community. However, these points still revolved around a limited agenda. The points that the Islamists of this period problematized in their writings can be summarized with these concepts: degradation (*tedenni*), standstill (*tevakkuf*), depression (*inhitat*), the downfall (*inkıraz*) of the Ottoman Empire and the Islamic World; the domination of lethargy (*rehavet*), and languidness (*cümud*) in the Muslim society. According to these Islamists, Islam became "a skin worn inside out" (*ters giyilmiş deri*). The problem of backwardness did not stem from Islam but from the ruler that alienated Islam from its sources and principles, and from the *ulema* and Muslims who approved of this diversion. Their solutions to these problems the broadest version were: to procure progress (*terakki*) and advancement (*teali*); to highlight the concepts of *jihad*, work, and effort and to change the content and meaning of resignation (*tevekkül*), destitution (*fakr*), and asceticism (*zühd*); to clean Islamic history and culture from destructive traditions and interpretations, and turn to pure Islam as symbolized by the *Asr-ı Saadet* (the days of the Prophet); to re-explore the rationality of Islam through re-interpretation; to achieve Islamic illumination through educational reforms; and to fight despotic regimes.[145]

In terms of content and methodology, similar to other intellectual movements like the Young Turks, the Islamism of the Second Constitutional period was profoundly affected by the Young Ottomans. However, compared to the Young Ottomans, knowledge of Europe and Western Civilization by these Islamists was very limited, except a few intellectuals such as Said Halim Paşa and Halil Halid who studied in Europe. The columns of the Islamist journals about political issues were written by Yusuf Akçura and Ahmed Ağaoğlu, who would later become prominent names of Turkish Nationalism.[146]

The Islamists' views on Abdulhamid during this period were not different from other intellectual movements. Depending on the intellectual's manner, their

---

[145] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri 1*, 20.

[146] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri 1*, 24.

views on Abdulhamid can be softer or harder, but an article published in *Beyan'ül-Hak* written by a member of the *ilmiyye*, Hafız Mehmet, summarizes the Islamists' views on Abdulhamid:

> "The previous government applied the greatest persecution to Muslims among all Ottomans and plagued to Islam the most unbearable form of banditry and despotism that applied to the helpless population. He still declared that the crimes that he performed to legitimize the employed cruelty and destruction of law and to hypocritically veil his secret treason from public attention, based on the precious rules of the religion. He said that the taxes that he viperously imposed on the people were the "zekat" which the caliph has the right to collect. He dedicated himself to destroying the meaning of religion and to annihilating the ceremonies of the *Shariah*. He collected religious books and burned them in abominable places and the boiler rooms of hammams. Since they had libertarian thoughts, he sent the students abroad with trashy caiques. He suspended a court of justice like the Court of Serenity (*Huzur Mahkemesi*), and he abolished the *Mecelle* Parliament, which was a place of enlightenment. While the Europeans were translating the norms of jurisprudence by Ibn Abidin, the *Minhac*, the *fiqh* of *Hanafi* and *Shafii*, and published several times a book of *Kalam*, the *Şerh-i Mevafik*, he removed them form the market of knowledge. In his last years, he bothered the believers so much that when the members of the religion saw the rift in the body of religion because of this damned despotism, they understood that religion had started to perish in these lands…"[147]

During the Hamidian Period and the heyday of the revolution (1908-1909) until the 31 March Incident, enmity towards Abdulhamid was the main factor of coalescence among intellectuals. Before turning to the ideological conflicts, especially after 1909, this situation led to conflicting scenes. For example, Derviş Vahdeti, who was hanged for his role in the 31 March Incident, praised Abdullah

---

[147] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri 1*, 125. "Hükümet-i sâbıka bütün Osmanlılar'a reva gördüğü zulmün en şeni hissesini müslümanlara tevdi eder, biçare ahaliye havale eylediği silah-ı şekavet ve istibdadın en mukavemet-sûzunu İslam'a musallat ederdi. İhtira eylediği mezâlime, kanun-şikenliğe bir şekl-i meşrû vermek, cebîn-i hıyanetini riyakârâne bir surette enzâr-ı tecessüs-i âlemden sete eylemek için icra eylediği cinayâtın hâlâ ahkâm-ı celile-i din-i mübînden olduğunu ilan ederdi. Ahaliye hâinâne tevzi eylediği vergileri hilafetin hakk-ı cem'i olan zekat olmak üzre gösterirdi. Meâlim-i din-i mübini hedm u tahrib, merasim-i şeriat-ı garrayı mahv u nâbûd eylemeği bir vazife edinmişidi. Kütüb-ü diniyeyi toplar, en hasis yerlerde, hamam külhanlarında ateş yakardı. Talebe-i ulûmu - kendilerinde efkâr-ı ahrarâne bulunduğundan dolayı- mavnalarla, süprüntü kayıklarıyla hârice tarz u teb'îd eyledi. Huzur Mahkemesi gibi bir bab-ı adalet-i sedd ü tatil, Mecelle Meclisi gibi bir mahfil-i ilm u irfanı lağıv u tenkil etti. Avrupalılar İbn Âbidin'i, Minhâc'ı, fıkh-ı Hanefi, Şafiî, Malikî'den binlerle desâtir-i adalet ve ahkâsı tercüme ettikleri, Şerh-i Mevâkıf gibi kütüb-i kelâmiyeyi defaatle tab'u neşr ettikleri halde revacgâh-ı sûk-ı irfandan kaldırdı. Sinîn-i ahîrede ibadullaha o kadar musallat oldu ki erba-ı diyanet bu melâ'in-i istibdadın cism-i İslam'a açtığı rahnelere bakarak bu memleketten İslamiyet'in artık zevale yüz yuttuğuna hükümler vermeğe başladı, matemler içine girdi. (…) "

Cevdet, who translated the book of Reinhart Dozy (1820-1883) which attacks Islam and its prophet.[148] However, in the heyday of the Revolution advocates of each ideology began to express their real agenda and distinguish the boundaries of their ideologies from others.

The Islamists of the Second Constitutional Period gathered around the journals of *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan,* and *Beyan'ül Hak,* were the primary actors in conflict with the Hamidian regime. Since they deepened the intellectual discussions on the agenda of Islamism, they made Islamism a distinct ideology in the Ottoman Empire. In the context of the conflict with Abdulhamid, they were not different from the general intellectual trend of the time. This point, together with their discourse and the details of their agenda, will be evaluated in the following part in a detailed manner.

2.3. The Discourse of Intellectual Islamism

In the nineteenth century, according to Şerif Mardin, Islam lost its ascetic nature and became a tool for Muslims not only for the interpretation of the conditions in their locale but also for integration in the broader world. Islam was used as an intensifier for the social relations and a locator that determined the place and identity of Muslims in the broader world.[149] Similar to other modern ideologies, Islam provided a system of thought to make sense of the world in which the masses lived, and to give direction to them.[150] Therefore, in the detrimental conditions of the 1860s and 1870s social movements that previously had no guiding ideology took up religion as the ideology, and it became their language. Thus, any group that wanted to gain power for its political ambition needed to speak this language first.[151] Therefore, until

---

[148] Şükrü Hanioğlu, *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 308.

[149] Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* 17.

[150] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 24.

[151] Ibid., 92.

the liberal environment of the 1908-1909 period, intellectuals had to defend their ideas using this language.

As can be understood from the various definitions discussed in the introduction of the thesis, from the 1860s to 1950s the main discourse of Islamism was that the conditions being experienced were the results of straying from the principles of Islam. If the domination of religion were reestablished, the unfortunate events could be reversed. Although the wording of the discourse is the same, in the hundred-year period covered by this thesis, different Islamist actors understood or implemented this discourse differently. Therefore, in the discourse parts of the three chapters, the Islamist discourse will be evaluated in terms of its anti-Western attitude, the perception of the caliphate, nationalism, constitutionalism, and other points that distinguished them from others.

To begin with, the main concentration of the Young Ottomans' writings was on the reimplementation of religious principles. For them, starting with the Tanzimat period the Ottoman Empire had begun to loss its cultural identity. The best way to reverse this deterioration was to reintroduce the religious principles that were lost due to the Tanzimat reforms.[152] As mentioned in the part concerning the concept of civilization, during the Tanzimat period the reaction of the elites to the political rapprochement with the Western powers was in the form of the universalization of the principles of Western civilization as an ultimate remedy for the challenges of the empire. The emergence of the discourse of the Young Ottomans corresponds to the period that this political balance began to break up.

However, the discursive confrontations with the general trend of the Tanzimat period did not exist in reality. The Young Ottomans accepted the validity and universality of the civilizational discourse and the superiority of Western values. The primary objective of the Young Ottomans' Islamism was to show the existence of the Western concepts and institutions that were accepted as universal within the Islamic tradition, and to prove that they were suitable to Islamic principles. In this process, they used the language of the past, and made references to traditional values. For them, as Berkes points out, "*Ummet* meant nation, *icma* meant social contract, *biat* meant

---

[152] Şerif Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017), 91.

parliamentary legislation, *meşveret* meant democracy, and *ilm* meant science."[153] They had the same agenda as the Tanzimat elites. The difference was their appeal to Islamic justifications to convince the masses.[154]

In the first phase of Western imperialist expansion, as mentioned before, Muslim modernists first adopted the universal discourse of civilization and wanted to prove the "civility" of the Ottoman Empire to get equal rights with other nations in the international arena. However, starting with the collapse of the balance of power toward the ends of the 1860s and increasing imperialist expansions of the Great Powers in the 1880s, these intellectuals partially gave up their attempts to prove the civility of the Ottoman Empire. They began to imagine an alternative world order that would provide equality in the international arena with an alternative way.[155] From this time onward, anti-Westernism began to dominate not only Islamist but also all intellectuals' discourse.

As Niyazi Berkes indicates, "the dominant desire was to turn all eyes away from the West. … The supplement to anti-Westernism was the cultivation of an attachment to the past and the old. For the first time since the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Orient and the medieval Islamic past replaced the modern West as models for reform."[156] In this environment, the Japanese victory against Russian expansion in 1905 became the symbol of anti-imperialist feelings among Ottoman intellectuals. The general intellectual trend of "making the Ottoman Empire the Japan of the Near East," was also shared by the Islamist intellectuals gathered around the journals of *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan,* and *Beyan'ül Hak.*[157]

---

[153] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 261.

[154] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 42.

[155] Ibid., 63.

[156] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 261.

[157] Hanioğlu, *Preparation for a Revolution,* 304.

For instance, in one part of his poems, Mehmet Akif admiringly praises the Japanese people. He describes their lifestyle as the way of life idealized by Islam, even though they are not Muslim. He writes that if the Ottomans made efforts to proselytize Islam, it would flourish there.[158] However, this anti-Westernism and pan-Islamism caused some to accuse the Ottoman intellectuals of being xenophobic and reactionary, and they therefore attempted to prove the reverse of these claims and to show the defensive nature of Islamism toward Western expansionism.[159]

The tension that many Muslims perceived between the universal notions of global modernity and the immoral and imperialist politics of the Eurocentric world order led them to imagine an alternative vision of world order that would be more in harmony with their search for equality in the international sphere. The idea of the transnational solidarity of the Muslim communities as a way to overcome their subjugation by the Western powers developed in this context as a practical realpolitik option. Muslim modernists initially favored implementing the standards of civilization in a secure international environment based on the normative notions of the rights of states. Yet, against the dynamics of the power politics of imperialism and under the influence of the Darwinian idea that the weak will be eliminated by the powerful unless the weak parties cooperate and protect themselves, pan-Islamism became an indispensable defensive idea.[160]

Besides the political discussions, there was also an intellectual discussion revolving around the claims of Renan and Gladstone about the impossibility of the civilization of Muslim communities. Ottoman Islamists had an apologetic discourse in this discussion. They tried to delegitimize these claims about Islam's being an obstacle to advancement. The counter-argument of the Islamists was that all that is

---

[158] Mehmet Akif Ersoy, *Safahat* (Konya: Palet Yayınları, 2008) 178. "Sorunuz şimdi de Japonlar nasıl millettir? Onu tasvire zafer-yâb olamam hayrettir. Şu kadar söyleyeyim; din-i mübinin orada, Ruh-u feyyazı yayılmış yalnız şekli: Buda. Siz gidin saffet-i İslam'ı Japonlarda görün. O küçük boylu, büyük milletin efradı bugün. Müslümanlıktaki erkan-ı sıyanette ferid. Müslüman denmek için eksiği ancak tevhid… Müslümanlık sanırım parlayacaktır orada Sâde, Osmanlıların gayreti lazım arada."

[159] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 64.

[160] Ibid., 63.

good in civilization (referring to Western Civilization) is directly or indirectly included in Islam. In a point that any one of the civilizational principles could not be legitimized through an Islamic principle, the argument of the Islamist turned into that the religion was always open for the better. They wanted to prove that the real civilization is the Islamic civilization. In this discussion, the addressees of the Islamists' discourse were not only Westerners but also other Ottoman intellectuals who began to see Islam as a burden on the way of civilization.[161]

In addition to the theoretical Islamization of Western concepts, another attempt was to trace Western values back to the Islamic tradition. This was an attempt to prove that the principles of the civilization or the technical and scientific superiority of the West stemmed from advancements made in the Islamic world in previous centuries. The claim to be the pioneers of modern progress among some Islamists eventually went to such lengths that it was claimed that the main idea of the French Revolution came from Muslim lands, that during the Egyptian Campaign Napoleon highly appreciated the advancement of the Islamic civilization, and even that the novel that made the French writer Victor Hugo famous was translated from an Arabic *risale*.[162]

In terms of the discourse directed toward the Muslim audience, the content of this discourse was not different from the points mentioned above. The main part of the discourse was dedicated to the return to the religious sources that had been forgotten over the course of history. These forgotten principles were the remedy of current conditions. However, in reality, there was no connection with the past, and the principles that they claimed had been forgotten had never existed. Since the primary purpose of the Islamists were release, development, power, progress, and sovereignty, they were more inclined to find immediate solutions to short term problems. They appealed to the past as far as it served progress in the way of the future. In the

---

[161] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I*, 25-27.

[162] Ibid., 25-27.

discourse of most Ottoman Islamists, the future took the place of the present and the past.[163]

The concept of "progress," which was also used by the Committee of Union and Progress, was not peculiar to Islamists. Indeed, it was the main commonality of the intellectuals of the late Ottoman period. This concept was fortified by the concept of "power" (*kuvvet*), that the Muslim world was in search of power through the concept of progress. An *ayah* about power was frequently mentioned in the books and sermons of these Islamists: "Prepare power as far as you can for your enemy."[164]

It is known that the major ideologies of the late nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, Ottomanism, pan-Islamism, and pan-Turkism, concentrated on the creation of identity among the subjects of the empire, and the prevention of the diffusion. Starting with the Tanzimat period, the Ottoman Empire tried to stop these rifts through the creation of an identity of unity through these ideologies. Together with the impact of foreign powers, while non-Muslim subjects consolidated their national consciousness and where increasingly inclined to separatist attempts, the Ottoman Muslim elites attempted to provide unity. As Cevdet Küçük states, there was a belief among Muslims that the state already belonged to Muslims,[165] and therefore the concepts of "unity" (*ittihad*) and "brotherhood" (*uhuvvet*) constituted an important place in the Islamists' discourse.

These concepts were elaborated in different contexts with new meanings to prevent separatism from the empire. On the one hand, the purpose of "progress" was "the working of the Muslim and non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman lands with unity and a sense of brotherhood, under the great title of Ottoman." On the other hand, progress was the "comprehension of the Muslims that they are together in reality but

---

[163] Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I*, 18.

[164] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I*, 27.

[165] Cevdet Küçük, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda "Millet Sistemi" ve Tanzimat," in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu,* ed. Halil İnalcık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2006), 384.

dispersed in sight, the truth of the religion through pursuing a common ideal, and the progress of Islamic civilization and education according to religious principles."[166]

The need for the prevention of separatism of Muslims and non-Muslims in the empire led the Islamists to think about multiple brotherhoods to sustain unity. The discourse of "equality" of the Tanzimat era turned into "unity" and began to be heard everywhere in the empire, including the mosques.[167] The concept of "brotherhood" was elaborated among the Islamists in multiple ways that covered all existing subjects of the empire: biological brotherhood (*uhuvvet-i Nesebiyye*), religious brotherhood (*uhuvvet-i diniye)*, national brotherhood (*uhuvveti vataniyye)*, human brotherhood (*uhuvveti insaniye)*.[168]

When addressing non-Muslim communities, one frequently referenced point is the articles of Islamic Law on *Zimmi*. However, the interpretation of these articles by the Islamists on the level of advocating the equality of Muslims with *zımmis* was a modern understanding which did not have a basis in the Islamic tradition. When Islamists could not base their argument on an Islamic tradition about inequality or differences, they chose to remain silent. Some of them interpreted the *ayah* that states that Muslims are brothers of each other as the brotherhood of the people of book (*ehl-i kitap*). They appreciated the priority of the worldly rights of those *zımmis* who live under the protection of the *Shariah* before the Muslims. However, after the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), many Muslim intellectuals felt deceived, and the tolerance in their discourse turned to hatred.[169]

The last group of concepts in the Islamist discourse of the late Ottoman era was about regime preferences. As has been seen above, Ottoman intellectuals were

---

[166] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I*, 29. "Memalik-i Osmaniyedeki müslim ve gayrımüslim efradın, Osmanlı ünvan-ı bülendi altında yekdilane ve uhuvvet-karane çalışması… hakikatte müttehid lakin sureta müteferrik bulunan müslümanların bir fikr-i emel takip ederek hakayık-ı dini idrak eylemesi ve medeniyet ve maarif-i İslamiye'yi evamir-i diniye mucibince terakki ettirmesi…"

[167] Ibid., 30.

[168] Ibid., 32.

[169] Ibid., 33-34.

also under the effect of the current civilizational discourse. Starting in the 1860s constitutionalism began to dominate the agenda of Ottoman intellectuals, who wanted to put an end to the absolute power of the sultan.[170] These tendencies increasingly dominated the intellectuals' agenda. The banners of the Second Constitutional revolution, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and Justice," show how deep this inclination was.[171]

These concepts were supported by the concept of "despotism" (*istibdad*) that is used to express the unmerited rulers of Muslim communities.[172] According to Mizancı Murad's statements, many intellectuals did not support the First Constitutional Revolution (1877) since they saw the constitution as a foreign invention. However, during the Second Constitutional Revolution (1908), no one hesitated to welcome the new regime except the lower classes, whose daily affairs were positively affected by Abdulhamid's policies.[173]

For example, in his first speech after the Constitutional Revolution "Addressing Liberty" Said Nursi, who was one of the most prominent Islamists and a member of the Union of Muhammadan, said, "the unity of heart and the national love which are the source of felicity and freedom were achieved by other nations through the loss of millions of valuable people, and this unity was accidentally obtained by the Muslims…"[174] In Nursi's discourse, despotism is the base of arbitrary rule, cruelty, and oppression, and that through its various forms it was responsible for the backwardness of the Ottoman Empire and the Islamic world in general. He understood that political despotism s led to religious imitation and scientific intolerance in the

---

[170] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 31.

[171] Şükrü Hanioğlu, "The Second Constitutional Period, 1908–1918," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey; Turkey in the Modern World*, vol.4, ed. Reşat Kasaba (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 65-66.

[172] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I,* 120.

[173] Ibid., 95.

[174] Nursi, *Asar-ı Bediyye,* 449.

religious sciences.[175] On the other hand, in an article about the relations between Said Nursi and Abdulhamid, Abdulhamid is seen as the representative of the state-oriented religiosity that started with Muaviye (603-682) and ended the period of the Four Caliphs. Other Islamists of the Second Constitutional Period had discourses similar to Nursi.

However, in the ten months between the revolution and the 31 March Incident, Abdulhamid was still mentioned in a tolerant way because he held the title of Caliph. However, after the Incident, the Islamists were accused of being obscurantist (*irtica*) by other intellectuals, and in response the Islamists worked to show that they had not worked with Abdulhamid to break the Constitutional Regime.[176] This apologetic attitude went so far that in a sermon at the Ayasofya Mosque, Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı (who was also an Islamist) almost claimed irreligious saying "we want *Shariah*," which was the motto of the Incident.[177]

2.4. Conclusion of the Second Chapter

In this chapter, I analyzed the regional and international context of the period that led to the emergence and evolution of Islamism, the actors of intellectual Islamism, and the general discourse that they used. What I meant by "intellectual" was, in its broadest sense, a "person whose life or work centers around the study or use of ideas, such as in teaching or writing." Before passing to the evaluation of the actors' relations with Abdulhamid, I first positioned each actor in the broader discussions of Islamism. I examined if these actors were really Islamists, in what sense they differentiated from others, and if they always relied on an Islamists agenda. Finally, I compared and contrasted the points that they agreed or disagreed on with the Hamidian regime. The Islamist personalities and groups that I analyzed in this chapter were the Young Ottomans, the Revivalist Movements, Afghani, and the

---

[175] Ibid., 298.

[176] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I,* 50

[177] Ibid., 52.

Islamists who gathered around the journals of *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan,* and *Beyan'ül Hak.*

Concerning the Young Ottomans, I concluded that Islamism was not the primary concern of their agenda. What they did in the context of Islamism was to Islamize the concepts of Western origin. The objective in doing that was to win the support of the Muslim masses in their political struggles. They chose an Islamist discourse since it had become the language of the Muslim masses in the post-*Islahat* period. Although they seemed to be opposed to the Tanzimat reforms, they still relied on the same Western principles. In terms of their relations with Abdulhamid, they were among the actors that convinced Abdulhamid to proclaim the first constitution and the assembly, but they did not have long-term direct relations with Abdulhamid. Their primary role in Ottoman intellectual life is that they were the pioneers of almost all the modern ideologies of the late Ottoman period. Therefore, they had an impact on almost all intellectual movements of the subsequent periods.

The second actor of intellectual Islamism was the Revivalist movement. According to our findings, Revivalists were the most important actors of Islamism in the nineteenth century. They began to spread in the peripheral regions where the central Muslim states could not stop foreign expansion. They mobilized the Muslim community and brought them into the political scene. Their primary role is that they constituted the base for Islamist intellectuals in many parts of the Muslim World. In terms of pan-Islamism, they first created the consciousness in the Muslim community for local resistance toward foreign expansion, and when they failed to stop that they turned their attention to pan-Islamist mobilization. The masses that Abdulhamid appealed to as the Caliph of the Muslims were created by these movements. Furthermore, when the existing elites/intellectuals were discredited by foreign powers and changing state institutions, they looked for the creation of their own elites and *ulemas* to be able to learn and perform their religious life. As far as the life span of Afghani is taken into account, he can be seen among these *ulemas* created by the Revivalists.

The third actor analyzed was Afghani. Afghani had the greatest effect Islamist on intellectuals (not only Islamists) in many parts of the Muslim World. Although similar to the general trend of the time he was in favor of a constitutional system, he

was also looking for a charismatic leader who would unite the Muslim World like the Germans and Italians had been united, and so wanted to cooperate with Abdulhamid. However, because of Abdulhamid's suspicious character, he did not find the support that he was expecting. On the contrary, in the last period of his life Abdulhamid pacified him with a few symbolic missions in Istanbul and prevented him from leaving the city.

The last actors analyzed in this chapter were the Islamists who gathered around the journals of *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan,* and *Beyan'ül Hak.* These Islamists were among the main actors of the conflict with Abdulhamid. During his period Abdulhamid prevented any kind of political or intellectual organization in the Ottoman lands, including Islamism. Therefore, the Islamists who gathered around these journals experienced the heavy censorship of the Hamidian regime. They were also affected by the general intellectual trend of constitutionalism. Therefore, although they enlarged the Islamist literature to the non-political issues, similar to the Young Ottomans, they re-interpreted the Islamic principles to show the importance of constitutionalism and the heresy of the despotic rule of Abdulhamid. In their opposition to Abdulhamid their Islamism did not play the central role. This point will be analyzed more closely in the following chapter concerning Abdulhamid's state-centered Islamism.

CHAPTER 3

HAMIDIAN STATE-CENTERED ISLAMISM (1876-1909)

In this chapter, similar to the scheme of the previous one, the Islamism of Abdulhamid and his conflict with intellectuals will be evaluated under three titles: the regional and international context that led to the empowerment of the role of the caliphate, the actors of state-level Islamism, and the discourse that Abdulhamid created and used. In each tittle, along with general descriptions, Abdulhamid's relations with the actors of intellectual Islamism will be evaluated. Since the Islamism of the intellectuals and of Abdulhamid were two different outcomes of the same international and regional conditions, points that are mentioned in the previous chapter are also valid in this chapter. Therefore, in the first subtitle of this chapter, it will suffice to evaluate the conditions that led to the adoption of Islamism as a state policy, and to assess the conditions that brought an end to the reign of Abdulhamid and created the new era.

3.1. International and Regional Context

3.1.1. The Rise of the Caliphate

In the 1870s the international balance that had existed for 50 years began collapse with the unification of Germany and Italy. As a result of the need for a new balance the attitude of the foreign states, especially Britain, toward the integrity of the Ottoman lands began change.[178] In addition, the international, economic, military, and demographic conditions of the empire had changed drastically. In this environment,

[178] Benjamin Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey; Turkey in the Modern World,* vol. 4, ed. Reşat Kasaba (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 44.

Islamism was the dominant ideology in the Ottoman Empire. Islamism served to consolidate power over the changing demography of the empire and to threaten the imperial powers that ruled millions of Muslims in their colonies.[179] Islamism thus became a tool for Abdulhamid for the creation of a new balance of power. In this environment, with new roles and new attributed meanings, the caliphate emerged as a main actor.

Although the caliphate had passed from the Abbasid Caliphate to Yavuz Sultan Selim, before the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca of 1774 the post had not been used as a separate title over the Muslim population or in international relations. After the loss of Crimea, which was the first Muslim territory lost by the Ottomans, the sultan wanted to maintain his spiritual authority over the land that he lost political authority over. Therefore, the titles of caliph and sultan began to be used separately.[180]

Furthermore, during the Tanzimat period, because of the policy of creating an Ottoman nation, a more secular attitude was used by the sultan, who used that title to express his power over all Ottoman subjects regardless of their religion, while using the title of caliph to express his power over all Muslims. After the renouncement of the Tanzimat reforms, the title of caliph gained further importance. This title was legalized in the 1876 Ottoman Constitution as, "the Padişah, by virtue of the caliphate, is the protector of the religion of Islam and the ruler and emperor of all Ottoman subjects."[181] After Abdulhamid's adoption of Islamism as the state ideology, the caliphate started to play an even more crucial role in the international arena.

Before the Ottoman sultan proclaimed himself to be the authority over all Muslims and the protector of Islam, because the Ottoman Empire was the only state capable of helping Muslims living under colonial rule, Istanbul was already recognized as the center of the Islamic World and the sultan as the leader of all Muslims.[182] The call for solidarity and support from the Ottoman sultan by Muslims

---

[179] Ibid., 48.

[180] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 10.

[181] Buzpinar, "The Question of Caliphate," 19.

suffering under British rule in India and Russian expansion in the Central Asian Khanates during the 1860s and 1870s created a consciousness among intellectuals and pressure on the Ottoman rulers.[183] This dynamic was also noticed by the Great Powers during the 1870s, and pan-Islamism and the caliphate started to be perceived as threats to their authority in their colonies.[184]

Furthermore, the deterioration of relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Western powers in the 1880s further supported the authority of the Caliph over the Muslim World. On the one hand, the adoption of strict Islamist policies by Abdulhamid made him the enemy of civilization and enlightenment in Western propaganda.[185] On the other hand, this situation was interpreted by the Muslim World as the independence of the caliphate from European guidance and suppression, as was perceived during the Tanzimat period. For example, the leading Egyptian Islamist Muhammad Abduh said, "the Ottoman Empire was what was left of the political independence of the *umma*, and if it vanished Muslims would lose everything and become as powerless as Jews."[186] Abdulhamid took advantage of this situation internally and externally.

3.1.2. The Effects of Hamidian Rule (1876-1909) on Intellectual Life

In addition to the conditions that increased the importance of the Caliph, Abdulhamid also created new conditions that led to the emergence of a different intellectual class. As Niyazi Berkes writes, the Hamidian Period "was boiling with the

---

[182] Selim Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State: The Reign of Abdulhamid II (1876-1909)," *International Journal of Middle East Studies 23, n*o. 3 (Aug., 1991): 350.

[183] Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism," 20.

[184] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 39.

[185] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 44.

[186] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 355.

signs of a coming revolt."[187] Therefore, the conditions that he forced on the intellectuals also determined the attitudes of the Islamists and their counter-arguments towards his rule.

In 1876, together with the dynamics mentioned above, intellectuals and state elites convinced Abdulhamid to declare the *Kanun-ı Esasi* and the parliament. However, after the disastrous results of the Russo-Turkish War (1878), Abdulhamid closed down the parliament and a thirty-three-year authoritarian regime began. Intellectuals were subject to a policy of censorship and exile, similar to the Young Ottomans, and as a result a new but more powerful intellectual movement known as the Young Turks emerged in this period.[188]

Generally speaking, the nature of the intellectuals of the Hamidian Period is different from the intellectuals of the previous and subsequent periods. Compared to the courageous nature of the Young Ottomans, the intellectuals under the authoritarian rule of Abdulhamid were frightened, oppressed, fearful, suspicious, pessimistic, and rebellious in thought and sentiment. Most of them perceived their environment darkly and the future as hopeless.[189]

Furthermore, as a result of this suppression these intellectuals had to concentrate on non-political and cultural questions that resulted from the challenges of the times and which were overshadowed by the search for political reforms by the previous intellectuals.[190] Under these conditions, Islamism, as well as other ideologies, started to form as an intellectual movement that was more concerned with religious questions than political ones. Their suppression by Abdulhamid for further control deepened the intellectual basis of the ideologies and consequently resulted in the reverse of what the sultan expected.[191] However, the lines between the different

---

[187] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 289.

[188] Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi,* 119-120.

[189] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 274

[190] Ibid., 289.

ideologies established during this period were distinctly seen after the 1908 Revolution.[192]

This passage form Hüseyin Rahmi very well illustrates the conditions that were created by the Hamidian rule and its impacts on intellectual life:

> "Western civilization has been a torchlight for our awakening… The Hamidian tyranny… suppressed all the publications that are the moral food of a nation… One thing, however, could not be eliminated. Despite the sever inspections of the customs and educational officers, foreign books could reach the shelves of the intellectuals…. I used to notice one thing: while the stores selling the Turkish works censored and approved by the government were without customers, despite their colorful window displays, the stores selling foreign books thrived. The vacuum created by the bankruptcy of the traditional culture was filled by the foreign culture… European thinkers, historians, poets, and writers became known as if they were our own. The good effects of foreign literature, however, were felt only by a small elite among the youth… as the lights of our minds were on the verge of being extinguished entirely, the sparks flying here from European culture rekindled them. If there are today (1908) men who can think, can write and can defend freedom, they are those minds who were enlightened by these sparks. In those dark and melancholy days, our friends, our guides were those intellectual treasures of the West. We learned the love for thinking, the love for freedom, from those treasures. All of the recent developments in our ways of thinking, as well as in our poetry and verse, are the products of the winds blowing from the West."[193]

3.1.3. The Young Turks and the Emergence of the Constitutional Period

The Young Turks is the name of the umbrella movement that contained almost all opposition to the Hamidian regime with a wide range of agendas and motivations. Although its name and leading members changed a few times, the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), which was founded by students from the Imperial Medical School in 1889, constituted the central part of the movement. The primary point that brought these different groups together was the opposition to Abdulhamid.[194]

---

[191] Ibid., 292.

[192] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I,* 24.

[193] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 292.

One of the main reasons for the opposition stemmed from a tradition in the Ottoman court that was removed by Abdulhamid. According to Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, in the Ottoman state tradition there had always been intermediaries between the sultan and the population, so the sultan was not the direct target of accusations from his subjects. In a case of discontent in society, accusations were heard by an intermediary and the official who took responsibility was dismissed. When society was appeased and the issue was forgotten, these intermediaries were re-assigned to a new position. By doing so, the sultan was praised as the executor of all pleasing actions, while intermediaries were accused of the bad ones, and no one dared criticize the sultan directly.[195]

As mentioned above, one of the reasons that the Young Ottomans criticised the *Bab-ı Ali* was similar. Since the Ottoman political traditions did not allow criticism of the sultan, the Young Ottomans chose the *Bab-ı Ali* as their target and frequently attacked Fuat and Âlî Paşas. However, as Selim Deringil has noted, Abdulhamid, with his authoritarian and centralizing manner, removed all the responsibilities of the intermediary bodies. He was seen as the only executor of all policies in the empire. Consequently, his personality was open to accusations stemming from the malfunctioning of the empire. By centralizing power and tying all institutions to his personality, he created a stronger opposition group of intellectuals and soldiers, which was known as the Young Turks.[196] Consequently, this growing opposition inside and outside of the Ottoman Empire, and the re-emergence of the Balkan problem which ended the short-lived First Constitutional Period in 1878, also brought an end to Hamidian rule.[197]

---

[194] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 58-59.

[195] Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Maruzat, e*d. Yusuf Halaçoğlu (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1980), 244.

[196] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 355.

[197] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 58-59.

When Abdulhamid realized the hopelessness of the conditions for himself in 1908, he agreed to restore the constitution, and then reconvened parliament after thirty years.[198] The Young Turks broke the absolutist rule of Abdulhamid with the slogans of the "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and Justice." They established a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary democracy, which had been the dream of Ottoman intellectuals since the 1860s. They removed the censorship of the press and idealistically wanted to sustain unlimited freedom of expression. They opened the way for political parties and also wanted to replace the old notables and religious orders in the state.[199]

When the Hamidian period was ended by the Young Turks in 1908, a four-year liberal environment emerged. By 1910, 353 newspapers and magazines had appeared. Political exiles returned to Istanbul. The four pillars of the Revolution "liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice"[200] were tried to be applied by the CUP leaders. In this period separatist political associations were prohibited, but since ethnic and religious organizations were perceived as cultural organizations they could continue to perform their activities. In this liberal environment, while Turkish intellectuals were fighting against Ottomanist motivations, their non-Muslim colleagues were seeking rights for their *millets*.[201] However, much as the Russo-Turkish War terminated the First Constitutional Period, the catastrophic losses of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) ended this liberal environment.[202]

When it comes to the Islamism of the Young Turks, it is essential to note that religion did not constitute a vital place in the agenda of the CUP. It can be even

---

[198] Ibid., 60-61.

[199] Hanioğlu, "The Second Constitutional Period," 65-66.

[200] Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity,* 194-195.

[201] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism*, 327.

[202] Ibid., 201.

described as anti-religious. Most of the members saw religion as the main obstacle to the process of civilization, which was the dominant intellectual trend of the post-Renan period. The main characteristic of the opposition movements of the Hamidian period was that they were reactionary, such as anti-imperialist, or anti-Hamidian. Therefore, the difference in their agendas did not pose a problem for their cooperation. In addition to the Islamists in Istanbul this reactionary nature provided for broader cooperation. Two prominent Islamists, Muhammed Abduh who supported Abdulhamid in the early days of his reign and his student Rashid Rıza, had worked closely with the Young Turks.[203] Moreover, although Ahmed Rıza was frequently criticized for being an "atheist" among the Ottoman Islamists, because of his anti-imperialist articles in foreign reports he was seen as a pan-Islamist fanatic.[204] As Cemil Aydın points out, the Pan-Islamist vision between 1870s and 1920s had a character of being the criticism of the Imperial world order and the domination of the Western Civilization. Those who had a Pan-Islamist vision at that time did not always have an Islamic sensitivity in the social life.[205]

Until the end of the Hamidan period and during the first phase of the Second Constitutional Revolution, the CUP also partially appealed to Islam with three main motivations: "first, as a proto-nationalist device to agitate the Muslim masses against the sultan; second, to attack European imperialism; and third, to delegitimize the sultan's position from an Islamic point of view."[206] As mentioned before, although it began to decrease, Islam was still the main legitimizer in political life, and the language of the masses.[207] After the revolution the CUP leaders were aware of the

---

[203] Hanioğlu, "The Second Constitutional Period," 103.

[204] Hanioğlu, *Preparation for a Revolution,* 307.

[205] Cemil Aydın, "İmparatorluk ve Hilafet Vizyonları Arasında Osmanlı'Nın Panislamist İmajı, 1839-1924," in *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi ve Hareketi: Sempozyum Tebliğleri,* ed. İsmail Kara, and Asım Öz (İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2013), 47.

[206] Hanioğlu, *Preparation for a Revolution,* 307.

[207] Ibid., 302-306.

existnce of different religious fractions in Ottoman society. Therefore, they had to form an *ulema* branch to convince the society and to continue to hold the support of the masses. Some of the leading Islamists already welcomed the revolution and began to deal with the publication of articles supportive of the CUP. However, it was also expressed by the Islamists that, "what was done was only to remove the stumbling block to progress: Turkish society would be reformed thoroughly according to the principles of Islam that had been forgotten under un-Islamic tyrannies."[208]

However, the relations between the Islamists and the CUP deteriorated with the return of many CUP members to their main anti-religious discourse.[209] The liberal environment of the period revealed the main motivations of each opposition group who were under the same umbrella. Although most of the Islamists did not join the counter-revolution led by the Union of Mohammedans under the leadership of Dervish Vahdeti, they constantly opposed the secular attitudes of the CUP members, and wanted to promote the religiosity of the state and to amend many articles in the 1909 Constitution. However, in the final step, they were pushed aside by the CUP.[210] In this process, the CUP gradually diminished the role of religion in different aspects of political and social life.[211]

There are different views on the Young Turks' attitude toward Abdulhamid after the revolution. According to Niyazi Berkes, in the first year of the revolution most of the revolutionaries were still under the effects of the previous period that made them submissive to Abdulhamid. Therefore, after their disenchantment with the Hamidian despotism in the heydays of the revolution, the deposition of Abdulhamid could be imagined.[212] After the counter-revolutionary attempt of a group of *ulema* led

---

[208] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 348.

[209] Hanioğlu, *Preparation for a Revolution,* 307.

[210] Hanioğlu, "The Second Constitutional Period," 68.

[211] Hanioğlu, *Preparation for a Revolution,* 308.

[212] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 254-256.

by Dervish Vahdeti under the banner of *"Shariah"* in April 1909, Abdulhamid was deposed and sent to Salonica.[213] From the perspective of Azmi Özcan, although the Islamists were against the despotic rule of the sultan, they refrained from direct criticism of Abdulhamid after the revolution because of his role as the caliph. Instead, because of his proclamation of the constitution, they wanted to see Abdulhamid as having good intentions and directed their criticism toward the people around him. However, in the last period, Abdulhamid and those who around him were depicted as responsible for the chaotic environment, and were shown a deep hatred.[214]

A more logical understanding is that of Şükrü Hanioğlu. The heroes of the revolution had a conservative agenda instead of wanting to destroy the old system. Although they made the revolution under the banner of the French Revolution, unlike the French Revolution the CUP did not destroy the old regime. Unlike the Iranian example, it did not replace the absolutist monarchy with a constitutional regime. They only restored the already existing but suspended constitution, and the parliament of 1876. However, what they expected for the revolution did not come to pass, and instead they ended up with a chaotic environment in which different power centers aggressively pursued their own agendas. As a result, this environment led to the dethronement of Abdulhamid and latter to the emergence of a new, authoritarian, one-party rule.[215]

3.2. Actors

In this part of the chapter I will analyze the main actors of Abdulhamid's state-centered Islamism. Although he was the main actor, there were also other actors that he relied on, such as pro-state *ulema*s, bureaucrats, and the Muslim masses of the

---

[213] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 60-61.

[214] Özcan, "İslamcılık."

[215] Hanioğlu, "The Second Constitutional Period," 66.

Ottoman Empire and the Muslim World. In this part of our chapter I will analyze their actions and the role that they played in Abdulhamid's Islamist policies.

3.2.1. Abdulhamid II

Abdulhamid II came into power in 1876 with the promise of the promulgation of the Constitution and the Parliament.[216] However, citing the results of the Russo-Turkish War (1878), he dissolved parliament and suspended the Constitution. After that time, he began to establish a new administrative system that lasted for 33 years.[217] He spent his first years looking for possible solutions for the chaotic conditions of the state. His main concerns were preserving peace and preventing the loss of further land, developing a plan to create balance between the conflicting interests of the Great Powers, putting the finances and military of the empire into order, implementing reforms in administration, and establishing the means to provide solidarity among Ottoman subjects.[218]

In the first period of his rule, he tried to transfer power from the *Bâb-ı Âli* back to the court. In 1895, he subdued the *Bâb-ı Âli*, which had dominated the state during the Tanzimat period. From 1895 onward, he created an absolutist regime that endured until 1908.[219] He reformed the administrative cadres through a modern bureaucracy headed by technocrats loyal to him alone, similar to the ways of the earlier sultans.[220] Finally, he adopted Islamism as a means of solidarity among Ottoman subjects and as a deterrent force toward foreign threat.

---

[216] Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire,* 111.

[217] Ibid., 123.

[218] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 47.

[219] Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire,* 109.

[220] Ibid., 125.

Abdulhamid's main motivation during his rule was the four pillars of the state codified by Reşit Paşa: Islam, the maintenance of the house of Osman, the protection of the Haram al-Haramayn (Mecca and Madinah), and the maintenance of Istanbul as the capital city. The absence of one of these pillars was seen as the end of the empire.[221] Therefore, in the 33 years of his reign Abdulhamid adopted Islamist policies where they served the preservation of the empire in accordance with these pillars.

If the when Islamism of Abdulhamid is seen as stemming from a personal religious motivation for the sake of Islam, as Ihsan Süreyya Sırma does, it undermines the arguments of the Islamist intellectuals in their opposition to the sultan and makes us blind to the different dimensions of Abdulhamid's agenda. In his prominent book on Abdulhamid's Pan-Islamist policies, Sırma answers the question of what did the Young Turks want from the Abdulhamid in this way: "The Young Turk movement that was guided by the West had emerged against the conservative policies of Abdulhamid. To be Western, to think Western, to dress Western, to legislate Western, to eat Western; to imitate the West without any reasoning…"[222]

However, Sırma and other Islamists of today ignore the point that Abdulhamid personally was not religious to such an extent that Islamism would constitute the sole motivation for him in his policies.[223] Instead, as the last capable sultan of the Ottoman Empire, Abdulhamid created a new phase for the state with his seemingly contradictory characteristics. He was repressive on the one hand and reformist on the other; Islamist on the one hand, and Westernist on the other. The widest-reaching Western-style reforms in the army and education were realized during Abdulhamid's reign. The Islamism of Abdulhamid served to extend the existence of the Ottoman Empire and the caliphate by winning the support of the Muslim population.

---

[221] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 346.

[222] İhsan Süreyya Sırma, *II. Abdulhamid'in İslam Birliği Siyaseti* (İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 2007), 15.

[223] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 41.

According to Ismail Kara, through the modernization of education and the foundation of Westernized institutions, Abdulhamid created the powerful cadres that would bring about his end. On the other hand, since he kept the use of Islamism under his monopoly, he weakened independent intellectual Islamism compared to other ideologies.[224] During his reign, Islamism as an ideology did not show any sign of intellectual advancement, but was only used as a tool for the survival of the state.[225] Therefore, looking at his motivation in terms of his personal preferences would lead to the misinterpretation of the arguments of the intellectual Islamists.

In the context of Islamism what should be understood from Abdulhamid's Islamism is the flourishing of the religious element under the rule of one man in a wide range of fields.[226] In its general forms, the actions that Abdulhamid implemented in the context of Islamism can be summarized as: the promotion of the post of the caliphate, being in close contact with the Muslims in the world as their ultimate authority, sending missionary Sufi members around the world, promoting religious education in the *medreses*, increasing official attention to the Sufi organizations, publishing selectively the main classical religious books and delivering them to rural areas, increasing the official status of the Arab provinces, bringing the children of prominent Muslim leaders to Istanbul for education, benefiting from the unifying mission of the pilgrimage for the propagation of the caliphate, and delivering messages of loyalty from the Muslims of the world to Ottoman Muslims through every possible means.[227] Through symbolic images, ceremonies, architecture, and medals, the Islamic character of the state was advanced everywhere in the empire.[228]

---

[224] Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 29.

[225] Özcan, "İslamcılık."

[226] Eraslan, *II. Abdulhamid ve İslam Birliği,* 23.

[227] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 270.; Eraslan, *II. Abdulhamid ve İslam Birliği,* 31-32.; Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 28.; Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 57.

[228] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 53.

For those villages that could not afford to build mosques a charity program was applied, and the presence of the state was reinforced in the periphery.[229]

Through an ornate celebration of religious days and nights, and by controlling the morals of the society, Islam was made visible in society. The general liberal trend of the Tanzimat period on the individual level was reversed, and the police forces were given the task of implementing the rules of *Shariah* in the society.[230] After the humiliating conditions of the Tanzimat period for the Muslim population, the state visibly played the role of the protector of Muslims to cure the demoralization of society.[231] Under these conditions, the Islamism of Abdulhamid overshadowed nationalism and constitutionalism, which were the two most prominent ideologies of the subsequent period.[232]

Parallel to the general trend in the world, one of the main concerns of Abdulhamid in the 1880s was the foundation of an empire-wide education system. From 1867 to 1895 the number of *rüştiye* students increased four times. However, this number was still half of the non-Muslim students.[233] Since lack of education was higher among the Muslim population, educational reform also became an important issue of the Islamist agenda. Muhammed Abduh and al-Afghani, concentrated on educational reform in Egypt.[234] Said Nursi's university project *Medresetü'z-Zehra* regarding Al-Azhar in Cairo, that combined the positive sciences and sciences of religion in Eastern Anatolia to increase the literacy of the Kurdish population, was also part of the general trend of the time.[235] What is interesting is that instead of

---

[229] Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* 92.

[230] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 259.

[231] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 87.

[232] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 270.

[233] Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* 55.

[234] Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh."

reforming the traditional religious schools (*medreses*), Abdulhamid favored pursuing Tanzimat-style secular education reforms.[236] Furthermore, he also dealt with the reforms of the *medreses*; however, Abdulhamid's main attention for their amelioration stemmed from the role that the *ulema* was played in the propagation of Islamism and the symbolic performance of Islam.[237]

With the same motivation, Abdulhamid appealed to the Sufi orders. In comparison with other actors of Islamism, he used the basic methods of the "revivalists" orders mentioned in the previous chapter.[238] However, his relations with the *tarikat*s were not official. To avoid diplomatic foreign pressure, Abdulhamid implemented some of his Islamist policies through the foundation of an unofficial personal network centered in Istanbul among the Islamist leaders of the Muslim World.[239]

In the higher levels of the intellectual and political circles, Abdulhamid was generally more supportive of non-Turkish organs.[240] Unlike the other Ottoman sultans, he hired Arab subjects for important positions of the bureaucracy.[241] Between 1901 and 1907, 167 Arabs studied in the Imperial Public Service School (*Mekteb-i Mulkiye-i Şahane*). These students, who later became the prominent intellectuals and state elites of the future Arab states, studied in Istanbul as a result of the Hamidian education policies.[242] Furthermore, the Arab subjects of the Empire and Muslim tribes

---

[235] Said Nursi, *Tarihçe-i Hayat* (İstanbul: RNK Neşriyat, 2016), 48.

[236] Fortna, "The Reign of Abdulhamid II," 50.

[237] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 347.

[238] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 23.

[239] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 66.

[240] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 60.

[241] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 346.

from Sulawesi, Singapore, and Sumatra sent their children to Istanbul. After the end of their education, these children returned to their home fluent in Turkish, with Turkish passports and the power to claim themselves as "civilized" to the imperial domination of Europeans in their land.[243]

The main addressees of Abdulhamid in terms of his Islamist policies were the lower classes of the subjects in the Ottoman territory. At the end of the nineteenth century in Anatolia, Muslims, Armenians, Kurds, and other ethnic and religious groups were living in a complex social system that ensured a separate social life.[244] The increasing political and economic power of the non-Muslim populations since the beginning of the Tanzimat period was perceived as a threat toward both the state and Islam. Furthermore, while there were not enough infrastructural investments by the state for the Muslim population, Christian missionary activities were high and increased the welfare of the non-Muslim population.[245] Furthermore, the conflicts in Anatolia were different from the ethnic conflicts in the Balkans or other parts of the empire. Since there were no clear ethno-religious boundaries in Anatolia, any concession to a non-Muslim *millet* was perceived as a threat toward Turkish and Muslim existence.[246] The continuation of the politicization of the different ethnic and religious groups, and the increase in their economic investments and cultural institutions, increased the sense of backwardness among the Muslim population.[247] Thus one of the major Islamists policies of Abdulhamid aimed to increase the self-

---

[242] Ibid., 355.

[243] Ibid., 350.

[244] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 78-79.

[245] Ibid., 54-56.

[246] Lewis, *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu,* 482.

[247] Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity,* 178-179.

confidence of the Muslim population, and mitigate hatred toward non-Muslims to avoid any potential conflict.[248]

One of the main characteristics of Hamidian rule was the extreme centralization of power around the personality of the sultan. At all levels of state institutions, he bound authority to his personality and removed intermediary bodies, especially parliament and ministries. He also prevented the formation of any powerful organizations and the emergence of an alternative dominant personality.[249] For this reason, sharing the same destiny with other intellectual movements, Islamists were not able to establish a Pan-Islamic association within Ottoman territory. Abdulhamid preferred to work with the existing *tarikat*s instead of allowing the emergence of an Islamist association. However, it is also unclear in what level pan-Islamic policies had penetrated these *tarikat*s.[250]

In general, the Sufi organizations that Abdulhamid promoted and prepared to the propagation of pan-Islamism with particular missions were ascetic organizations dealing with mystic aspects of religion. They did not deal with the political issues that constituted the main agenda of the intellectual movements. Furthermore, these *tarikat*s were weak organizations that were unable to cooperate. According to Landau, this situation was their major weakness in terms of the realization of pan-Islamist policies.[251] The pragmatism of Abdulhamid can be seen in this ambivalence to the perception of religion. Although Sunni orthodoxy was stressed as the state religion, he did not prefer to apply Sunni Islamism but mostly appealed to the Sufi orders for propaganda.[252]

---

[248] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 87.

[249] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 355.

[250] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 51.

[251] Ibid., 52.

[252] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 347.

Abdulhamid's strict dedication toward the centralization of power around his personality was also seen in his relations with the leaders of the Muslim World. The preservation of the religion or the Muslim populations against the Western threat was not enough, and it was also necessary to preserve the authority of the House of Osman. For example, a silver door for the Kaba was sent from the Nawab of Rampur, and 40000 rupees were sent by an Indian Muslim to Mecca. They were both rejected for the reason that: "All such gifts can only be made by the Exalted Persona of the Caliph who alone holds the august title of Protector of the Holy Places. No foreign ruler has the right to partake of this glory."[253] This shows the exclusivist approach of Abdulhamid toward the leaders of the Muslim world. On the other hand, it would also be inaccurate to depict the world Muslims as completely open to accepting the supremacy of Abdulhamid. His attempts to represent himself as the sublime leader of all Muslims was reluctantly welcomed by some Muslim leaders such as the Iranian Shah and the Emir of Afghanistan. Since both of them were squeezed between the Anglo-Russian rivalry in the region, they had to cooperate with Abdulhamid.[254] Instead, the lower classes played the primary role in the acceptance of Abdulhamid throughout the Muslim World, as they were mobilized by the Revivalist movements.

Finally, similar to the Constitutionalists (the Young Ottomans and then the Young Turks) and Revivalists, Abdulhamid benefited from the political potential of the masses for the survival of the Ottoman Empire. When Abdulhamid appealed to the traditional values of the masses, he wanted loyalty to his personality. Constitutionalists in return for the proposed reforms offered material betterment and political freedom, which was a new concept to these populations. For the Revivalists the aim was to reverse the deterioration of the conditions of the Muslims and the revival of the Islamic consciousness. As Kemal Karpat summarizes,

> "the sultan, the revivalists, and the constitutionalists all preached versions of populism that were in line with their philosophies and expectations. The revivalists practiced a community-based religious populism at the grassroots;

---

[253] Ibid., 352.

[254] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 44.

> the sultan promoted religious populism, managed, orchestrated, and contained by the state—in other words, himself—from the top; and the constitutionalists preached an institutional populism that took concrete form first in the Constitution and Parliament of 1876–78, then reappeared in the period 1908–18." [255]

3.2.2. Other Actors

While Abdulhamid generated strong opposition, he also managed to get the support of different actors. Abdulhamid did not only rely on the state apparatus but also on the Muslim masses in the empire and abroad, the pro-state *ulema*s, and intellectuals.

The Muslim masses were the main actor of Hamidian Islamism. Abdulhamid appealed to the beliefs and superstitions of the Muslim masses in the ways mentioned above.[256] In addition to the perceived religious degradation of Muslims during the Tanzimat period, what made the Ottoman Muslims gather around Abdulhamid was the changing economic conditions. Changing dynamics in economic life in the early 1870s resulted in bankruptcy in 1875. The masses perceived this bankruptcy as a sign that the modernization reforms meant the domination of the European powers over the Ottoman economy, and the decline of domestic agriculture and industry. Consequently, it meant a further deterioration in their economic conditions. While the masses were reactionary toward the West, Abdulhamid appeared as "indigenous, tradition-loving, Islamic, and free from the worries and discomforts of change." Abdulhamid's anti-Western attitudes appealed to the already existing anti-Western feelings of the masses and his "personal austerity, sobriety, and piety" appealed to their discomfort toward the extravagant Tanzimat rulers.[257]

According to Niyazi Berkes, the environment that Abdulhamid created was such that "the man in the street could feel comfort in the security of this tradition. The

---

[255] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 9.

[256] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 258.

[257] Ibid., 255.

Hamidian regime built up for him a dream world in which his illusions appeared to be coming true. The period was one of escape from actual conditions and a time of reaction against the efforts as well as the frustrations of the Tanzimat." Under these conditions, the absolutist rule of Abdulhamid was benevolently accepted by the masses and almost no one, including the intellectuals, were immune to these feelings.[258]

The second actor of Abdulhamid's Islamist policies was the Muslim World. As explained in different parts of the thesis, two coinciding conditions attracted the attention of the Muslim World toward the Ottoman Caliph. On the one hand, in 1857 Moghul rule was exterminated by the British and in the 1860s the Central Asian Turkic Khanates were invaded by the Russians, meaning that the central powers in the Muslim World were eliminated and the Muslim masses stand alone. On the other hand, in this period the Ottoman Empire, which held the holy post of caliphate, was the only independent power capable of helping these Muslims.

Furthermore, the emerging social power under the domination of the Great Powers and their attraction to the Ottoman Empire gave the sultan the opportunity to use this dynamic to create a new balance in the international arena in place of the one that had collapsed at the beginning of the 1870s. On this occasion, Abdulhamid deteriorated the already existing negative attitudes of the foreign powers toward the Ottoman Empire.

The third group of actors was the *ulema* who lived in the palace. This group of *ulema* were the advisers of Abdulhamid in his Islamist policies, and they were also sent to local areas when it was necessary. In his pan-Islamic policies, Abdulhamid consulted to four important names: Shaykh Muhammad Zafir, a Tripolitanian and one of the leaders of the Shadhiliyya-Madaniyya Fraternity, who was responsible for Egypt and North Africa; Sayyid Fadl from India who was responsible for the Red Sea region and India; Shaykh Ahmad Asat from the Hijaz who was responsible for the Holy Cities and Yemen; and the last and most prominent name was Shaykh Abulhuda

---

[258] Ibid., 255.

from the Rifa'i order who came from Syria and was responsible for the remaining parts of the Arab lands.[259]

Shaykh Abulhuda al-Sayyadi was the official ideologue of the sultan in Islamist policies and also in the formation of propaganda.[260] Abulhuda lived in the Palace between 1878-1908 and the majority of his 212 books and pamphlets were written in this period. Most of these works are about the legitimacy of Abdulhamid's caliphate. He called for Muslims to unite around and to obey the order of the caliph as a requirement of faith.[261] Abdulhamid highly benefited from this group. Compared to the Young Ottoman Islamists, Abdulhamid's *ulema* created a stronger religious discourse. The Young Ottomans first read the Enlightenment philosophers and then looked at religious sources for their legitimization. However, Abdulhamid's *ulemas* relied on a strong Sunni tradition that was already on the side of the ruler. They looked at religious sources and interpreted them following the wishes of the sultan.[262]

The last actor of Abdulhamid's Islamism is Ahmet Cevdet Paşa (1822-1895). He was one of the prominent statesmen of the Tanzimat and the early Hamidian period, and the writer of the *Maruzat*, which was made up of reports about the Tanzimat period and presented to Abdulhamid. He was also important for the formation of the *Shariah*-based Civil Law, *Mecelle* (1876), after the rejection of the constitution created by a commission including Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa which was based on the Belgian Constitutions of 1831. He is an important name to distinguish Islamism from statism.

Şerif Mardin mentions about Ahmet Cevdet Paşa as one of the most prominent names of Islamism and evaluates Ahmet Cevdet in the same context with the Nakshibendi reaction that aimed to overthrow Abdulmecid and revealed in the Kuleli

---

[259] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 71.

[260] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 347.

[261] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 31.

[262] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 262.

Incident (1859).[263] As Mümtaz'er Türköne points out, state rulers and intellectuals should be evaluated separately because the state elites were concerned with the raison d'état instead of intellectual contemplations.[264] Ahmed Cevdet's Islamism was very similar to that of Abdulhamid which had a secondary place after his statism. In his famous book *Tezakir*, Ahmet Cevdet Paşa mentions the Nakshibendi reaction that was revealed in 1859 as the "malice society" (Cem'iyyet-i Fesâdiyye) because they were a reaction to the state.[265] Furthermore Namık Kemal made several statements praising the leader of the movement, Shaykh Ahmed Efendi.[266]

Ahmed Cevdet and the Young Ottomans' different views on the Kuleli Incident shows the primary concerns of those actors who are known as Islamists. Again, according to Mardin, the trigger for the reaction to the sultan in 1859 from the Revivalists and the reason for the foundation of the Young Ottomans stemmed from the same conditions. Therefore, Shaykh Ahmed is seen as the pioneer of the Young Ottoman ideology in terms of their reaction to the *Islahat* conditions.[267] Ahmed Cevdet disliked the society because of its reaction to the state and Namık Kemal praised them because of the Young Ottomans' criticism toward the Tanzimat reforms. Neither Ahmed Cevdet nor Namık Kemal had a religious affiliation in their approaches toward the Kuleli Incident.

Overall, although Abdulhamid seems practically and ideologically alone when comparing the different actors of Islamism, he also relyed on different Islamist actors. In addition to the sultanate and the caliphate, he had strong support from the Muslim

---

[263] Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi,* 91.

[264] Mümtaz'er Türköne, "Müzakere," in *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa: Vefatının 100. Yılına Armağan,* 162-164 (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1997), 163.

[265] Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, *Tezakir II*, ed. Cavid Baysun (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1986), 83.

[266] Muharrem Varol, "Kahramanlıktan Kalebendliğe: Kuleli Vak'asının Baş Aktörü Süleymaniyeli Şeyh Ahmed'e Dair Bilinmeyenler," *Tasavvuf 35,* (2015/1): 124-125.

[267] Şerif Mardin, *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006), 281.

masses both inside and outside of the Ottoman Empire. In addition to them, he formed a group of advisers from the *ulema* for his pan-Islamic policies.

3.3. Abdulhamid's Islamist Discourse

Selim Deringil writes that:

> all states have recourse to ideologies to justify their existence both to other states and toward their subjects. These ideologies are usually promulgated by a state elite that depends on them for its raison d'etre. The Ottoman state was no exception to this rule… The legitimizing ideologies of the Hamidian era and its elite were based on a set of clearly perceived policy aims, but especially on the preservation of the state.[268]

The most crucial point that Deringil mentions is the "preservation of the state." It was also the case for Abdulhamid that he created his tools of legitimacy toward his subjects and foreign powers to preserve the Empire. If the realization of Islamist policies is evaluated as the main purpose of Hamidian rule, the discourse that he created can be seen as confusing. However, if the discourse that was created and used by Abdulhamid is evaluated in the context of the preservation of the state, it constitutes a meaningful tool in the service of Abdulhamid's statism.

Although the *Millet* system collapsed, religion was still the main determinant of the unification of society and relations with the rulers. In this sense, the post of caliph already allowed Abdulhamid to appeal directly to the Muslim society and also to the independent countries of the Muslim World.[269] In the case of loyalty, beside the Ottoman tradition, classical Sunni Orthodox literature also served Abdulhamid. Although there are hadiths that state that the caliphate belongs to the tribe of Quraish, some prominent Islamic scholars such as Maverdi, Gazali, and Cema'a stressed that the ability of the caliph to protect the *Shariah* and prevent chaos among the Muslims

---

[268] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 345.

[269] Buzpınar, "The Question of Caliphate," 26.

was a priority above his being a member of the Quraish.[270] This tradition eventually came to legitimizes loyalty to any kind of state authority rather than collapse into disorder.[271] Relying on this strong Sunni tradition, Abdulhamid used the discourse of the *din ü devlet* (religion and state) and tried to create a "caesaro-papist" title to increase the prestige of the state.[272]

However, while Abdulhamid appealed to the post of the caliphate to protect his legitimacy, a reactionary discourse emerged from the side of the West to undermine his legitimacy. The reaction of the Great Powers occurred through the claims of Orientalists such as George Birdwood, James Redhouse, and the most prominent, Wilfrid Scawen Blunt who also had close relations with Afghani and Abduh. They aimed to break the power of the caliphate in the Arab World and wanted to create an alternative power center for the Islamic World instead of Abdulhamid.

These propagations concentrated on two points. First, in Islam the caliphate is a spiritual leadership, not a political one. Religious reawakening and spiritual unity should be under the leadership of the otherworldly caliphate. In the establishment of the spiritual caliphate, the British government as a civilized state would be beneficial while overthrowing the obstacles for the Muslims to restore the true caliphate.[273] Second, the caliph should be from the tribe of the Qureish. In this point as well, British forces wanted to support the Sharif of Mecca as the new caliph, with whom they had close relations.[274] Toward this reaction, Abdulhamid tried to legitimize his position by creating a discourse in the Khaldunian sense, which is, "in the Abbasid period, the

---

[270] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 172.

[271] Türköne, *İslamcılığın Doğuşu,* 124.

[272] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 346.

[273] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 268.

[274] Buzpınar, "The Question of Caliphate," 26-27.

Qureish lost power and were unable to fulfill the post, so many *ulema* concurred that the condition of Qureish was no longer operative for the later Caliphs."[275]

In addition to the Islamist side of Abdulhamid, he also appealed to Westernist discourse. Under the conditions of high imperialism and the domination of the discourse of Western civilization with a universal claim, Abdulhamid had to deal with unequal relations with the West and had to get the recognition of Western powers in the international arena over the rule of the non-Muslim populations in Ottoman territory. In this process, Abdulhamid strictly relied on the universal discourse of civilization.[276] He refrained from identifying himself with anti-Western trends in the Muslim world and was repeatedly emphasized that pan-Islamism was not a political movement but a religious one.[277]

However, as mentioned before, the transformation of the discourse of civilization during the nineteenth century was highly dependent on the need to legitimize the increasing expansionist policies. In this case, Abdulhamid was did not able to convince the Western powers to the "civility" of the Ottoman Empire. Essentially, besides expansionist Western policies, Abdulhamid was not against Western civilization. On the contrary, he believed to the necessity of Western-style modernization.[278]

To sum up, Islamic discourse was the panacea of the Hamidian period. Abdulhamid appealed to Islamic discourse to label any intellectual or political attempt as illegitimate.[279] With his complex state structure and the role of the caliphate, Abdulhamid claimed legitimacy and the monopoly over the protection and

---

[275] Ibid., 29.

[276] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 63.

[277] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 64.

[278] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism,* 66.

[279] Kara, *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri I,* 37.

reformation of religion. This claim was not accepted by most intellectuals, who reacted by attempting to delegitimize Abdulhamid's authority.[280]

3.4. Conclusion of Chapter Three

In this chapter, I analyzed the Islamism of Abdulhamid in terms of the regional and international conditions, the actors, and the discourse. Similar to the influence of the regional and international conditions of intellectual Islam, Abdulhamid's preferences for Islamism and its adoption as the state policy were also the result of these conditions. With the unification of Germany and Italy, the existing balance in the international arena began to collapse.

In the process of the formation of a new international system, the Ottoman Empire lost its protection over its sovereignty. Furthermore, in the 1880s, the Great Powers increased their expansionist policies and the Ottoman territories were not immune to this expansion. Under these conditions, Abdulhamid appealed to Islamist policies to ideologically mobilize the majority-Muslim Ottoman subjects and create a new force to deter aggressive Western policies.

In its broadest form the Islamism of Abdulhamid made Islam more visible in daily life. His Islamist policies were generally focused on the symbolic side of Islam, and regarding non-Ottoman Muslims sought to sustain his authority as the caliph of all Muslims. However, in educational reforms he continued the general trend of the Tanzimat by opening secular schools.

In his Islamist policies Abdulhamid had the support of several actors, including primarily the Muslim masses of the Ottoman Empire and the world, the pro-state *ulemas*, the state bureaucrats, and the *Sufi* branches. In general, the actors of Abdulhamid's Islamism were the actors that were subordinate to Abdulhamid and directly bound to him. The *Sufi* groups that Abdulhamid worked with had a mostly ascetic nature and did not have a world agenda. He generally prevented the formation of any alternative Islamist movements.

In light of our findings I concluded that although Abdulhamid adapted Islamism as a state ideology, the objective of this Islamism was not the re-domination

---

[280] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 8.

of Islam but to maintain the existence of the Ottoman Empire. He was the sultan of the Ottoman Empire more than an Islamist actor. The main pillar of Hamidian rule was not Islamism but the four other pillars codified by the Tanzimat grand vizier Reshid Paşa, and Abdulhamid relied on Islamism as far as it served these pillars. Therefore, in his relations with other Islamist actors the reason for the lack of cooperation is that Islamism did not constitute a central place in Islamists agenda. However, since religion was the language of the masses at that time, Abdulhamid also legitimized his actions or delegitimized others through religious discourse.

CHAPTER 4

WHAT CHANGED IN THE CONTEMPORARY MIDDLE EAST?

The last chapter of this thesis will evaluate what changed between the period of the Ottoman Empire and the modern Middle East, up until the 1960s. Like the previous chapter it will examine the regional and international context, the actors, and the discourse of modern Islamism. In the first part of the chapter, the focus will be on three different regions: Turkey, the Arab world, and India. In the second part, which is dedicated to the actors of the modern Middle East, four different actors will be taken into consideration: Muhammed Abduh (1849-1905) and Hasan El-Benna (1906-1949) from Egypt, Said Nursi (1872-1960) from Turkey, and Mawdudi from India/Pakistan.

Although Muhammed Abduh was a contemporary of the Ottoman Islamists who were evaluated in the previous parts, because of his role in the transition process to modern Islamism he will be included in this chapter. The reason for choosing Said Nursi is because, compared to the other Islamists, he provides more information when comparing the transformation of Islamism from the Ottoman Empire to modern Turkey. He was active in both the periods with different methodologies. The reason for choosing Hasan El-Benna and Mawdudi is that they are the founders of the two most influential Islamist movements in the modern Islamic World, the Muslim Brotherhood, which has had a great effect on the Arab World, and the *Jamaat-i Islami* in Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh.

In the last part, the discourse of modern Islamism will be analyzed in comparison with the discourse of previous Islamists. Wahhabi Islamism will not be considered in a detailed manner, but it will be discussed in the third part in the context of Salafi discourse. Finally, since Shi'ite Islamism mainly took its place in the modern Middle East after the Iranian Revolution (1979), it will also not be included in this chapter.

4.1. Regional and International Context

The beginnings of modern Islamism are traced back to three significant events of the 1920s and 1930s: the abolition of the caliphate in 1924, the creation of the Muslim Brotherhood in 1928, and the foundation of Saudi Arabia in 1932.[281] After the removal of the caliphate, the Muslim World lost an institution that had united all Muslims politically and spiritually. From that time onward, the Islamic World was divided into three main geographical and cultural groups: the Sunni Arab Middle East, the Sunni Indian subcontinent, and Irano-Arab Shiism. Turkey lost its leadership over the Muslim World, and with a profound change in the nature of the state, it was also isolated from the Arab world that had ruled for centuries.[282]

Furthermore, Islamism had lost its "monolithic" nature with a center and a sublime leader. Although Islamist intellectuals continued to make global references, from this time onward they mostly concentrated on regional conditions.[283] In addition to regionalization, the power vacuum that emerged after the abolition of the caliphate created different, sometimes rival Islamist movements that wanted to fill this gap.[284] Therefore, the regional and international contexts of the modern Middle East will be examined separately under three main regions: Turkey, the Arab World, and India.

---

[281] Florence Gaub, "Islamism and Islamists: A Very Short Introduction," *European Union Institute for Security Studies,* (October 2014):1.

[282] Olivier Roy, *The Failure of the Political Islam,* trans. Carol Volk (Cambridge& Massachusetts: Harward University Press, 1994), 2.

[283] Mozaffari, "What is Islamism?" 24.

[284] Gaub, "Islamism and Islamists," 1.

4.1.1. Turkey

Although the Ottoman Empire declared its neutrality upon the outbreak of World War I in August 1914, due to the strength of the pro-German branch of the CUP and German pressure to include the Ottoman Empire in the war in order to open new fronts with Russia and Britain, the Ottoman Empire entered the war at the end of October 1914.[285] As was expected, the Ottoman Empire tried to use its authority over the Muslim world to rebel against the Western powers, and in November 1914 the Ottoman *ulema* issued the *Cihad-ı Ekber* (Grand Jihad), which included the non-Sunni sects and expected a global rebellion. However, it did not create the forecasted results,[286] and the war did not live up to the expectations of the CUP leaders. In November 1918, the Ottoman Empire had to sign the Armistice of Mundros.

At the end of the War, the Ottoman sultan, Vahdettin, was willing to make peace with the Entente powers, which would be favorable to Istanbul. He wanted to preserve "the house of Osman" and "Istanbul as the capital," which were two of the abovementioned four pillars of the empire as expressed by Reşit Paşa and strictly applied by Abdulhamid. Therefore, he rejected the alternative defense in Anatolia led by Mustafa Kemal.[287] On the other hand, in the context of Islamism, the case was hopeless. When the First World War ended, the *millet* of Islam had lost all its material support, and the only thing that remained in its hands was a nationalism fortified with religion. In the last phase, the Islamists had the dilemma of either supporting the caliph or the national government in Ankara, and they chose the latter despite the antagonism

---

[285] Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire,* 178.

[286] Hanioğlu, "The Second Constitutional Period," 94.

[287] Joshua Teitelbaum, "Taking Back the Caliphate: Sharif Ḥusayn Ibn Ali, Mustafa Kemal and the Ottoman Caliphate," *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series 40 (Nov., 2000: 413

of the caliph. This choice showed the point where the political agenda of the Ottoman Islamists had evolved.[288]

The victories of the National Struggle with Greece and the derogation of the caliphate with his signing of the Treaty of Sevres strengthened the hand of Mustafa Kemal for the reforms that he was planning.[289] The announcement of the National Pact in 1920 already meant the rejection of the Ottoman Empire and previous ideologies concerned with the rescue of the Empire.[290] According to Niyazi Berkes, in an environment full of the joy of the independence, by stating "the real war is starting now," Mustafa Kemal announced the beginning of the war to secularize Turkey.[291] Thus began the phase of creating the Turkish nation and state based on national sovereignty and independence.[292] Mustafa Kemal and the Kemalist elites decided to adopt secular nationalism as the main ideology in all levels of the new state and society.[293] This nationalization and secularization process was codified as to reach "the level of the civilized nations," which would be achieved through the total appropriation of Western civilization.[294]

In the new period, contrary to the previous period, Islam became a matter of dispute.[295] To illustrate, during the First Constitutional Era the discussion among the Young Ottomans was the source of the sovereignty in an Islamic State, but in the new

---

[288] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 30.

[289] Teitelbaum, "Taking Back the Caliphate," 414.

[290] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 435.

[291] Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma,* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2017.), 493.

[292] Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity,* 248.

[293] Ahmad, "Politics and Islam in Modern Turkey," 3.

[294] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism,* 463.

[295] Ibid., 431.

republican regime, the question became the place of Islam in a democratic regime.[296] Although in the years of occupation religious feelings were used to unite people[297] and for the creation of Turkish national identity, but it was not pursued.[298] Mustafa Kemal wanted to cut the ties with Islam and the past in the new state.

The first reason for this willingness is that Mustafa Kemal's reformism was more realist and pragmatist than other reformist ideologies. Almost all ideologies of the previous period had already been tested and shown that they did not work. As Şerif Mardin points out, for Mustafa Kemal there were 'decades,' while for the Islamists of that time there were 'millennia.'[299] Secondly, the experiences of the Second Constitutional Period had shown that Islam could be an obstacle to radical reforms. Since Islam was the main legitimizer of the state and the opponents of the reforms appealed to this discourse, the Kemalist elite responded to this opposition by militantly limiting religion and extending secular laws to all parts of the society.[300] To prevent religious reactions, through the abolition of the caliphate in 1924, the official ties of the state with Islam and the Muslim World were ended.[301] Thirdly, as Abdullah Cevdet had argued during the 1910s, Mustafa Kemal also accepted the superiority of Western civilization as a rescuer.[302] Since the "nation" and "Western civilization" constituted the basis of the newly constructed state and society, there was no more

---

[296] Berkes, "Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma," 540.

[297] Umut Uzer, *An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism: Between Turkish Ethnicity and Islamic Identity,* (Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2016), 95.

[298] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 417.

[299] Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* 49-50.

[300] Ahmad, "Politics and Islam in Modern Turkey," 3.

[301] Ibid., 6.

[302] Lewis, *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu,* 360.

need for religion for the creation of social cohesion.[303] Fourthly, the religion that Mustafa Kemal wanted was the "civic religion" in the Durkheimian sense in which religion has a secondary or marginal role.[304]

There is also an argument that Mustafa Kemal was not against religion but wanted to limit its role in social and political life and to individualize and rationalize it.[305] This view is a reconciliatory view between Islam and Kemalism. Similar to the main arguments of the Islamists, Islam is a religion that evaluates social life in terms of the divine message and wants to bring society to Islam's ideal social system in which Islam is the main performer, not a superstructure.[306]

The most critical reforms concerning Islam were the abolition of the caliphate in March 1924. As a result of that religion lost its ability to penetrate to every level of daily life. Other reforms include the removal of the *Şeyhülislam* (March 1924), the *Evkaf Vekaleti* (Ministery of Foundations - March 1924), and the Religious Court (April 1924), the dispersion of the *tarikats, tekke, zaviye* (dervish lodges), and *türbe* (tombs) (November 1925) which were expressed by Said Nursi as the branches of the *Ittihad-ı Islam*,[307] the removal of Islam as the state religion (April 1928), the introduction of the Latin alphabet (November 1928), and the change of the *Ezan* (call to prayer) to Turkish (February 1932).[308]

With article 163 of the Criminal Code, the use of religion for political purposes was banned. Article 241 of the code prohibited a religious official from criticizing state laws or institutions. According to the Law of Association (1928), any group

---

[303] Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* 62-66.

[304] Ibid., 119.

[305] Uzer, "An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism," 101.

[306] Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* 10.

[307] Nursi, *Asar-ı Bediyye,* 83-84.

[308] Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* 96-97 and 121.

based on religion, sect, *tarikat*, i.e., and any of the *Sunni, Alevi, Nakşibendi,* or *Nurcu* organizations were banned, and any religious dressings were restricted to the time of prayer.[309] In this period, almost all institutional and social bases of Islamism ended.

Kemalism had a gradual process of evolution. Through the many reforms in alphabet, clothing, calendar, and so on, the difference between Turkey and the West decreased. Moreover, through the exclusion of religion and the change in the alphabet and the language, the Ottoman past became inaccessible for the new society,[310] and a new culture and history were created. In 1926 the Turkish Hearth (*Türk Ocağı*) was replaced by the People's House and by the 1930s it had around 200 offices and 30,000 members all over the country to spread Turkish nationalism and Kemalist ideology. In 1927, the People's House started to work with the Republican People's Party (CHP).[311] The "Sun Language Theory," which asserts that all languages are derived from Turkish, and the "Turkish Historical Thesis," which claims that the Sumerians and Hittites were early Turkish societies, were promoted by the state.[312]

Finally, the events that were experienced during and after the First World War restricted the Islamists' perspective to a narrower geography. Those who supported the Ankara government either continued to support the new regime or were eliminated, like Said Halim Paşa who was not allowed to return to Turkey from exile, or Mehmet Akif and Mustafa Sabri Efendi, who went to Egypt. The remaining Islamists such as Ahmed Hamdi Akseki, Babanzade Ahmet Naim, Ferit Kam, and Izmirli İsmail Hakkı had weaker voices and also gradually lost their power in Turkish

---

[309] Berkes, "Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma," 534-36.

[310] Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity,* 256.

[311] Uzer, "An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism," 35.

[312] Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity,* 255-256.

politics.[313] However, during the democratization process between 1945-1950, Islamism emerged as the primary opposition to the Kemalist regime.[314]

4.1.2. The Arab World

In the first fifty years after World War I, nationalism became the main ideology of the Middle East.[315] According to Nikki Keddie, after the deposition of Abdulhamid in 1909 Middle Eastern intellectuals understood the weakness of traditional political systems and began to adopt nationalism. The political and social outcomes of the Balkan Wars had discredited Ottomanism and World War I had discredited Islamism.[316] Furthermore pan-Turkist and Turanist tendencies in the Young Turk regime had increased until eventually the Young Turks had adapted Turkism as the main ideology of the state and gradually decreased the role of religion.[317] Arab intellectuals' separatism started after the adoption of Turkish nationalism by the Young Turks.[318] Even some Islamists, such as the prominent student of Abduh, Reşid Reza (1865-1935), had joined Arabist groups in opposition to the caliphate.[319] Finally, with the abolition of the Ottoman Sultanate in 1923 and

---

[313] Özcan, "İslamcılık."

[314] Tunaya, *İslamcılık Cereyanı,* 190.

[315] Edmund Burke III, "Orientalism and World History: Representing Middle Eastern Nationalism and Islamism in the Twentieth Century," *Theory and Society* 27, no. 4, (Aug., 1998): 493.

[316] Uzer, "An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism," 75.

[317] Hanioğlu, *Preparation for a Revolution,* 305-306.

[318] Keddie, "Intellectuals in the Modern Middle East," 49.

[319] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 29.

the caliphate in 1924, the ties with the Islamic past had been cut, and the old Islamic elites lost their legitimacy.[320]

Because of its non-colonial background, Turkey was one step ahead of the Arab states in the process of modernization. The period from the end of Abdulhamid's reign until the foundation of the secular nation-state of Turkey was experienced by Arabs in the interwar period. Intellectual disputes in the Ottoman Empire about the preferences for Ottomanism, pan-Islamism, or pan-Turkism were seen in the interwar period among Arab intellectuals either to support separatism or pan-Arabism. After the Independence Struggle, Mustafa Kemal decided to implement a realist Anatolian-Turkish nationalism limited to the existing territory after WWI. However, Arab politics was, on the one hand moving towards building nation-states similar to Kemalism, with Egypt returning to the Pharaohs and Lebanon to the Phoenicians, and on the other hand pursuing a pan-Arabism similar to the utopic pan-Turanism of the Young Turks.[321] Over time Arab nationalism evolved. Lebanese, Syrian, and Egyptian nationalisms emerged in the interwar period, but pan-Arabism became the dominant ideology among both intellectuals and the masses after the foundation of Israel in 1948.[322] The creation of a Jewish state in the middle of the Arab nations created psychological pressure on the Arabs and was seen as another level of Western colonialism.[323]

While nationalism became the main ideology of the modern Middle East, Islamism also played a crucial role in its formation. As Nikki Keddie asserts in her seminal article "Pan-Islamism as Proto-Nationalism," Islamism played an essential role in the formation of Middle Eastern nationalism:

---

[320] Burke III, "Orientalism and World History," 492.

[321] Keddie, "Intellectuals in the Modern Middle East," 52.

[322] Ibid., 49.

[323] Ibid., 52.

> "Pan-Islam gave a new nationalist emphasis to the ideas of solidarity and cultural superiority found in traditional Islam. Drawing on traditional mass sentiment, Pan-Islam thus included several features that later went into local nationalisms: hostility to the West, and particularly to Western conquest and exploitation; identification with a glorious age in the past, specifically with an age that was seen as having both "modem" institutions and military prowess; statements of the superiority of the indigenous culture, in this case Islam, to all others; and an appeal to both conservatives and liberals for the common goals of unity and strength. All of these features find analogies in other nationalisms, and all are found again in the local nationalisms which gained strength in the Middle East as Pan-Islam declined. Not only Afghani, but several of the early Iranian, Egyptian, and Arab nationalists and many Pan-Turkists were simultaneously Pan-Islamists."[324]

When it comes to Islamism, it continued to play a secondary but still important role in Middle Eastern politics. However, compared to the time of the Ottoman caliphate Islamism had lost its unity as new types of understanding emerged, such as Wahhabi Islamism led by Saudi Arabia, which was founded in 1932. In the twentieth century, Sunni Islamism was mostly represented by the Muslim Brotherhood founded by Hasan al-Banna in Egypt in 1928, which became the umbrella term for different sub-groups with sometimes conflicting agendas, such as *Tanzim al-Jihad* (Jihad Organisation) and *Al-Takfir wal-Hijra (*Atonement and Emigration), of which the latter was responsible for the assassination of president Anwar el-Sadat in 1981. People like Ayman al-Zawahiri (second to Usama Bin Laden) come from this type of organization.[325] This group will be evaluated in detail in the subsequent parts.

Secondly, struggles over the propaganda and discussion about the nature of the caliphate during the Hamidian period turned into an ongoing conflict. In addition to the separatist Arab revolt, shifting the caliphate from the House of Osman to the Hashemite family was an important motivation for the revolt of Sharif Husayn of Mecca and his son Abdullah with the British support. He eventually achieved this goal when the caliphate was abolished by the Turks themselves,[326] however that caliphate

---

[324] Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism," 26.

[325] Mozaffari, "What is Islamism?" 25.

[326] Teitelbaum, "Taking Back the Caliphate," 412.

did not play the same role as had the Ottoman Empire. Together with the foundation of Saudi Arabia in 1932, it began to represent an alternative religious understanding and with oil revenues, financially supported the similar Wahhabi branch of Islamist groups.[327]

The third group is the Shiite branch of Islamism that mostly began to increase with Khomeini in the 1960s and took its place among the other Islamists after the 1979 Revolution. Unlike in the Ottoman Empire and Egypt where religious authority was bound to the state, in Qajar Iran (1796-1926) religious authority was a sovereign institution.[328] In terms of politics, similar to the collaboration between the Islamist and secular-nationalist Young Turks, in the 1906 Constitutional Revolution the Shia *ulema* reacted to the absolutist monarchy with the liberal-nationalists and were motivated by anti-imperialist feelings. This relation with liberal-nationalists was not an ideological rapprochement.[329] Until Khomeini, the principle motivation of Shia Islamism was the protection of the privileges of the previous period in Iranian territory. Their reactions to political and social events were shaped by this motivation.[330] Since the transformation of Shia Islamism corresponds to the later period, it will not be evaluated in the context of this thesis in a detailed manner.

4.1.3. Indian Muslims and the Khilafat Movement (1918-1924)

As mentioned above, from the collapse of Mughal rule in 1857 onward, Indian Muslims focused on the Ottoman caliphate as the symbol of Islam's worldly power. Despite the conditions that the Ottoman Empire had to confront, including the heavy burdens of the defeat in WWI and the fact that Islamism had been replaced with

---

[327] Mozaffari, "What is Islamism?" 25.

[328] Sami Zubaida, *Islam, Halk ve Devlet,* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994), 103.

[329] Ibid., 105.

[330] Ibid., 104.

nationalism for the majority of Muslim intellectuals, Indian Muslims continued to believe in pan-Islamism. They believed that if the Ottoman Empire lost its independence, Muslims "would become like Jews—a mere religious sect whose kingdom was gone."[331] For the Indian Muslims under British rule, the Ottoman Empire's sovereignty and integrity were of vital importance.

When the Allied powers threatened the existence of the institution of the caliphate, Indian Muslims decided to support the Ottoman Empire. They organized around the Khilafat Committee and demanded the survival of the Ottoman state and the protection of the holy places. In addition to Muslims, due to the anti-British nature of the organization it also had support from non-Muslim Indians and turned into a movement that united people all over India with a sincere "enthusiasm and capacity to suffer and sacrifice for their cause." The leader of the Indian National Congress, Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948), joined the central committee of the All Indian Muslim League.[332] Although this movement failed to achieve its purpose, it opened the way for the national independence of the Indian people. It broke the reliance on the British authority, and Indians learned to rely on their own power and unity.[333]

The first concrete step of the Khilafat Movement (1918-1924) was the foundation of the All India Muslim League in Delhi in 1918. The main objective of the League was to create public pressure on Britain. In 1919, the movement reached its peak point and was governed by a central committee with adequate funding. This movement was also supported by the Turcophile living in Europe. In this way, Indian Muslims started to put pressure on British rule from both inside and outside. The primary feature of the movement compared to other Islamist movements is that it was a passive resistance movement, not a military one. This was also the prerequisite for the support of non-Muslim Indians. They wrote petitions and sent representatives to

---

[331] M. Naeem Qureshi, "The Indian Khilafat Movement," (1918-1924) *Journal of Asian History* 12, No. 2 (1978): 153. Directly quoted from Valentine Chirol.

[332] Ibid., 153-154.

[333] Abdul Rauf, "The British Empire and the Mujāhidīn Movement in the N.W.F.P. of India, 1914-1934," *Islamic Studies* 44, No. 3 (Autumn 2005): 411.

the British authorities to express the demands of the Indian Muslims and organized mass meetings. Those representative groups led by Ağa Han (1919), Muhammed Ali Jinnah (1919), Muhammed Ali (1920), and Hasan İmam (1921), were the most critical envoys. In this passive resistance, all Indians including non-Muslims boycotted British rule in many aspects such as refusing to do military service and pay taxes. Furthermore, they financially supported the independence struggle in Turkey led by Mustafa Kemal with grants collected from the population.[334]

However, none of the attempts managed to deter the British from their decision about the future of the Ottoman Empire. When the peace conditions for the Ottoman Empire were declared in the Sevres Treaty (1920), Indians reacted in two ways. One group known as the Indian Hijrat Movement proclaimed that the Indian land had become *Darul Harb,* i.e., meaning it was impossible to perform the principles of the religion, and immigrated to Afghanistan. The second group continued to perform the same passive resistance. However, after the departure of Gandhi, the movement lost the support of non-Muslim Indians, though it still effectively continued until the abolition of the caliphate in 1924.[335]

After the success of the Independence Struggle in Turkey, Indian Muslims turned their attention from the Ottoman Dynasty to Mustafa Kemal. They recognized Abdülmecid Efendi, who was the last caliph after the separation of the caliphate and the sultanate, and proclaimed Mustafa Kemal as the savior of the caliphate (*Müncî-i Hilafet*). After the abolition of the caliphate in March 1924, different views emerged among the leaders of the movement. The Ali brothers wanted to open the issue of the abolition of the caliphate for discussion. Mevlana Azad proposed to offer the post of caliph to Mustafa Kemal. Muhammed Ikbal did not see any problem with the policy of the Ankara government and proposed to take it as an example for the Indian Muslims. Finally, when Muhammed Ali Jinnah became the head of the All Indian

---

[334] M. Naeem Qureshi, "Hindistan Hilâfet Hareketi," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfi İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol.18 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1998).

[335] Ibid.

Muslim League and turned the agenda of the movement to the independence of Indian Muslims, this movement further diffused.[336]

Finally, according to the famous Turkish author Halide Edip (1883-1964), the Khilafat Movement had "two curiously contradictory results in India: that of uniting the Muslims and Hindus around a common activity; and that of dividing them."[337] The abolition of the caliphate deepened the identity crisis among Indian Muslims, which emerged as a result of colonization, moral degeneration, and rapid change. Therefore, Muslim thinkers turned to search for an alternative political framework under the new conditions, and in the following years many of them came with proposals of an Islamic state which was theoretically universal and practically modern nation-state limited to a geographical place.[338]

The Indian Khilafat Movement was the result of strong pan-Islamist sentiments that had existed since the 1860s. When it comes to the nature of the movement, it was similar to the revivalist movements of the eighteenth century led by Wali Allah, and to the Sarekat-Islam and the Muhammadiyya movements of Indonesia in the twentieth century.[339] As mentioned in the subchapter on Revivalism, the revivalist movements of the nineteenth century emerged mainly in the periphery where the state was inadequate to maintain the religion. Similar to that, this large-scale movement had emerged to support the caliphate as the last hope of Muslims where it was unable to protect its existence. Compared to other Islamists movements, the pragmatic character of the Young Ottomans or Abdulhamid in terms of Islamism did not exist in the agenda of this movement. As far as the primary concerns of the movement are considered, it can be said that while Islamism was in decline in other parts of the Muslim World, it was still influential in all levels in this region.

---

[336] Ibid.

[337] Qureshi, "Hindistan Hilâfet Hareketi," 166.

[338] Elisa Giunchi, "The Political Thought of Abul A'la Mawdudi," *Il Politico* 59, No. 2 (Aprile-Giugno 1994): 350.

[339] Qureshi, "Hindistan Hilâfet Hareketi," 153.

After the abolition of the caliphate and the adoption of Turkish nationalism limited to Anatolia, Hindu-Muslim cooperation collapsed, and the old rivalries in the community re-emerged. For Indian Muslims, pan-Islamism played an essential role in the formation of the national character. The movement had a dual nature that first aimed to maintain the sovereignty and power of the Muslim community, and secondly to sustain the security of the Muslim community in India.[340] However, although this movement failed to achieve its objectives, it opened the way for a different Islamist policy. Passing through various levels of Islamism, Indian Muslims realized that the solution was neither universal pan-Islamism nor nationalism, and it was according to a "multi-national neo-pan-Islamist" policy developed by Mohammed Iqbal (1877-1938) that Pakistan emerged.[341]

4.2. Actors

In this part of the fourth chapter I will analyze four different intellectuals: Muhammed Abduh, Said Nursi, Hasan el-Benna, and Sayyid Abu al-A'la Mawdudi. Similar to the regional division of the previous part, I chose these names from three major countries of the post-Ottoman Muslim World.

4.2.1. Muhammed Abduh (1849-1905)

Muhammed Abduh was one of the most prominent Islamist intellectuals and was highly influential on the Islamism of his time in the Muslim World and also on the Islamism of the modern Muslim World. The intellectual thought of Abduh had an effect on a wide range of intellectuals in the Ottoman Empire, including most of the writers of the *Sırat-ı Müstakim* and *Sebilürreşad* journals, some of the writers of the *Islam Mecmuası* that later became nationalist, and even Westernists in the journal of

---

[340] Qureshi, "Hindistan Hilâfet Hareketi," 154-155.

[341] Ibid., 168.

Ictihat such as Abdullah Cevdet and Celal Nuri.[342] Abduh advocated for an Islamic state and society that would rely on the basic principles of Islam but also be flexible enough to cooperate with the necessities of the modern state and economic system without any compromise. Similar to most Islamists, he appreciated the successes of European civilization and was profoundly affected by Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer.[343]

Muhammed Abduh had a *medrese* background and a mastery of religious issues, which is why he was seen as the leading figure of Islamism together with Afghani. In his childhood Abduh was encouraged by his father to pursue education, but on his first attempt he quit the *medrese* because of its repetitiousness and returned to his village. After his return he met Shaykh Darvish, who reignited his interest in learning. From this time onward, he pursued education through extra-curricular courses such as mathematics and logic. After his meeting with Afghani in Cairo in 1871, he began to deal with social and political issues and became the mentee of Afghani.[344] After their exile upon the Urabi Revolt in 1881, they embarked on a productive collaboration through the journal of *al-Urwa al-Wuthqa* in Paris in 1884.[345] In 1885, their relationship began to deteriorate, and Abduh left Afghani. This separation also led to a methodological distinction among them. As Hourani states, "Al-Afghani came from some distant place not to be determined with certainty, and passed like a meteor from one country to another." Therefore, compared to his master, Abduh became a more systematic thinker.[346]

Abduh was the founder of the school of Islamic modernism that reopened old discussions from the Sunni tradition such as the *Mu'tazilite* understanding that is open

---

[342] Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh."

[343] Zubaida, *Islam, Halk ve Devlet,* 32.

[344] Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh."

[345] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 25.

[346] Hourani, *Arabic Thought,* 130.

to a discussion the Ayahs and Hadith that seem to be contradictory with rational thinking. Abduh tried to prove the congruity of Islamic understanding with modern sciences and modern principles.[347] As a result of the increase in the attacks of orientalists parallel to the imperial expansionism of the 1880s, Abduh had an apologetic demeanor compared to his confident attitude until the middle of the 1880s.[348]

Instead of political activism, Abduh was an important agent in the teaching and interpretation of Islam. His interest in daily politics diminished over time because of his interpretation of current events that created the necessity to be in good relations with the British in Egypt. His main idea was that "Islamic values had been eroded, but the Muslims themselves were at fault; regeneration of the early unadulterated Islam would restore its pristine character and enable it to compete successfully with European values." He understood that the realization of the existing pan-Islamic idea of a united Muslim state was not possible. He believed in a slower but more successful methodology, which is education reform within the limits of Islamic religious and social reforms.[349]

For the sake of his long-term plan he implemented a pragmatic attitude. After his return from exile, he began to seek British support for the realization of his reforms. Like Afghani in order to confront the despotic regimes and gain support for educational reform he joined a Masonic Lodge, but he left after a short time since they did not react to colonialism.[350] Because of the changing conditions of different parts of the Muslim world, Afghani started to focus on local dynamics, even though his ideas were theoretically universal. In one article translated by Mehmet Akif, Abduh advocated the priority of the national existence and gave a secondary role to pan-

---

[347] Keddie, "Intellectuals in the Modern Middle East," 47-48.

[348] Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam,* 27.

[349] Ibid., 25.

[350] Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh."

Islamism.[351] This idea distinguished him from his contemporaries and made him a transitional actor between the Islamism of the time of the Ottoman Empire and the Islamism of the modern Middle East.

In terms of the caliphate, although in his early writings Abduh saw the existence of the Ottoman Caliph as the prerequisite of the political independence of the Muslims,[352] his views changed later. According to Abduh, "Islam was corrupted by its rulers: intellectual anarchy spread among Muslims, under the protection of ignorant rulers." He strongly disagreed with the Abu'l-Huda, Abdulhamid's main adviser on Islamism, on his conservatism about religious issues.[353] As mentioned in the chapter about Abdulhamid, this conservatism was mainly based on obedience to the Caliph. In his political writings Abduh advocated the dominance of the consultation (*meşveret*) and the law as opposed to the despotic rule of the Muslim leaders.[354] According to Hourani, Abduh "was no less opposed to the autocracy of the Khedive than to foreign intervention."[355]

Furthermore, similar to Blunt's claim about the nature of the caliphate, Abduh stressed the spiritual and symbolic role of the caliphate. He interpreted pan-Islamism as religious-social unity instead of political unity, that provided cohesion, solidarity, and support among Muslim populations. By asserting the religious, ethnic, and sectarian differences in the Muslim lands, he did not support the centralization of power.[356] According to Abduh, the caliph had to have the respect of the Muslims to provide spiritual unity, not to rule them. There should be a chief of the Egyptian nation

---

[351] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 28.

[352] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures," 355.

[353] Hourani, *Arabic Thought,* 151.

[354] Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh."

[355] Hourani, *Arabic Thought,* 157.

[356] Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh."

under the religious sovereignty of the caliphate. This is a system that did not contradict the existence of nation-states.[357]

What makes Abduh the key actor in modern Islamism is the role of his reformation and methodology on modern Islamism. Compared to the activism of Afghani, Abduh had a profound effect on other Islamists. Firstly, his closest follower, Reşid Rıza, after the death of his master and under the conditions of World War I came to a more strict Salafist line and rejected any version of Western modernization. This line would later trigger the emergence of the Muslim Brotherhood. Secondly, Abduh's reformism that projects the synthesis of Islamic thought with modern though was pursued by the scholars of the al-Azhar, especially Mohammad Farid Wajdi (1878-1954), Mustafa al-Maraghi (1881-1945), Mustafa Abd al-Raziq (1885-1947), etc. Thirdly, there was also a nationalist group that transformed his localism into nationalism, and a group that turned his moderate attitude toward the West into "radical laic modernism."[358]

4.2.2. Said Nursi (1877-1960)

Said Nursi is an important name in the evaluation of Islamism from the Hamidian period to the 1950s. In his long life, he experienced politically and sociologically different periods, and he preserved his Islamist attitude until his death. What makes him an actor in this chapter is his position in modern Turkey compared to other Islamists. In the context of Turkey, the concept of Islamism was also used to denominate new type of intellectuals including Necip Fazıl Kısakürek (1904-1983), Sezai Karokoç (1933-), and Nurettin Topçu (1909-1975). However, the Islamism of these names was a conceptual similarity. They cannot be evaluated in the same context as the Islamism that had evolved since the 1860s.[359] Said Nursi can be evaluated in

---

[357] Hourani, *Arabic Thought,* 156.

[358] Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh."

[359] İlhan Kutlular, "İslamcılık," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol. 23 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2001.)

accordance with the previous context, however in this part Nursi's life during the Republican period will be considered.

Said Nursi was born in 1877 in the village of Nurs in Bitlis province in a mostly Sunni Muslim, ethnically Kurdish environment. His family was known for their piety and most of his brothers and sisters had a reputation for their religious knowledge. Nursi started his education at the age of nine and received his diploma at the age of 14 after passing through several *medreses* in Eastern Anatolia with a good reputation for intelligence and comprehension. In 1907 he came to Istanbul to find funding for the university he intended to open in Eastern Anatolia with both a religious and a scientific curriculum but he failed to find funds. In the meantime, he joined the Constitutional revolution and was jailed for his participation in the 31st March Incident. He was released upon his defense which was latter published as *Divan-ı Harbi Örfi*. In 1910 he returned to Van and for one year he visited different cities in Eastern Anatolia and Syria. The speech that later became one of his most famous books, *Damascus Sermon (1911)*, was delivered in this period. In June 1911 he joined Sultan Mehmed Reşad's Balkan journey and managed to get the necessary funds for his university project upon the cancellation of a university project in Kosovo after Balkan wars.[360]

He returned to Van to realize his project but upon the outbreak of World War I, he joined the war as a regimental commander to soldiers that were mostly made up of his students. In 1916 he was captured by the Russians and sent to Kosturma province in Western Russia as prisoner of war. In 1918, he escaped and returned to Istanbul. Although Nursi was politically active in Istanbul between 1918 and 1922, he began to adapt a new Islamist methodology in the social and political life in this period. In 1922 he went to Ankara after being invited but when he realized that the new political environment was not proper for Islamic services in April 1923 he returned to Van as "the New Said" (as Said Nursi named himself). However, the Shaykh Said Revolt in 1925 led the Ankara government to feel threatened by the power of Said Nursi and he was exiled to Western Anatolia. The rest of his life passed

---

[360] Şükran Vahide and Ibrahim M. Abu-Rabi, *Islam in Modern Turkey: An Intelectual Biography of Bediuzzaman Said Nursi (*Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.)

in exile in Burdur, Isparta, Eskişehir, Denizli, Afyon, and Kastamonu. A few months before his death he went to Urfa, and on 23 March 1960 he died there.[361]

During the Independence Struggles, like most Islamists, Said Nursi had friendly relations with the Ankara government.[362] After several invitations, in November 1922 he went to Ankara but he perceived the general political trend to be a threat to religion.[363] He dealt with this trend through the publication of two books about atheism, *Zeyl'ül-Zeyl* (1923) and *Hubab* (1923), and made a speech in parliament about personal religious obligations.[364] He wanted to pursue the agenda of the previous period but the secular reforms, especially on education, forced him to transform his methodologies.[365]

In the beginning of the Kemalist period, Said Nursi realized that the problem of society existed at the micro level and could not be solved through political and institutional transformations. For him skepticism and the positivist philosophy were the main dangers to religion and consequently to society, so raising Islamic consciousness should be the primary concern.[366] In this period he tried to compose an Islamic map of meaning and a mode of thinking on the individual level for Muslims to protect the faith, which was directly contradicted by the epistemology of the Kemalist elites who wanted to create a new society and state.[367]

---

[361] Ibid.

[362] Nursi, *Asar-ı Bediyye,* 103.

[363] Said Nursi, *Lemalar,* (İstanbul: RNK Neşriyat, 2016.), 215.

[364] Vahide and Abu-Rabi, *Islam in Modern Turkey,* 168.

[365] Ibid., 172.

[366] Hakan Yavuz, "Towards an Islamic Liberalism? The Nurcu Movement and Fethullah Gülen," *Middle East Journal* 53, No. 4 (Autumn, 1999): 588

[367] Ibid., 586-589.

Contrary to the new type of social cohesion under Kemalist rule, Said Nursi gave priority to the awakening of the individual as a member of a community, not as a part of a political order.[368] Nursi's methodology fits with Mevlana Halid Baghdadi's (1776-1827) Revivalism, mentioned in the second chapter of the thesis.[369] What Said Nursi wanted was the renewal of traditional Muslim ways of life and personal relations within the new industrial society.[370] In this process he relied on the lower classes, contrary to the elitism of previous Islamists like Afghani and Abduh.[371] Şerif Mardin writes that the failure of Kemalism was to leave unanswered questions in the lower part of society and this failure increased Nursi's power in the lower classes of the Turkish society.[372]

Contrary to his active involvement in political life during the Ottoman Empire, Nursi refrained from active politics and only concentrated on religious affairs. In this period his agenda was reduced to the protection of the daily practices of Islam or the belief system in spite of the state's policies. He did not intervene in political power but attempted to increase the religiosity of the population while attacking materialism, which constitutes the base of Kemalist positivism.[373] Moreover, while the regime was looking to create a homogenous society that included even the Turkification of religious practices, Nursi advised people to perform religion as an individual or a community, not as a part of a political order.[374] That is to say, his actions created

---

[368] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 166.

[369] Hamid Algar, "The Centennial Renewer: Bediüzzaman Said Nursi and the Tradition of "Tajdid," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 12, No. 3 (September 2001): 291-311.

[370] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 29.

[371] Dale F. Eickelman, "Qur'anic Commentary, Public Space, and Religious Intellectuals in the Writings of Said Nursi," *The Muslim World* (1999, 89): 265.

[372] Mardin, *Said Nursi Olayı,* 270.

[373] Ibid., 71.

resistance toward a perceived threat, which indirectly touched the political agenda of Kemalism.

The writings of Said Nursi reached the broader population after 1950 with the removal of the ban on his *Risale-i Nur*.[375] However, Nursi's ideas was not accepted by the population as a part of the pan-Islamism. In his new methodology Nursi integrated his ideas to both the newly created culture imposed by the state and the heritage of the Turkish society.[376]As the culmination of his experiences, Said Nursi created faith-based activism, which is based on the spread of the Islamic faith among individuals without any political agenda. It became neither Sufism, which concentrates on spirituality, nor political Islam, which concentrates on institutional transformation.[377]

In the last phase of his life, Said Nursi accepted the dynamics of the modern world and limited his agenda to the preservation of the faith instead of political institutions. By the end of his life he did not support Islamist political organizations. In a letter in the *Emirdağ Lahikası II,* he explains that since the religiosity of society decreased, any attempt in the name of Islamic unity would lead religion becoming an instrument for the politics, instead of the reverse, and it would lead to hypocrisy.[378] Through this reasoning, he did not support Islamist parties but rather the Democrat Party (DP), which was relatively more democratic and liberal than the RPP. He appreciated the religious sensitivity of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and Islamist journals like *Sebil'ür-Reşat* and *Büyük Doğu* in Turkey, but his agenda differed from

---

[374] Ibid., 166.

[375] Ibid., 18.

[376] Ibid., 48.

[377] Zeynep Akbulut Kuru and Ahmet T. Kuru, "Apolitical Interpretivism of Islam: Said Nursi's Faith Based Activism in Comparison with Political Islamism and Sufism," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 19/1*,* (Sep. 2010): 100

[378] Said Nursi, *Emirdağ Lahikası II,* (İstanbul: RNK Neşriyat, 2016), 168.

theirs mainly in political issues.[379] There is an enormous change in the dynamics of social and political life from the 1910s to 1950s; in the former Islam is the almost unquestioned basis of the state, while in the latter it is laicism.

In an environment in which Islam became one option among many, Said Nursi aimed to create a map of meaning for Muslims to protect their belief. Although Nursi's approach toward politics are criticized by some traditional scholars and Islamists, Nursi has begun to be appreciated as a pioneer in contemporary secular issues among Islamists.[380]

What makes Said Nursi a crucial actor in the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the contemporary Middle East is the evolution of his Islamist methodology in the new secular nation-state. In the last period of the Ottoman Empire, Said Nursi aimed to establish a university, and joined in the political struggles. However, after the foundation of the Turkish Republic he directed his aim to the revival of the Islamic faith in Turkish society, instead of political reforms. In this period many Islamists either left the country or had to reconcile with the Kemalist government. This methodological change by Said Nursi shows us the rupture in the long period of Islamism from the 1860s to the contemporary Middle East by showing one of the reactions of Islamism to the secular state.

4.2.3. Hasan El-Benna (1906-1949)

Hasan El-Benna was one of the most influential Islamists of the twentieth century. The organization that he founded in 1928, the Muslim Brotherhood (*Ikhwan AlMuslimin*), is seen as the beginning of modern Islamism, together with the Jamaati Islami founded by Mawdudi in Pakistan in 1941.[381] Hasan El-Benna received his first education from his father, then enrolled in a traditional *medrese* and latter went to a high school (*i'dâdi*) that gave him a modern education. When the Egyptian

---

[379] Metin Karabaşoğlu, *Tehlikeli Denemeler*, (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2016), 122.

[380] Eickelman, "Said Nursi," 267.

[381] Roy, *The Failure of Political Islam*, 35.

government closed down the *i'dâdi*s, he moved to the teacher high school. In his high school years he joined different religious organizations and became a member of the *tarikat* of *Hassafiyye*. When he finished high school in 1927, he continued his education in Cairo. Besides his education, he managed to organize some shaykhs from Al-Azhar, including Yusuf ed-Dicvi (1870-1946), Abd al-Aziz Jawish (1876-1929), and Rashid Rida (1865-1935) to act against British imperialism and, consequently, toward the corrupt rulers. With the people gathered around him, he founded the Muslim Brotherhood in 1928. He continued his activities in Ismailiyye where he was appointed as a schoolteacher, and the center of the organization was in Islamiliyye until 1933. After a few years, the movement was able to reach to people from different social levels.[382]

After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, British colonial power led to the Westernization and secularization of the educated class in Egypt. This secular trend gradually decreased the role of Islamic laws and institutions, and traditional values.[383] Under these conditions, the organization had three main objectives: "social renewal based on Islamic values, the long-term implementation of traditional Islamic law, and ending foreign occupation of Muslim lands."[384] It focused on the establishment of different institutions, schools for children's education, factories and other economic infrastructure, and *medreses* that gave traditional education. To increase the intellectual and material level of Muslims, a wide range of religious, social, educational, athletic, and economic activities were supported.[385] In terms of pan-

---

[382] İbrahim El-Beyyûmi Ganim, "Hasan el-Bennâ," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.16. (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1997.)

[383] Noman Sattar, ""Al Ikhwan Al Muslimin" (Society of Muslim Brotherhood) Aims and Ideology, Role and Impact," *Pakistan Horizon* 48, No. 2 (April 1995): 9.

[384] Ganim, "Hasan el-Bennâ."

[385] Gaub, "Islamism and Islamists," 2.

Islamic appeal, Benna advocated the unification of Muslims through the re-establishment of the caliphate.[386]

In terms of his position among other Islamists, Benna's methodology may be evaluated in relation to previous Islamists such as Afghani, Vahhab,[387] Abduh, and Reşih Rıza.[388] However, it is hard to make a connection with a specific Islamist to compare with Benna. The agenda, discourse, and methodology of the Muslim Brotherhood was a summery of the agenda of the Islamists since the 1860s. It is an amalgamation of the previous Islamists' methodologies reshaped according to new conditions of Egypt.

Similar to the nineteenth-century revivalist movements, the Muslim Brotherhood had a military side because, unlike Turkey, Egypt was still experiencing the conditions of the nineteenth century. That is, there was still foreign control over the state. Furthermore, they were closely following the Palestinian issue in the 1940s, which was perceived as another version of Western domination. During the Arab-Israeli War upon the declaration of independence by Israel on 15 May 1948, the Muslim Brotherhood declared *jihad* toward Israel. This military action created discontent among the Western Powers, and their ambassadors in Cairo forced the government to disperse the movement. The government agreed, and confiscated all its assets with the pretext of attempting to rebel against the state, in December 1948. After 20 days Prime Minister Mahmoud an-Nukrashi Pasha was killed by a young member of the Muslim Brotherhood, and in February 1949 Benna was possibly assassinated by the state. From that time onward, the Muslim Brotherhood continued to play an important role both in Egyptian politics and in the Islamic World.[389]

---

[386] Ganim, "Hasan el-Bennâ."

[387] Sattar, "Al Ikhwan Al Muslimin," 8.

[388] Zubaida, *Islam, Halk ve Devlet,* 91.

[389] Ganim, İbrahim El-Beyyûmi. "İhvân-ı Müslimîn." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol.20. (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2000.)

According to Benna, like other Islamists, the main reason for the weakness of Egypt, and the wider Muslim World, was the weaknesses of Muslims' ties with religion, and the political and cultural imperialism of the West. With a Salafi discourse, he urged a return to the sources of religion and the elimination of the *bid'ats* (innovations) that entered the religion over the course of history. Unlike the elitism of the Islamists before World War I, Benna wanted to implement this return to the original Islamic principles by penetrating to the lower classes of the population.[390]

When the social and political conditions of Egypt and Turkey for the Islamists are considered, we can see that Benna's willingness to appeal to the lower class is very similar to Said Nursi. Because of the existence of the British authority and the anti-imperialist nature of the movement, Benna confronted the state authority. On the other hand, since the nature of the state turned into a nationalist-secular state after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, Said Nursi also confronted with the state. Although Nursi did not enter into active politics, since there was no other option, both Nursi and Benna directed their attention to the lower classes. Moreover, compared to Benna and Nursi, the Young Ottomans, Afghani, and many others tried to use the power that emerged from dissatisfactions of the masses. The early Islamists mostly wanted to win the support of the community on the way to political reformation. They did not concentrate on changing the masses themselves, such as by educating them, increasing religious consciousness, or finding immediate solutions to poverty in the community. Benna and Nursi did not have the pragmatism that I mentioned in the previous period. Mawdudi had also similar reaction in India during the 1920s, as will be evaluated below.

4.2.4. Sayyid Abu al-A'la Mawdudi (1903-1979)

Sayyid Abu al-A'la Mawdudi and the Jaamat-i Islami movement that he founded in 1941, is the other pioneer of Islamism, along with Hasan El-Benna, in the modern Islamic World. Mawdudi was born in Deccan region of India in 1903 as the son of a lawyer. Unlike Hasan El-Benna and Said Nursi, he was not raised as a

---

[390] Ganim, "Hasan el-Bennâ."

traditional *ulema*, but he learned Arabic and Persian at an early age due to his father's religious sensitivity, which later allowed him to access Islamic sources. After the death of his father in 1918, he had to leave his education, and received neither a *medrese* nor a modern school degree. Later he started to work as a journalist and at the age of 20 he was invited to the *Jamiat-i Ulama-i Hind* (the Association of the Indian Ulama), which had a close relationship with the Khilafat Movement, to work as an editor in its journal, *al-Jamiah*.[391] His first involvement in politics corresponds to these dates. He joined the Khilafat movement, and after the abolition of the caliphate, like Indian Muslim thinkers he turned his attention to India. In the early years he supported the *Hijrat* Movement and also cooperated with the All-India National Congress. However, due to increasing Hindu propaganda, he could not continue his relations with the Congress.[392]

In 1924, a leader of the extreme Hindu movement was murdered by a Muslim for having insulted the Prophet Muhammad. Gandhi and many other non-Muslim Hindus criticized Islam for being violent, and most Westernized Muslims took an apologetic attitude toward the concept of *jihad*. Mawdudi did not accept this attitude and his evaluation led him to distinguish himself from both Westernized Muslims and the traditional *ulema*.[393] He explained *jihad* in a traditional manner but by skipping the historical experiences of the Muslim world and referring directly to the days of the Prophet and the four caliphs.[394]

Aside from his anti-British manner that gradually turned into total anti-Westernism, since it was also necessary to respond to the Hindus' claims stemming from the conflict that dissolved the Khilafat Movement, Mawdudi concentrated on proving the superiority of Islam over Western values and explaining what "true" Islam was. These attempts were in a fertile ground that the Hindu-Muslim cooperation was

---

[391] Eran Lerman, "Mawdudi's Concept of Islam." *Middle Eastern Studies* 17, No. 4 (Oct., 1981): 493.

[392] Giunchi, "Abul A'la Mawdudi," 350.

[393] Lerman, "Mawdudi," 493.

[394] Giunchi, "Abul A'la Mawdudi," 351.

collapsing and the Indian Muslim was looking for an alternative.[395] Consequently, he was accepted as one of the major Muslim thinkers and gained the status of Mawlana (a religious teacher) among the Indian Muslims.[396] As a result of this reputation, through Iqbal's initiative a Waqf including a press was given to Mawdudi. He played an active role in the discussions concerning the future of the Indian Muslims through several books and articles published in this press.[397]

The life of Mawdudi can be evaluated in two periods. In the first phase, from the 1920s until the Partition in 1947, he did not have any political agenda or aim to create a concrete political theory. His existing writings on politics were generally about individual attempts rather than institutional frameworks. The *Jamaat-i Islami* movement, which was founded in 1941, did not emerge to gain political power. Until the Partition, it mostly had the character of a revivalist movement.[398]

In 1920s, Mawdudi rejected the positive attitude of the *Jamiat-i Ulama-i Hind* toward Gandhi's liberation movement and interpreted it as another passivity of *ulama*s in the face of a vital issue. Until the establishment of Pakistan, the main target of his critiques were the Westernized leaders, especially Jinnah, who turned the existing religious identity of the Indian Muslims to a national one. He criticized the call for the Partition of India by the Muslim League, headed by Jinnah, in 1940. According to Mawdudi: "In India, the Muslims who have had a Western education are unable to understand this sublime truth (the truly Islamic State); and they are, even if they chatter about an Islamic state, forced by their mentality and Western culture to aspire to no more than a national state."[399]

---

[395] Ibid., 350.

[396] Lerman, "Mawdudi," 493.

[397] Ibid., 494.

[398] Giunchi, "Abul A'la Mawdudi," 347-348.

[399] Lerman, "Mawdudi," 495.

His revivalist attitude in this period can be seen in his long-term propositions to societal problems. He criticized both Jinnah's and Gandhi's nationalist attitude but did not offer any alternative solution to the daily issues of India. He based his attitude on the Prophet's concentration on the formation of a dedicated Islamic society instead of looking at the immediate problems of Arabia, such as Byzantine and Persian imperialism and internal conflicts. Therefore, he claimed the priority of the "re-creation of a truly Islamic society."[400] One of his criticisms toward the Khilafat Movement was that its failure was to expect "so-called Muslims to act like real Muslims."[401] Similar to Nursi and Benna, he turned focused on the revival of religion in society as the prerequisite to a bigger change.

After the Partition, Mawdudi created a general framework from the theological and ethical evaluations of the first period. Since the creation of Pakistan was based on the Western political system, Mawdudi's second period is mainly characterized by criticisms of this political system. In the Partition, the preferences of the nation-state provided a more concrete short-term basis for the new state compared to Mawdudi's seemingly weak conceptualization. From that time onward, Mawdudi began to be involved in Pakistani politics, and his political theory became more detailed and systematic. Consequently, in the 1950s the *Jamaat-i Islami* lost its revivalist character and actively took its place in political life and joined in the elections.[402]

As Elisa Giunchi points out, Mawdudi's political work should be evaluated on two levels: "the account of the ideal and idealized Islamic 'Golden Age,' and the detailed and concrete proposals which were designed to respond to the particular problems of Pakistan, and which found their practical model in the Western political system." The proportion of the second part increased after Mawdudi's active

---

[400] Ibid., 495.

[401] Ibid., 493.

[402] Giunchi, "Abul A'la Mawdudi," 348.

involvement in politics, especially after the 1956 Constitution, yet his idealism always existed even if it created an inconsistency with the second part.[403]

4.3. The Discourse of Contemporary Islamists

In the modern period, Islamism began to be referred to as fundamentalism. The concept of fundamentalism is used for movements or doctrines that want to preserve the unity of religion, state, and society and confront the modern secular states in the Muslim world. Their focuses are on the return to the fundamental sources (Quran and Hadith) of Islam in the political and social realms. Although it is not homogenous, in general fundamentalism means the rejection of the political and jurisdictional norms of the Islamic tradition that were created by Muslim states for centuries.[404] Fundamentalism rejects the conservative *ulema* that worked with secular governments and reformers such as Abduh who wanted to integrate Islam into a modern state and economic system to sustain the "progress" of the Islamic World.[405]

Similar to the Ottoman Islamists, the content of Islamist discourse remained selective. Since every movement confronted its own government and regional conditions, they appealed to the Ayahs and Hadiths that were useful for their concerns. Although Sunni fundamentalists did not reject the Sunni tradition, since in the medieval time Sunni *ulemas* were silent and mostly in favor of the state, modern Islamists could not find any reference point for them and put aside the Sunni tradition.[406] The refore, the long-lasting discussion of opening religious doctrine for reinterpretation (*Ictihad kapısı*) continued in this period.

Although conceptually fundamentalism is a new concept, in terms of returning to the fundamental sources is not a new one. As explained in the previous parts, the

---

[403] Ibid., 349.

[404] Zubaida, *Islam, Halk ve Devlet,* 76.

[405] Ibid., 32

[406] Ibid., 40.

Islamists of the late Ottoman period also appealed strongly to the discourse of "returning to the fundamental sources." However, when the general context is elaborated, it can be seen that a major change occurred. According to Mehdi Mozaffari's definition of Islamism, which covers the modern time, Islamism is "a regressive ideology which is oriented towards the past (*salaf*). Islamism's ideal is the Medina model under Prophet Muhammad as well as the caliphate of the first four caliphs (*Khulafâ al-Râshidûn*)."[407] Although the Ottoman Islamists used the same discourse, their main point of concentration was the future. They used the past legitimize the future, but the modern Islamist discourse had a strict conceptual return to the past. In this context, despite their differences modern Islamist like Mawdudi, Said Nursi, and Hasan El-Benna appear more Islamist in the sense of the definitions made in the introduction. These Islamists' main orientation was primarily the preservation of Islamic thought instead of material survival.

For example, one of the leading names of the Muslim Brotherhood after the assassination of Benna, Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966) who was sentenced to death by the Egyptian government in 1966, wrote that economic and social worries have only secondary importance. The aim of *jihad* cannot be social justice or liberty; the main objective of *jihad* is to break the domination of the human being and to eradicate the period of ignorance (jahiliyyah).[408]

Economic, military, and political superiority, and the dominant notion of universal European Civilization based on liberal thought, created a perception that the modern world is the ultimate achievement of mankind and it provides the set of criteria for those who want to attain this achievement. Therefore, most Islamists before World War I had an apologetic manner toward this claim and tried to prove the conformity of Islam with this set of criteria. This perception was shattered by the two world wars and Marxism. In this environment Mawdudi, for example, pursued Al-Ghazali's (1053-1111) revivalist understanding. Al-Ghazali played an important role in the preservation of Islamic reasoning while Islamic philosophy was under the

---

[407] Mozaffari, "What is Islamism?" 22.

[408] Zubaida, *Islam, Halk ve Devlet,* 99.

effects of the Greek philosophy. Similar to Al-Ghazali refutations of Ibn Sina's thought, Mawdudi directed his critic toward Muslim intellectuals such as Sayyid Ahmad Khan who accepted the superiority of Western civilization. Mawdudi saw the West as "a sick and declining civilization."[409] According to Mawdudi, if the aim is to overcome Western political and intellectual dominance, it is not the Islamic traditions that should be transformed. Rather, what is necessary is the reestablishment of Islam's basic message.[410] The reconciliatory attitudes of intellectuals had led to the decline of Islamic morality.[411]

In addition to the concept of fundamentalism, Salafism is the dominant concept of the discourse of modern Islamists. It is important to notice that this concept determines the nature of the movements. Sometimes it is used as an accusation by equating the movement with radical Islamist terrorist movements like Al-Qaeda.

Salafism is the religious school that is strictly bound to the wording of the Quran and Hadith, and does not accept any kind of interpretation (*te'vil*). The concept means following those who lived during the time of the Prophet. In modern times it has been used interchangeably with fundamentalism, but it has deeper roots in the Islamic tradition. It found suitable ground under the Hanbali school of Sunni Islam, and it was transformed into a systematic thought by Ibn Taymiyyah (1268-1328). Its main rejection was directed toward the *Mutezilite* understanding, which tries to prove religious principles through rational reasoning, and some extreme Sufi understandings.[412] However, since in modern times conceptual meaning of Salafism and its common usage is different, describing Islamist groups with this concept is leading to the conceptual confusions.

As mentioned before, from the beginning almost all Islamist actors used Salafi discourse to legitimize their critiques and their solutions to the problems of the

---

[409] Lerman, "Mawdudi," 504.

[410] Ibid., 496.

[411] Ibid., 494.

[412] M. Sait Özervarlı, "Selefiyye," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.36 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2009.)

Muslim World. They mentioned the divergence from the true Islam that was lived in the *Asr-ı Saadet* (days of the Prophet). Instead of conscious belief, imitation had increased among the Muslims. Instead of the true principles of Islam, the ideas of scholars had been considered. The Sufi groups had lost the essence of the religion and kept Muslims from performing the real Islam. Since this Islamist discourse was very close to Ibn Taymiyyah's discourse, most Islamists, including Muhammed Abduh, Reşid Rıza, Hasan El-Benna, and Mawdudi, were seen as Salafis.

All Islamists used a variant of the Salafi discourse, however, except for some exceptions like Mawdudi, Benna, and Nursi, most Islamists, including Namık Kemal, Abduh (who was criticized of being quasi-*mutezilite* in his time),[413] and Afghani, were not Salafis in terms of returning to the fundamental sources of Islam. As mentioned in the chapter on intellectual Islamism, returning to the *asr-ı saadet* was the only option to convince the masses of the religiosity of their proposal in front of traditional Islam. As Ismail Kara points out, although nineteenth-century Islamists talked about returning to the past, their main concern was the present and to find immediate solutions to existing problems. They relied mostly on the concept of "progress," which was part of Darwin's theory of evolution.[414]

However, when calling a movement Salafi, the most crucial point is the sense in which the word is used. In addition to the points mentioned above, although Wahhabism was not accepted as a Sunni branch, its members call themselves Salafis or Muwahhiduns, and consider themselves within the limits of the Sunni tradition. Because of methodological similarities, several Islamist movements in the Muslim World have been seen as Wahhabi, such as some Caucasian and Central Asian independence movements, but this is just a similarity on the discourse.[415]

The Wahhabi understanding of Islam is rooted in the doctrines of Muhammed Abdalwahhab (1703-1792) who was influenced by the Hanbali scholar Ibn

---

[413] Keddie, "Intellectuals in the Modern Middle East," 47-48.

[414] Kara, *İslamcılık Düşüncesi I,* 18.

[415] Büyükkara, "Vehhâbîlik."

Taymiyyah. Compared to other branches of Islamism, Wahhabism is more intransigent and violent.[416] Following Ibn Taymiyya's views, they can perform *jihad* even toward Orthodox Muslims if they find them contrary to religious purity.[417] Salafism and Wahhabism, in terms of discourse, rely on the same scholars. According to Özervarlı, Wahhabism was a literal interpretation of Hanbalism but is a movement closed to renewals.[418] Although on theological grounds it is not far from the Hanbali understanding, together with the political and regional factors, it becomes a political movement more than a theological understanding.[419]

The final point about Islamist discourse in modern time regards their regime preferences. From the emergence of Islamism in the 1860s, constitutionalism and parliamentarianism were the major preferences of the Islamist. The Japanese defeat of Russia, as the only constitutional state in Asia, expanded this interest among the intellectuals. The revival of the Ottoman constitution in 1908, the Persian constitutional revolution of 1905-1911, and the Arab parliamentary regimes between the world wars were the parts of this trend. In the Islamist discourse, after the Second World War, nationalism (and later pan-Arabism) and socialism emerged as the new panaceas in the Arab world.[420]

For the Islamists, the restoration of the caliphate was the first step of the revival of Islam to rule over the entire world. Although in Shi'a doctrine the Imamate has legitimacy, Ayatollah Khomeini shared the view of the Sunni Islamists about the restoration of the caliphate without considering sectarian differences.[421] On the other

---

[416] Mozaffari "What is Islamism?" 25.

[417] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam,* 25.

[418] Özervarlı, "Selefiyye."

[419] Büyükkara, "Vehhâbîlik."

[420] Keddie, "Intellectuals in the Modern Middle East," 48-49.

[421] Mozaffari "What is Islamism?" 23.

hand, the understanding of the restoration of the caliphate by Reşid Rıza, a Sunni, was very close to the Khomeini's doctrine of *velayet-i fakih*.[422]

4.4. Conclusion of the Fourth Chapter

In this chapter I analyzed the evolution of Islamism from the Ottoman Empire to the contemporary Middle East, a time when the nature of the state and the elites had drastically changed. Contrary to the previous period, the regional and international context that each new state faced profoundly changed, and therefore I analyzed the regional and international conditions of three main regions: Turkey, India, and the Arab World. In accordance with these regions, to show the reaction of the Islamists to the new conditions, I chose four intellectuals: Muhammed Abduh, Said Nursi, Hasan El-Benna, and Mawdudi. In analyzing these figures, I first evaluated them in their local context, then looked at the continuities and ruptures from the Islamists of the Ottoman Empire, and finally compared the methodology of each in terms of their reactions to the new conditions. In the last part of the chapter I analyzed the discourse of contemporary Islamists, mostly in the context of Salafism.

As far as these intellectuals are concerned, I concluded that these Islamists are still part of a long tradition. When they are compared with the Revivalist movements of the previous period, Mawdudi, Nursi, and Benna can be evaluated as parts of this Revivalist tradition. Each of them had a strong agenda and discourse on the preservation of the faith. Their methodological differences do not stem from differences in their agendas but from differences in the regional and international context. In terms of changes and continuities from the previous Islamists, the methodology of these figures closely resembles the methodology of the Revivalists. Moreover, since religion had lost its centrality in the contemporary period, the pragmatism that the Young Ottomans, the Young Turks, and Abdulhamid appealed to did not exist for these actors. The overall evaluation of the thesis will be made in the following chapter.

---

[422] Zubaida, *Islam, Halk ve Devlet,* 52.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I answered the questions "What are the commonalities and divergences between the Islamism of Abdulhamid and that of the intellectuals? What changed in the contemporary Middle East in the context of Islamism?" In the first and second chapters of the thesis, the conflict between Abdulhamid's Islamism and the Islamist intellectuals of his time were analyzed. In the last chapter, I answered the question of what changed in the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the contemporary Middle East. In three chapters, the Islamist intellectuals of the Ottoman period, Abdulhamid, and the post-Ottoman Islamists were analyzed in terms of their regional and international conditions, their various actors, and their general discourses. Although the main comparison centered on the Islamism of Abdulhamid and the intellectual opposition, I also explored the similarities and differences of the actors among themselves. In this thesis, in general I created a map of Islamism from the emergence of Islamism in the 1860s until the 1950s, in which many of the contemporary Islamist actors like the Muslim Brotherhood, the *Jaamati-i Islami*, and the *Nurcu*s emerged.

Many studies about the conflict between Abdulhamid and intellectuals, and the Islamist intellectuals in particular, concentrate mainly on the conflicts stemming from the intellectuals' demands for the constitution and the assembly. Although this is an important point, it does not give us information about the role of Islamism per se and the relations of other Islamist actors, like the Revivalists and non-Ottoman intellectuals, with Abdulhamid. Therefore, I included several Islamist actors in the discussion of this conflict and showed the role of Islamism in those Islamists' agenda.

Moreover, most of the political and intellectual actors of the late Ottoman period showed Islamist features because of the centrality of Islam in the state institutions and society. When those actors were analyzed comparatively as a whole,

I was able to distinguish the role of complementary ideologies like statism, anti-imperialism, and nationalism. In the contemporary world the majority of Muslims live in secular nation-states. Therefore, in contrast to earlier Islamists, while analyzing post-Ottoman Islamist actors there is no problem of identity. The lines between them are visible. However, at this point the problem becomes the lack of connections while trying to understand these contemporary actors. In this thesis, I showed the similarities among them, and the changes and continuities from the Ottoman period to the contemporary Middle East.

Conceptually Islamism is a Pandora's Box that covers many different people and movements from the entire Islamic world since the 1860s. Depending on a scholar's perspective, Islamism has been used interchangeably with similar concepts like pan-Islamism, *Ittihad-ı Islam* (Union of Muslims), Revivalism, Muslim modernism, and *islamlaşmak* (Islamization). Although many researchers limit their definition of Islamism to one of these concepts, in this thesis I took Islamism in its broadest sense to cover all Islamist actors that have been analyzed under these complementary concepts. The actors that were evaluated in this thesis are the Young Ottomans, the Revivalists, Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani, the Islamists of the Second Constitutional Period, Abdulhamid, pro-state bureaucrats, the Muslim population in the Ottoman Empire and outside of it, Muhammed Abduh, Said Nursi, Hasan el-Benna, and Sayyid Abu al-A'la Mawdudi.

Islamism is a modern concept that emerged in the 1860s. After the foundation of a new international system after the Congress of Vienna (1815), the concept of Western Civilization began to dominate the intellectual and political life of the Ottoman Empire. For the Ottoman rulers, being part of the new international system was the only way to prevent the aggressive policies of Russia, and for Ottoman intellectuals the application of the principles of Western Civilization was the only way to reverse the decline of the empire. As a result of this rapprochement, the European powers demanded reforms in order for the Ottomans to be accepted as a part of the "concert of Europe," especially concerning the non-Muslim population. A series of reforms changed the balance between Muslims and non-Muslims in Ottoman society.

In the emergence of Islamism, the conditions stemming from the *Islahat* Edict played important role. Firstly, the Edict removed the official superiority of the Muslim

community, which was the last motivation for them in the changing conditions of Ottoman society. Secondly, the rights given to the non-Muslim subjects increased their national and political consciousness and led to demands for further rights and, in the 1860s and 1870s, a series of revolts in the Ottoman periphery, especially in the Balkans. Thirdly, the Crimean War (1856) stopped Russian military expansion in the Balkans, causing Russia to turn its focus to pan-Slavic propaganda in the Balkans and military expansion in the Central Asian Khanates. Russian pan-Slavic propaganda on the one hand inflamed the revolts in the Balkans, and on the other hand, together with the general "pan" trend in Europe, increased the consciousness of Muslim intellectuals about pan-Islamism.

After the unification of Italy and Germany, the Ottoman Empire began to lose the protection of the Western powers over its territorial integrity. Therefore, during the 1870s, the Ottoman Empire became vulnerable toward Russian expansionist policies. By the 1880s, the concept of civilization had developed an aggressive tone that claimed that Muslims could not be civilized because of racial and religious obstacles. This discourse was the justification for high imperialism. The concept of Islamism and the Islamist actors emerged under these conditions.

In terms of Islamist actors, the Young Ottomans, especially Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa who are accepted as the pioneers of Islamism, emerged in the 1860s as an opposition group toward the Tanzimat rulers, Âlî and Fuat Paşas. These intellectuals wanted to protect the Ottoman and Islamic tradition against the challenges of the contemporary world. However, according to our findings, the point that some scholars have used to claim that these intellectuals were Islamist is not sufficient because their social and political views on reforms were a mixture of traditionalism, reformism, Westernism, and Islamism. When the Young Ottomans are analyzed only in terms of Islamism they appear to be Islamists, but from the broader perspective it is clear that they were also Ottomanist, nationalist, secular, and modernist at the same time. They used Islamism to legitimize their agenda, mainly by adopting the principles of Western civilization and finding Islamic equivalents for them, including "*adl*" (justice), "*biat*" (contract of investiture), "*icma-ı ümmet*" (consensus of the community), and "*meşveret*" (consultation).

Moreover, in terms of their relations with the West, similar to almost any intellectual movement from the 1860s onward, the Young Ottomans had an anti-imperialist attitude. They were against foreign interference in Ottoman affairs and expansion in the Muslim world. However, they did not reject the principles of Western civilization. Finally, concerning the Young Ottomans I concluded that although they had some features of Islamists, Islamism did not play a central role in their political and intellectual agenda.

Another Islamist actor that gained strength in this period were the Revivalists (*mujaddadis*). In the nineteenth century Khalidi Bagdadi was able to spread his revivalist understanding in many parts of the Muslim World. It first emerged in the periphery of the Muslim states where they could not prevent foreign invasions. When the Muslim states began to lose their Islamic natures, the movements began to approach the center of the states. Therefore, in terms of their relations with Abdulhamid, many of the revivalist leaders were subordinate to Abdulhamid's Islamist policies.

Discursively the main aim of the Revivalists was to return to the Koran and the Sunna, but more than twenty Revivalist movements became resistance movements toward foreign occupations in Central Asia, the Caucasus, India, and North Africa. In terms of Islamism, the role of the Revivalists was to mobilize the Muslim populations and bring them to the political arena. They mainly used the power of these masses to resist invasion and oppose Western-style reforms. It is also possible that the masses to whom the Young Ottomans appealed are the same masses mobilized by the Revivalists. Moreover, the proto-nationalist sentiment mentioned by Nikki Keddie may have been driven by the mobilization of the masses by the Revivalists.

When the main motivations are considered, Islam played a more central role in the agenda of the Revivalist movements compared to the pragmatism of other actors. When the strong Muslim states were discredited by foreign powers and the remaining or new elites did not have legitimacy in front of the population, the Revivalists turned their attention to the masses and pursued religious renewal. Although during the time of the Ottoman Empire they were not so influential, when the discourse and methodology of el-Benna, Mawdudi, and Nursi are analyzed, it is clear that they applied this revivalist methodology.

The third actor of intellectual Islamism is Afghani. He was an influential personality in many parts of the Muslim World including India, Egypt, and the Ottoman Empire, not only for Islamists but also for nationalists. According to Afghani, Muslim societies can be saved from imperial pressure by gaining equal recognition in the international arena, which is only possible through military and political revival. For this reason, he attributed great importance to Abdulhamid as a potential leader of Muslims similar to Germany's Bismarck and Italy's Cavour. Therefore, he wanted to cooperate with the sultan, but he was not welcomed by Abdulhamid who, because of his suspicious character, held Afghani in Istanbul with a few symbolic missions. Finally, our findings in the second chapter showed that Afghani, with his complex Islamist vision, was open to any kind of cooperation with different actors.

The fourth and last Islamist actor are the Islamists of the Second Constitutional Period gathered around the journals of *Sırat-ı Müstakim, Sebil-ür-Reşad, Beyan'ül-Hak*, and *Volkan*. Although each member of this group is worth evaluating individually, because of the limitations of the thesis I analyzed them as a group. As a result of the strict censorship of the Hamidian regime, like other intellectual groups in this period Islamists had to shift to non-political issues. Compared to the Young Ottomans, this situation provided them a deeper perspective concerning religious renewal. This is why they are seen as the first Islamists. This group of Islamists was the main actor in the conflict with Abdulhamid. Although Abdulhamid appealed to Islamism in many aspects of the state apparatus, he prevented any Islamist intellectual attempt in Ottoman territory, and he only supported Islamist actors outside the Ottoman Empire. Secondly, members of this group of Islamists were highly influenced by the principles of Western civilization, especially the notion of "progress." Although discursively they mentioned the past, unlike twentieth century Islamists they never looked back. For them the despotism of Abdulhamid was an obstacle in the way of the future. Our findings showed that although they tried to legitimize their attitude through religion, their primary motivations in their conflict with Abdulhamid were not religious.

In the third chapter of the thesis, I analyzed the Islamism of Abdulhamid, which mostly served to make Islamic symbols visible everywhere in the empire and

to sustain his authority over the Muslim World as the caliph. The Tanzimat reforms especially after the Islahat Edict created a deep disturbance among the Muslim subjects, which Abdulhamid wanted to reverse. On the other hand, toward the end of the nineteenth century the Ottoman sultan was the only leader capable of helping the Muslims living under the imperialist expansion of the Western Powers. With the effects of the Revivalists and other Sufi movements, Abdulhamid appealed to the Muslim population with the title of caliph and used it as a force of deterrence towards the expansionist powers. Since they had already been excluded from the concert of Europe, the adoption of Islamist policies was a realist choice.

Although it is widely accepted that Abdulhamid adopted Islamist policies in many levels of the state, I concluded that Abdulhamid had a pragmatic approach to the promotion of Islamism because of the conditions of the time. The vision to which Abdulhamid appealed during his reign was based on the traditional four pillars of the Ottoman Empire: the religion of Islam, the maintenance of the house of Osman, the protection of the *Haram al-Haramayn*, and the maintenance of Istanbul as the capital city. He appealed to Islamism as far as it served these pillars. This pragmatism can be seen from the prevention of any Islamist organization in the Ottoman lands, the incarceration of Afghani in Istanbul despite his goodwill, and the rejection of tributes to the holy lands sent by Indian Muslims.

Concerning the conflict between Islamist intellectuals and Abdulhamid, it is concluded that Islamism did not play a central role in this conflict. Moreover, in the agendas of the Young Ottomans, Abdulhamid, and the Islamists of the Second Constitutional period, Islamism was not the main objective and its definition was not the revival of Islam. Constitutionalism, anti-imperialism, and progress were prevalent in the discourse of these Islamists actors. In the relations between Abdulhamid and the Islamists, the only actors that had Islamist motivations were the Revivalist movements and Afghani. Although the Islamists of the Second Constitutional period promoted Islamism intellectually, in their relations with Abdulhamid their primary motivation was political.

The primary motivation of the Revivalists was the revival of Islamic consciousness and the return to a powerful Islam. They emerged where the central state and the existing elites became unable to protect and unite the Muslim

community. Although they had always existed in Caucasia, India, and Central Asia, their existence became clearly visible when the Muslim states were replaced by secular nation-states. As illustrated in the fourth chapter, three important Islamists of the contemporary Middle East, Said Nursi from Turkey, Hasan El-Benna from Egypt, and Mawdudi from India, pursued the same revivalist methodology in the absence of a religious state.

Said Nursi first came to Istanbul in 1907 to find funds for his university project in the Eastern Anatolia. In this period, he began to struggle with political issues. He was against the despotic rule of Abdulhamid and in the heyday of the revolution he openly supported the CUP regime. He joined World War I as a benevolent regimental commander and was captured by the Russians in 1916, returning to Istanbul in 1918. He continued to be active against the British occupation and supported the Ankara Government despite the counter-decree of the sultan. However, when he saw the process of the creation of a secular nation-state and a society compatible with the new state of the Kemalist regime, Said Nursi gave up the political struggle and began to concentrate on the reinterpretation of religious principles. What he was doing in terms of Islamism was discrediting the basis of Kemalist reforms in the lower classes of the society. Aside from methodological similarities, in his discourse he directly linked himself to the tradition of Revivalism dating back to the seventeenth century.

Mawdudi emerged in an environment in which Hindu-Muslim cooperation had collapsed, the spiritual power of the caliphate had disappeared, and Indian Muslim were looking for an alternative. He came up with a question of what the "true" Islam was. He aimed to provide a framework for religious revival on the individual level, not for institutions. Although after Partition in 1947 he gradually created a political agenda, until that time he applied a revivalist methodology that aimed to revive the true meaning of Islam.

As the last example I looked at the methodology of Hasan El-Benna, and saw that he created a new methodology as an amalgamation of different Islamist methodologies that had emerged since the 1860s. However, the main actor that his methodology resembled was again the Revivalists. He also wanted to penetrate into lower classes. Unlike Nursi and Mawdudi, he directly confronted the state authorities because of British control over Egyptian politics.

What I understood from these three figures is that the Islamist actors of the late Ottoman period, except for the revivalists, wanted to use the power of the masses for their political reforms, but they did not want to change or awaken the masses. However, Benna, Mawdudi, and Nursi aimed for the revival of religion in society.

Finally, in this thesis, I created a map of Islamism in the period of one hundred years from the 1860s to the 1950s. I showed the similarities and differences among the different Islamist actors who lived in the same period, and the evolution of these Islamist actors from one generation to other. I dissipated the fog over the relations of the Islamist actors, mainly between the intellectuals and Abdulhamid. I summarized the role of each Islamist actor and positioned them within the broader tradition of Islamism.

This study was designed according the framework of a master thesis. Since the topic of the thesis covered a long period and several actors and dynamics, I had to concentrate on the major points concerning our topic. Therefore, a full description of the nature of each actor and the evolution of their relations with other actors remained superficial. Those who were examined under groupings such as the Young Ottomans, the Islamist of the Second Constitutional Period, and pro-state *ulema*s, are all worth a more in-depth examination. For the same reason, I could not concentrate much on the primary sources of the actors. These were the limitations of our thesis.

However, these limitations opened the way for further studies. First of all, although our approach provided us with a map of one hundred years of Islamism, the methodological similarities and differences among Islamist actors should be clarified with in-depth studies. Secondly, since these actors are well known there are many biographical studies, however what is lacking is their position in a social, historical, and theoretical context. The social conditions that created each actor, whether or not they relied on a tradition in the history of Islam, and a theoretical evaluation of the concept and the discourse that these actors used in terms of Islamic political thought, can help us better understand these figures.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, Feroz. "Politics and Islam in Modern Turkey." *Middle Eastern Studies* 27, no.1 (Jan., 1991): 3-21.

Ahmed Cevdet Paşa. *Maruzat.* Edited by Yusuf Halaçoğlu. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1980.

——. *Tezakir II.* Edited by Cavid Baysun. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi,1986.

Akbulut Kuru, Zeynep and Ahmet T. Kuru. "Apolitical Interpretivism of Islam: Said Nursi's Faith-Based Activism in Comparison with Political Islamism and Sufism." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 19/1. (Sep. 2010): 99-111.

Algar, Hamid. "The Centennial Renewer: Bediüzzaman Said Nursi and the Tradition of "Tajdid."" *Journal of Islamic Studies* 12. No. 3 (September 2001): 291-311.

Aydın, Cemil. *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Aydın, Cemil. "Globalizing the Intellectual History of the Idea of the "Muslim World."" In *Global Intellectual History.* Edited By Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.

——. "The Emergence of Transnational Muslim Thought, 1774–1914." In *Arabic Thought Beyond the Liberal Age: Towards and Intellectual History of the Nahda*. Edited by Jens Hanssen and Max Weiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

——. "Imperial Paradoxes: A Caliphate for Subaltern Muslims." *ReOrient*. Vol. 1. No. 2 (Spring 2016): 171-191.

——. “İmparatorluk ve Hilafet Vizyonları Arasında Osmanlı’Nın Panislamist İmajı, 1839-1924.” In *Türkiye’de İslamcılık Düşüncesi ve Hareketi: Sempozyum Tebliğleri.* Edited by İsmail Kara, and Asım Öz. İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2013.

Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey.* London: Hurst&Company, 1998.

——. *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma.* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2017.

Burke, Edmund III. “Orientalism and World History: Representing Middle Eastern Nationalism and Islamism in the Twentieth Century.” *Theory and Society* 27. No. 4, (Aug., 1998): 489-507.

Buzpınar, Tufan. “The Question of Caliphate under the Last Ottoman Sultans.” In *Ottoman Reforms and Muslim Regeneration.* Edited by Itzchak Weismann and Fruma Zachs, 17-37. London, New York: Tauris, 2005.

Büyükkara, Mehmet Ali. *Çağdaş İslami Akımlar.* İstanbul: Klasik, 2015.

——. “Vehhâbîlik.” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol. 42. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2012.

Cambridge Dictionary. “Intellectual.” Accessed June 18, 2019. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/tr/sözlük/ingilizce/intellectual

Chowdhury, Rashed. “Pan-Islamism and Modernization During the Reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II, 1876-1909.” PhD diss., McGill University, 2011.

Deringil, Selim. “Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State: The Reign of Abdulhamid II (1876-1909).” *International Journal of Middle East Studies 23, n*o. 3 (Aug., 1991): 345- 359.

Dale F. Eickelman, "Qur’anic Commentary, Public Space, and Religious Intellectuals in the Writings of Said Nursi,” *The Muslim World* 89 (1999): 260-269.

Eraslan, Cezmi. *II Abdulhamid ve İslam Birliği*. İstanbul: Ötüken, 1992.

Ersoy, Mehmet Akif. *Safahat.* Konya: Palet Yayınları, 2008.

Findley, Carter Vaughn. *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity: A History, 1789-2007.* New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2010.

Fortna, Benjamin. "The Reign of Abdulhamid II." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey; Turkey in the Modern World.* Vol. 4, edited by Reşat Kasaba, 38-62. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Ganim, İbrahim El-Beyyûmi. "Hasan el-Bennâ." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.16. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1997.

——. "İhvân-ı Müslimîn." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.20. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2000.

Gaub, Florence. "Islamism and Islamists: A Very Short Introduction." *European Union Institute for Security Studies,* (October 2014).

Giunchi, Elisa. "The Political Thought of Abul A'la Mawdudi." *Il Politico* 59, No. 2 (Aprile-Giugno 1994): 347-375.

Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkleşmek, Islamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak.* Ankara: Akçağ, 2010.

Gülsoy, Ufuk. "Islahat Fermanı." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.19. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1999

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire.* New Jersey and Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press, 2008.

——. *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

——. "The Second Constitutional Period, 1908–1918." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey; Turkey in the Modern World.* Vol. 4, edited by Reşat Kasaba, 62-112. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Hourani, Albert. *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age:1798-1939.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Kara, İsmail. *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri 1: Hilafet ve Meşrutiyet.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2017. (Revised version of the PhD thesis defended in 1993)

——. *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2017.

——. *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi II*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2017.

Kara, İsmail, and Öz, Asım. *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi ve Hareketi: Sempozyum Tebliğleri.* İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2013.

Karabaşoğlu, Metin. *Tehlikeli Denemeler.* İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2016.

Karaman, Hayreddin. "Efgânî, Cemâleddin." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.10. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994.

Karpat, Kemal. *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Keddie, Nikki R. "Intellectuals in the Modern Middle East: A Brief Historical Consideration." *Daedalus* 101, no. 3 (Summer, 1972): 39-57.

——. Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism." *The Journal of Modern History* 41, no. 1 (Mar., 1969):17-28.

——. The Pan-Islamic Appeal: Afghani and Abdülhamid II." *Middle Eastern Studies* 3, no. 1 (Oct., 1966): 46-67.

——. "The Revolt of Islam, 1700 to 1993: Comparative Considerations and Relations to Imperialism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 36, no. 3 (Jul., 1994): 463-487.

——. *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1972.

Kiren, Akın. "II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Pan-Islamist Uygulamaları Ekseninde Osmanlı-İran İlişkiler." PhD diss., İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2013.

Kuran, Ercüment. "Devlet Adamı Olarak Cevdet Paşa." In *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa: Vefatının 100. Yılına Armağan,* 3-7. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1997.

Kutlular, İlhan. "İslamcılık." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol. 23. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2001.

Küçük, Cevdet. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda "Millet Sistemi" ve Tanzimat." In *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu,* edited by Halil İnalcık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu , 375-387. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2006.

Landau, Jacob M. *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Lee, Dwight E. "The Origins of Pan-Islamism." *The American Historical Review* 47, no. 2 (Jan., 1942):278-287.

Lerman, Eran. "Mawdudi's Concept of Islam." *Middle Eastern Studies* 17, No. 4 (Oct. 1981): 492-509.

Lewis, Bernard. *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*. Translated by Boğaç Babür Turna. Ankara: Arkadaş, 2002.

Mardin, Şerif. *Bediüzzaman Said Nursi Olayı Modern Türkiye'de Din ve Toplumsal Değişim.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

——. *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*. USA: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

——. *Türk Modernleşmesi.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017.

——. *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017.

——. *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006.

——. *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998.

Mozaffari, Mehdi. "What is Islamism? History and Definition of a Concept." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 8, no. 1 (March 2007):17–33.

Nursi, Said. *Asar-ı Bediyye.* İstanbul: Envar Neşriyat, 2010.

——. *Emirdağ Lahikası II.* İstanbul: RNK Neşriyat, 2016.

——. *Lemalar.* İstanbul: RNK Neşriyat, 2016.

——. *Tarihçe-i Hayat.* İstanbul: RNK Neşriyat, 2016.

Özervarlı, M. Sait. "Muhammed Abduh." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.30. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2005.

——. "Selefiyye." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.36. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2009.

Özcan, Azmi. *Pan-İslamism: Osmanlı Devleti, Hindistan Müslümanları ve İngiltere (1877-1914).* İstanbul: TDV İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi Yayınları, 1992.

——. "İslamcılık." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.23. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2001.

Qureshi, M. Naeem. "Hindistan Hilâfet Hareketi." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* Vol.18. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1998.

——. "The Indian Khilafat Movement. (1918-1924)" *Journal of Asian History* 12. No.2 (1978): 152-168.

Rahman, Fazlur. *Islam & Modernity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Rauf, Abdul. "The British Empire and the Mujāhidīn Movement in the N.W.F.P. of India, 1914-1934." *Islamic Studies* 44, No. 3 (Autumn 2005): 409-439

Roy, Olivier. *The Failure of the Political Islam.* Translated by Carol Volk. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Said Halim Paşa. "İslamlaşmak." *Buhranlarımız ve Son Eserleri.* İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012.

Sattar, Noman. ""Al Ikhwan Al Muslimin" (Society of Muslim Brotherhood) Aims and Ideology, Role and Impact. *Pakistan Horizon* 48, No. 2 (April 1995): 7-30.

Sırma, İhsan Süreyya. *II. Abdulhamid'in İslam Birliği Siyaseti.* İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 2007.

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire.* Lanham, Maryland, and Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2003.

Teitelbaum, Joshua. "Taking Back the Caliphate: Sharif Ḥusayn Ibn Ali, Mustafa Kemal and the Ottoman Caliphate." *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series 40 (Nov., 2000): 412-424.

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer. *İslamcılık Cereyanı: İkinci Meşrutiyetin Siyasi Hayatı Boyunca Gelişmesi ve Bugüne Bıraktığı Meseleler.* İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1962.

Türköne, Mümtaz'er. *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994.

——. "Müzakere." In *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa: Vefatının 100. Yılına Armağan,* 162-164. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1997

Uzer, Umut. *An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism: Between Turkish Ethnicity and Islamic Identity.* Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2016.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2017.

Vahide, Şükran and Ibrahim M. Abu-Rabi. *Islam in Modern Turkey: An Intelectual Biography of Bediuzzaman Said Nursi.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Varol, Muharrem. "Kahramanlıktan Kalebendliğe: Kuleli Vak'asının Baş Aktörü Süleymaniyeli Şeyh Ahmed'e Dair Bilinmeyenler." *Tasavvuf 35,* (2015/1): 97-143.

Yavuz, Hakan. "Towards an Islamic Liberalism?: The Nurcu Movement and Fethullah Gülen." *Middle East Journal* 53, no. 4 (Autumn, 1999): 584-605.

Yentürk, Hatice. "*Ittihad-ı Islam* and its Conceptual History with a Special Focus on the Young Turk Press Before 1908." PhD diss., Wien University, 2016.

Zubaida, Sami. *Islam, Halk ve Devlet*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994.

APPENDICES

A. TURKISH SUMMARY/ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

OSMANLI SON DÖNEMİNDE ABDÜLHAMİD VE MUHALEFETİN İSLAMCILIĞI

Bu tezde Osmanlı son döneminde Abdülhamid'in İslamcılığı ile diğer İslamcı aktörler arasındaki ilişki ele alınmıştır. Tezin araştırma sorusu şu şekildedir: Osmanlı son döneminin İslamcı aktörleri nelerdir ve bu aktörler ile Abdülhamid'in İslamcılığı arasında benzerlikler ve farklılıklar nelerdir? İslamcılık bağlamında Osmanlı'dan Çağdaş Ortadoğu'ya neler değişti?

Bu tezde, İslamcılığın ortaya çıktığı 1860lardan, günümüz İslamcılığın birçok aktörünün ortaya çıkmış olduğu 1950lere kadarki süreci kapsayan yüz yıllık bir dönemin İslamcılık ve Ortadoğu bağlamında haritası çıkarılmıştır. Kapsanan dönem ve coğrafyanın genişliği sebebi ile birincil kaynak kullanımı sınırlı tutulmuş olup daha çok akademik kitaplar, makaleler, sempozyum bildirileri, ansiklopedi maddeleri ve biyografik çalışmalar kullanılmıştır.

Bu tez dört üniteden oluşmaktadır. Birinci ve aynı zamanda giriş bölümünde konunun önemi, tezin araştırma sorusu, tezdeki akademik yaklaşım, literatür taraması ve tez boyunca kullanılacak olan İslamcılık kavramının farklı boyutları tartışılarak, İslamcılığın farklı yönleri ve sınırları ele alınmıştır. İkinci ünitede Osmanlı son dönemi entelektüel İslamcılığı ele alınmıştır. Bu ünitede takip eden üç ünitede olacağı gibi entelektüel İslamcılık bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlar, aktörler ve söylem olmak üzere üç ana başlıkta incelenmiştir. Birinci alt başlığı oluşturan bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlarda 19 yüzyılda İslam dünyasını ve özelde Osmanlı entelektüel yaşamının geçirmiş olduğu değişim ele alınmıştır.

İkinci alt başlıkta ise Genç Osmanlılar, İhya hareketleri, Cemaleddin Afgani ve İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan* ve *Beyan'ül Hak* gazeteleri etrafında toplanmış İslamcılar olmak üzere dört grup aktör ele alınmıştır. Üçüncü ve son alt başlıkta da bu dört farklı aktörlerin kullanmış olduğu genel söylem incelenmiştir.

Tezin üçüncü ünitesi II. Abdülhamid'in devlet merkezli İslamcılığının incelenmesine ayrılmıştır. Bir önceki üniteye benzer bir şekilde Abdülhamid Dönemi Osmanlı yönetimde İslamcı politikaların yükselişinde etkili olan bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlar ele alınmıştır. İkinci alt başlıkta Abdülhamid'in İslamcı politikalarının parçaları olan ulema, Osmanlı ve İslam dünyası Müslüman kamuoyu, ve Halife sıfatı ile Abdülhamid'in kendisi ele alınmıştır. Üçüncü alt başlıkta ise Abdülhamid'in İslamcı politikalarında kullanmış olduğu temel söylem ele alınmıştır.

Dördüncü ünitenin ana konusu Osmanlı'dan çağdaş Ortadoğu'ya geçişte İslamcılık bağlamında devamlılıklar ve kopuşlar ele alınmıştır. İlk alt başlık olan bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlarda Osmanlı'nın akıbeti ve Müslüman dünyasının yeni şartlarının yanı sıra Türkiye, Hindistan/Pakistan ve Arap Dünyası özelinde bölgesel değerlendirmelerde bulunulmuştur. Aktörlerin incelendiği ikinci alt başlıkta coğrafi çeşitlik ve İslam dünyasındaki etkileri göz önünde bulundurularak Mısır'dan Muhammed Abduh ve Hasan el-Benna, Türkiye'den Said Nursi ve Hindistan'dan Mawdudi olmak üzere dört farklı figür ele alınmıştır. Bu isimler seçilirken içinde bulundukları toplumdaki etkileri göz önünde bulundurulmuştur. Bu aktörlerin bireysel rolleri haricinde kendi aralarında metodik benzerlikler ve farklılıklar ele alınmıştır. Son kısımda ise bu aktörlerin değişen bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlar içerisinde kullanmış oldukları söylem mukayeseli olarak ele alınmıştır. Bunun yanı sırada, 20 yüzyılda İslamcılığı domine etmeye başlayan ve günümüzde daha da bilinirlik kazanan Selefilik, söylemsel olarak bu kısımda ele incelenmiştir.

Bu tezin temel bulguları ise sırası ile şu şekildedir. İslamcılık tanım itibari ile çok geniş bir içeriğe sahiptir. İslamcılık, İslami yeniden hakim kılma ülküsü ile hareket eden her türlü siyasi, entelektüel, bilimsel, toplumsal hareketi içinde barındırır. Bu geniş tanım bazen birbiri ile çatışan İslamcı aktörleri bile aynı tanım içerisine sokabilmektedir. Bu yüzden İslamcı aktörleri ele alırken dönemin şartlarını ve bu aktörlerin temel motivasyonlarını o dönemin şartları içerisinde nereye

oturduğunun aydınlatılması gerekir. Bu tezde de en geniş hali ile İslamcı olarak nitelendirilen aktörlerin öncelikle Abdülhamid yönetimi ile olan ilişkileri ve aynı zamanda kendi aralarındaki benzerlikler ve farklar ele alınmıştır.

İkinci ünitede işlenen konu kapsamında şu sonuçlara varılmıştır. Her ne kadar Genç Osmanlılar modern anlamda ilk İslamcılar olarak ele alınsa da, tam anlamıyla onların İslamcı olarak nitelendirilmesi isabetli olmayacaktır. Bu tezin bulgurları gösteriyor ki Genç Osmanlı Tanzimat Dönemi eğitim ve bürokrasi reformlarının yetiştirdiği bir nesil olup dönemin baskın "Batı Medeniyetinin evrenselliği" söyleminin dışına çıkamamışlardır. Her ne kadar siyasi anlamda meşveret, şura, şeriat gibi kavramları çok dillendirseler de bu kavramlara yükledikleri anlamlar İslami gelenekte var olan değil tamamen Batı Medeniyet tasavvurunun getirdiği yeni anlamlardır. Bu durumun en somut örneği 1876 Kanun-i Esasi'nin hazırlanması için kurulan ilk ekipte Genç Osmanlılardan Namık Kemal ve Ziya Paşa bulunmaktadır. Ancak şeriatı baz almak yerine 1831 Belçika Anayasası örnek alınmıştır. Bunlara bağlı olarak bu tezde Genç Osmanlılar hakkında varılan sonuç şudur ki onların Abdülhamid ile olan ilişkilerinde İslamcılık temel motivasyonu oluşturmamaktadır. Onların söylemsel olarak şeriata başvurmalarının temel sebebi Islahat Fermanı sonrası dönemde Osmanlı Müslüman topluluğunda oluşan kamuoyunun gücünü arkalarına alma isteğidir.

Bu ünitenin ikinci önemli aktörü İhyacı Hareketlerdir. 19. Yüzyılın ilk yarısında Halid-i Bağdadi önderliğinde tüm Müslüman dünyasına yayılmış olan bu hareket 16. yyda yaşamış olan ve Ekber Şah'ı dindeki reform anlayışına karşı çıkmış olan İmam-ı Rabbaniye dayanmaktadır. 19. Yüzyılda ilk yayılmaya başladıkları bölgeler merkezi İslam devletlerinin Müslüman halkları Batı emperyalizmine karşı koruyamadığı yerlerdir. Lokal bazda başlayan bu hareketler daha sonraki dönemlerde daha büyük örgütlenmeye duyulan ihtiyaç sonucunda İslamcılığın ilk formunu oluşturan İttihad-ı İslam düşüncesinin olgunlaşmasını ve yayılmasını sağlamışlardır. Bu hareketler İslamcılık kavramından bahsetmeye başladığımız 1860 sonrası dönemin önemli aktörlerinden Seyyid Ahmed Han, Cemaleddin Afghani ve daha sonraki dönemde Mawdudi ve Said Nursi'yi metod noktasında etkilemiştir. Abdulhamid ile ilişkileri noktasında ele aldığımızda ise her ne kadar Abdülhamid daha mistik dini grupları desteklemeyi tercih etse de İhyacı gruplar Abdülhamid'in Halife sıfatından

ve de Müslümanların birleşmesi yolunda sembolik bir yer tuttuğundan dolayı, Abdülhamid'i desteklemişlerdir.

İkinci ünitede ele alınan üçüncü figür Cemaleddin Afgani'dir. Her ne kadar metot ve motivasyonlarına yönelik ciddi eleştiriler olsa da Osmanlı son dönemi İslamcılığında ciddi bir etkisi vardır. Hayatı boyunca İslam coğrafyasının farklı beldelerini dolaşmış ve oralardaki İslamcı oluşları etkilemiştir. İslamcıların yanı sıra Müslüman dünyasında oluşan milliyetçilik akımları üzerinde de derin tesiri vardır. Afgani'nin Abdülhamid'e bakışına bakılırsa sürekli birlikte hareket etme gayreti içerisinde olduğu görülür. Afgani'ye göre Abdülhamid Almanlar ve İtalyanların birliğini sağlayan liderler gibi Müslümanların birliğini sağlayacak lider pozisyonundadır. Ancak Afgani'nin pozitifliğine karşı Abdülhamid'in Afgani'ye bakışı daha kuşku doludur. Bunun temel sebebi Afgani'nin ilişki ağının çok geniş olmasından kaynaklanmaktadır. Örneğin Hilafet'in Kureyş Kabilesine ait olduğu propagandasını yapan ve ciddi destek de toplayan Wilfrid Blunt ile olan yakın arkadaşlığı Abdülhamid'de ciddi kuşku uyandırmıştır. Bu sebepten dolayı Abdülhamid Afgani'yi kontrol altında tutabilmek için İstanbul'a davet etmiş ve İstanbul'dan ayrılmasına izin vermeyerek birkaç göstermelik görevle İstanbul'da göz hapsinde tutmuştur.

Bu ünitede ele alınan son grup, İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi dergilerinden *Sırat-ı Mustakim, Sebil'ür-Reşad, Volkan* ve *Beyan'ül Hak* etrafında toplanmış olan İslamcılardır. Günümüzde halen etkileri devam eden Mehmet Akif, Elmalılı Hamdi Yazır, Filibeli Ahmet Hilmi, Said Nursi (Birinci Said dönemi) bu dönemin önemli İslamcılarındandır. Abdülhamid Dönemi baskılarının bu dönem İslamcıları üzerindeki tezahürü entelektüel derinleşme şeklinde olmuştur. O dönemin İslamcılarının gündemini meşgul eden birçok soru üzerine derinlemesine literatür oluşmuştur. Bu yüzden İsmail Kara gibi bazı akademisyenler İslamcılığın kendi ayakları üzerinde duran bir ideoloji olmasının bu dönemde olduğu gerekçesiyle İslamcılığı bu dönemden itibaren ele almışlardır.

Abdülhamid ile ilişkileri noktasında bu dönemin İslamcıları Abdülhamid'e muhalif olarak toplanmış olan Jön Türklerden bağımsız hareket etmemişlerdir. Her ne kadar bu İslamcıların İslamcılıkları noktasında tereddüt olmasa da Abdülhamid ile ilişkilerinde temel motivasyonu dönemin baskın talebi olan Meşrutiyet ve Anayasa

noktalarında olmuştur. Ancak 1860lardan beri toplumda geçerli olan dil din olduğu için diğer İslamcı aktörler gibi bu grup İslamcılar da siyasi fikirlerini din ile meşrulaştırma gayretine girmişlerdir.

Bu tezin üçüncü ünitesinde Abdulhamid'in İslamcılığı ve onu tamamlayan diğer aktörler ele alınmıştır. Osmanlı'nın Hilafet makamını kullanmaya başlaması Küçük Kaynarca Anlaşması ile ilk kez bir Müslüman teb'ayı kaybetmesi üzerinedir. Müslüman bir topluluk üzerinde siyasi otoritesini kaybeden Osmanlı, papalık gibi hilafet makamını dini otoritesinin devam etmesi için kullanmak istemiştir. Bundan sonraki süreçte, Tanzimat sürecinde biraz hız kesse de Hilafet makamının önemi gittikçe artmıştır. Abdülhamid dönemine geldiğimizde ise dört önemli değişim ile bu süreç daha da artmıştır. Birincisi Tanzimat Dönemi boyunca Osmanlı'nın sığınmış olduğu uluslararası diplomatik denge bozulmuştur. 1870lerin başında Almanya ve İtalya'nın birliğinin sağlanması ile yeni dengeler kurulmuş, kurulan yeni dengede Osmanlı, Rusya gibi bir tehdide karşı savunmasız kalmıştır. İkinci 1880lerden itibaren emperyal yayılma hız kazanmış ve de Osmanlı topraklarına da sirayet etmeye başlamıştır. Üçüncüsü ise özellikle 1878 sonraki dönemde Osmanlı Devleti'nin demografik yapısı ciddi oranda değişmiş, Müslüman nüfus artmıştır. Son olarak, 1850lerden 1880lere kadar olan süreçte Müslüman toplulukların şartları kötüleşmekte olduğu için bir kurtarıcı arayışı zirveye ulaşmıştır. Bu şartlar altında İslamcılık ve dolayısıyla hilafet makamı Osmanlının elinde önemli bir güç haline gelmiştir.

Ancak Abdülhamid'in İslamcılığına dair bu tezin temel bulgusu, devlet merkezli İslamcılığın pragmatik oluşudur. Abdülhamid'in devlet yönetimi dört esas üzere kaimdir: selatin-i İstanbul, Hanedan-ı Osmani, Millet-i İslamiyye, Haram el-Harameyndir. Bu rükünlerden birisi bir diğerine tercih edilemez, her biri olmazsa olmazdır. Bu rükünler ışığında Abdülhamid İslamcı olmaktan ziyade bir Osmanlı sultanıdır ve asıl gündemi beka-yı devlettir. Bu yüzden de Osmanlı bekasına tehdit olarak algıladığı her türlü oluşumu engelleme yolunu seçmiştir. Osmanlı dışında her türlü İslamcı aktörü desteklerken Osmanlı içerisinde katı istibdat uygulamıştır. Bunun yanı sıra Osmanlı Devlet geleneğinin aksine karar verme mekanizmasında her türlü aracıyı kaldırıp doğrudan kendisine bağlamıştır. Geçmiş dönemlerde padişah eleştirilemez bir konumda tutulmuş, olası aksaklıklar bir vezir ya da paşaya yüklenilmiştir. Bu gelenek Genç Osmanlıların Sultan'ı eleştirememesinin bir

sebebidir. Bu yüzden de Abdülhamid döneminde, Genç Osmanlıların eleştirilerini Sultan yerine Ali ve Fuat Paşalara yöneltmesi gibi bir durum olmamış, Abdülhamid entelektüellerden gelen tüm eleştirilerin odağında kalmıştır.

Abdülhamid'in İslamcı politikaları İslamiyet'in sosyal hayatta sembolik yönleri ile daha görünür olması şeklindedir. Daha genel olarak baktığımızda eğitimde reform tarzı başta olmak üzere birçok alanda Abdülhamid batı tarzı reformlar yapmayı tercih etmiştir. Onun İslamcılığı kandil ve bayramların şaşalı bir şekilde kutlanması, belli dini kitapların Anadolu'ya dağıtılması, imkanı olmayan köy ve beldelere cami inşa edilmesi, dünya Müslümanları ile sıkı ilişkinin kurulması gibi yöntemlerle Osmanlı Devletini dini kullanarak toplum hayatında ve de uluslararası arenada daha görünür hale getirmektir. Bu durum tam da hedeflenildiği üzere Müslüman teb'ada 1860larda ve 1870lerde içine düşmüş olduğu sahipsizlik duygusunu bir nebze hafifletmiştir.

Abdülhamid İslamcılığını tamamlayan hilafet haricinde farklı aktörleri de vardır. Bu aktörlerin birincisi devlet ulemasıdır. Bu devlet ulemasının görevi ayet ve hadislere dayanarak Osmanlı hilafetinin meşruiyetinin zeminini tesis etmek ve de muhalif İslamcılar tarafından yöneltilen ve yine dine dayanan eleştirilere cevap vermek olmuştur. Abdülhamid'in görevlendirdiği dört önemli ulema örnek verilebilir: Trablusgarp'tan sorumlu ve Şadiliyye-Medeniyye tarikatının liderlerinden Şeyh Muhammed Zafir; Karadeniz ve Hindistan bölgelerinden sorumlu Seyyid Fazl; Hicaz bölgesinden sorumlu Şeyh Ahmet Esad; ve en önemlisi Rifa'i tarikatına mensup ve Hicaz harici Arap coğrafyasından sorumlu Şeyh Abulhuda'dır.

İkinci aktör ise tarikatlardır. Abdülhamid Müslüman dünyasında Osmanlı hilafetinin varlığının hissettirilmesi genelde tarikatlar kanalı ile yapmıştır. Ancak Abdülhamid kendi kontrolünden çıkma ihtimali ve siyasi ajandası olan tarikatlara yani ihyacılara temkinli yaklaşmıştır. Üçüncü ve tüm İslamcı aktörler için de en önemli olanı Müslüman teb'adır. 19. Yüzyılın ikinci yarısında oluşan Müslüman kamuoyu Hilafet makamına ciddi önem atf etmiştir. Entelektüel İslamcılar da onların desteğini almak istemişler ancak Abdülhamid kadar bu kamuoyunun desteğini alamamışlardır.

Abdülhamid İslamcılığının ve de tamamlayıcı aktörlerin söylemsel olarak dayandığı güçlü bir Sünni gelenek vardır. Moğol İstilaları sonrası süreçte muhtemel bir kaosun önüne geçmek için Sünni ulema her türlü lidere itaati öngören bir

pozisyonda olmuştur. Bu durum güçlü bir itaat kültürü oluşturmuştur. Abdülhamid bu itaat kültürüne dayanırken 1860tan itibaren ortaya çıkan birçok entelektüel hareket bu geleneği kırmak için uğraşmıştır.

Dördüncü ve son ünitede Osmanlı'dan çağdaş Ortadoğu'ya geçişte İslamcılık bağlamında devam eden ve değişen noktalar ele alınmıştır. 1920lerle başlayan süreçte başta Osmanlı'nın parçalanması ve Hilafetin Kaldırılması olmak üzere birçok değişiklik olmuştur. Osmanlı Devleti'nin yerini seküler ulus-devletler almıştır. İslamiyet toplum ve siyasal hayattaki yerini kaybetmiş milliyetçilik ve sekülerlik baskın ideoloji halini almıştır. Bunların yanı sıra Osmanlı son dönemi ile mukayese edildiğinde İslam Dünyası çok daha parçalanmış ve farklı bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlar içerisinde bulunmaktadır. Çoğunlukla Osmanlı mirası üzerine kurulmuş Türkiye Cumhuriyeti geçmişten kopmayı tercih etmiş ve seküler ulus devlet anlayışına uygun bir toplum inşası için uğraşmıştır. Hindistan coğrafyasında 1915 sonrası Hindu-Müslüman birliği dağılmış ve 1947'de Pakistan'ın kuruluşu ile sonuçlanacak süreç başlamıştır. Arap dünyasında ise pan-İslamism yerini pan-Arabism almıştır. Bu güçlü önemli değişimlerin İslamcılık üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi Mısır'dan Hasan El-Benna ve Muhammed Abduh, Pakistan'dan Mevdudi, Türkiye'den Said Nursi'nin incelenmesi ile olmuştur.

Bu ünitede ele alınmış olan ilk aktör Muhammed Abduh'tur. Abduh yaşadığı dönem itibari Osmanlı son dönemi İslamcılarından olsa da bu dönemden çağdaş Ortadoğu'ya geçişte önemli bir rol oynadığı için bu bölümde ele alınmıştır. Osmanlı son döneminde Afgani ile birlikte İkinci Meşrutiyet dönemi İslamcılarının üzerinde çok derin tesiri olmuştur. Hayatının son dönemine rastlayan dönemde Muhammed Abduh modern siyaset ve ekonomik sisteme entegrasyonun nasıl mümkün olabileceği üzere düşünceler beyan etmiştir. İlerleyen dönemlerde hakim olacak olan ulus-devlet düşüncesinin İslamiyet ile uzlaşması üzerine ilk fikir beyan edenler arasındadır. Bu yüzden birçok Osmanlı'da ve Arap dünyasında etkili milliyetçi entelektüeller üzerinde de tesiri olmuştur.

Bu tezin temel bulgularından birisi şudur ki bu üç İslamcı aktörün İslamcılığı farklı toplumsal ve uluslararası şartlara verilmiş benzer tepkilerdir. Günümüzde Hasan el-Benna'nın kurduğu Müslüman Kardeşler, Mevdudi'nin kurduğu Cemaat-i İslami ve Said Nursi'nin öğretileri doğrultusunda kurulmuş Nurculuğun birbirinden

bağımsız ele alınmasının sebebi bölgesel ve uluslararası şartlardaki radikal değişimdir. Bu tezde de gösterildiği gibi bu İslamcılar derinlemesine ele alındığında benzer söylem ve metot ile hareket ettikleri görülecektir.

Kurtuluş Savaşı sonrası süreçte Saltanat ve Hilafet kaldırılmış, dinin devlet ve toplum hayatındaki yeri sınırlandırılmıştır. Osmanlı döneminde atılacak adımlarda, yapılacak reformların bir İslam devletindeki yeri tartışılırken, yeni kurulan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde inşa edilecek olan yeni devlette dine ne kadar alan tanınacağı tartışılmakta idi. Bu şartlar altında İslamcılar ya baskılanarak Kemalism yönetimi ile anlaşmayı tercih ettiler ya da ülkeyi terk ettiler. Said Nursi ise ne anlaşmayı kabul etti ne de ülkeyi terk etti. Kendisinin ifadesi ile Yeni Said dönemini başlatarak yeni bir metotla İslamiyet'in toplumdaki yerinin muhafaza edilmesine uğraştı. Cemiyetlerin, cemaatlerin, tarikatların kapatılması ve geleneksel yöntemlerin mümkün olmadığı bir ortamda yazmış olduğu kitapların gizlice çoğaltılması ve okutulması yolu ile, bir bireyin hiçbir büyük oluşuma ihtiyaç duymadan inancını koruyabilmesini hedefledi. Her ne kadar aktif siyasetten uzak dursa da yeni bir toplum inşası sürecinde Kemalist reformların toplumda yerleşmesine mani olacak tarza hareket etti.

Osmanlı Devleti'nin Birinci Dünya Savaşı'na girmesi ile Hindistan Müslümanları Hilafet Hareketi'ni başlatmıştır. Ancak bu hareket sadece Müslümanlardan değil Hindular tarafından da desteklenmiştir. İngiltere'nin Osmanlı Devleti'ne yaptığı ve yapmayı planladığı baskılardan vaz geçirmek için sivil itaatsizlik uygulanmış, silahlı çatışmaya girmeden askere gitmeyi, vergi vermeyi ve İngiliz yönetimi ile birlikte hareket etmeyi reddetmişlerdir. Ancak bu durum İngilizleri tutumlarından vazgeçirmemiştir. 1920 sonrası Osmanlı Sultan'ından bağımsız Anadolu'da bir mücadelenin başlaması ve sonrasında Hindular ve Müslümanlar arasındaki anlaşmazlıkların artması ile bu hareket dağılmıştır. 1947'de ayrılma ile sonuçlanacak olan süreç 1920lerin başında başlamıştır. Bu şartlar altında Mevdudi İslam'ı bilmeyen insanlardan Müslümanca bir tutum beklenildiği gerekçesi ile "doğru İslamı" anlatmak için yazmaya başlamıştır. Bu yazdığı dönem Hindistan Müslümanlarının Hilafetin yokluğunda yeni arayışlara girmesi sebebiyle ciddi rağbet görmüştür. 1947'ye kadar İhyacı bir yöntemle hareket eden Mevdudi daha sonrası dönemde kurulan İslam Devleti'nin pratik sorunlarına yönelik de yazıp çizmiştir.

Pakistan gibi bir İslam devletinin varlığı sebebiyle diğer İslamcılara göre siyasete dair daha çok fikir beyan etmiştir.

Osmanlı'nın yıkılışından sonra Arap dünyasında İslamcılık yerini Arap Milliyetçiliğine bırakmıştır. Arap dünyasının en köklü ve büyük devleti olan Mısır özelinde ise Osmanlı'nın yıkılışı ve İngilizlerin Mısır üzerindeki hakimiyetinden sonra Mısır'da eğitimli sınıf seküler bir tutum sergilemeye başlamıştır. Böylelikle Mısır'da da İslamcılığın hakim ideoloji olması ortadan kalkmıştır. Bu şartlar altında Hasan el-Benna'nın İslamcılığı önceki dönem İslamcılarından Afgani, Abduh, Vahhab ve Reşid Rıza gibi birçok İslamcının metodunun bir sentezi olarak görülebilir. Hasan el-Benna hem toplumun imani zafiyetlerinin giderilmesi, Müslümanların ekonomik şartlarının iyileştirilmesi, İngilizlerle ve seküler devlet yöneticileriyle mücadele edilmesi için çok yönlü metot benimsemiştir.

Bu tezde 1930larda Sudi Arabistan'ın kurulması ile siyasi ve ekonomik güç kazanan Vahhabi İslamcılığı ile 1960lardan itibaren Humeyni önderliğinde toparlanmaya başlayan Şii İslamcılığı ele alınmamıştır. Bu iki grup İslamcılık geçişme güçlü bağları olmayan çoğunlukla 20 yyda ortaya çıkmış olan İslamcılıklardır. Bu yüzden Osmanlı'dan çağdaş Ortadoğu'ya geçişte devamlılık ve kopuşların incelenmesi noktasında diğer İslamcı aktörler kadar faydalı olmayacaktı.

Son olarak bu tezde ele alınan husus Osmanlı sonrası dönemde İslamcıların söylemidir. Modern İslamcılığına dair literatürün İslamcılığı 1930lardan itibaren ele almasından da anlaşılacağı üzere, çağdaş Ortadoğu'da İslamcı söylem radikal bir şekilde değişmiştir. Osmanlı son döneminde her ne kadar dinin özüne dönüş gibi bir söylem hakimse de pratikte İslamcıların hepsi geleceğe bakmaktadır. Arzuladıkları "asr-ı saadet" kılıfı altında her şeyin daha iyi olacağı gelecektir. Ancak Osmanlı sonrası dönemde İslamcı söylem geleceğin daha iyi bir şey getirmeyeceğine kani olduğu için "asr-ı saadet" söylemine daha sıkı sarılmış. Hatta İslamiyetin doğuşundan 20yy kadar oluşan geleneği reddeder pozisyona gelmiştir. Bu yüzden Çağdaş İslamcılar ele alınırken Selefi söylem sıkça incelenmektedir. Biz de dördüncü ünitenin söylem alt başlığında selefi söylemi ele aldık.

B. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences [x]

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Sancak
Adı / Name : Lütfullah
Bölümü / Department : Middle East Studies

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : THE ISLAMISM OF ABDULHAMID AND ITS OPPOSITION IN THE LAST PERIOD OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans** / Master [x] **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. [x]
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years.** * ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. * ☐

** Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ..... **Tarih** / Date