

FOR REFERENCE

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PRINCE SABAHADDIN

AND

HIS SOCIOLOGY

*Bogazici Universitesi
Kutuphanesine
Saglanmista.*

*Ali Arslan
6.4.1988*

Ali Arslan

by

Ali Arslan

Bogazici University Library



39001100312167

14

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in
Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Sociology

PRINCE SABAHADDIN

AND

HIS SOCIOLOGY

APPROVED BY

Assoc.Prof.Mim Kemal Öke

Assoc.Prof. Ayşe Öncü

Assis.Prof.Selim Deringil

DATE OF APPROVAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	4
INTRODUCTION	5
PART I-LIFE OF PRINCE SABAHADDIN	14
Ch. 1- 1879-1899	17
2- 1899-1906	24
3- 1906-1948	40
4- His death and Celebrations	65
PART II-THE SOCIOLOGY OF PRINCE SABAHADDIN	74
A Short Introduction	
5-PRINCE SABAHADDIN'S APPROACH TO LA SCIENCE SOCIALE	75
a-Comparison of Science Sociale and Sociology	75
b-Where he stood	78
6-THE TEACHINGS OF LA SCIENCE SOCIALE	80
a-Its Classification of Societies	81
b-The Principle of Transformation	82
7-PRINCE SABAHADDIN'S FINDINGS	84
a-His Discovery of the type of Social Structure of Ottomans	84
b-His Comments on the Type of Government Methods	84
c-What matters most in the Government Administration	86
d-Two Fundamental Conditions for an Ideal Society	88
e-Implications of the Two Fundamental Conditions	89
1-On the Method of Government	89
2-On the Economic Structure of the Country	91
8-AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM TO TRAIN AND CREATE THE IDEAL MAN	93
a)Social and Cultural	93
b)The System of Education	94
9-THE IDEAL MAN AND CONCLUSION	97
INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	101
APPENDIX A	113
APPENDIX B	119
BIBLIOGRAPHY	122



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is one of the ideas of this thesis that most people at one stage in their life receive or experience a kind of guidance that has an effect on them for the rest of their lives. I believe that I have now such a guidance in the form of the advises of Assoc. Prof. M.Kemal Öke with his guidance I am now in the process of completing one of the most important stages of my life. I can only express my gratitudes not with words but only I think with stating the above fact.

During the writing of this thesis I must mention Tuncay Yurdal as the person who helped me to write it from beginning to end as if it was his own. I thank him for everything but mostly for the patience he showed for me in during our discussion.

I must also mention my deepest gratitude for Mrs. Nezahet Nureddin Ege who helped me to understand the ideological structure of Prince Sabahaddin, and also gave me the opportunity to read the letters of Prince Sabahaddin from her private collection which constituted for the thesis a valuable source of information. I am greatly indebted to her.

But all this would not be possible if I would not have the support and the tolerance of the Director General of Research Centre for Islamic History Art and Culture which is subsidiary organ of OIC, Prof.Dr.Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu and the Director of the Library Mr. Halit Eren, my directors in the palace where I work. My sincerest thanks to them.

Also I would like to thank Prof.Dr. Şerif Mardin, Prof.Kemal Karpat, Dr.Şükrü Hanioglu, Assoc. Prof. Ümit Meriç, Assoc. Prof. Baykan Sezer, Mrs.Zeynep İnal, and Mr.Mustafa Kaçar who gave their valuable time for reading the thesis and assistance.

As for the valuable contributions of the jury members, Assoc. Prof. Ayşe Öncü, and Assis. Prof. Selim Deringil I am most grateful.

Finally my sincerest thanks to Miss Gönül Kırıcı who typed the thesis into the computer, to Acar Tanlak, Mahmud Nedim Mülâyim, Bayram Mert and to all those who made this thesis possible to complete.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to trace the origins of the ideas of Prince Sabahaddin, an Ottoman politician, sociologist and moralist who lived at the later part of the 19th and the early part of the 20th centuries.

I hope to assess whether his suggestions and the solutions he offered for the revitalization of the Ottoman Empire still have any relevance to the current problems of today's developing societies. To this aim, I adopted the method of biographic analysis, since it would not be possible to evaluate Prince Sabahaddin and his ideas independently from his environment and his life experience.

I have chosen him and his works as the subject matter of this thesis, for he was among those 19th century Ottoman intellectuals who were mainly interested in the new ideas in order to discover some solutions for the immediate problems of their country, and whose works later formed the basis for the subsequent developments of 20th century political thought of his country

In his search for a solution that would stop the decline of his country; Prince Sabahaddin, like many of his contemporaries, chose the teachings of western world. His choice could be more revealing when compared with the others' because he was not only coming from the ruling family who had first-hand knowledge of the existing problems of the country but also he was given the best available education of his time which included the teachings of both western and eastern cultures for he was expected to be one of the future statemen of his country.

He found his answers in the studies of sociology which was then emerging as a special discipline among the social sciences toward the end of 19th century. He made his debut into the political life at the very young age he soon became one of the leading politician of his time. He led the so called Young Turks opposition movement against the sultan in Europe. He was mostly supported by the minority groups of Empire who found his ideas appropriate for their own political ends. Therefore, with his ideas, he not only represented the political views of many Ottomans but also made an impact on the intellectual life and the scientific works of the country through his sociological studies of the school of la Science Sociale. His ideas can illustrate us how the 19th-century European thought and Science Sociale influenced Ottoman thought. More specifically we can see how one Ottoman intellectual borrowed certain ideas from the European context in his attempt to provide solutions for his country.

a) Major Currents of Ottoman Thought in the 19th Century and Prince Sabahaddin

What also made 19th century Ottomans so interesting to study is the fact that a huge empire, with so many different nationalities under her rule, was experiencing a speedy decline after centuries of ascendancy. Now the Empire was struggling to stand against the rising powers of the west, but despite all the efforts it made, it was not able to escape disintegration, the European powers took every occasion to annex parts of its territory.

During the earlier part of the century, in order to stop the worsening in the country's situation, the Ottoman government had declared a packet of political reforms based on the ideas which were mostly imported from the West. As known, among these reform programmes was the Tanzimat movement. But the application of such reforms deepened the conflicts and quarrels that existed between various groups in the society which were later widened under the pressure of the outside forces to the extent of causing a life and death struggle of the country.

One of the characteristics of Ottoman Empire was that until the end of the 18th century all the reform movements introduced in the country had always been initiated by the government itself. But with the arrival of 19th century, the political situation both at home and abroad further deteriorated. This time, the government was not only under the pressure of external powers who were demanding changes in the administration policies of her internal affairs but also her own people including for the first time the intellectuals of the country, who openly showed their dissatisfaction with the administrative policies of the government and demanded constitutional reforms.

The response of the government to the demands of foreign powers was the declaration of Tanzimat Decree (1839) which basically aimed to please her Christian subjects together with their foreign supporters. This marked the beginning of a new era in the political life of Empire for it was brought by the pressures of outside forces and not brought by the government itself which had always had been the case in the past.

From then onwards, the government with the consequences of further military defeats had become subject to the ceaseless reform demands of European powers which challenged her own very existence. The motive behind the reform demands of foreign powers was the fact that they all wanted to grab a piece of land from her possessions as they made their intentions open during the Vienna Congress of (1853-55) under the issue of Eastern problem.

It was also during this time, the public opposition in Istanbul started to gather its momentum against the political powers of Sultan as they publicly called for the adoption of a Constitutional government system in the Empire. They were all well intended but lacked the support of masses and first came to public notice during the Abdulaziz reign when they formed their committee whose members were called "New Ottomans". Among them, the most famous were Namik Kemal, Ebuzziya Tevfik, Ziya Pasa, Ali Suavi and Şinasi. These intellectuals who were clearly under the influence of 18th century political events and thoughts of France, expressed the feelings of many Ottomans in their writings which were published in the newspaper of Hürriyet and Muhbir by asking from the government for more justice, freedom, equality and fraternity

Their opportunate moment came when Abdulaziz was dethroned and Abdulhamid promised them that he would declare constitution if he succeeded him. He kept his word when he was made Sultan as he declared the first Constitution and appointed Mithad Pasha as the head of the first Ottoman Parliament. But after a brief period he dissolved the parliament, sent its prominent members to exile and ruled the country with single hand. From then onwards those intellectuals who continued their political opposition against Sultan Abdulhamid either worked secretly in Istanbul or went to Europe and joined the opposition groups. However, they were split with respect to the solution of the country's problems as they had various ideas which they put forward to prevent the decline of their country. They, which included the old members of the New Ottomans committee, continued their opposition movement in their newly formed The Union and Progress party. But as we shall see in the following pages the groups were so diverse in their political thoughts, they failed to achieve a strong and consistent opposition against the government of Abdulhamid who in the meantime was trying to put his own reform, known as 'Panislamism' which aimed to unify the country. In the realization of this objective, Abdulhamid expected to benefit from the support of all Muslims in the world.

Among these various ideas Prince Sabahaddin unlike his contemporaries looked for the solution in the change of the social structure of the society. His approach which was new when compared with the existing ones, brought some different and original explanations. For example he was the first man in Turkey who advocated the need for structural changes before any reform action was taken. It was this aspect of his activities which made us choose him as the subject of our thesis.

b) 19th Century Social Sciences in Europe and Prince Sabahaddin

The 19th century was an era of great social and economic change for European societies, a period in which technological and scientific discoveries accelerated. Changes, of course, meant new social problems for the social scientists to solve, that is, to develop scientific theories that would explain the working of social phenomenon. Unsurprisingly they employed scientific methods in their works for it was clear from the results of scientists of the other disciplines that the solutions or explanations of problems were only possible by the employment of scientific methods. Hence the name positivist given to the social scientists of the period who believed that there existed social laws like natural laws, and consequently aimed to formulate, like evolutionary theories of physics and biology etc., a theory of evolution of human societies.

The fundamental idea of the theory of social evolution revolved around the process of growth and decline of human societies whose course of the development has been found in various evolutionary stages with the emphasis has been on the idea that the lives of societies has always been subject to a continuous change (dynamism).

This theory, together with the theory of Darwin, a 19th century biologist whose theory of evolution which was then found on the idea of competition and natural selection, dominated the ideas of 19th century European thought despite the fact that these two theories were the outcomes of the works of two different disciplines. But in effect they reinforced each others' findings and reached to the minds of European public as a single concept.

Among the supporters of the theory of social evolution the most well knowns were Comte, Hegel, Marx, Spencer and Durkheim. Although the explanations of social phenomenon of these men were all based on the theory of social evolution their explanations of the evolutionary stages that the human societies experienced in the course of their progress and development, differed widely from one another.

The determining factor in the course of advancement of human societies in the theories of these men, according to Comte it was human knowledge, to Hegel it was freedom, to Marx it was the means of production, while Spencer thought everything, that is, the development of all social phenomena (e.g. social-political institutions) as well as the development of all natural phenomena, had an evolutionary direction which he described as "homogeneity to heterogeneity". Where as Durkheim emphasised the importance of the functional relationship that exist between the members of society with its evolutionary direction in structurally being from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity.

The effects of the writings of these men on the politicians of the Europe as well as the politicians of the rest of the world has been great (enormous). For example Hegel's writings not only personified the Prussian state but also found its way to Hitler's Germany, while Marx's ideas not only formed basis for the state ideology of today's Soviet government but also influenced the politicians of many other countries of the world in their selection of their government methods, e.g. China.

However to understand the early developments of these sociological thoughts but much more so their relevance and their affects to the 19th century Ottomans it would be better to glance back to the 18 century ideological developments of France which in the end led to the revolution of 1789. The imminent issue then for the social scientists of the period was to find out the best political system which would solve or at least improve the existing social problems (e.g. poverty, political injustice) of the French society. Social concepts like liberty, fraternity and equality were the main social goals that the 1789 revolution aimed to achieve. The introduction of these ideas to the public were made possible by the works of men like Voltaire, Montesquies and Rousseau whose studies aimed to find the best social methods in the administration system of their countries. According to their findings for example Rousseau argued for democracy whereas Montesquies argued for the constitutional system as the best type of government system.

The innovative findings of these three men not only influenced the works of social scientists of the later periods but had a direct impact (especially Rousseau) on the ideas of the co-founders of USA government in the determination of the government method of their country. However it was not only USA government but the politics of the whole world affected by the ideas of these men among them of course 19th century Ottoman intellectuals who were partly responsible for the introduction of the first and the second Constitutions.

While on the other hand the 19th century political thoughts in Europe were dictated by the ideas of those 19th century social scientists the political views were broadly divided into three major groups as conservatives, liberals and radicals. Generally those who supported the views of these social scientists and supported the application of new ideas and human policies into the administration policies of their governments, were found among the liberals and radicals. Conservatives on the other hand were usually found among those whose interest was threatened by the over increasing number of social and economic changes due to the process of industrialisation which was basically originated from application of scientific discoveries e.g. steam engine that revolutionized the methods of previous production systems and laid the foundations of factory system.

The problems were started when the number of those who were engaged in industrial jobs increased enormously. The industrialists of the period acquired great wealth while the industrial workers found their political muscle through their collective bargaining actions (unions). The direct result in the shift of this political balance was a political confrontation between the industrialists, the industrial workers and those who were not affected by this transformation process and held the political power previously in their hands (land owners).

In this struggle industrial workers adopted and used the ideas of Marx and other social socialist writers of the period in their fight to improve their economic and political rights, e.g. more wages, better working conditions, political representation through universal suffrage and in effect they constituted the radical wing of political stage. While liberals which included the present day industrialists, traders and those who benefited from the changing conditions, followed policies which were essential for their economic development and process, e.g. free trade policies which were elaborated and represented by the writings of Adam Smith who a century ago in his book Wealth of Nations expressed and defended the benefits of free trade and division of labour on which the industrialization process was built.

But much more to the point was the fact that unlike her main rivals who owed their supremacy to their industrialization process, the 19th century Ottoman Empire was still an agriculture society whose problems were therefore much similar to those of 17th and 18th century France. In consequence the writings of those 18th century Frenchmen found more followers in the Ottoman Empire than the writings of 19th century European social scientists.

One of the few exceptions to this rule were the ideas of Prince Sabahaddin who argued that the problems of Empire were structural, thus could not be solved by political means as it was suggested by those 18th century Frenchmen whose writings mainly advocated the ideas like liberty, equality and fraternity, which failed to provide quick solutions to the existing social problems of 18th century France when they were put into practice soon after the revolution.

As he was studying those sociological traditions found La Science Sociale's methods much more suitable for the solutions to his country's social problems as it was associated with the ideas of decentralization and private initiative.

There were two major elements in the tradition of empirical social research. The first of these to emerge was the collection and quantification of social data which Durkheim can be given as example for this tradition. The second, though it did not eschew quantification, was more concerned with the observation of social life and the development of techniques for gathering as well as analyzing social data.

This second major branch of empirical research that clearly originated in France is that associated with the work of Frederic Le Play. Though obviously interested in quantification, Le Play invented new techniques for both gathering and analyzing nonquantitative data. While Le Play is perhaps best known for his emphasis on the empirical observation of contemporary social life, particularly his studies of family budgets, he was much concerned with the development of social indicators and with the problems of classification that arise in the analysis of social data.

His followers founded a journal with the promising name of La Science Sociale and his school was later labelled La Science Sociale School.

However he was not interested in every aspect of La Science Sociale teachings. The areas he was mainly interested in were those parts which studied the identification, classification, and the structural developments of the societies. His sociology, if there was any, mostly contained structure, conduct, performance, analyses of the societies, the comparison of the methods of centralization and decentralization as the main forms of government administrations, and various education and training methods for the development of the ideal member of a society found on the ideas of private initiative.

It was difficult for him not to be overwhelmed with the idea of private initiative as he realized the fact that behind all these changes which caused the industrial revolution and made countries like Britain so powerful, there were individuals who had courage, vision and private initiative. It was a period of science and as he was looking for ways to stop his country's decline his choice inevitably was made on La Science Sociale, a science which tried to bring scientific explanations to the causes of the social phenomena.

He combined his studies with search for the various types of human models in order to find the most successful type of individual in which he spent some time studying the educational methods of the European countries in search of the best training methods necessary for the members of a society. Therefore when Sabahaddin's sociology is read in the following pages the reader should bear in mind the reasons mentioned above as the major determinants of his sociology.

For example in his writings there is not a single word about the positive sides of the system of Centralization. As we would know from history, the system of centralization had also produced some very succesful results. He would have been the first to admit that the way he did his comparisons was not very scientific. Therefore one can not understand the sociology of Prince Sabahaddin if he does not understand his motives, and to understand his motives one has to first know something about his personal life and the environment he lived in (his biography).

c-Advantages and shortcomings of Biographic Analysis in Social Sciences

The main advantage of a biography is the fact that it is the only method available to social scientists in their explanation of the past social phenomenon while its main disadvantage is to remain neutral and objective with the facts of their cases. Obviously this is a very diffucult thing to achieve because everybody including the social scientists are after all subject to the influence of their environment and their social and cultural background.

But the point is that they have to be objective with the facts of their case if they want to employ biographies as a method for a scientific research simply because the aim of any scientific research is to provide verifiable information so that it can be employed by other people in the solution of their problems and for this reason the social scientists can not allow themselves to any diversion away from the facts of their case.

Therefore the difficulties of writing biographies for the purpose of scientific research are in fact their disadvantages (shortcomings), and unless the social scientists do not overcome these difficulties that is, if they do not remain strickly within the boundries of the facts of their cases then the outcome of their endavour becomes nothing but a fiction.

With these in mind, a social scientist encounters his first difficulty at the first stage of his research activity during when the selection of the facts of case are made. This is also the most important stage of the research activity for it determines the course and the outcome of the research. The difficulty is mostly due to the constant economic, technological, demographic etc. changes that take place in our environments which make the relative order of importance of the parts that constitute those social phenomena unstable. This in turn can make the recommendation or the application of any past finding to the conditions of a different period meaningless because the issues or events do not maintain their relevance indefinetely as their constituent factors as well as the degree of their importance in relation to each other change with time.

The second difficulty arises during when the researcher starts to arrange the order of facts (findings) according to their importance for the presentation of his case. The danger here is that social scientists despite their training are also vulnerable like any one else to the effects of their cultural and social values. So under such cultural influences a social scientist over and under consider the importance of some facts of the case under investigation and thus in his presentation may place some facts of the case in a different order than that of the order of actual case, and by doing so the social scientist may lead people into misleading ideas and wrong conclusions.

The third and final difficulty arises when the researcher starts to interpret the findings of his case. The problem here is that when there is an element of interpretation there is always the danger of the existence of subjectivity and this abundantly exist in the body of method itself for the simple reason that biographies are distinctly form of art and literature and not of science. If the researcher does not interpret the results of his findings and stricly remain within the boundries of the facts of case then his research merely becomes a collection of records which can have only value for historians. To overcome this difficulty the social scientist relies on the existence of past events on which he can base and build the interpretation of his findings that are necessary for the construction of his case. This is the advantage of biographies. Because history is so rich in social events that are often validating one another. If you like it is like a huge laboratory filled with past social experiments which are at the disposal of social scientists. Of course they have to be careful with the distortions and the manipulations that are often found in the writings of historians. So biographies can be employed as a tool by social scientists in their researches provided that they are aware and take notice of its difficulties mentioned above.

During the writing of the biography of Prince Sabahaddin my interest has been on the political and the social aspects of his life. Therefore I tried to present the historical data in such an order and emphasis for to draw the attention of the reader to the factors which influenced the development of his ideas and to the origins and causes of some social and political concepts as for they are still in the political agenda of today's government leaders.

PART I

LIFE OF PRINCE SABAHADDIN

"The exact date of Prince Sabahaddin's birthday from the official records is not clear. The year he was born in is registered as 1295 (1879) in the book in which the dates of the crown family members' births, weddings and deaths were recorded, and this book is at the present kept in the Ottoman State Archives of the Prime Minister. The dates in this book were according to the Arabic Calender which was in use during the period. Although the days and the months of the birthdays of the dynasty members were normally recorded in this book, Prince Sabahaddin's day and the month of his birth were somehow not stated. According to his brother Ahmed Lutfullah, Prince Sabahaddin was born in the Kuruçesme Palace on the day when the first parliament of the Ottomans was dissolved indefinitely by the order of the Sultan." (1)

Sabahaddin's mother Seniha Sultan was the daughter of Sultan Abdülmecid. She followed the current political issues with great care. From the same mother and father she was the sister of Murat V. who was briefly the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire before Abdülhamid II., who also was her brother. But she was closer to Murad V. who became mentally sick and deposed from the throne and made to reside in the Çırağan Palace. She was not able to see Murad V. nor was she able to receive any reliable news about his illness, because of Abdülhamid's surveillance of the Palace. Abdülhamid's motives of surveillance made her just to be come even more suspicious, for she thought her brother had overcome his illness. "As a result of these suspicions, she committed herself into various moves to overthrow Sultan Abdülhamid in order to save Murad V." (2)

Consequently, she followed the activities of the Secret Scalieri-Aziz Efendi Committee with great interest of which she later became a member herself. Her relationship with this committee in the end caused the dismissal of her husband from his post of the Minister of Justice-despite the fact that he had no connection with the committee. "She had not informed her involvements to her husband who did not even know the existence of such a committee." (3)

There were different points of opinion with regard to the princely title which Sabahaddin assumed. According to the existing common point of view he was not a prince. But because he was called the prince in Europe he became to be known as such by us too. "The use of this title had become so established in the foreign and local press, it became impossible to call him by a different title." (4)

However, four uncles of Prince Sabahaddin had become Sultans; Sultan Murad, Sultan Hamid, Sultan Reşad and Sultan Vahdeddin who were the brothers of Seniha Sultan. "Because of this Ziya Gökalp used to refer to Sabahaddin Bey as İnal Sabahaddin". (5) But Prince Sabahaddin did not use the title of Prince when he signed his writings. (6)

Sabahaddin Bey's grandfather and his father were sons-in-law of the Sultans. His grand father, Halil Rifat Pasha, (in Türkish Paşa) was married to Saliha Sultan, the daughter of Sultan Mahmud and his father was married to Seniha Sultan, the daughter of Sultan Mecid.

His grandfather Gürcümen Halil Rifat Pasha who had been a commander in the army and the navy was one of the slaves brought up by the famous Hüsrev Pasha. Halil Rifat Pasha, after completing his private education in the palace of Hüsrev Pasha, had worked as a sealer of arms and a treasurer for the crown. In 1834 with the title of Marshal of the Tophane Arsenal, (7) "he became the son in law to the palace by marrying Saliha Sultan and subsequently have been called the son-in-law Halil Rifat Pasha." (8)

Mahmud Pasha, the son of Halil Rifat Pasha and the father of Prince Sabahaddin, was born in Istanbul in the year 1853. After his primary education, he did his apprenticeship in the "Room of Amedi" of the Civil Service for a brief period. Then by marrying Seniha Sultan he became the brother-in-law of Abdülhamid II. With the consequence of the term son-in-law being added to his name. Together with his nickname Celaledin, he was then called "son-in law Mahmud Celaledin Pasha". (9)

"In his youth Mahmud Pasha was sent to the Consulate in Paris as a clerk." (10) He was given the rank of ministerialship after marrying Seniha Sultan and "became a minister at the age of 24 and at 25" (11) "he became the Minister of Justice in the cabinet of Sadık Pasha." (12) "Soon after he became the Minister of Justice, the ministry under him became more efficient, and Sultan Abdülhamid often exchanged views with him regarding matters of government policy." (13)

"But he was dismissed from his post by Sultan Abdülhamid whose suspicion was arosed by his brother-in-law's possible relationship through Pasha's house manager Hacı Bekir Efendi who had connections with the Cleanthi Scalieri Aziz Efendi, an underground committee" (14) involved with subversive activities. After his dismissal, he withdrew to his home and passed his time by talking about literature with his visitors. He also took a keen interest in the training and the education of his sons. (15) At the same time "he was a poet writing poems in the Asaf Mahlas style which was given to him by the poet Faik Bey." (16)

We can roughly make the following table to show the periods of Prince Sabahaddin's stays at home and abroad, and from which we can see the clues of the development of his personality as when and where and under which cultural atmosphere he had come up and against which the events.

1879-1899	20 years old	(Turkey)
1899-1908		(France)
1908-1909		(Turkey)
1909-1912		(France)
1913-1919		(Switzerland)
1919-1924		(Turkey)
1924-1948		(Switzerland)

Chapter 1

1879-1899

The conditions under which he spent his childhood were extra-ordinary. He lived the first 20 years of his life in Turkey, at the home of a father who was a member of the Palace and who had become but later dismissed a Minister of Justice. He took private lessons and had been present in the conversations of the intellectuals of the period who had used to visit his father. So at very early ages he filled his tender mind with difficult subjects.

"During the later half of the 19th century, Seniha Sultan's Kuruçesme Palace, an architectural masterpiece in itself, which was located at the beautiful shores of the fabulously beautiful Bosphorous in a shadowy park rich with rare trees brought with great care from the four corners of the earth, was turned to be a private university for Sabahaddin and his brother Lütfullah. During various times of the year, the family stayed in their pavilion on the Çamlıca Hills and sometimes in their magnificent summer house on the beaches of Pendik that were also to serve as the branches of a university for the boys. The air, full of science and knowledge, that was something special about the family, surrounded them like a mystical attraction and filled the tender minds of the young princes with great hopes and expectations." (17)

This comfortable environment, extraordinary conditions, private tutors and excessive affection caused Prince Sabahaddin to be brought up very well. Under his father's supervision Sabahaddin had been taught Arabic, Persian and French at a small age to the extent that he was able to make translations from these languages. As we can see he knew very good Arabic and French from the following incidents:

One day when Ibn-ül Emin M. Kemal Bey had visited Damad Mahmud Pasha at his summer house in Pendik, he was asked by him to test his son. Kemal Bey described the occasion like this.

"He, (the son) from the book of Ibni Haldun's Mukaddima-i Arabiya which was considered as a difficult (heavy) piece of work, casually opened a page and read it as if it was in his mother tongue and translated the piece completely. Astonished with great admiration for his knowledge of the Arabic language I returned and reported back to his father." (18)

Once again when the children were about 11 or 12 years of age Damad Mahmud Pasha asked this time to Şemsettin Sami Bey who had written French/Turkish dictionaries and was among those poets and authors gathered in the palace, to examine his sons' knowledge of French. Şemsettin Sami Bey after examining the readings of the young Princes, their translations and the compositions they had written in French, told Pasha

"Your highness, it is out of the question that I would be the one who could examine the Young Princes, had we stayed together a bit longer they would in fact examine me." (19)

They were given lessons by those who were famed in the subjects of the Ottoman, Persian and Arab literatures. İsmail Safa was teaching them the literature, Sadık Belîğ was teaching them the law, Kadıhanlı Emin and Hoca Hayrettin Efendi taught the Arab literature and Hüseyin Daniş and Muallim Fevzi were teaching them the Persian literature. "Hüseyin Daniş said that when he was appointed as their private tutor he made Sabahaddin and Lutfullah become engaged with the Persian and the French literature without any interruption for six years." (20) Apparently "we also know close connections existed between Baheddin Hayret Efendi and Damad Mahmud Pasha." (21) Apart from these "he was also taught Persian by the son of the judge of the city of Muş, Müftizade Reşid Efendi." (22)

"He was taught French also by M. Berchille Bertrator and M. Cherlier who were invited from Switzerland, the piano by Ceza Hege and painting was taught by one of the artists of Italy Aurelli Valeri. Apart from these a teacher named M. Revene was always with the two brothers making sure of their progress in the French Language." (23)

At this stage we see Sabahaddin as a Renaissance man, an intellect, who had wide interest in culture and arts, and "thought about the things that were too advanced for his age." (24) Despite his youth he was always required by his father to be present in the most serious literary discussions. "His knowledge of physics, chemistry, astronomy and biology had reached a point where he won the admiration of European Professors of positive sciences when he was with them." (25) As seen from the above he grew up in a family environment which had contacts with the Europeans who were in fact his tutors, and surrounded by the intellectual guests who held frequent political and ideological conversations. The evolution of his intellect had been the result of the influences of his Ottoman and European tutors in conflicting ways. Because of the opposing influences of these two different cultures, his personality was not settled, a type of personality which had been frequently seen in the Ottoman Society during the period

when most of the Ottomans were under the influence of the European cultures. Those tutors with their different cultural backgrounds inevitably caused Sabahaddin's personality to come under the influence of both Ottoman and European cultures.

As will be seen in the following pages, the main reason why he spent his youth by fighting against Sultan Abdülhamid could be found in his mother's and father's early involvements with the anti-sultan movements. As he had almost no contact with the people in street, all his knowledge about Sultan Hamid and his administration was learnt by what he heard from his family surroundings and through the visitors of his father.

Of all the people who shaped his thoughts during his boyhood his father's influence was seen to be the greatest. But the sources of his anti-government knowledge was first obtained from his personal readings of the Ahmed Rıza's Layihā and Ali Şevkati's İstikbals of which he said:

"My first reading about the anti-despotism and tyranny was the First Layihā of the six Layihās of Ahmed Rıza Bey which he had given to Sultan Hamid. Afterwards I read the deceased Ali Şevkati's İstikbals, then secretly followed up the articles of Murad Bey in the Mizan. I used to read these writing with feelings of great respect and fondness for their authors." (26)

Within the family circles it had continuously been talked about against the Sultan while the foreign press on the other hand was reporting that the country was heading towards a catastrophe. As time went on, "anti Abdülhamid talks and publications reached such a stage that to be an enemy of the Sultan was considered the same as being a hero or a radical," (27) and those who found the opportunity were going to Europe in order to oppose Sultan Hamid.

In the meantime all the allegations about his father were ill founded. As a result Sultan Abdülhamid offered Sabahaddin's father Mahmud Pasha the post of the minister of construction. "Never forgetting his dismissal which he accepted as being an insult to his honour, a feeling that he carried on for ever, Pasha refused the offer of the Sultan, cut his connections with the palace and retired to his house." (28)

But as the conditions of the country deteriorated he began to write letters (Layihā) to the sultan whom he thought followed the wrong course.

When he was in Rome he recounted the affair that took place between himself and the Sultan to Fazlı Bey as follows.

"The degree of my relationship with the Sultan was like of a friend. Together we used to read the reports sent from the Parliament, commented and made the required decisions accordingly. Not a single day passed without us eating together.

One day Abdülhamid, after reaching a decision in connection with the Hacı Bekir affair, which was the cause of my dismissal from the Ministry, and with which I was not involved called me to his palace. He made compliments and tried to win my heart. However I did not give any importance to the compliments and refused to take the jobs he offered me. His last words to me before I left him were that if he would make any mistakes of governing the country the responsibility would be mine for he did not have anyone else to trust.

I didn't take too much notice of his words and retreated to my home and stayed there. But when I saw the situation of the country deteriorating every day I started to send him Layihas in order to warn. In return to my Layihas Abdulhamid made the following reply that contained the following words

When I begged him he refused me. if the conditions he described now exist, then he should not put the blame on me or anyone but on himself. I also would add this, since he himself (Pasha) had been away from the government business for a long time he wouldn't know nor would he understand the political needs of the present day. Therefore I would suggest that he stay at his home and not interfere with my business any more".(29)

In addition to this affair there was also the following affair which shook and finally determined Pasha's future behaviour.

One day, Prince Sabahaddin and Lutfullah was approached through their teacher Ceze Heke by a man called Maymon who introduced himself as the representative of a powerful English group, and told them if the railway concession was granted to British it would make English Politics heavily inclined in favour of Turkey's side and this would be in the interest of Turkey, so he requested his offer to be carried to Sultan by the mediation of Damad Mahmud Pasha.

Damad Mahmud Pasha who beleived in the necessity of granting the concession to the British carried the offer to the Sultan. However, Sultan Abdulhamid declined the offer by saying the following about Pasha's approach:

"Firstly, it is not right for a man to mediate under the influence of his political views whether the concession should be awarded to this or another group, especially since Pasha himself was not involved with the politics for a number of years. Secondly his claim of giving the concession to the group he wanted would be in the interest of Turkey, was also not correct. Therefore I suggest, he said: Pasha should not involve himself with the matters like these."
(30)

Witnessing all these affairs , Prince Sabahaddin consequently made up his mind like his father that the country was really in great danger. It then became an unescapable duty for him to work to save the country from the danger facing them within, left him with no other alternative but to join the struggle against Abdülhamid and in order to achive this Pasha and he finally went to Europe saying "If this is the case let's go the same way like the others and let's work for the salvation of our country which is in danger." (31)

There are various points of view with respect of Mahmud Pasha's departure to Europe. According to some, the reason was his dismissal, from the Ministry, and to some it was the dissappointment he felt when his offer was refused in connection with the concession of the Baghdad Railway which he wanted to be granted to the British.(32)

For us the reason of his leaving Turkey was partly due to the deterioration of his relations with the Sultan and the consequent development in the opposite directions after his dismissal, and partly due to the fact that the majority of people who were interested in the freedom of their country chose to escape to Europe.

NOTES AND REFERENCES TO CHAPTER I.

- (1) Taha Toros, "Prens Sabahattin", **Milliyet Journal**, 16-22 February 1978.
- (2) Bahaddin Alpkan and Yücel Yükselen, **Milli Savunma Bakanlığında 150 Yıl 1826-1976**, Ankara 1976, p. 42.
- (3) Semih Mümtaz, **Tarihimizde Hayal Olmuş Hakikatler**, İstanbul 1948, p.118.
- (4) Sabahaddin was from Ottoman dynastic family through his mother. Unlike Sabahaddin these men are called as Sultanzade not as Prince.
- (5) Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıklıoğlu, **Le Play Mektebi ve Prens Sabahattin**, İstanbul 1962, p.72; According to Ziya Gökalp, inâl or Yinal is an old Turkish term, those who have sultan mother were called as like. See. Ziya Gökalp, **Küçük Mecmua**, 1922, No. 20, Diyarbakir.
- (6) He usually wrote his name as Sultanzade Sabahaddin, Sabahaddin or Mehmed Sabahaddin.
- (7) Tophane Müşiri.
- (8) Alpkan and Yükselen, *op.cit.*, p. 42.
- (9) *Ibid.*, p.69; Mümtaz, *op.cit.*, p. 119.
- (10) Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, "Damad Mahmud Paşa," **Resimli Tarih Mecmuası**, Vol. 31, July 1952, p.1613.
- (11) Sina Akşin, **Jön Türkler ve İttihat Terakki**, İstanbul 1987, p. 41.
- (12) Alpkan and Yükselen, *op.cit.*, p.69.
- (13) Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler**, İstanbul 1945, p. 64; Mümtaz, *op.cit.*, p. 119.
- (14) For detailed information for the Cleanti Skalieri committee and Seniha Sultan see. Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, **Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyetinde İnkılâb Hareketleri**, İstanbul 1959, pp.140-143; "Damad Mahmud Paşa," **Resimli Tarih Mecmuası**, Vol. III., No 28, April 1952; Şerif Mardin, **Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri: 1895-1908**, İstanbul 1983, p. 31.
- (15) Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...**, p.65.
- (16) inâl, **Son Asır Türk Şairleri**, Vol.I, İstanbul 1930, p.60.

- (17) Nezahet Nureddin Ege, *Prens Sabahaddin Hayatı ve ilmi müdafaaları* İstanbul 1977, p.6. This description was made by Nezahet Nureddin Ege who used to visit Prince Sabahaddin every week, and this part of the palace was completely destroyed after a big fire
- (18) İnal, *Son Asır...*, Vol.I, p. 62.
- (19) Ege, *op.cit.*, p. 7. This was told by the french teacher of Nezahet Nureddin Ege who was also the student of Şemseddin Sami Bey.
- (20) İnal, *Son Asır ...*, Vol.I, p. 262.
- (21) *Ibid.*, p.583.
- (22) *Ibid.*, Vol.II, İstanbul 1930, p.1455.
- (23) Ege, *op.cit.*, p. 6.
- (24) Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *Makedonya'dan Orta asya'ya Enver Paşa*, Vol.I, İstanbul 1972, p.260.
- (25) Ege, *op.cit.*, p. 7.
- (26) M. Sabahaddin, "Gençlerimize Mektub intibah-ı Fikrimiz," *Terakki*, No.1, pp. 3-4; *Terakki* issues do not have regular dates, but all issues were published between 1906-1908, they were only 20.
- (27) These were told Nezahet Nureddin Ege by close friend of Prince Sabahaddin, Nihat Reşad Belger.
- (28) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p.64.
- (29) *Ibid.*, pp.64-65.
- (30) *Ibid.*, p.64.
- (31) During a conversation these were told me by Nezahet Nureddin Ege who obtained the information from Nihat Reşad Belger.
- (32) Akşin, *Jön Türkler...*, p.42; Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p.67.

Chapter 2

1899-1906

Prince Sabahaddin's political life started when he left Turkey for Europe in 1899 and started his struggle against Sultan Abdülhamid, soon after he went to Paris with his father. As a matter of fact since his father's dismissal from his post he had spent the first years of his youth together with him, sharing his problems of the politically unstable years. "It has been understood that the father together with his two sons had formed a sort of political family front." (1)

"After leaving Turkey Damad Mahmud Pasha and his sons first went to Marseille and from there to Paris. All the Turks living in France, the first being Ahmed Rıza, met them with enthusiasm." (2) Ahmed Rıza, a Young Turk who had been in the leadership had escaped to Paris earlier. And by coming to Europe, the Pasha and his sons too joined the Young Turk caravan. The type of environment he lived in can be better understood if we remember the period when France had almost been made a head quarter by those Turks who were against the type of government in Istanbul.

It would be appropriate to mention here something briefly about the Young Turks. Of course the Young Turk Movement was not initiated by Pasha and Sabahaddin, its roots were founded much earlier. "It was Ali Şevkati who became the first to start the anti-Abdülhamid publication in Europe." (3) "The term Young Turks covered all those who prepared the first and the second constitutions together with those rebels and revolutionaries who wanted reforms to be introduced in the Ottoman Empire in accordance with their own particular needs." (4) "The ideologies of Young Turks mainly were constitutional but also carried some social elements." (5) Their most special features were to spread their views and to act against Abdülhamid II.

As against Young Turks' views Abdülhamid's own thoughts were like the following:

"How come these sons of the motherland whom I consider of my sons were not able to see the great truth as they go all over the world while I was able to see it within the four walls of this palace. How couldn't they? As they caused to sink this large country with their own hands which had been washed over with the blood of their fathers.

I do not want to accuse them, but they saw the fact that the English, the French, the Russians and even the Germans and the Austrians, that is, all the major European powers had their interest in breaking down the possessions of the Ottoman Empire.

These were the enemies. They also saw that those countries were fighting with each other but agreeing and forgetting their differences when it came to the idea of sharing the Ottoman Empire. The only thing they were not in agreement was the size of their share as they all wanted to have the largest share after its fall. Such was the situation and such were the intentions of the major powers. Couldn't they still understand and deduce any meaning from the help that the major powers were giving to them?

I said it, I will say it again. I told it, I will tell it again. Haven't they ever thought the fact that the Ottoman Empire had come into being with the combination of various nations. In a country like this, the constitution was mortal as the main element of the country. Were there any Indian, African and Egyptian representatives in the English parliament? Were there any Algerian representative in the French parliament, so that they were asking us to have a Greek, an Armenian, a Bulgarian and an Arab representative in the Ottoman parliament?"(6)

"The common side of these freedom fighters (Young Turks) were of their idea of freedom that was not thought out deeply." (7) Poor levels of political ideas resulted, partly because the majority of them were directed to finding quick practical solutions and partly they sprang from the lack of a developed ideological environment. I believe that the Young Turk ideology with its principles and its basics is a subject that should be examined separately and because of this I leave this to the works of Mardin (8) and Hanioğlu, (9) I now turn here to examine the political activities of Prince Sabahaddin .

"Pasha's arrival in Paris together with his two sons raised some hopes amongst the Young Turks." (10) By his arrival the scattered Young Turk movement entered into a new phase and thus found an opportunity to unite at one centre. While at the same time Sultan Abdülhamid was trying to persuade them to come back to Turkey. But Pasha had already asked his sons to join this struggle together with himself and since he himself pushed them into the political arena, "he wanted his sons' ideas should be also asked" (11) regarding the efforts of a Sultan who was trying to make them return to Turkey, by saying the following: "My sons too came here for the same goal, they are here to help me for this sacred duty".(12)

During the time of Pasa's arrival at Europe, one of the important publications of the Young Turks was Osmanlı.

Prince Sabahaddin's first published writing that we could discover appeared at the 57th issue of this paper as being the second letter that was written to the Palace. The first letter had been written by the Pasha and the second was by the two brothers together. When the letter appeared as the leading article at that particular issue of the Osmanli, there was an introductory part(13) acknowledged by the editor-in-chief who wrote that it was a great honour and an occasion for their newspaper to publish this letter and they were very proud of introducing the brothers to the public for the first time, as the most valuable assets of Mahmud Pasha who were very well trained, very knowledgable and very dedicated for the betterment of the causes of their motherland. The brothers' letter following the above introduction was written in a very respectful language and contained mainly the following message:

"My Lord,

In the letter that our father wrote to you after we left Istanbul, it was explained that how the prevailing conditions made us to feel desperate despite the fact that we only wanted to be useful for our country. The hopelessness of the situation in the end forced us to leave Istanbul with the hope that we might be of some help to our country's problems here abroad as we failed in our country.

We have been very sincere in our wishes and in the ideas that were put forward in the several letters written to you by our father during the past number of years. However all his efforts resulted with no avail whose sole purpose in life has been to be a servant of humanity. But now we deeply regret to say that our hopes of getting any response equal to our sincerity from you has almost vanished.

Your Lordship,

The survival of your reign depends on the development and the continuity of the people you lead. Therefore, to find the reasons of the causes that constitute the social development of the nations are nothing but a service to your self.

We choose to come to Europe in order to find ways that would help to save our country from its decline, because you gave us no other alternative but to leave the country, by

refusing to pay any attention to the letters of our father that he wrote to you for the last eight years.

The overwhelming congratulations and support from the letters we have been receiving every day from all corners since we have come to Europe, can only indicate the present feelings of your people." (14)

"After Paris Mahmud Pasha went to Geneve. There he helped the newspaper of Osmanlı to improve its financial condition by finding them the necessary funds" (15) and of course an action of this type was not to the liking of the Sultan. From Geneve, Pasha soon went to Egypt after the invitation of Abbas II .

"Abbas's aim was to persuade the Pasha to leave Europe, by which he was hoping to gain the confidence of the Sultan. Therefore, Abbas was working hard to effect Pasha's return to Istanbul on terms that would be advantageous to him" (16). But "he eventually overplayed his hand, Also he learned that the two sons of Mahmud Pasha who were with him had made it known that they were not going to return to Turkey under any circumstances." (17)

After failing to reach an agreement with Abbas, Mahmud Pasha and his sons returned again to Paris. It was during this time when Sabahaddin and his brother made their personal entrance to the political stage by publishing their first manifest Osmanlı Vatandaşlarımızıza (To All our Ottoman citizens). (18)

In the manifest they described the oppression and the freedom as the main occurrences of history and talked about the need for the representatives of all the minority groups under the Ottomans and suggested to those who wanted their freedom in the name of their nationalities, that they should form a "united action / enforcement groups (kuvve-i müttehidey-i umumi)".

They also said that it would not be right for the minorities to ask their independence from the Ottomans' as they explained the economic and the military benefits that they would acquire under such rule. Then after saying "any contribution to the rebirth of the Ottomans is a service to mankind" they explained the reasons of their disagreements with the Sultan, wanted a united action to be taken against the Sultan and for this purpose they wanted various groups to get together for an arrangement of a congress. They explained the reasons of arranging the Congress as below.

"Our goal is mainly to put an end to the existing disorderly course of events, and to find ways and means to establish the correct foundations for the future governments of the Ottomans by combining the strenghts of Turks, Arabs, Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Kurds into one direction who in fact share a common interest but now are scattered, ruined, and experiencing irreparable damages."

As a result of this, for the first time an opportunity had arisen for the gathering and the combining the forces of the Young Turks who were scattered all over Europe.

"After his return from Egypt Mahmud Pasha stayed in Paris for a while but left for Korfu due to the reasons that he couldn't get used to partly the weather of Paris and partly to acquire a less costly living." (19) From there he went to Rome and came back again to Paris. In the meantime Prince Sabahaddin and his brother were busy in trying to organize and strenghten the scattered Young Turks and arranging the praparations for the Congress.

We know that at the beginning it was Pasha's weight that pulled the scattered members in one place, and activated and liven up the movement whose members were knitted around him as a result of this. However "this liveness in the movement were in fact mostly achieved by the efforts of Sabahaddin, not the Pasha." (20) "The importance of Sabahaddin's personal contributions in terms of being a planner, organizer and supplier of the necessary funds to the movement's revival were great." (21) "Prince Sabahaddin and his brother met all the expenses of the Congress including the cost of fares of all those invited." (22)

Prince Sabahaddin's main purpose was to bring together all the Young Turks abroad and to introduce a common policy that could be adopted by all of them. "But the Young Turks were so many in numbers, and correspondingly so different in their views that it can be said there were reform projects as many as the numbers of the Young Turks". (23)

If we remember, "after the declaration of the political reforms in 1839 (Tanzimat), Turkey started to experience structural changes in every aspect of its life. But the nature of these changes that happened in the structure of Turkish society, are still been discussed by the scientists of today. Anyhow in whatever ways it was interpreted, as for example a reform attempt emposed by foreign influences or as a transformation from laxiness to orderliness or as an effort for the maintenance of the old religious and the legal civilisation under the name of political Europeonization, the Tanzimat affair was undoubtedly the expression of a structural change in the Ottoman Empire." (24)

The passage from centuries old Islam civilizations ruling to the European civilization brought two different ideologies and the technologies against each other. The conflict observed between these two cultures were wide apart as could be seen in the lives of the individuals. At the same time the subsequent loss of battles that the Empire suffered reinforced the idea of the superiority of Europe, a fact which was becoming more apparent, and this in turn increased the number of people who believed in the need for the structural changes that had to be made in the Ottoman Empire. (25) As a result of this, the Empire in which so many different cultures existed side by side had become an arena for political, literary, social and ideological discussions. (26)

Coming back to the Young Turks, thanks to the efforts of the Prince Sabahaddin and his brother "the first Young Turk Congress took place on the days between 4th and 9th of February in 1902." (27) "Despite his father's presence it was Prince Sabahaddin who was in the front line and became its president while his father only took the nominal presidency of the Congress." (28) Sabahaddin's efforts for the arrangement of this congress were very meaningful from the Young Turks point of view, because it was the first of its kind.

"The congress, with the presence of guests whose numbers almost reached 50 included all the other Ottoman subjects of the minority groups, was opened with a brilliant speech by Sabahaddin and followed by a reading of the manifest which had been published in Cairo in 1901." (29)

"According to reports that have been published, two important questions came up during and after the congress. One was the argument, that by propaganda and publications alone a revolution can not be made. It is therefore necessary to work to ensure the participation of the armed forces in the revolutionary movement "(30). Shaw stated that "Sabahaddin and his group advocated the use of all available means including revolution and pressure from the powers. Since his ideas seemed to coincide with the demands of many of the national groups for autonomy in their own areas of the empire, he welcomed their support as well" (31)

It was on the other question, that of intervention, that a serious split developed. Ahmed Riza and most of the Turks in the Committee of Union and Progress were opposed to first idea in their view, according to them the problem was, a purely internal one, and any outside intervention would be unnecessary and even harmful (32).

"So the issue of inviting foreign intervention for the introduction of a constitutional regime divided the Young Turks" (33) as those in favour of intervention and those who were not. "The congress broke up without any final agreement, therefore, deepening the rivalry between Sabahaddin and Ahmed Riza." (34)

As for Prince Sabahaddin he became the leader of the Young Turks and was supported generally by those non muslim elements in the movement who favoured him. "The other group led by Ahmed Riza and which was first known as the Ottoman's Committee for Union and Progress but then changed its name to Ottoman's Committee for Progress and Union after the congress" (35) was more conservative in their views and continued to publish the Suray-ı Ummet in Egypt.

"While it was true that Prince Sabahaddin was friendly to Great Britain and France, and favored free enterprise and a loose federation and thus, might be considered a liberal," (36) "the main aims of these two groups were not fundamentally different from each other. Both wanted to save the Empire but with different methods," (37) and continued the struggle in accordance with their own ideas and views.

After the congress Sabahaddin attempted to prepare a revolutionary coup against Abdülhamid II. with Ismail Kemal Bey and Recep Pasha. To determine the form of the revolution he went to Malta to meet Recep Pasha and his assistant Şevket Bey. Their meeting was ended when the final decisions were taken which were basically the division of work into two phases. Responsibility for the finance, the politics and the transportation were assumed by Sabahaddin and Ismail Kemal while the responsibility for the military affairs were taken up by Recep Pasha and Şevket Bey. (38)

But according to Kuran, Ismail Kemal Bey wanted to achieve the revolution by using the instruments of the aristocracy, that is, wanted the help of the Kings of Greece and Egypt (Hidiv). But when his efforts to win the supports of these people did not succeed he told others he gave up this attempt by saying it could not be achieved without their help. Recep Pasha also shared the views of Ismail Kemal. Subsequently the plan was not realized and Sabahaddin went back to Paris where he continued his intellectual activities. (39)

In the meantime the existing divisions of rivalry between the members of the Young Turks, and the efforts of Abdulhamid who wanted him to come back exhausted Mahmud Pasha. Since he was also ill, he decided to return back and the public was informed with his return to Turkey through the notices published in the newspapers. But Prince Sabahaddin at the last moment succeeded to change his father's mind from going back by begging and crying. (40) However, Mahmud Pasha a few days after this event died.

After the death of his father, Sabahaddin became very sad and being in a state of mixed thoughts "he started to study the various sociological currents in Europe" (41) in order to find solutions for the difficulties his country was facing.

All the particulars that we have mentioned so far formed the political experiences of Prince Sabahaddin and made him to gain a place in the struggle of his father and the movement of Young Turks.

"The ten year period he spent in France bore fruit in two phases, one of which was in the sociology and the methodology of the social thoughts and the other was in the political ideas and the organisations." (42) After his father's death from one side he was pursuing the political cause to which he was thrown in by the surrounding conditions. From the other side as his scientific mind was making him continuously to think "he was searching for a science that would enable him to find and solve the causes of the disasters that were wearing out his country." (43) It was these scientific sociology research and the studies he did in France that led him to be accepted as a sociologist.

"During this period he used to attend to the anatomy lectures of the Medical Faculty of the University of Sorbonne. He even used to work together with their Private Doctor Aleksanyan Efendi when he was in Istanbul on the corpses that were in the surgical room of the Medical Faculty." (44) Amongst his other interests was astronomy in which he had spent a great deal of work and "had a rich library at their Pendik summer house". (45) But we understand during this period his mind was not settled on anything specific yet because of the fact that he was involved with the politics and the scientific studies both at the same time.

He was studying various subjects and was continuously searching ways to find answers to the questions of the problems of his country. One day after discussions with the Young Turks he was walking along a Paris Avenue and he came across "La Science Sociale". He described the affair in the following way:

"One day, feeling very tired and sad walking in one of the famous streets of Paris my eyes met with the famous work of Edmond Demolin's "A quoi tient la superiorite des Anglo-Saxons" in the window of a bookshop. Immediately I got into the bookshop and bought the book. At that night I read the book without a brake from beginning to end. In the book the answer that the author gave to the question of (Anglo-Saxon Superiority-to

what is it due to) I discerned the existence of a method similar to that of a positive science that I had not met before in any other sociological publications I read.

Next day I went to the same bookshop and bought all the books of Edmond Demolins. While I read these books with great attention my intuitions had been strengthened with the fact that these works followed a certain scientific method, based on the same observation system as it is in the positive sciences. Then later I had the honour to win the friendship of the great writer Edmond Demolins, and by becoming personally a member of their club I had the opportunity to work with the other members of la Science Sociale.

With great enthusiasm, joy, and gratitude I read and reread the works of all the writers who belonged to this stream of thought, including the works of Frederic Le Play and Henri de Tourville who were the founders of la Science Sociale. Then I was convinced that by using their methods I would be able to analyse the structure of the Ottoman society with the possibility of a chance to prepare the much needed reform programme for the Ottoman Empire."(46)

Also, before and after the congress he was writing articles in the Osmanlı. "These writings formed an important part of the journal and reflected some of the ideas on which he based his articles on science sociale that appeared later in Terakki."(47)

Apart from the Osmanlı he also wrote articles for the magazines published in Europe with the intention to create pro Ottoman feelings amongst the European communal. In fact much of his time during this period was taken with these activities. All of this aimed to promote the interests of the Ottomans in France on the one hand he was writing articles about Turkey for the Revue and the Martin newspapers on the other hand for the introduction and the explanation of the existing social issues in Turkey, he was giving lectures in the Mole Tokuil Hall.(48)

His approach to the explanation of the problems were scientifically based on the ideas of "science sociale" and it aroused a sincere interest in France. On December 15, 1905 the magazine La Revue published one of his articles titled Les Turcs et le Progres /The Progress Achieved by the Turks in the Civilized World.(49)

It was an attempt to give explanations, to correct the prejudices and erroneous opinions that Europeans held about Turks.

The article was in three parts, the first part covered the history of Turks in the period when they were in Mid Asia, the second part covered the period from 7th century to 1855 and the third part covered the period after 1855.

At the end of his article, he said:

"After all these periods there is now a generation of young people grown up who are able to introduce the western civilisation into Turkey, and the efforts of these newly found intellectuals will soon be translated into a speedy recovery that can be seen in the Ottoman Empire resulting in peace and order which will be the fair solution of the eastern problem that can also be witnessed by the European Countries."

While on the political front the Young Turks were encouraging all the people to rebel against Abdulhamid II. amongst them Armenians were the most active ones, attempting various plots against the Sultan. "But in spite of all efforts, all these struggles including the plot of some committee members which was executed by their man Edward Joris on the date of 21st of July 1905 that took place in the Garden of Hamidiye Mosque near the Yildiz Palace, failed." (50)

In his memories Abdulhamid told about this affair in the following way:

"I am not suprised that the Armenians were seized with the passion of independence especially when I know that they are continuously being encouraged by the great powers. But I am still suprised by those Young Turks who share work with the Armenians and even accept money from them and publish newspapers against myself when they escape to Europe.

They say that they want to save the Ottoman Empire from disintegration while at the same time they are making agreements with the very people who are breaking the Empire down into pieces. If I would not put discord into and spoil their partnership, I wonder to what extent they would go in their accomplishments? To establish an Armenian government in the middle of Anatolia, would this be the proof of their patriotism?

I write these to set an example in order to show clearly the identities of the friends of those people who became my enemies. While crying out for the present situation of our motherland, it distresses me to think about these. They didn't pull down Abdulhamid. No, that is how they pulled down the Ottoman government." (51)

"The Armenian issue is not the issue of Armenians. I can say it with a clear conscience that the Armenian race who are the best people have adopted and represented the ideals of Ottoman Empire. They have served our civilization, worked for the maintainance of our government and with their faithful service produced outstanding Ottoman personalities. First Armenians did not have any complaints against us. But when the Russians materialized their desires over Bulgaria they started to interfere with the affairs of the Armenians in order to grasp another piece from the Ottoman Empire. With spies they sent, they got hold of the Armenian priests and the teachers first, then found and caused to turn against us those Armenians who were keen on adventure." (52)

"Not much later, the French and the English also joined with the Russians. They too wanted to have a say in this new piece of land that was going to be grabbed from the Ottoman Empire. The formation of the first Armenian Committee in Paris instead of in Turkey makes every thing so obvious. The head of the disorder was outside." (53)

However, "when the Armeniens started to divert their attacks to the very existence of the Empire, rather than to Abdulhamid himself, Prince Sabahaddin wrote an open letter to the members of the Armenians Committee, telling them the road they were following was wrong and could lead to bad results for all the Ottomans, including themselves." (54) He also added that he found the Armenian publication harmful to the interests of the Ottomans as he accepted the fact that the elimination of Sultan Hamid was one thing and the defense of the Ottoman justice was another thing.

As for the movement itself there was now a slow-down. Nearly every one had withdrawn to his corner. But there were also some new comers to the movement. One of them was Dr. Bahaddin Sakir. Dr. Sakir with the view of uniting the Young Turks held seperate meetings with Sabahaddin and Ahmed Riza and after also taking

the consent of the other members asked Sabahaddin to prepare a new programme for the movement in order to liven up the members again.

Upon this offer Sabahaddin prepared the programme of "Decentralization and the Private Initiative" and based its ideas on the knowledge he obtained from la Science Sociale. However, this programme deepened the conflict further down. The reason for this was the idea of decentralization. "According to Ahmed Riza and his supporters decentralization was meant no centre, and from this their argument followed as when there was no centre there was also no country. In consequence they started a campaign against Prince Sabahaddin's ideas and himself." (55)

From this point onwards as the last attempt to unite the Young Turks failed, Prince Sabahaddin decided to work alone.

NOTES AND REFERENCES TO CHAPTER II.

- (1) Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıklıoğlu, **Le Play Mektebi ve Prens Sabahattin**, İstanbul 1962, p. 69.
- (2) Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler**, İstanbul 1945, p. 91.
- (3) Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve İttihad ve Terakki** İstanbul 1948, p.91.
- (4) For detailed information see : Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön ...; İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve İttihad...**; Osmanlı imparatorluğunda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyetinde İnkılâb Hareketleri, İstanbul 1959.
- (5) Serif Mardin, **Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri: 1895-1908**, İstanbul 1983, p. 35.
- (6) İsmet Bozdağ, **Sultan Abdülhamid'in Hatıra Defteri**, İstanbul 1985, p. 61.
- (7) Mardin, *op.cit.*, p. 35.
- (8) Mardin, *op.cit.*
- (9) Şükrü Hanioğlu, **Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti ve Jön Türklük (1889-1902)**, İstanbul, no date.
- (10) Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...**, p. 91.
- (11) *Ibid.*, p.101; Kuran, **Osmanlı imparatorluğunda ve ...**, p. 282.
- (12) *Ibid.*, p. 91.
- (13) "Mahmud Paşa Hazretlerinin en büyük meziyet-i daniyeleri, mehadim-i kemal-i aşinaları ziyaret edildikten sonra takdir edilebilir. Bu iki gülgonca-ı necabet, vüs'at-ı malumat fart-ı hamiyet ve gayrette cihetiyele, Hanedan-ı Ali Osman'ın varisi fedaili oldukları gibi hali hazırda o dudman-ı necabettin bahis-i iftihar-ı add edilmeye cidden elyakkırlar. İşte bu münasebetle o iki istikbal milletin, zadei tefekürat-ı necibaneleri olan mektub-ı maaliyi uslubü gazetemize ziver-i sername-i iftihar eyliyoruz.", **Osmanlı**, 8 April 1900, No. 57, p. 2.
- (14) *Ibid.*, pp. 2-5.
- (15) Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...**, p. 92.

- (16) Ann Elizabeth Mayer, "Abbas Hilmi II: The Khedive and Egypt's Struggle for Independence," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1978, p. 344.
- (17) Ibid., p. 345.
- (18) Osmanlı, April 1901, No. 81, pp.2-5; Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön....*, pp. 297-298; for further information see: Cavit Orhan Tütengil, *Prens Sabahaddin* İstanbul 1954, pp. 22-24; Paul Fesch, *Constantinople aux derniers jours d' Abdul-Hamid*, New York 1971, pp. 365-367.
- (19) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön....*, p. 146.
- (20) Because Pasha wanted to leave his place to his sons and was also ill.
- (21) Ali Erkul, "Prens Sabahattin," *Türk Toplum Bilimcileri I*, Ed. by Emre Kongar, İstanbul 1982, p.91.
- (22) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön....*, p. 150.
- (23) Tarık Z.Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaştırma Hareketleri*, İstanbul 1960, p.69.
- (24) Tütengil, *Prens Sabahaddin*, p.5.
- (25) For further explanations on the need of reforms in Ottoman Empire see. Ibid., pp. 9-15.
- (26) The following works are useful sources about the ideologies present at that time: Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi ...*; Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkılâb Tarihi*, Ankara, 1983.
- (27) Taha Toros, "Prens Sabahattin", *Milliyet Journal*, 18 February 1978.
- (28) Ibid.
- (29) Osmanlı, 15 February 1902, No.102; To Toros the first speech in the congress was made by Lutfullah. See. Toros, *op.cit.*, 18 February 1978.
- (30) Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Oxford 1968, p.202; see also Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön....*, p. 152.
- (31) Standford J. Shaw, and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol.II, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1977, p.258.

- (32) Lewis, *op.cit.*, p.202.
- (33) Şükrü, Hanioglu, "The Genesis of the Young Turk Revolution of 1908," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları Dergisi (The Journal of Ottoman Studies)*, No 3, 1982, p.295.
- (34) Shaw, *op.cit.*, p.258.
- (35) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p. 154.
- (36) H. Nejdet Göze, "Modernism and Traditionalism in the Ottoman Empire 1790-1922," Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, American University, 1964, p.169.
- (37) The author put forward this idea in comparison with Enver Pasha. The same opinion is also true for Ahmed Rıza, *Ibid.* p.170.
- (38) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, pp. 155-6.
- (39) *Ibid.*, pp.162-65.
- (40) Nezahet Nureddin Ege, *Prens Sabahaddin Hayatı ve İlmî Müdafaaları*, İstanbul 1977, p. 30.
- (41) Fındıkoğlu, *op.cit.*, p. 69.
- (42) Ege, *op.cit.*, p. 35.
- (43) Commemoration meetings are being held because of his contributions to social sciences rather than his political activities.
- (44) *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- (45) *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- (46) *Ibid.*, p. 36.
- (47) M. Şükrü Hanioglu, "Jön Türk - Basını," *Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol.II, İstanbul 1985, p.849.
- (48) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p. 169.
- (49) For Turkish translation see. Ege, *op.cit.*, pp. 57-67.
- (50) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, pp. 167-68.
- (51) Bozdağ, *Sultan Abdulhamid'in...*, pp.59-60.
- (52) *Ibid.*, p.56.

- (53) Ibid., pp. 56-57.
- (54) Kuran, İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön..., p. 153.
- (55) Ibid., pp. 169-72.

Chapter 3

1906-1948

To prevent the decline of his country he chose the decentralised system of governing as opposed to centralized system for he observed that those nations who practiced decentralization and private initiative were among the strongest nations in the world during that particular period, while those who practiced centralized government systems were the most backward ones irrespective of whether the type of their government is monarchy or democracy. The reason of his insistence for the acceptance of the science sociale methods could be based on his belief that it was only through science sociale teachings and their methods that the realisation of the effects of these systems and their transformation from one to other, were possible.

It was Science Sociale which constituted the source of his writings. He had come across to it first in 1903. After several years, by examining the works of science social and facing with unsuccessful political developments, Prince Sabahaddin tried to organise his followers, by founding a new society in 1906, the Society for the Private Initiative and Decentralization (Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Ademi Merkezîyet Cemiyeti) and started the periodical publication of Terakki.

Terakki was being issued till the proclamation of the 1908 Constitution, irregularly at the beginning. It did not have any date on its first issues. On its first page there was a note which read as "free of charge for those who want". The paper changed its subtitles various times. "Terakki was not a newspaper in the proper sense. It was rather a pamphlet which put forward a certain point of view concerning the salvation of Ottoman Empire." (1)

"The ideas in Terakki are important because this was the first publication which systematically presented the ideas of Prince Sabahaddin's group." (2) Prince Sabahaddin's regular writing life started with the Terakki. "The ideas of Sabahaddin found in his later books and brochures were first formed during his early writings in the Terakki." (3) "Terakki's point of view on daily political events was also another key to the mentality of Sabahaddin." (4) "Let aside his political activities, on the intellectual platform he searched methods for his purpose and discovered a social theory, namely the theory of Science Sociale." (5)

The Terakki expressed the main ideas of the society they formed as the following.

- 1) To spread the ideas of "science sociale" which teaches the liberty of individuals and the prosperity of the masses, and translate into Turkish those of its important works that contained social issues .
- 2) To unite the opposing views of the various interest groups that existed in the Empire.
- 3) To defend the Ottomans' justice and create a continuous pro Turk feelings in the advanced countries.
- 4) To establish orderly organisations in the needy places of the country. (6)

In order to give an idea to the reader about the contents of Terakki, the style of Prince Sabahaddin's writings, and the activities he was involved between the years 1906-8, I will write down some of the main points of his writings published in the various issues of Terakki.

In the first article which begins as A Letter to Our Young People he explains the reasons of publishing the Terakki and with these explanations he clarifies the criteria on which he is going to base his present and future evaluations. He compares the present day's papers with the papers of the last 15 years and by giving some examples he says "not a single new idea developed during all this time, whatever written 15 years ago the same things are being rewritten today except a little variations in the presentation of their ideas." Then he says

The majority of these writings have no merit in them at all, lacking of any substance of an idea or a form. By repeating the repeated so many times, our political press resembles nothing but a cry of a beaten man. Consequently our readers have become bored with these publications for they were not able to find any concrete ideas in them.(7)

He corrolates the present situation to a doctor/ healer relationship. A healer, he says, never improves his profession because he is bound with the traditions which are carried by visual learnings whereas a doctor improves his profession constantly because he works with methods. The condition of our political press is similar to that of a healer. All they do is to report/describe an event then criticize the government but not offer any solutions for it. Their critizism have only been just good enough to open the eyes of a few people.

After long explanations he says

"The purpose of making these long explanations is to show that a work that is not based on any method is bound to fail, (8) and knowing this "we were looking for a guide which would enable our efforts to succeed. Now after all these years we found the guide, namely science sociale whose methods were essential for the foundation of the present civilisations. So from now on, the real methods that should be applied to social problems for their solutions are those of the discoveries of La science sociale. (9)

"Our purpose is not to waste our time by opposing to anybody just for the sake of opposing, including the governments. A Sultan by himself can not make a society which consists millions of people either happy or unhappy. The reasons of decline should not be found not on his personality but on the life style of the society. A nation who knows how to work can not tolerate any kind of oppression either domestic or foreign. Our defeats are directly resulting from the fact that we don't know how to work."(10)

"The operation of the law of survival in nature is also true for the life of the societies in which a progress can only be achieved by those who adopt themselves to the conditions of their environment best. So since it is not in our hands now to improve our conditions, then we must soon discover the ways which will take us to the success of reaching the level of civilized nations . We now know the ways how to reach civilization, as it goes through the application of science sociale methods. We will therefore work hard to disseminate its ideas in our motherland as soon as possible."(11)

One of his other writings carried the heading of Whereas Muslims in Turkey are Condemned to Centralization the Non-muslims are Enjoying the Benefits of Decentralization. In it after emphasising the fact that non-muslims are not subject to certain laws and consequently they are in a privileged position as compared to Turks, he says:

"These previliges made it possible for non-muslims to develop their private initiatives and the consequence of this they have overtaken the muslim population in the fields of trade, agriculture and industry."(12)

To prevent this he talks about the need of abandoning the centralized system of governing which is only applied to muslims for the decentralized system of government under which the non muslims prospered and progressed.

In his article An invitation to the People of the Cities which appeared in the 12th issue of the Terakki, he talks about the private initiative and describes it as the skill that the people show at their work. He explains it as the following:.

"In order to live free and honourably in any society one should possess the skills required by his environment. Because it is not in the governments but it is in our hands to be free."(13) "For some time we hear the sickness of Sultan Hamid and expecting to reach our freedom at the time of his death. We are saying that those who will come next to Hamid would set us free. Can you imagine the fredom of people who think like this." "We accept freedom as something you get it by your own efforts, so instead of hope we are now inviting our citizens into action." (14)

For Sabahaddin, Abdulhamid was not a cause any more, but a result. The real cause was the weakness of the society. But at the same time he saw Abdulhamid and centralization, represented by the present administration led by Abdulhamid, as an obstacle to the development of private initiative and the major impediment on the way of his country's salvation.

For this reason he supported any kind of activity that would help to terminate the life of the present government, and to replace it with his proposed administrative system. As we see, occasionally, in his writings published in Terakki, his encouragement for the Anatolian uprisings of Trabzon, Bitlis and Van, all of which followed the Erzurum events (15). In the tenth issue of Terakki, Prince Sabahaddin says that Erzurum took the first step, all other Ottomans should unite in taking the second step (16).

He also says that:

"People should resist the government's demands of tax and military service until the constitutional regime is proclaimed and decentralization is established."(17) "We shouldn't forget that the government is becoming a government with the blood and the money of the people. Therefore we should pay our taxes and give our military services to a government which is accountable to the people."(18)

"Whether Prince Sabahaddin's group was active directly or indirectly in these uprisings, is not clear."(19) "There are differing opinion about the role of Prince Sabahaddin's group in the Anatolian uprisings."(20)

It might appear that with such a support Prince Sabahaddin had helped directly or indirectly to those who were aiming to disintegrate the Empire. But his motives as was explained earlier had only been for the aim of replacing the actual government system of centralization with the system of decentralization. In fact, as far as the unity of Islam and the Empire were concerned, he was one of the most ardent supporters of it; a fact which can be observed in many of his articles. As for example his article which appeared in the fourth issue of the Terakki partly represents his efforts to defend Ottoman justice, and carried the title of Unity of Islam (ittihad-i islam). (21) The article was written in response to the speech made by Edward Grey Foreign Minister of Britain. In 1906 Edward Grey delivered a speech in the British Parliament condemning the Unity of Islam as a big threat to the civilized world and blamed the Ottoman Empire for supporting it.

Prince Sabahaddin sent a very convincing answer to Edward Grey and this answer was published in many of the European newspapers, including the Times of August 12, 1906, and many leading editorial writers approved his way of interpretation of the problem. Below is the part of the letter that was published in the Times.

In this article addressing Edward Grey, he says:

"The unity of Islam is not a superstition. It is the natural outcome of the reckless policies of the west. Because if the unity of Islam, which is still on his way to be realized, can be said from a point of a sociologist as a natural response of muslims to the aggressive policies

of the west. More over the policies of the muslims for the unity of islam are not the results of the religious influences as the west thinks but the expressions of their discontentment". (22)

One of his other articles which was published earlier on the second of January 1907, by the Times newspaper appeared in the 9th issue of Terakki under the title of The Eastern Problem. (23) It was signed by Sabahaddin who used the title of his family (24) and "written again for the purpose of defending the Ottoman justice at a time when the westerners were taking a close interest to the problems of the East." (25)

In it he first explained the reasons why the reforms applied in the past failed and tells how they can be applied with success in the future. Talking about the past he says:

"non muslims (christians) showed their discontent together with the muslims against the announcement of Tanzimat for the reason that they had privileges prior to it and now they are dissatisfied for the fear of losing their privileged position because Tanzimat brought equality to all races." (26)

From the angle of the East as he makes correlations between the Turks, the Christians and the Europeans he suggests that all these different races living in the Empire with their different religions would be much better off if they remain under the unity of Ottomans. Furthermore he says:

"Both Europeans and the Americans would too benefit from the development of Turkey. Therefore they should also desire that the Ottomans should sort and solve their own problems by their own efforts." (27)

He expresses his hopes for the future mostly as the following:

"The civilised world should know that, beneath today's official Turkey, there is a growing society longing for economic and legal development. A permanent peace can only be established when this advancement which exists now only in the moral field is reflected in the material well being of the country, and also when the west realize the fact that Ottoman State belongs to the Ottomans the fundamental pre-requisite for the policy of an independent Turkey." (28).

In the 15th issue of Terakki there was his answer that began as While Reading Your Criticism to a man called Nitra whose article had appeared in the 13th issue of Terakki. In it he answers the questions and the objections of "Nitra who refuses the legacy of the Ottoman rule over different nations of the Empire." (29) Generally in this letter which is addressed to Nitra, he examines the judiciary rights of the Christians emphasising those ideas which he had suggested in his article entitled The Eastern Problem.

The second part of his answer appeared in the 19th and 20th issues of the Terakki, together with the following sub note in which he said "part of this answer forms a reply to Nitra, a man who holds an important position in his committee, but this answer also constitutes an article in its own right as it is being connected with the current issues." (30)

In the Young Turk movement there were now new developments as the Armenians realized that they could not achieve their aim by their own efforts. Subsequently they offered to share work with the Young Turks and conveyed their proposals to the members of the Progress and Union committee as well as to the Society for the Private initiative and Decentralization. This in turn led to the calling of the second congress of the Young Turks (31)

For the consideration of the Armenian offer, the second congress of the Young Turks took place on 27/12/1907, and lasted three days. After long debates, headed by Prince Sabahaddin, the following decisions were taken in the congress: 1) The deposition of Abdülhamid from his throne 2) The removal of the present administration 3) Establishment of a constitutional government (32)

But soon after the second congress, the second constitution was declared in Turkey. As a result there was no need for the application of the decisions taken in the congress.

Prince Sabahaddin came back to Turkey on the 2nd day of September 1908 (21 August 1324). (33) But before his arrival he sent a manifestation to the members of the the society for the Private initiative and Decentralization in Istanbul for to be published in the newspapers regarding the need to strengthen and to support 2nd constitution. (34)

While in the meantime there were efforts in Istanbul to unite these two societies, and in one of their meetings it was decided to cease the present sectarian hostilities until the opening of the parliament (35) as they made the subsequent announcement in the papers:

"We hereby declare the unification of the committee that worked in Paris up today under the name of the Society for the Private initiative and Decentralization and Constitutional Monarchy with the committee known as Ottomans' Union and Progress and they will work from now on under a common program and will be called as Ottomans' Union and Progress Committee." (36)

However in spite of this agreement which was described to be "as weak as a cotton thread" by Hüseyin Cahit, (37) "the hatred and the personal conflicts that arose when they were in Europe had not disappeared. In fact they had become even stronger in the mean time and begun to give sprouts." (38)

These people, especially the minorities whose interests coincided with the policies of Prince Sabahaddin met him with great enthusiasm. Consequently, his arrival from Paris to Istanbul became a historical event. All the people, Muslims as well as Christians, and school children were whirling around the S.S. of Princess Maria on row-boats, tugs-boats and sailboats as if they were to form a protective wing. Groups of delegations came over to S.S. Maria, from Çanakkale Municipality, and Greek, Armenian and Jewish Communities. (39) During the reception, a series of speeches were made; Prince Sabahaddin, in his speech, said the following:

"The reason of all the catastrophies we have experienced so far were resulted from the wicked system of centralization. From now on we must accept decentralized governing system and only then we can carry on our national duties with our private initiatives (40)".

Prince Sabahaddin had also brought his father's remains to Istanbul. In the following day of his arrival, his father was buried in the family grave yard in Eyüp. The funeral ceremony was attended by many important official and unofficial people, including personally the Şeyhülislam Cemaleddin Efendi and the religious leader of the jews. Also present were the religious delegations from each of the patriarchates. In the following days for the recognition of the interest shown for his father's funeral he made several visits, first to Şeyhülislam Cemaleddin Efendi then to other religious leaders, as well as to the patriarchate. It was this visit to the patriarchate, that was used as a pretext by the newspapers of Union and Progress, and to create negative feelings against his personality and also initiated the counter-arguments about his ideas. (41)

So Prince Sabahaddin who came back to Turkey after the declaration of the 2nd constitution with great expectations, was not able to materialize his hopes. Because those Young Turks who also came back to Turkey maintained their conflicts with him even after their return. They were mainly against his idea of decentralization of which they criticized a lot.

The thesis of decentralization he was defending unceasingly exhausted him as he had to explain it over and over again, as well as the ensuing misconceptions, for many years. Decentralization was taken in political terms by his opponents, who thought he was promising independence to the minorities; whereas he was saying exactly the opposite when he criticized the Armenian uprisings, as :

"The Turkish and the Armenian intellectuals should take the necessary measures that would prevent the reoccurrence of the past events, muslims and christians who are the sons of the same motherland should live in such a unity that would only suit to them."(42)

But his past collaborations either with Armenians or with the other minorities and especially his close relations with some of the foreign countries left his words without any effect. Even though he repeated several times that he meant the decentralization of the government administration and not the political administration of the country with the term decentralization, in spite of this fact the attacks on this point against him did not come to an end, and had been in fact rather too heavy.

Upon this, Prince Sabahaddin who thought that his ideas were understood wrongly, was forced to write down his open letters and explanations. These explanations, that put forward his political and sociological ideas, were in three pieces. First Explanation (1908), Second Explanation (1908) and Third Explanation (1910).

His first explanation, under the title of An Explanation About the Private initiative and the Allocation of the Responsibilities was published first time in the ikdam newspaper (43) in order to enlighten the arguments that were going on at that time about the programme of decentralization.

In it he emphasised that:

"Although it is clear that decentralization has no connection with the systems of autonomy or administration by autonomous committees, the signification of the term was totally modified under the continuous influence of the advocates of the previous administration" (44).

"The reforms we advocated for a long time under a system of decentralization were to increase the power of the mayors and the other local administrators and to allow them form their own local councils as soon as possible in order to determine the most fair and the most appropriate methods of tax collection."(45)

After the announcement of the second constitution the preparations for the election were started. In the political arena there was Union and Progress party which was supported by the majority. In oppositon, there were some of the friends of Prince Sabahaddin who formed a new party on 1st of September 1324 (14.9.1908) (46) twelve days after his arrival, which was called the Ahrar party (47). "Some people contributed the formation of Ahrar party to Sabahaddin Bey. But infact its establishment coincided with Sabahaddin's trip to Manastir."(48) "The idea for the formation of the party comes from Nureddin Ferruh who happened to be influenced by the speech which Sabahaddin made it in the Bebek Garden."(49) "Sabahaddin was later offered the leadership of the party. But after refusing the offer he promised to recommend one or two of his friends for the party."(50)

Before the elections, "some news appeared in the newspapers of the minorities, especially of those of Armenians and Greeks, in connection with Prince Sabahaddin's alleged promises such as the one he promised to give special priviliges to the pathriacate." (51).

Upon this, Hüseyin Cahit, who was the leading supporter of the Union and Progress in the press wrote an article of Election Intrigues which was published in the Tanin newspaper on the date of 26 Teşrin-i sani 1324 (52). As he said the following:

"The promise of special priviliges for the religious groups that the patriachate obtained from Prince Sabahaddin were in fact not religious previliges but were previliges for political means and ends" (53).

In reply to these Prince Sabahaddin wrote his second explanation that was titled as The Second Explanation about the Decentralization and the Private Initiative. (54) The main theme of the article was again about the term of decentralization. But one other thing he also pointed out in this explanation was about the article of Hüseyin Cahid which he described as "an open slander". (55) Refusing all the claims made against himself by saying as:

"In all these years there have been numerous objections to me by some, in various writings published in the press. Among all these claims, I wish one could have shown, at least for once, a sentence or a word that they could prove!!! There was no such possibility, and because they were unable to do so, they committed themselves to further lies and slanders" (56).

While these discussions and arguments about the ideas of the Prince continued, suddenly the affair of March the 31 st was broken out. Prince's name was also mixed with the name of the organizers of the affair.

But there are various views regarding the extend of his involvement with this affair. According to some he was amongst the leaders (57) but to some he had no connections with the affair and definetely he was not one of the organizers of the affair.(58) But even today the real cause of the affair has not been clarified. (59)

One thing we know for sure that Prince Sabahaddin was involved in various moves to turn the affair against Abdülhamid, (60) and when he heard that the soldiers were showing an interest, he went to Enver Pasha and asked his direct help to overthrow Abdülhamid from the throne. The reply of Enver Pasha was that he couldn't achieve a thing like this by his own efforts. In return Prince said the following : "No other alternative left to save the country but the removal of Sultan Abdülhamid", "Yıldız can not stand against the guns of the navy" and then he went to the warship Hamidiye and asked for their help (61) and in between these comings and goings he published two comminiques, one to the soldiers asking them to obey their officers and one to the Ulema saying as

"You, The Hardworking Ulemas

You should work, especially today, work more than you usually do, so that all the muslims can be freed from the possibility of being a tool of tyranny. From now on the muslims should not follow as for their aims nothing but generosity, fraternity and virtuosity. Work, especially today work more than you usually do so that our hearts would be freed from the beats of hatred, and selfishness. Let's spread the generosity and nobility even to our enemies." (62)

As a result of these activities Prince Sabahaddin was arrested and was charged with mixing with the organisers of the affair.

But when his innocence were understood he was discharged, as seen from the official report below:

"Since there is no proof that would necessitate the arrest of Prince Sabahaddin we return his freedom to him.

April 15, 1909 (1325)
Central Commander of Istanbul
Major Remzi "(63)

According to Akşin the reason of his discharge was Prince's closeness to the British. To him, the discharge of the Prince and his brother were the result of pressure exerted by the British who considered the brothers as their men.(64) But according to Orbay it was Sultan Reşad who ordered the release of the prince during his coronation when he visited the ministry of defence. "On his arrival, the mother of Sabahaddin, Seniha Sultan, sister of the Sultan Reşad himself started to cry and scream in front of the room where his son was kept and when Sultan Reşad heard this, he discharged Sabahaddin after making him to promise that he would not involve again with the politics any more."(65)

Prince Sabahaddin had been too much affected with his unfair arrest and after reaching his freedom he went back again to Europe and "kept his promise by not involving with the politics for some time."(66) After he returned to Paris he wrote his open letters to Union and Progress. They comprised eight letters and were the continuation of the first and second explanations that he wrote when he was in Turkey and they were titled as the Open Letters To Union and Progress- The last And the Third Explanation About Our Doctrine (67).

To him "these letters were letters that tried to discover the road to social harmony", and (68)

"was dedicated to the most conscious members of the Union and Progress, the party which took the responsibility of governing the country after the declaration of the 2nd constitution." (69)

His first letter started with the following words.

"Gentlemen.

I shall start my letters with the idea of a very talented sculptor.

When beauty and ugliness meet, he said, beauty conquers nature by a divine law, goes always toward the very best, and ceaselessly evolves toward the perfect. If we apply Rodin's viewpoint to the social field we can say that when truth and power collide, at last the truth will conquer and when friendship and enmity meet, at last friendship wins. We do not forget this sublime law and we are addressing these letters with a friendship of fifteen years to those who have been for ten years our political enemies. In fact we want to prove that nature by a divine law goes always toward the best, evolves to the perfect."(70)

"We always wanted freedom, but never opined on the ways by which it had been gained by those who possessed it. Our publications were ineffective for we never came closer to criticize our social ills." (71) "The substance of your publications before the declaration of the 2nd Constitution were based on the idea that the cause of all social problems was the despotic governing system of monarchism, and you thought you would solve all the problems by pulling it down and establishing a constitutional system instead. Everything would then be allright, with the ideal result that the country would have been saved. We never believed in this and from the moment you started to think so; our ways were seperated from the way of our friends in the Union and Progress. Although we appreciated the moral side of their efforts we couldn't avoid telling them the incompatibility of their ideas with the existing social problems."(72).

Seeing that the outcome of the affairs were proving his early predictions Sabahaddin further distanced himself from the current political issues and gave himself to the introduction of the ideas of La Science Sociale and the to the other social works. Most of the letters he wrote from Paris were mainly directed to the explanations of the ways and the means of his programme that could be put in use.

Back in Turkey the wishes of those unionists who came to power after Abdulhamid were not to defend the maintainence of country's existing position. "They wanted to revive the state and make it a going concern in the modern world. In a sense they were gamblers; they wanted all or nothing."(73)

Yet the country was sick. It was essential that it shouldn't be moved and strained. Abdulhamid recognized this fact and tried to maintain the present status quo. But his opponents attributed this to his clumsiness.

Abdulhamid's own politics were based on the ideas that would stop the disintegration of the Empire, as stated by Feroz Ahmad, "he tried to save the state in its existing form; and he had accomplished this in a masterly way."(74) About this Abdulhamid told the following:

"I am thinking about what my country was once and what it is now". An Empire which was once spread over continents came down to a handful of land within ten years. Whose fault is this? And since we lost the motherland, what is the use even, if we find out who is guilty.

For forty years I waited for the major powers to start quarelling with each other. This was my only hope, and I saw the fortune of the Ottomans in this. The expected day finally arrived. But unfortunately, I had lost the throne by then, and those who had the power could not use the opportunity that I had waited for forty years; it disappeared from the hands of the Ottomans for ever.

It was only for this reason that I tried to stay on the throne for some thirty years. If I made concessions to some powers during my reign, they were again for this reason. It was even for this reason that I blockaded the navy in the Golden Horn and did not allow the soldiers to exercise. If I dared to have a battle with the Greeks it was not to loose the island of Crete to the advantage of the British. Any way, whatever I have done, good or bad, I did for this reason only.

I hid this secret for forty years. I will tell it to the future generations to let them know the facts about myself. I didn't tell this even to my closest prime ministers. Because I know from my experience that if one thing is known by two it no longer remains a secret, and definitely this shouldn't be heard and known by the other countries. Ottomans could be saved only if they would use this opportunity wisely and only then they could become a great nation again.

In order to understand how I reached this belief, one should first know the conditions that prevailed in the country and the world when I succeeded to the throne. I didn't reach this conclusion in my early days. I reached it after seeing closely the intentions of the great powers towards us during and after the Russian War that we had lost. We didn't have enough strength to live and stand on our own feet. We could have a chance to become again a power, a voice in the world only if our enemies, united to disintegrate us, quarrelled with each other, broke up and we become a power indispensable for at least one of 3 these countries.

It was obviously inevitable that the rivalry between the powers would at the end lead them into a fight. Therefore until that moment the Ottoman government should have to stay away from any conflict and should enforce its strength only when such day of reckoning arrives. This was the secret of my politics which lasted 33 years."(75)

When Prince Sabahaddin was engaged in writing his letters back at home the political and military situation were deteriorating further. Especially the situation in Balkans was getting worse as most of the Balkan countries were making new demands. When these countries namely Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbia, Montenegro did not get any reaction regarding to their demands, they started to form allies against the Ottomans who were also supported by the Russian.

While in Istanbul there were some who opposed to idea of entering a war. But Union and Progress who wanted to win back the former lands of Turkey was in favour of the war. But during this time as a result of a new political development in Istanbul the Union and Progress party fell from the power and replaced by a group of opposition members who were sympathetic to Prince Sabahaddin's ideas.

Not surprisingly, "soon after this Prince Sabahaddin returned to Turkey upon the invitation of the new Sadrazam, Gazi Muhtar Pasha," (76); this was 12 days before the beginning of Balkan war. And he objected to the involvement of Turkey in that war. The Prince was a sincere advocate of peace in the Balkans.

For this he even visited his uncle Sultan Reşad and begged him to prevent the entrance of Turkey into war against the Balkan countries as he tried to explain that such a move would be a disaster for the country.

In reply to his words Sultan Reşad told him that he should not worry, that his government would try to take every precaution for not entering such a war. (77) But the previous errors of the past political party in power had made it inevitable for the Empire to enter into this bloody war.

As soon as the war started all the conditions militarywise were against the Ottomans. Upon this Prince Sabahaddin wrote a letter (78) to Sultan Reşad asking him lead the army himself in the battlefront as the moral of the soldiers were very low. In the end of the war Turkey lost practically all of her European provinces as well as the islands in the Aegean Sea.

After the war political situation was getting more complicated everyday as many people were dissatisfied with the performance of the elected members of the parliament, and the involvement of the army with the politics. There were some officers who were also against the involvement of the army with the politics, especially their support of the Union and Progress. They asked Sabahaddin to support them by giving moral and financial help. This group was known as the Halaskar Zabitan Group. (79) There was also another group of civilians which later became the biggest opposition party in opposition against the Union and Progress. It was called Hürriyetperver Party and they also wanted to use Sabahaddin's ideas and his personality for the party's aims. But he refused to involve directly with their policies as he stated in the letter below:

A short explanation

"I would like to state that I have never joined the Hürriyet and itilaf Party. Despite the fact that I had been continuously and persistently offered the leadership of the party, I rejected it for the reason that I was completely sure nothing would come out of it in the end. It is certainly true that some of my friends had become the members of the party. But I have never interfered with the free decisions of my friends including the members of my family since I myself have been defending the idea of individual and social freedoms throughout my life. Any kind of diversion from this stand would, I think, constitute a self-contradiction. I believe defending one's own views and thoughts is something and oppressive interference in others' ideas is something else.

I would like to mention one of my memories in connection with Hürriyet and Itilaf Party which happened during the time when they were most powerful. They had prepared a political plot and I was asked to join with them. I refused their offer in a friendly way. Upon this, many congratulation were sent to me by the members of the Union and Progress while at the same time I received anger and condemnations from the opposite side. In my opinion both sides had been subjective in their responses. In the end so called plot was executed by the representative of bureaucracy, Mahmud Pasha who would do anything whatever he is told. All the members of the schools of la science sociale (meslek-i ictimâî) knew the fact that no party who only pursued to achieve political aims even with the best intentions can not save a communal country unless they have a concept of reform found on a methodical training system that would aimed to shape the social formation of society. These poor countries even when they occasionally reach high standart livings they soon end up again with failures. Is not it for this reason that the world is now slowly beeing pulled down to a world war. But one day in the future and certainly in a distant one when a party is born which is equipped with the knowledge of both La science sociale and La science spirituelle only then a party will be able to achive something positive. Certainly there are some backward countries where one can find the existence of private initiative and productivity but the existence of such activities in those countries are not due to the directions of their political parties but due to the superiority of the private lives of the members of society. However would this superiority of them last for ever? If the factors that improve the morale and the social standing of a community is learned by heart, the maintenance of their superiority can then be continued. Otherwise I personally think their superiority can not last very long. For a man who said approximately 30 years ago that the starting point in our lives would be love not hatred, can now not think and feel in any other way. Although I believe in the necessity of being the politics on morality and sympathy, the point made here was not aimed to cover these but the humanity."(80)

"Prince Sabahaddin who took Private Initiative and Decentralization as his main policies had never formed a party or an any organization in practice. But most of the time he kept near him a group of intellectuals who tried to spread his ideas and remained faithful to him." (81)

For him the expectations from the constitutional government were never materialized for the simple reason that he was seeking the solution to the problem with in the change of the social structure not with in the change of the political structure.

For this reason he showed his sorrow by saying the following words with regret "as we said when we were in Terakki one can not put an end to oppression by changing the form of the government." (82) About this point Neyyir-i Hakikat then asked him the following question.

"At first you escaped from oppression, now you are escaping from the constitution. In this case what do you want?" (83)

In reply to the this Prince Sabahaddin who believed that the constitutional governments are bound to fail unless the essence of their reformatations should be such that they should aim to transform the life styles of the people from the one based on collectivism to the one based on private initiative said the following:

"The salvation of our country is possible, not by the enforcement and enlargement of government authority, but by the development and strengthening of the life of the individual through private initiative and by the establishment of the same spirit of independence and the same goals in public life." (84).

He explained again the correctness of his views and emphasised the erroneous nature of the choices made all of which he thinks could have been avoided if they would have applied the methods of decentralization which were explained in his book How Turkey can be saved. (85)

But the political party which held the destiny of the Empire in its hands was not ready to accept the Prince's reform program. They condemned him as a traitor. Since he advocated decentralization of the government they thought that this would be a threat to Imperial unity. They argued that his plan would dissolve the huge Empire by giving each province the right to govern itself.

However there were some who believed in the sincerity of his ideas. Amongst them was Saidi Nursi. He believed in Prince Sabahaddin's sincerity but accepted his views as a mistake. Therefore he wrote down the letter below in which he explained the wrong parts of his ideas. His letter entitled An Answer to the Nice Idea of Prince Sabahaddin contained mainly the following message.

"If the idea of decentralization is applied without bringing all those who live on this land to the same cultural and ideological levels and let everyone who has a brother or a son to form their own particular associations, the already existing hatred of the other communal and nationalities would then flare up more than before as they take this as an opportunity to put their own idea of separation into practice. In consequence, we will then see with great horror that your idea of decentralization is not confined to its assumed boundaries as it would force with such a pressure that the curtain of constitution to which you attached most of your hopes would not be able to stand against its pressure and would be torn, in fact it would be rather burst with great ardour. These minorities composed of different races and religions would first ask for self-autonomy and later for independency.

We then find ourselves surrounded with innumerable small States which came into being after the disintegration of a large country, a situation expressed in the terminology of history as Tavaif-i Muluk. Resulting from the failure to control the feelings of competition, this opens such a road to terror that while we engage in our hostilities on the ruins of unequal forces, with the invasion of foreign powers, our country collapses and finally disappears. If we put the benefits of freedom that we had longed for on one scale of the balance and our losses on the other which would weigh more?

We wanted to cure the poisons of oppression by means of freedom. In this approach, our success depends on the establishment of a proper social structure.

If, under decentralization, our freedoms would harm our national unity and scatter seeds of mischief and separation, this would be nothing else than unwittingly opening a way for treason. Be careful that today, even those political clubs the intentions of which are not clearly known, are supporting separation movements.

Since the sole solution for our salvation is to defend freedom and the unity of our nation and to keep ourselves away from acts that are contrary to our wisdom and common sense, it is imperative that we prevent any attempt that could produce undesirable results, irrespective of its nature and place of origin.

I don't think it suits to your faith and patriotism to be on such a dangerous road that can turn our existence into a hell, an existence which could turn into an heaven under the future sky of Asia. Alas, what can we do? We can not put it into practice today with the wisdom and the ideas that we possess now. We need more time and more effort."(86)

According to Mardin, "Prince Sabahaddin had picked a wrong period as he hurried to apply the ideas of decentralization which he borrowed from La Science Sociale."(87) It was really a very difficult government system to apply into the Ottoman Empire. Because with the words of Abdulhamid

"the Ottoman Empire had been formed with the combination of various nationalities."(88)

It was a fact that before the second constitution the minorities were incited by the foreign powers. (89) The Ottoman idealism kept the various people in unity who had different races and religions for centuries but when the government started to weaken, these minorities did not stay in order. As Abdülhamid told once

"no race would remain in order when the country it belongs to becomes weak."(90)

The idea of Private Initiative which was introduced to Turkey by the efforts of Prince Sabahaddin was accepted by many people without an objection. But the idea of decentralization which he also wanted to be accepted had worn him down and removed any further possibilities of making any use of the talents of this man who was a real patriot. The decentralization view of Prince Sabahaddin was well intended though it was very vulnerable to exploitation.

We don't believe that he had any ill intentions when he shared work with the minorities. Because, for the sake of his country he spent his life in exile, living in various places while longing for it.

In the meantime the Union and Progress party were trying to get back the power it lost for a brief period. They attacked Babiali, they killed the minister of defence, Nazim Pasha and his assistance and forced Sadrazam Kamil Pasha to resign from his post. After this the candidate of Union and Progress, Mahmud Şevket Pasha became the new sadrazam. But this obviously did not improve the situation because this time all the opposition groups against the Union and Progress started to arrange their counter attacks to kill Mahmut Şevket Pasha and finally he was killed on 14 June 1913. It was this killing of Mahmut Şevket Pasha which gave the excuse for the Union and Progress to eliminate all its political opponents as they sentenced them either to death or long imprisonment. Among those sentenced to death was Prince Sabahaddin but he escaped abroad after hiding a few days in Istanbul.(91) After a successful escape he wrote a letter. The main ideas of which I give below.

In his letter he strongly denied the charges made against himself in connection with the assassination of Mahmud Şevket Pasha and said that he was ready to stand in any court provided that all the facts of the case could be examined thoroughly and objectively first. He said that he in fact advised those people not to resort to violence when they asked him that they were going to use force against their political enemies, for he rejected the whole idea of using violence for the very reason that it was the methods of the members of the Union and Progress which he never wanted to be associated with (92).

After this affair for a while there was a talk of amnesty for the people who were involved with the assassination of Mahmut Şevket Pasha. Prince Sabahaddin's name was amongst those names mentioned. As a matter of fact he had a visitor from Turkey representing the government who first conveyed the personal greetings of his uncle Sultan Reşad and then the intention of the government for his amnesty. But the real intention of the government was "to obtain the help of Prince Sabahaddin for a loan that the government was planning to borrow from the bourses of France." (93)

During this period, the political situation in Europe, was getting nearer to a breakdown (a situation which Abdülhamid wanted to happen during his time) as the Germans were trying to obtain new colonies at the expense of the other major powers namely England and France. Germans in search of new allies against their main rivals England were trying to obtain the

support of the Ottomans in order to win their alliance for the coming conflict. Against this, we know that the leading members of the Union and Progress were also thinking in similar lines with their counterparts in Germany.

Prince Sabahaddin was then in Paris, again in exile, watching closely the political developments in Turkey, and with his unfailing devotion to his country which compelled him to do what he could do to save her from the coming disaster. It was getting more obvious that Turkey was going to side with Germany in the coming war. To Sabahaddin this would be a catastrophe. Consequently he sent messages to the Sultan Reşad (94) and to the leader of the political party, strongly advising them to avoid entering the war and stating that such action would only result with the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.

At the same time he made contacts with the French Government and asked them to help him to prevent the entrance of the Ottoman Empire into the war as an ally of Germany. (95) However his efforts failed and Turkey became a participant in the tragedy of the First World War.

Even after this the Prince did not give up his efforts. He tried to influence the Ottoman Government to accept a separate treaty of peace. (96) But again the political party ignored his arguments, and the Ottoman Empire shared the fate of Germany.

When the war started, Prince Sabahaddin left France, as it became the enemy of the Ottomans and went to Switzerland and to settle there.

The entrance of Turkey into the First World War was again a blow to the ideas of Prince Sabahaddin for he consistently objected the idea of Turkey entering any war since the declaration of the 2nd Constitution. Like his uncle Sultan Abdulhamid he reached the same conclusion that the Ottomans were not in a shape to win any war either in the military field or in the arena of international politics.

Abdulhamid's observations were based on his first hand contacts with the leaders of the major powers of the period as he realized the fact that all of them were only interested to break down his country and to obtain a share of it and used the issue of minorities as an excuse for their own ends.

On the other hand the observations of Prince Sabahaddin were based on his first hand knowledge of the structural (the most important determinant) weaknesses of the Ottomans as compared with the undoubted superiority of the western powers through his scientific studies which of course included his observations he made during his long stay in Europe..

The ideas he advocated, like the decentralization were often used by his opponents without any close examination as an excuse to accuse him that he was working for the interest of the minorities and the western powers. But in reality the foreign powers wanted to use him for their own particular ends such as the French government which made a very attractive offer, when he was in Switzerland during the beginning of First World War, asking him to work against the government in Turkey who were then in war on the side of Germany. Although he was against the alliance of Turks with Germany, he still refused the French offer, (97) remained in Switzerland and continued to work for the interest of his country in spite of the numerous disappointments he had experienced.

As a result of the war, most of The Turks who lived in Europe gathered in Switzerland. Most of them were closely in touch with the politics in Turkey and they carried different political views with the result that there was no accord between the existing ideas of Turks.

It was again Prince Sabahaddin who took charge of the affairs and organized the Turks to take a concerted view with the effort of convincing the Turkish government to make separate peace arrangements with England and France, because most people who were watching the developments of the war were convinced that Germany was losing it and they all knew that Turkey would also suffer very heavily from the fate of Germany as they were allies.

As expected when the war was over, Germany surrendered unconditionally while the Ottomans were also forced to share the same fate as the country were occupied by the allied forces. This catastrophic result was not a surprise for the Turks in Switzerland, as they were making preparations for a congress to examine the Wilson principles in order to determine their future actions. The congress was held under the chairmanship of Prince Sabahaddin and took the following decisions which were mainly about the condemnation of the allied policies (unfair occupation) and therefore mostly against the declared Wilsonian principles. They sent copies which contained the decisions taken in the congress to the governments of the allied forces, to the world press and to the other relevant places (98).

Prince Sabahaddin in addition to his political involvements was also busy in spreading his sociological views which he strongly believed that the only solutions for the salvation of his country. He was in touch with his friends in Turkey who shared his views.

His ability to interpret social problems and his Social Reform Doctrine, aroused respect among a small group of university professors and students. They called themselves "Nesli Cedid", the New Generation. The members of Nesli-Cedid started to translate passages from "La Science Sociale" recommended by the Prince. They advocated new school programs to educate the people of the provinces for self-government. Earnestly they tried to adopt the reform program of the Prince to the Empire.

In fact he wrote and finished the prime work of his life that reflected his mature stage work in 1913 and carried the title of How Turkey can be saved. This work at the time of its publication made echoes all over the country. It was the application of meslek (Profession) into our social issues which was seen as the declaration of a reform policy. Although written in 1329H, its publication after the war in fact increased its influence twice as much. The book was published by Mehmet Ali Şevki in 1918 together with his preface The proffession, Against the Danger." (99).

"There were no original ideas in the book, only those ideas which he had put forward earlier, but this time they were presented in a more detailed, refined and compact style." (100)

Prince Sabahaddin came back to Turkey on 9/12/1919 and was met by a large crowd which included some members of the government, his family and the press. (101) As soon as he came back he wrote an open letter which was entitled To Our National Conscience. (102) Fındıkoğlu found this letter useful, for it carried the following point which was "with the application of certain methods of sociology, the past moment of experience of a particular country could be used to enlighten the presents political realities of that particular country." (103) The main message of the letter was that if any one has a reform program that was supported by such past experiences then we should put it immediately into practice, but if there was no such reform program in existence we should try to use the methods of our program (meslek-i ictimâî).

However, the existing situation was not good for any political activity as the city itself was under occupation and all political activities were forbidden by the occupying forces.

During this period Prince Sabahaddin spent most of his time by helping those who had problems with the occupying forces because his knowledge of western culture made him acceptable to the westerners. Moreover, most of the political activities were any way being moved to Anatolia where the movement of independence was taking place

As it is known after the abolishment, the dynasty members were forced to leave the country and as a result of his relationship with the family, Prince Sabahaddin was too exiled and forced to live abroad for the rest of his life.

During his later years he had not produced any more work that was in the nature of a book. "Occasionally he made some analysis of the Soviet Russia examining it from a social scientist's point of view which were published in the European newspapers." (104) But even during this period he didn't stop studying the issues he believed in, and tried to spread these ideas by various means.

His only work of this period that carried his views, which were also an important source of the period that related to his private life, were the letters he sent to his special friends who were the members of the movement of la science Social, a school of thought which he himself initiated in Turkey.

The majority of these letters in accordance with the type of issues they contained showed an internal growth of the movement as well as the development of the writer's own intellect which it was understood made a turning towards spiritualism in his later years. Most of these letters were kept in the private files of the well known author Nezahet Nureddin Ege since 1918 (105).

We learned about the existence of these letters from Prof.Dr. Hilmi Ziya Ülken (106) and Prof.Dr. Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu (107) who also stated that they were not published in any where.

Here, I thank and remember with gratitude Mrs.Nezahet Nureddin Ege who gave me the honour and the opportunity to read these letters which give some important clues and bring some hidden dark facts of Prince Sabahaddin's life to light which were not known before and to publish some of these letters for first time by taking out them from her private collection.

Chapter 4

HIS DEATH AND COMMEMORATIONS

One of Prince Sabahaddin's unusual side was his miserable and wretched end which he had come up against despite the fact that he had once limitless resources at his disposal. Because he belonged to the palace he was always surrounded with a large number of friends when he went to Europe. But his faith did not always share the same fortune. Especially during his final years he suffered a lot. His health had not been very good with the consequence that he moved from one canton to another in accordance with the changing seasons of the year. But there were also some other reasons for his continuous movement-such as the paying of the economic penalty of having the title of prince which was added in front of his name. It was not possible for him to stay in large hotels for his financial situation was not very good. As a result of this he was forced to live in small towns or in village guest houses under the name of Mehmed Sabahaddin (108). When his death was very close he was in a state of constant delirium and great sadness for he was feeling very homesick. "Just before his death he had fallen into a sleep and after a while he opened his eyes slowly and said

I am very bored here, why are we staying, let us go back to our country" (109).

"In this state of delirium he stared at his surroundings for a moment or so with an empty look in his eyes, then he pulled a silk Turkish flag from the drawer of a console near his bed, opened it with his trembling fingers, kissed it, and spread it over his eyes. Under the influence of his illness he continuously talked in his sleep as he was repeating the following words constantly:

Here, here is an airplane, the one which is covered with a Turkish flag is coming towards us it will now take us back to Istanbul." (110).

With his rights and wrongs Prince Sabahaddin who loved his country very much spent all his life for the benefit of his country.

After spending most of his life for the salvation of his country he died in Switzerland at the age of 70 on the 30th June 1948, suffering with a great pain of longing for he could not join his native land again. He believed in death and the existence of life after death. For him:

"How winter is essential and initiates spring, similarly death is essential for life as it initiates the life .."(111)

"After his death his body was embalmed and put in a lead coffin which was kept in an underground store house of a hospital in Switzerland for exactly 4 years and 2.5 months. His coffin was brought by a ship in September 1952, and on Friday the 12 th September, after the performance of the funeral prayers in Bayezid Mosque, his coffin was taken to the family graveyard near the Bostan quay of Eyüp Sultan, placed at the opposite corner of the Hüsrev Pasha Library, and there he was buried in his lead coffin next to tombs of his grand father, the sea admiral Halil Rifat Pasha and his father, Minister of Justice, son-in-law Mahmud Celaleddin Pasha." (112).

COMMEMORATIONS

The reform programs proposed by Prince Sabahaddin did not get enough chance to be put into practise in spite of the fact that they were widely discussed by the public. After the termination of the Empire and the establishment of the Republic, those ideas which were once silenced by the claims that they were the continuation of the ideas of Union and Progress, appeared again in the ideological life of the country. But again as the views took their place at the ideological centre, it was Durkheim's sociology which was once more started to be accepted as the sovereign ideological institution by the intellectuals. Furthermore Prince Sabahaddin failed to make the monographic examinations and observations despite the fact that he himself often repeated their importance. The reform programmes that he defended were accepted by some people only as "reform programmes whose outcomes needed to be proven." (113). As a result of these political and non political factors the teachings of La Science Sociale that he defended made less impact when it was compared with the teachings of Durkheim. However since his death to the present time he is still remembered, as the commemoration meetings are continuously being held for his honour for the contributions he made to the development of social sciences and the efforts he showed for his country. During these meetings the weight of the point of discussion has been heavily not on his political but on his scientific activities.

In a speech during a commemoration meeting Ülken said the following:

"When we arrange these commemoration ceremonies for this great guide we should not see him as a political reformist who was involved in the politics of a certain period and put into a particular political mould in which positive and negative opinions were pictured about him, but we should see him as the usher of a generation of sociologist and educationalists who have

decided to set on the road again as they shake the neglects of the past forty years. If we want to comfort his soul and put the country in an auspicious research path we should fill every part of the country with researchers who would work like ants, but before every thing we should first open social research centers in our universities." (114).

According to our findings the first commemoration meeting in Prince Sabahaddin's honour was held in the home of his close friend Dr. Nihat Reşad Belger in Siraselviler, on 30 (31?) 1.1949. Those present at this meeting were Hüseyin Siret, Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, Sadi Gür, Mehmed Ali, Prof. Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu and Nezahet Nureddin Ege.(115)

The second commemoration meeting was organised by the Teachers' Association of Istanbul two years after his death on friday the 30th June, 1950 at 17.30 p.m. in the large lecture hall of the Faculty of Law of the University of Istanbul. At the time when this meeting was held the funeral of Prince had not come to Turkey.

The fifth anniversary of the commemoration meeting of his death was again undertaken by the Teachers' Association of Istanbul in the sociology amphitheatre of the Literature Faculty of the University of Istanbul on the date of 30th June 1953 at 17.p.m.

The seventh anniversary of the commemoration meeting of his death was undertaken by the Prince Sabahaddin Bey Committee in the Eminönü Students' Hall on thursday the 30th June 1955 at 16.p.m. The commemoration meeting of the 15th anniversary of his death was undertaken by the Turkish Social Research Association under the supervision of its president Prof.Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu in the Çemberlitaş Teachers' Union hall on Sunday 30th June 1963 at 17.p.m. and was dedicated to the Prince as well as to the other members who belonged to the school of Prince Sabahaddin.

The ceremonies for the 27th, 30th, and the 31st anniversaries of his death was undertaken by Nezahet Nureddin Ege in the conference hall of Erenköy Güneş College.

NOTES AND REFERENCES TO CHAPTER III AND IV.

- (1) Nuray Mert, "A Young Turk Journal: Terakki," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1985, p.5.
- (2) Ibid., p. 34.
- (3) Cavit Orhan Tütengil, Prens Sabahaddin, İstanbul 1954, p.27.
- (4) Mert, op.cit., p.39.
- (5) Ibid., p.37.
- (6) Terakki issues do not have regular dates, but all issues were published between 1906-1908, they were only 20; Terakki, No. 1, p.1; see also. Ibid., p.5.
- (7) M. Sabahaddin, "Gençlerimize Mektup intibah-ı Fikrimiz," Terakki, No. 1, p.2.
- (8) Ibid., p.8.
- (9) Ibid., p.11.
- (10) Ibid.
- (11) Ibid., pp.7-8.
- (12) Sabahaddin, "Nasıl Hristiyanlar Vatanımızda Adem-i Merkeziyetten Müstefid Olageldikleri Halde Müslümanlar Merkeziyetin Mahkumu oluyorlar?," Terakki, No. 6, p.5.
- (13) Sabahaddin, "Vilayetler Ahalisine Bir Davet," Terakki, No. 12, p.4.
- (14) Ibid., p.5.
- (15) For the detailed information on Terakki itself and Anatolian uprisings Mert's thesis is good source, see. Mert, op.cit., pp.39-55.
- (16) Sabahaddin, "ittihad," Terakki, No. 10, p.5.
- (17) Mert, op.cit., p. 40.
- (18) Sabahaddin, "ittihad," Terakki, No. 10, p.5.
- (19) Mert, op.cit., p.44.
- (20) Ibid.

- (21) Sabahaddin, "İttihad-ı islâm," Terakki, No. 4, pp.1-4.
- (22) Ibid., p.1.
- (23) Sabahaddin, "Şark Meselesi," Terakki, No. 9, pp.1-6.
- (24) Sultanzade Sabahaddin.
- (25) Sabahaddin, "Onüçüncü Terakkide Tenkidinizi Okurken," Terakki, No. 15, p.1.
- (26) Sabahaddin, "Şark Meselesi" Terakki, No. 9, p. 1.
- (27) Ibid., p.5.
- (28) Ibid., p.6.
- (29) Mert, op.cit., p.62.
- (30) "Tenkidinizi Okurken," Terakki, No. (19-20), p.1.
- (31) Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler, İstanbul 1945, pp.284-85.
- (32) "Osmanlı Muhalifin Fırkaları Kongresinin Beyannamesi," Terakki, No. 17, p.2.
- (33) Kuran, İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön..., p.265.
- (34) Ibid., p.260.
- (35) Ibid., p.264.
- (36) Melâhat Topuz, "Prens Sabahaddin ve Adem-i Merkeziyet", Unpublished M.A. thesis, İstanbul University, no date, p.21.
- (37) Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, Siyasal Anılar, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası publication, 1976, p.45.
- (38) Sabahaddin, "İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık Mektuplar: Mesleğimiz Hakkında Üçüncü ve Son Bir İzah", İstanbul: Mahmud bey Matbaası, 1327H, p. 5, (Saffet Lutfi's preface). This work of Sabahaddin was transcribed as thesis with the same title, see. Hasan Katiboğlu, "İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık Mektuplar: Mesleğimiz Hakkında Üçüncü ve Son Bir İzah", Unpublished M.A.thesis, İstanbul University, 1975.

- (39) "Damad Mahmud Paşa Merhumun Nâ'sının Vatan Topraklarına Getirilişi," (The transportation of the Remains of Mahmud Celaleddin Pasha from Paris to His Country), *İkdam*, 8 September 1908; see also: Nezahet Nureddin Ege, *Prens Sabahaddin Hayatı ve İlmî müdafaaları*, İstanbul 1977, pp.140-41.
- (40) Topuz, *op.cit.*, p.19, quoted from *Yevmî Serveti Fünun*, 20 August 1324 (2 September 1908).
- (41) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p.266.
- (42) Sabahaddin, *Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Tevsi-i Mezuniyet Hakkında Bir İzah*, İstanbul, no date, p.11.
- (43) *İkdam*, 5-6 October 1908.
- (44) Sabahaddin, *Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Tevsi-i Mezuniyet...*, p.7.
- (45) *Ibid.*, p.14.
- (46) For the differences of the dates see: Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasi Partiler 1859-1952: İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi*, Vol.I., İstanbul:Hürriyet Vakfı Publication, 1952; Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p.266.
- (47) Sina Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat Terakki*, İstanbul 1987, p.101.
- (48) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p.270.
- (49) Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasi ...*, p.143.
- (50) Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyetinde İnkılâb Hareketleri*, İstanbul 1959, p.499.
- (51) Topuz, *op.cit.*, p.21.
- (52) H.Cahit Yalçın, "İntihabat Entrikaları," *Tanin*, 26 Teşrin-i Sani 1324/ 9 December 1908, no. 129.
- (53) *Ibid.*
- (54) Sabahaddin, *Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Adem-i Merkeziyet Hakkında İkinci Bir İzah*, İstanbul 1324.
- (55) *Ibid.*, p.25.
- (56) *Ibid.*, p.35.

- (57) Akşin, Jön Türkler..., p.129.
- (58) Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, **Türk İnkılâb Tarihi**, Vol. I Part II, Ankara 1983, p.185.
- (59) There are many books in the subject, the following is one of them: Faik Reşit Unat, **ikinci Meşrutiyet'in ilânı ve Otuzbir Mart Hadisesi**, II. Abdülhamidin son Mebusan Başkatibi Ali Cevat Bey'in Fezlekesi, Ankara 1985.
- (60) Sabahaddin, **İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık ...**, p.41.
- (61) Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...**, p.279; Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda ve..., pp.515.
- (62) Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...**, p.280; Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda ve..., pp.515; Sabahaddin, **İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık ...**, p.42.
- (63) Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...**, p.282.
- (64) Akşin, Jön Türkler..., p.130,138.
- (65) "Rauf Orbay'ın Hatıraları,"**Hatıralar, Vesikalar, Resimlerle Yakın Tarihimiz**, Vol.III, No.33, p.212.
- (66) **Ibid.**
- (67) Sabahaddin, **"İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık Mektuplar-Mesleğimiz Hakkında Üçüncü ve Son Bir İzah**, İstanbul 1327H.
- (68) **Ibid.**, p.137.
- (69) **Ibid.**
- (70) **Ibid.**, p.17.
- (71) **Ibid.**, p.20.
- (72) **Ibid.**, p.18.
- (73) Feroz Ahmad, **The Young Turks**, Oxford 1969, p. 157.
- (74) **Ibid.**
- (75) İsmet Bozdağ, **Sultan Abdülhamid'in Hatıra Defteri**, İstanbul 1985, pp.65-67.
- (76) Ege, **op.cit.**, p. 273.

- (77) Ibid., p.278.
- (78) Sabahaddin, "27 Teşrin-i Evvel 1328 Tarihiyle Huzur-u Muallay-ı Padişahiye Takdim Edilen Açık Bir Arıza", (A pamphlet); See also: Ege, op.cit., p. 280.
- (79) Tunaya, Türkiye'de Siyasi..., pp.324-25
- (80) Letter of Prince Sabahaddin dated 10 March 1948 and written to Nezahet Nureddin Ege ; see appendix B for the letters presented in this thesis as original sources for their original as well as turkish copies.
- (81) Bayur, **Türk İnkılâb Tarihi**, Vol. II. Part IV, Ankara 1983, p.235.
- (82) Ege, op.cit., p. 400.
- (83) Sabahaddin, **İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık ...**, p.32; quoted from Neyyir-i Hakikat, No 120.
- (84) Sabahaddin, **Türkiye Nasıl Kurtarılabilir? Meslek-i ictimâî ve Programı**, İstanbul 1334, p.65.
- (85) Original name is Türkiye Nasıl Kurtarılabilir?, Ibid.
- (86) Necmeddin Şahiner, **Bilinmeyen Taraflarıyla Bediüzzaman Said Nursî**, İstanbul 1979, p.114.
- (87) Şerif. Mardin, **Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri: 1895-1908**, İstanbul 1983, p. 216.
- (88) Bozdağ, op.cit., p.65-67.
- (89) About Prince Sabahaddin see also: Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, **Makedonya'dan Orta asya'ya Enver Paşa**, Vol.I, İstanbul 1972, p.1260.
- (90) Bozdağ, op.cit., p.56.
- (91) Ege, op.cit., pp. 286-87.
- (92) For detailed information see: Ibid., pp.289-292; Kuran, **İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...**, p.341.
- (93) Ibid., p.342.
- (94) Ege, op.cit., pp. 313-5, quoted from **Bulletin de la Societe Internationale De Science Sociale**, 122 Livraison, Decembre 1911.

- (95) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p.345-46.
- (96) *Ibid.*, p.352.
- (97) *Ibid.*, p.363.
- (98) *Ibid.*, p.365.
- (99) Tütengil, *Prens Sabahattin*, p. 47.
- (100) Paul Descamps, *Deneysel Sosyoloji*, prefaced and translated by Nurettin Şazi Kösemihal, İstanbul 1965, p.15, (Kösemihal's preface).
- (101) Ege, *op.cit.*, p. 397.
- (102) *Ibid.*, pp.399-412.
- (103) Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıklıoğlu, *Le Play Mektebi ve Prens Sabahattin*, İstanbul 1962, p. 71.
- (104) Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, İstanbul 1979, p.333.
- (105) Fındıkoğlu, *Le Play Mektebi ...*, p. 71.
- (106) Ülken, *op. cit.*, p.333.
- (107) Fındıkoğlu, *Le Play Mektebi ...*, p.107.
- (108) Kuran, *İnkılâb Tarihimiz ve Jön...*, p.363.
- (109) Ege, *op.cit.*, p. 498.
- (110) *Ibid.*, p.501.
- (111) "Kış nasıl bahar için lâzım ve baharı mübeşşir ise, ölüm de hayat için lâzım ve gayr-ı mer'i ve lâhuti âlemlerin bahar-ı müstakbelini mübeşşir!...", *Ibid.*
- (112) Descamps, *Deneysel...*, p.17, (Kösemihal's preface).
- (113) *Ibid.*
- (114) H. Ziya Ülken, "Büyük Bir Yol Gösterici," *Yeni Bilgi*, Vol. IV, No 40, 1 August 1950, İstanbul p.5.
- (115) *Vatan*, 1.1.1949. The other information concerning the commemoration meetings was obtained from the printed invitation cards.

PART II

THE SOCIOLOGY OF PRINCE SABAHADDIN

A Short Introduction

The foremost problem in studying the life and especially the works of Prince Sabahaddin is to determine the meaning and function he attributed to social science or La science sociale. In this context one can say that Prince Sabahaddin approached the study of social sciences not in a detached manner but with the practical purposes of adopting the ideas of the social sciences to the degree of their utility and of using them to prevent the disintegration and downfall of the country.

His studies (His sociology) mainly aimed at finding out the most successful human type for he believed that it was nothing but the combined efforts of the members of a society which made a country strong and prosperous.

So "if we distinguish the ideas and the discoveries he made (all of which constituted his sociology) we come up against the following ideological structure.

- a) The creation of an ideal man as model to follow.
- b) An educational system that would train and create the ideal man
- c) A new type of society which would possess the appropriate means to the creation of an ideal man
- d) A system of thinking appropriate to the social analysis of the existing societies

The ideas that we set up in the above order would probably start from bottom to top when their effects are taken into consideration."(1)

In all his scientific activities, the only thing he was interested was to find out the ways that would save a declining country and to formulate methods for the foundation of a strong society. To him, science was an instrument not an end. And the instrument he used was the teachings of La Science Sociale. Broadly speaking his sociology consist of ideas together with their training methods on how to make the members of a country strong and prosperous.

Chapter 5

PRINCE SABAHADDIN'S APPROACH TO LA SCIENCE SOCIALE

Prince Sabahaddin, who first got to know la Science Sociale from Desmolins' book of A quoi tient la superiorite des Anglo - Saxons?, especially admired its classification of the societies. Using this classification Prince Sabahaddin thought that he could determine the place of the structure of the Ottoman society(2). And as one of the member of this school he had become the first person who disseminated its ideas in Turkey.

But in Turkey anyone who talked about Sabahaddin regarded him as a sociologist and mentioned his sociology. However Sabahaddin insistently said that he belonged to the school of la Science Sociale rather than to the conventional teachings of sociology. For this reason, before we talk about his sociology, it is better to explain the terms of sociology and la science Sociale as he understood in order to prevent any misconceptions.

According to Ziyaeddin Fahri Findıkoğlu "Prince Sabahaddin and his pupil Mehmed Ali Şevki used to talk about the topics regarding the existing metaphysical currents usually under the heading of sociology (or ictimaiyat) in a critical manner." (3) But the position in fact was not an argument about the usage of a word. The main point he was concerned with the sociology and the social sciences were the solutions they brought to social problems. Prince Sabahaddin explained his own position in an indirect way to Ziyaeddin Fahri by saying that the only reason why he preferred to use the term "science sociale" over "sociology" in the Principles of Methodology was to make its understanding more specific in terms of the methods of a scientific study. So his purpose was not to create an argument about the use of a term. (4) However despite his vague statement here above, he had not come across with a principle of sociology that he could accept.

a-Comparison of Science Sociale and Sociology

According to him sociology and la science Sociale were not the same things and the methods of la science Sociale did not resemble the methods of sociology. There were important differences between them. He explained the differences between Science Sociale and Sociology as the following:

"Many people confuse sociology, which is a social philosophy saturated with imagination and abstraction, with la science sociale, which is a positive science as physics and chemistry. And this proves clearly that the latter is very little known.

La science sociale is an exact science like any other, and it explains the natural laws which govern the social relationships of mankind, and makes it possible to diagnose the reasons of the social ills that have caused the ruin of the lives of many nations in the past."(5)

For him, "La Science Sociale has truly succeeded in analysing social problems by its own special methods." (6) Saying as la Science Sociale was born of observation he states that:

"Scientific observation must never be confused with superficial observation. In order to observe anything scientifically, one must be in possession of a method of analysis which deals with the fundamental rather than the external aspects of the problem. With the discoveries made by such a method of analysis, one arrives at a synthesis and a classification of facts, which are in turn form the foundation of a science. Since sociology deals with the general and external aspects of social phenomena, it is unable to reach to the essence of the problems it sets out to solve.

For sociology to become a science, sociologists will have to observe social phenomena from a purely social point of view, that is, a special and fundamental, points of views of the social relations rather than the general points of the views of psychology, ethics, philosophy, history, law, and religion from which todays social problems are interpreted and the result of this approach is being such that no sociologist can complete the unfinished work of his colleague. As we see, there is neither scientific analysis nor a scientific continuity in the publications issued as sociological literature. There is no scientific analysis in sociology because in reality, law, economics, and ethics are manifestations of social life which change with the changing social formations rather than the cause of these formations. To examine social phenomena from the point of view of law, economics, or ethics is, therefore, scientifically unsound. And since sociology has no system of analysis, every sociologist becomes an author writing on the subject of sociology from his own subjective point of view. Under these conditions, confusion rather than a science will arise.

Approximately ten years ago one of our friends, whom we have since lost, said, It is queer that none of the sociology books I read have any common points. Authors such as Spencer, Charles Letourneau, Tarde, Durkheim, Gustave Lebon have all investigated social problems from different points of view and have all arrived at different conclusions. This makes me doubt the true value of sociological publications. What a blessing it is to have such a discerning reader. Even though the list of names given above contains some of the most famous names of the century, their works form nothing but a barren social philosophy and have never and will never become a true science.

Everybody knows that natural science became a science only after various classifications and analyses were made, which in turn led to the developments of other branches such as zoology, botany, and mineralogy. Before the zoological or botanical classification were made, the sciences of zoology and botany did not exist. Since sociology has no system of classification of its own, it reminds one of a state of the science of zoology before Cuvier's time. While sociologists are wasting their time as well as that of others as they pursue their imaginary science which is nothing but a mirage, the real social science (la science sociale) is advancing steadily and rapidly in its discoveries."(7)

Generally Prince Sabahaddin trusted neither any sociologist nor any ideas of sociology. In one of the letters (8) he wrote as seen below he talked about insensitiveness of the sociologist and again emphasised the differing position of la science sociale from that of sociology as for example he tried to justify the reason of his mistrust of the sociologists by suggesting that their wrong usage of the term "rural sociology"

"I notice that I had not come across yet with any of the principles that la science sociale put forward in the sociology books that I knew of, but of course there might be some other ideas of sociology in the books that I have not read. The examination of the other ideas of the sociology may also be necessary especially for to illustrate the superiority of la science sociale as a science over sociology. However those writings of our valuable and learned citizens who were engaged with the study of social problems that introduces the ideas of sociology to their people, must also be appreciated."(9)

"If we exclude to a certain extent the American public and its statemen and some small democratic countries like Switzerland, nearly all the other countries of the East and West were in such a state of incomprehension and in blindness and were so blind and unscrupulous that they did not see the existing deep rivalry between Russian and German dictotorships, and their governments' acknowledgement of the introduction of the worst torture methods to the thousands and millions of people as their political means, what, then at a time like this those sociologist, who were mushroming from every where with their principles and especially those American doctors of sociology, were doing?"(10)

"If science sociale had been thought in the various places and the University of Harvard according to the ways in which it really was, then the term "rural sociology" would not have been used. Because this term was misleading for the students and for the majority of intellectuals as it could make them think science sociale as one of the other endless theories of sociology. The evidence for this fact could be shown with the failure of those various sociologists of not being able to point out the facts to their citizens while the world was being pushed by these countries towards a catopstrophy. Those sociologists who claimed that they did not make any mistakes were the ones who needed awards."(11)

b-Where he stood

Prince Sabahaddin did not accept the idea of being a follower of Le Play. For his own interest he preferred to be known as the supporter of the school of la science sociale, because of its evolution , not the supporter of Le Play.(12) For the fear that he might be labelled as a supporter of Le Play, and he thought that this could mislead those people who did not understand the core of the issues and might be led to think that he was taking a side with a person rather than with a science.(13)

Nevertheless this did not prevent him from feeling great respect and admiration for the great and painstaking monoghraphic works of Le Play who was also among the founders of the ideas of la science Sociale. He thought that "Le Play had fallen into some serious errors but this was only because Henri de Tourville's nomenclator was not available in Le Play's time."(14)

Prince Sabahaddin who coincidentally met Demolins conceived science sociale not as a science but as a number of scientific formulas that could be used as solutions for social events. For this reason "he drew his attention rather on the classifications and the systems side of the school of science sociale, spending most of his time with its syntheses and consequently neglected the study of the research of its monographes and its management side." (15) He showed his appreciation for the works of la science Sociale with the following expression.

"The biggest and the most valuable work that La science sociale has produced so far was its 75 years-old social classifications which crowned the study of scientific analyses". (16)

At this point he was separated from Le play. But this separation was related to working methods rather than to ideologies. For example he did not have a single field work of his own while Le Play and his followers directed their studies towards more field work. But "the reason of this could be found in the fact that he was away from his country most of the time and he was also very busy with the issues of his country." (17) For these reasons his ideas and examples about his country were mostly based on the teachings of this school. Although he himself had not studied the analytical and administrative side of Le Play's teachings, he often used the works of the members of la science sociale and tried to explain the results he got from his observations with the application of the methods of their works.

Chapter 6

THE TEACHINGS OF LA SCIENCE SOCIALE

In this chapter we shall outline briefly the teachings of la science sociale again with the sole purpose of showing why Prince Sabahaddin made its findings as the basis of his sociology.

"La Science Sociale, which owes its birth to three geniuses, Frederick Le Play, Henry de Tourville, and Edmond Demolins, advanced in its task of scientifically observing the social life of human beings by the compilation of a series of monographs which investigated social formations, beginning from simple forms on to increasingly complex ones. From these monographs which various professors of the same social school in different countries had been preparing and accumulating over a period of eighty years, Edmond Demolins, with his rare genius, made a social classification. This great classification has resulted in the formation of a science which will be the sole guide in the private and community lives of human beings and will be the central science that will give men a new understanding of law, ethics, economics, psychology, religion, and history. To know the classifications of Social Science means that one is able to know just what stage of what kind of formation each nation belongs to." (18)

This was exactly what he was looking for. A study of social analysis that examined and classified scientifically the social structure of the existing societies in accordance with the characteristics of their members. With the help of this classification he could first determine the social formation of the Ottoman Society and then diagnose the real causes of the decline of the Ottoman Society.

The implications of the findings of la science sociale were such that the most important element in growth and development was not the form of political structures but the characteristics of the people and the form of the structure of societies. So first the structure of the society should be examined, then its characteristics should be determined and until then the solutions that are appropriate to its own problems should be brought in.

In fact if the social issues are not scientifically analysed and the relationship that exist between them are not properly understood or to put it shortly without the benefit of the socio-scientific discoveries (methods) one can neither find the right course to reform a society nor can see the real factors that would put a country into the right direction. Therefore:

"When solutions are looked for to social issues, the structure of the society should be known first, and then accordingly it must be acted upon." (19) "Anything which is not based on any scientific method is bound to be a waste whether we like it or not". (20)

a-Its classification of societies

According to the classification of the social groups which is the most important discovery la science sociale; Societies are divided into two general groups. 1. Communal Formation, 2. Particularistic Formation.

Those two formations are also divided into many subdivisions. The differences of the characters of the two formations were like this:

"In communal nations, the people mainly are not those who rely on themselves but are dependent, according to the level of development, on their families, on their communal, on their political parties, or on their governments. These communal, in spite of some developments in education, form societies with low productivity levels. The countries of Asia, Africa, South America, Turkey, Russia, Southern and the Central European countries can be given as an example for this type formation." (21)

"The nations which are classified as particularistic formation, according to the degree of their progress in their formation, are those whose members rely on their own efforts to solve their own problems, and as a result they create the most productive, energetic, independent and prosperous nations." (22)

La science sociale shows that the real independency of the members of a country can not be reached with the change of the form of government and its laws. Therefore, to Prince Sabahaddin:

"Changes in the forms of governments under the system of centralization secure nothing in social progress. Real progress in public life

comes, not from a constitutional monarchy, nor from parliamentarism, nor yet from a republic, but from private enterprise which gives strength and order to the life of the individual. Communal societies like Turkey, which can not understand the fundamental importance of the life of the individual and falls into the fallacy of believing that only politics counts in the determination of the course of a nation and tries to remedy their social defects by political and legislative means, in fact fall from one crises into another."(23)

To him, the essence of progress and development is not found on the shape of the political and administrative institutions but on the formation of the social structure.

"Irrespective of its shape the same social structure would always give the same result, that is, produce always similar performances."(24)

Therefore, the solution of the problems are only possible when the people are able to obtain their self independence and change themselves into an enterprising, productive, and industrious characters. But is a change from one formation to another possible? If it is possible how can it be done?

b-The Principle of Transformation

According to the discoveries of la Science Sociale social formations too are subject to the principle of transformation, and the change from one formation to another is possible. Therefore, when the required factors do exist, these two type of organisations can be transformed from one to another.

"In order to make the change consciously from one formation to another, one should have to know the real differences that exist between these two formations. In the past, the factors were the working conditions, the environment and the geography. But today the real factors that cause the differences in the types of social organizations are thanks to la science sociale known. Therefore, the occurrence of transformations of the social structures are now within the reach of human will."(25)

"Because without making a scientific and a proper analysis of the structure of any society and without diagnosing the right causes any reform program which is then put forward can achieve nothing but can only speed up the disintegration of the country."(26)

In the following chapter we shall see how he first examines the social structures of various countries, compares their administrative methods and concludes particularistic formation as the best type of social structure, then finally sets out the required conditions that will make it possible for the existence and the development of such structure.

Chapter 7

PRINCE SABAHADDIN'S FINDINGS

At this stage, after learning science sociale and the methods it put forward, he was convinced with the existence of a possibility which would enable him to analyze the structure of Ottoman Empire and to prepare the reformation program that was required for it.

a-His Discovery of the type of Social Structure of Ottomans

With the social classification of la science sociale at his disposal, it was not difficult for him to find out that the social structure of Ottomans was of communal formation, and the problems of the society were mostly the results of this type social structure. The Ottoman people deprived of any kind of private initiative, were consuming while living in idleness and isolation.

"There is nothing easier than describing a point that can be reached with the members of a country whose 98 percent of its population escape from work as if it is the plague, and with the fraudulent dealings and the false promises of its politicians who do it for their reelections.

In this case, should we lay the blame for everything on the governments? No, the government is not the cause. This is a bad result of the social structure. Now then what can be expected from the application of the constitution in this country? "(27)

What he means here is that whether it is a constitution or a monarchy it was not the type of government but the social structure of the country which ultimately determines the conduct and the performance of a society.

b-His Comments on the Type of Government Methods

As the country was heading toward its catastrophic end there were many people from the different sections of the country who had been suggesting various types of government forms, e.g. democracy, constitutional monarchy as solutions to the problems of the country. Against the ideas of such people Prince Sabahaddin made the following comments:

"No constitution or any democracy of the world can make a country free if her people do not possess any initiative in ideas and only aims to live without the hardship and the struggle of a work. The form of the government is in fact far away from being of any importance. In United Kingdom there is more freedom and the degree of it can not even be compared with the one that exist in France. As for the democratic governments of the southern America the bandits rule the country not the governments."(28)

"As for parliamentarism, like any other social institution, it produces positive or negative results depending on the consciousness and the understanding levels of its people. In order to comprehend this fact it is enough to look at South and North America. Isn't there the presence of Parliaments on both sides? But in the United States the freedom and the democracy prevail whereas in the countries like Chile, Peru, Argentine, Venezuela whose populations are mostly made up people of Spanish and Portuguese origin, dictatorship prevails!!!!..."(29)

For Sabahaddin, the efforts of becoming a westerner come to the same meaning as in the meanings of democracies that exist in the countries of Latin America.

"It is sad that in our country the idea of becoming a westerner is taken something like accepting the moral and material standards of the west, for example these people think that we can bring Turkey to the level of western civilization by building immaculate roads, railways, harbours, canals and by establishing institutions like schools, libraries, banks etc. However we never think the fact that the west has created and carry on creating these works out of nothing, nor that they are not creating these from imitation." (30) As for us, we are always spending our time with the end results, instead of looking for the causes and the reasons that create those causes. "For this reason the direction that we want to follow under the title of westernization can not be other than the same old direction that brought us down to the pawns of the beasts of prey."(31)

Therefore imitation too is not a salvation for an ideal society. "For years, freedom, constitutional government, better education and moral standards, and ideas of the west have been called and are still been called. But non of these ideals so far put into practice were able to achieve any progress not even for an inch, neither for the committees, nor in the thoughts of the people that tried to practice those reforms. Because, these socio-political organizations are not the results of the various ideals mentioned above. On the contrary all these ideals come into existence in contrasting ways that result from the interactions of the opposing socio-groups which are inherent in all social organizations." (32)

"The examination of the kinds of government as well as the other kinds of public organizations without an analysis of the underlying and relative lives of the individuals of any community, is absolutely meaningless. There is no method of government organization such as centralization or decentralization which occurs by itself. The lack of strength and independence in the life of the individual leads to centralization, whereas, strength and independence in private life give us a decentralized organization." (33) "The English with a concise expression peculiar to their language call it "Self Government" (34) So, "the theories of conservatism, liberalism, democracy, socialism, progressive or nationalism have all arisen from the lack of any scientific analysis, and from the acceptance of some of the ideas that are fixed in the mind as the truth from which we reach conclusions by ways of applying the wrong system of deductive methods". (35)

c-What matters most in the Methods of Government Administration?

"Because the structure of our social life can not rely on a certain base and the reason why it can not rely has been discovered a long time ago by la science sociale." (36)

Prince Sabahaddin believes that the salvation of the future is only possible when the discoveries of la science sociale are accepted and translated into the reformation programs indicated.

In order to make clear his ideas, he gives one example from a communal society and one from a particularistic society, and says,

"If you want, let's look at England and Spain. Both are administered with the constitutional system of governments. Yet the former is on the top of the ladder of civilization while the latter at the bottom of it. Of course this awfull difference between these two countries do not arise from the minor differences that exist between their laws. This great difference between Great Britain and the Iberic peninsula result from fundamental differences in their educational systems which cause fundamental differences in their life styles because the British are brought up to stand on their private initiatives, while the Spainards are brought up to seek their standing points in life on the back of their governments.

If you want let's look at South and North America. Both sides are administered with the democratic systems of governments. Life in the republics on the both sides of America are founded on the principle of freedom for their people. Yet the difference between South and North is like the difference between day and night. There is a progress and development and a big freedom in the North whereas in the South in appearance there is the same freedom but in reality it is a serfdom together with a deep rooted poverty. Why? Because in the North, the element that combine the prosperity with the civilization and the freedom with the happinees is the private initiative of the Anglo Saxons, who obtain their freedom with their own private efforts. In other words they are producers who increase their production under the system of decentralization thereby securing their independence while in the South there are those Spaniards tightly bound to the system of centralization, who are only interested with the idea of obtaining political power. In other words they are consumers who seek their independency through political means.

Put another way, the Northerners get the provision of their independency by their own private initiative. They are producers who enlarge their private initiative with the system of decentralization, whereas in the south there are those Spaniards who are only interested to get hold of political power and attached firmly to the system of centralization. That is they are consumers who try to obtain their personal independencies through political means.

For example in the South the ministry of construction is also very busy, i.e. in preparing projects, giving concessions. But it is the foreigners who make the most of it. All the natural resources of the south are slowly passing into the hands of foreigners. In their own soil, the Spaniards are even being used to increase the power of the foreigners. If it goes like this it is an obvious fact that the Spaniards will even endanger their own political independency. The problem is not with being an Anglo Saxon or a Spanish but with having these two different educational systems which result either in social prosperity or in social poverty." (37)

After emphasising the need for us to increase the number of the producers who have private initiative in our country he says

"If we do not turn our efforts to this purpose, you must be sure of the fact that a dry constitution with its own would not be able to save us from the final perils of bankruptcy not only in the economic field but in the moral field too."(38)

If you take notice, the unit of measurement taken here is not to be of an English, or of American or of a western origin but it is the possession of certain characteristics of the members of society. Therefore, he gives the English as an example not the type of policies they have but credits them with possess a type of social structure which is based on private initiative.

d) Two Fundamental Conditions for an Ideal Society

Therefore the society Prince Sabahaddin was longing for was neither a westernized society nor a democracy or any other society governed with any other type of a system. He stated the ideal society is the one based on private initiative. The point he was insistent on about was the impossibility of the development of the ideas of private initiative in our mother land as long as the system of centralization continued to exist there.

Quoting from the discoveries of La Science Sociale Prince Sabahaddin's views are based on the following two fundamental principles. 1) Private Initiative. 2) Decentralization. For the development of any society private initiative is a condition that can not be excluded and as for decentralization, this is an administrative system which feeds the private initiative. Therefore private initiative and decentralization are essential

for each other, that is one complements the other. If we say it with a different expression, reforms either in private life or in social life should be initiated together. The purpose of the reform programmes made in the private lives are to stir the private initiatives of those people. Therefore in order to achieve this the present system of administration should be changed to a decentralized system of administration. Decentralization is not a purpose in its own but a form of administration which stirs and feeds the private initiative. The important thing for him was the self sufficiency of individuals of the members of a society.

Therefore the only solution is to transfer the structure of the society from the socio system based on conflicting social groupings (collectivism) to the socio system based on private enterprise.

So according to Sabahaddin, the change from communal formation to a particularistic formation meant that there was a transformation of the members of a society from being in the state of inertia to a state of private initiative, from consumption to production, and from dependency to independency.

e) Implications of the Two Fundamental Conditions

1-On the Method of Government

For Prince Sabahaddin, the direction is then necessary to follow for the reform actions in government organizations are as follows:

"Instead of the lethargic, irresponsible group of government officials who are forced to depend on each other for orders in a chainlike series starting from the top of the central government to those who are not empowered to act on their own initiative, we find it necessary to substitute them with energetic, responsible, resourceful men who will hold the authority in their hands under a decentralized system of administration which is the product of a particularist formation. Thus we will have to replace a centralized government which has no capacity for organization and activity with a decentralized one." (39) Therefore, "our administrative organization should be set up, not to spread the orders of one central government to all parts of the country, but to establish a responsible board of men for each district as the government of their locality. For the organization of such local governments, it is

necessary to replace the nomad like class of government clerks and officials who have no interest whatsoever in local prosperity and reconstruction with a class of men who are residents of that locality and are, therefore, deeply interested in the prosperity and welfare of their district. The local people, especially those respected in their community who have been successful in life through their business activities should be encouraged to take part in the administrative activities of their own affairs. Therefore, in the appointment or in the elections of the officials for the business of governing the local community, the essential thing that should be kept in mind is to get those people who will administer their own affairs best which will anyway be for their own interest."(40)

"Thus the right direction that we must give to the life of individuals for them to become independent and self-reliant is by creating a particularist social formation strengthened and enforced through the tools of administrative methods. As for the officials whose appointment by the central government is absolutely necessary, these men should be chosen on their proven ability to organize and to assume responsibility only when the permanency of their positions is assured as much as possible."(41)

Finally, "Public Organizations, always and everywhere are absolutely under the influence of the conditions of the life of the individuals. Because of this, administrative and political problems can not be solved by themselves. These problems, like all of our other problems, are part of the fundamental problem of our social formation. It is necessary to look at the problems of the organization of public life from this point of view and the direction that should be given to any social reform would be in accordance with the results obtained from this analysis."(42)

In addition to these he sets one another condition which he thinks is necessary for the implimentation of government policies. We find this in the explanation of a new term which he uses for the description of his views in connected with international politics. It is called "Meslek-i siyasi" (the profession of politics). As it is known

"the profession of politics which has been born out from the profession of science sociale (meslek-i ictimâî) is one other phase of the proffesion of science sociale." (43) "If we had started with the application of the profession of science sociale and politics all over the country with the feelings of affection (vatan şumul muhabbet) we would never have experienced the anxieties that we are having today, instead we would have had a continuous development of peace and prosperity in our lives." (44) "However this is not sufficient alone. It is also necessary to have world wide feelings of affection." (45)

2) On the Economic Structure of the Country

"Prince Sabahaddin was one of those who longed most for the involvement of the Turks with the economic activities of the country. It is this side in his personality which is pointed out when the value of him as a thinker is talked about amongst the Turks." (46)

He said that a strong economy should be based on an agricultural structure and believed that an agriculture which was practiced with scientific methods could save Turkey not only in the economic field but also in other fields. He believed that:

"Freeing ourselves from today's distressing social disasters can only be possible when we settle in our land properly and start to reform our private lives from their very roots." (47)

After stating that one of the most important features of the particularistic structure is an active agricultural system, he explains his thesis as follows:

"the particularistic structure first ties the individual to the soil through a hard and active agriculture and then to the other productive activities. Hence, it creates active societies comprising self-dependent individuals." (48)

In any case the particularistic structure stems not from an ideology but from a strong agricultural base which originates, in turn, from the combined effects of private initiative and private ownership. Thus Prince Sabahaddin calls upon the youth and shows the great ideal that's awaiting them as follows:

"The re-establishment of our country on the basis of private initiative, private ownership and scientific methods of agriculture!!! " (49)

Briefly, according to him, the economic structure of the country should be first built upon a strong agriculture, and then trade and industry should be based on it. Only then could one talk about having a strong economy. "Although it is true that the economic activities of agriculture, industry and trade are the three separate sources of wealth, " (50) but no trade or industry is a real wealth or a sign of prosperity when it is carried out without a strong agricultural base. However trade is the spirit of a country and without it there won't be a national wealth. But trade as well as industry should be both supported by a strong agricultural activity. Otherwise it would be a consumption without a production and "the road of consumption without production would only lead us straight forward to bankruptcy." (51)

In the economic field the Prince defended the liberal system. But he never approved the destructive side of the liberal economy.

"Instead of cases of destructive competition, economic and political issues should be approached with affection as he emphasised the importance of mutual help and concern by indicating the obvious value of the co-operative works which already exist in some societies." (52)

He even ponders with this idea at the government levels as he sees the lack of this approach in the international field as the major impediment to the establishment of true democracies in countries where the social structure is of communal type and argues as follows:

"It is obvious that the appearance of social and even economic disasters is the result of the lack of knowledge, affection and consciousness in the dealings of the governments. If a reform in the economic situation of the world is really desired, then we have to get rid of the evils like totalitarianism, currency speculations and monopolies and direct private lives and government affairs towards more constructive fields, by providing, for example, easy credit terms to honest citizens who would use them productively. These are the measures that have to be taken first. Otherwise, no real or continuous peace can be secured on any ground and no real democracy can be brought about anywhere other than in particularistic societies." (53)

Chapter 8

AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM TO TRAIN AND CREATE THE IDEAL MAN

Those conditions which make the social transformation possible mentioned in the previous chapter go through the education system. This word was not only intended to mean the education given in the schools. In order to become a strong, an orderly and a developing country, there should be a place for education in all stages of life and the individuals should be educated in every given opportunity. The environment for the application of these ideas are family, schools and the society which should be taken as a whole.

a) Social and Cultural

To Sabahaddin, family is the unit of measurement for the civilisation level of a society. For this reason the family life must be developed by a healthy balance in any society. This institution together with schools and other elements in the society should enable the members of our society to transfer themselves from communal formation to particularistic formation by bringing up their children in such a way that they can accommodate the supports of the other members of their family in their own personality. According to Sabahaddin:

"the peasants as well as the families of the cities do not prepare their children for an independent life when they bring them up. They can't give their children a continuous work nor do they give any strenght which would cause them to rely upon their own efforts in order to promote themselves later in life, on the contrary they raise their children always with the tendency to condition them so as to seek points of support in life other than their own."(54)

In order to get rid of this deficiency Prince Sabahaddin said the following:

"those families who have the agricultural, the industrial and the commercial means of production should support their children by going into partnership with them in the work they are engaged with."(55)

b) The System of Education

His opinion about the education system was that the problems of the society could not be solved as some people claim by saving people from their illiteracy by only developing the education levels of the schools.

Prince Sabahaddin believes that:

"When one critically examines the proofs presented in support of the argument that schools are the means of the propagation of education, so that they strengthen the social structure of a community, one sees that these proofs are nothing but social phenomena that have not been scientifically analysed."(56)

"The structure of societies gives the same results every where."(57) "No matter which social phenomena we analyse scientifically, we immediately discover its fundamental relation with the social formation of the country. The problem of education is related to the social structure."(58)

"If our national training which constitute our social identity do not walk in a rational valley and the means necessary for this walk are not prepared, all the reform projects are bound to rot on pieces of paper." (59) "Our purpose of telling this is not to claim that our present system of education has no value but only to show that the intellectual superiority does not necessarily secure the social superiority -that is, education is not the main factor for social development."(60)

Therefore, education should not be an end in itself; on the contrary it should be the means that would develop the personalities of the individuals. As a result of this the methods of the application of the existing education system are very important.

One of the point that should be taken care in this topic is to prevent memorizing as a method of teaching more applied and practical knowledge should be taught while efforts should be made not to teach too much theoretical knowledge. As for our educational system it is almost theoritical.(60)

"Today the success in all the branches of science are related to their being more experimental than theoretical. As it is not possible to learn a language by only memorizing its principles, it is also not possible to teach positive sciences by only theoretical lessons."(62)

Therefore for him in the second stage of training, that is, in the school stage, the purpose should not only be to teach bags of knowledges. But contrary to this fact, "our education system is divided into two parts as education and the training. These two should have to be combined into one."(63) The training that is given by the family should be complementary to the training given in the schools and both should be directed to one purpose.

He also pointed out that it was wrong to elevate our people's intellect to higher levels while their social side remain very weak. As an example for this he compares the English and the French students as he says "the English youth seems to be half ignorant in comparison with the French youths but when it comes to practical life how much more successful the English are".(64) He says that:

"The major elements of education that of phsical, mental and moral training should be given in such a combination that would aim to increase the personal skills of our people. In our country physical training is being neglected whereas good health is essential before every thing else in order to have success in life, since our schools are not being used to develop the health of the children, instead they are being used to destroy it."(65)

Therefore this absolute need dictates us he says "to turn our schools into a places where we develop the private initiative of our people as well as to train them to be more productive without discriminating whether they are male or female or come from different creeds."(66)

He also insisted on the point that La Science Sociale should be taught in schools, as he persistently said that it would be a great benefit for the countries of the world if the teachings of La Science Sociale were introduced and taught extensively in all the universities. With great sorrow he added that:

"the professors and their students were almost engaged with every science but they did not know anything about the most essential of them, La Science Sociale. He said "if they know La Science Sociale and if they can draw a practical

social ideology from it, only then will they be in a position to understand the unnecessary sides of the bloody revolutions and the other military encounters. Afterwards by initiating new ideological currents based on the conditions of peace, they will gradually achieve the establishment of real democratic systems of administration, of self governments or with another terminology, "the decentralized system of governments".(67)

However according to the Prince, this was still not enough. It was necessary for him to combine La Science Sociale and La Science Spirituelle together with the other sciences. Because between these two main sciences the former directly informed and the later served to increase our intelligences and consciousnesses. As for the abyss that to day's civilization has fallen into, wasn't this nothing but total insanity and incomprehension? And weren't these being proved by the events that were occurring with increasing pain with every passing day? So as long as these are not done, humanity can not be saved from falling into a terrible disappointment.

Chapter 9

THE IDEAL MAN AND CONCLUSION

Although Prince Sabahaddin had been involved with politics he was much more of a person who with the eye of a sociologist and moralist tried to search for the possibilities and the conditions of saving a declining society. Therefore with the help of the discoveries of La Science Sociale he tried to develop an education system for an ideal man and an ideal society. His ideal man was an active, self-dependent and self confident person having entrepreneurial knowledge, experience, ambition, perseverance and prudence .

One can not disagree with the characteristics of the ideal man of Prince Sabahaddin if he wants to have a progressive society. However, it is not the characteristics but the methodical way with which he built up his model that is the concern of the sociologists and it is this approach which makes his studies scientific.

For a start he began his task with a diagnosis of the real causes of decline of his country. At first sight this may not appear to be a very important or original step. But when we consider the previous efforts of reforms that were made by the Sultans before Abdulhamid then we realize that a few people before him identified the fact that it was the social structure of the country which was in decline, a process which was going on for the last three centuries effecting the political military and the economic life of the Empire. He was one of the few people who first approached to study the problems from the social structure of the country instead of the usual political or military structures.

Prince Sabahaddin's diagnosis of the declining Ottoman society was as follows: The social structure of the Ottoman society was of the communal type with the malfunctioning and the malformation of the government departments under the method of centralization, the members of the society had become more dependent and idle in their attitudes towards life with the result that they were getting more backward while their major rivals who had particularist social structures were going ahead in every field with their new discoveries in science and technology.

After making his diagnosis he went on to the next stage of comparing the features of the existing social structures in order to determine which type produced the most successful human type. At this point we must again emphasise the importance of the principle of the existence of a relationship

between the structure, the conduct and the discoveries on which La Science Sociale and Prince Sabahaddin's sociology were founded. Because when Prince Sabahaddin compared the performances of the two different social structures (communal versus particularistic) in the northern and southern countries; he was in fact comparing the political, economic and military achievements of those countries and relating their performances wholly to the type of their social structure. Is this approach scientific or a mere generalization? It can be scientific to a certain extent. He was mostly concerned with the problems of his country and of his time, but the analytical work on these topics which Prince Sabahaddin did not touch upon have been done by the founders of the school of La Science Sociale.

The next stage in his model was to determine the right sort of environment that would make possible the existence of the right conditions necessary for the development of a productive society. By conditions we mean the existence of conventions (social norms) and the legal rules (rule of law) that regulate the relationships of the members of society with each other. When Prince Sabahaddin observed the performances of those countries with different social backgrounds it was not difficult for him to see that the individuals of those countries who had a particularistic type of social structure formation were more productive and inventive at their work than the individuals of the communal type of society. Why? The answer to this of course is found in the issue of incentives.

In the communal type of societies all decisions related to economic activities, such as the allocation of the resources and the production and the distribution of the goods are made by the central authority. In such communal collective or state ownership rather than private ownership is allowed or encouraged. Furthermore the rewards for the factors of production in communal type of societies are not based on individual merits or efforts but on the existing collective social values of the people and on the views of the central planning authority. And accordingly the central authority of the community devises rules and regulations for the maintenance of the existing conditions described above.

For an individual, under such conditions there is no reason to work hard or be inventive at his work for he will not gain anything from his extra efforts whereas in the particularistic type of societies the individuals are allowed to get the benefits of their individuals efforts. Moreover those decisions which concern the economic activities of the members of a society are taken by the individuals without the existence of the orders and the rules of any central authority. Under such conditions individuals can develop their private initiatives more than the individuals of the communal type of societies, according to Prince Sabahaddin.

But we must make the point here that when Prince Sabahaddin compared performances of these two different social structures, his emphasis was probably on the motivational (this is why he continuously advocated the application of the methods of decentralization as the type of administration method for his country) rather than on their general effects for we know that the general performances of these two different types of societies vary according to the various factors that exist in their environment.

The centralized method of administration is usually found in societies whose social structures are of communal formation. On the other hand from the very nature of its rules and conventions the particularistic type of social structures usually lead to the development of decentralization as the administrative method of the society. Prince Sabahaddin thinks that it is the social characteristics of individuals which determine the type of administrative method they choose. In other words individuals who are of self reliant characteristic do not allow the evolution of a method of administration in their societies under which the decisions would be made for themselves rather than by themselves.

But according to Prince Sabahaddin, the transformation of one type to another type of social structure is possible, and he recommends decentralization as the number one requirement, fundamental for the creation of the right type of environment in which right conditions can exist to make it possible for the development of the private initiative of the members of a society

Once the conditions e.g. administrative, economic, are set properly, then it becomes possible to concentrate on the business of training and the educating of the members of the society. This was the direction to be taken. To him education and training of the members of a society were of paramount importance as he spent a lot of time studying the educational methods of the western countries. His emphasis on experimental rather than theoretical studies was not proven to be the right type of educational methods for our times but also crucial for the development of the right type of characteristics such as confidence and independence of the members of a society

He believed that with only the right type of training and educational methods, a society could become powerful again. When we look at the characteristics of the ideal man of his model we only see the features of a personality of a man who can only be productive, intensive, and progressive with his work. Now if we consider the dynamic conditions of the world then in the long term no type of man other than this can be successful to survive.

In retrospect nothing can explain the sociology and the aims of Prince Sabahaddin better than his own personality. His sociology as we see from beginning to the end evolves around the idea of finding the best type of man suitable for the development of a strong and a prosperous society. From this we deduce that his main preoccupation in life had been the salvation of his people and the general concern he felt for the other fellow human beings. His choice of sociology as the science of questions he was trying to answer also reveals one very important fact that he discovered the importance of the human element as the most important factor that should be taken into consideration first when social problems and their solutions are considered. This was one of the main messages of his sociology.

Education and training with the emphasis being on the experimental side of these teachings and the system of decentralization as the administration method of the country were the means of reaching the aims of his sociology for the creation of a strong and a prosperous society. The former is needed by the member of a society to face and to overcome the ever changing conditions of his environment especially at a time when science and technology are opening new frontiers in every field. The latter on the other hand is not only required for its motivational aspects explained in the preceeding pages but also for the benefits, e. g. quick decisions, better knowledge of the problems, it offers a system of organisation that can be more flexible and thus more adaptable than the system of centralization in meeting the challenges of a dynamic world.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

It was the operation of the social forces that made Sabahaddin the leader of the Young Turks. Nobody would bring a man to such a position if that man was in his early twenties and did not have any political experience. But he was elected, simply because of his family's social standing within the social hierarchy of the country. Why him and not his brother? The answer of this is found on his charisma (his personal merits) and partly on the powers of traditions of the society, as he was one of the member of the ruling family even though all the opposition were united against the man who was representing that family. The effects of the traditions are not as immediate as the powers of charisma but they are more lasting and powerful. They usually determine the fate of a man or the outcome of a social issue. e.g. E. İnönü.

As for his support for the policy of foreign intervention against the non-interventionist policies of Ahmed Rıza during the First Young Turks Congress, a conflict that kept him away from the political power all his life. What were the factors that led him to take such an opinion in his very early ages that proved to be so crucial in his later years? Why he did not support the policy of non intervention like any other patriot and opted together with the minorities for the policy of foreign intervention?

Obviously the reason can not be his relationship with the school of La Science Sociale for he had not yet met with its ideas but nevertheless had already made his choice at that time that determined which political side he was going to be with. The answer of his behaviour again is found in the operation of social forces that existed in his early environment. The influence of his foreign tutors and the closeness of his family with the cultures of western countries which reflected in the living styles of the family (e.g. Seniha Sultan).

Paşa was too under the influence of the western countries, as he displayed his willingness to cooperate with them when he acted as a middleman for the British in connection with the railway projection. All this indicates that the ideas of family were strongly in favour of cooperation with countries like Britain in the fight of saving their country from her decline. While on the other hand Britain and France were in favour of the idea that the Ottoman Government should give more power to her minorities in the determination of their own lives (decentralization) if she wanted their help and cooperation in the international field. And this might as well be the reason which led Sabahaddin to support the idea of decentralization.

After he made his choice in favour of decentralization against centralization as the better administration system for the Ottoman Government, he searched for a kind of political program that would fit his ideas so that he could present it to the public.

Among the sociological thoughts that existed in his time he could not be interested with the ideas of the Marxist school for it offered solutions to those societies which were experiencing social problems originating from their industrialisation process. Politically too he could not be interested with the ideas of Marxist school for he strongly believed in the concept of Ottoman citizenship and never showed any interest to the concept of class struggle. Nor he could be interested with the teachings of Durkheim whose solutions were much more appropriate to the views of his political opponents (ittihat Terakki).

As we know it was Ziya Gökalp a member of the ittihat Terakki Party who introduced and represented the sociology of Durkheim in Turkey and it was again him who supported the ideas of centralization and nationalism as a sociologist which were then became the official government policies of the period.

Therefore, the teachings of La Science Sociale were exactly the material that fitted his political ideas. Here we observe how a man makes his choices according to the wishes of the social group he sides with. Because for a man who had such a good scientific background like himself it was impossible not to mention the positive sides of the system of centralization as it should be if he was really making a scientific comparison of the two different systems. But we do not see in any of his writings such a neutral and objective analysis of these two systems. What we always come up in his writings are the good sides of the decentralization and the bad side of the centralization. He never mentions anything about the concept of nationalism as he would be the first to know the fact that those countries which he always praised e.g. England reached their present superiority through the application of the strict nationalist and the centralist policies (mercantilism) of the past centuries, whereas in his own country, the real and successful application of the above policies (nationalist, centralist) were only poorly existent since the end of 16th century.

But much more important than this he believed (his continuous praise for the northern countries) that it was the only way to keep the minorities under the Ottoman rule as he recognized, like his uncle, the fact that the Ottomans neither had the military nor the political muscle to maintain the order within the border districts of the country. His opponents in the Union and Progress thought it other wise and were in favour of wars.

Furthermore, Prince Sabahaddin through his studies and the personal observations of the foreign countries, was placed in a much better position than his opponents to realize the fact that the Ottomans were very inferior in most of the fields when they were compared with their main rivals in the international arena.

As he observed countries like Britain, Spain and France he sensed the existence of a wide gap which separated those countries from each other. Under the influence of Science Sociale he attributed those differences solely to the effects of either centralization or decentralization.

And this explains why he did omit in his writings to mention the positive effects of the system of centralization with its past glorious performances witnessed during the rise of many past empires including his own.(*). Because the successful performances of the past governments were no longer relevant, it was a different era and the most successful country of the period appeared to be administered with the system of decentralization (England).

Ironically, his approach was completely socio-political despite the fact that he himself had mentioned many times in his writings that it was not the political methods that made countries perform better, but this was expected from a man of his background and his over occupation with the politics which in turn made him fail to realize the effects of the socio economic changes and developments that were taking place during his period.

It can now be argued that the real difference that caused the gap was not in the applications of centralization or decentralization but were in the application of the economic methods, that is, industrialization which was founded on the factory system. Those countries that adopted factory system as the production system of their economies became more successful than those who could not. If this not so, how then the countries of today's world are divided into two major groups as the industrialized and non-industrialized.

This was the real difference which obviously made England and Germany so superior over the countries of South. And the fact that the application of the system of industrialization, (the factory system) did not depend on whether the country had a method of centralization or decentralization, a fact which was clearly demonstrated during his time by the respective victories of Germany and Japan who were relatively more industrialized over France and Russia.

(*) His interest, which was founded on the study of the methods of administration, was mainly directed to their motivational aspects as it was explained in detail earlier in the "conclusion" section of the part II.

It may be also important for the purpose of our investigation to note that Germany's (Prussia) victory over France had been founded on the successful unification of the small German states together with the successful application of the system of centralization as her method of administration.

But what may be more illustrative is the case of Japan, a backward and structurally a communal society like the Ottomans, which achieved through imitation (contrary to Sabahaddin's findings) a limited scale of industrialization within a very short period which made the big difference as they became powerful enough to beat Russia. However the Japanese achieved this because, unlike the Ottomans, they had a very homogeneous population and was far away from the constant threats of the major powers.

The common factors between the Germans and the Japanese were such that they were both centrally administered, had homogeneous populations, shared common beliefs and religion, and lived in an area where the control mechanism of their systems of centralization could reach all parts of their countries, whereas the conditions that existed in the Ottoman Empire were just the opposite. It was a multi racial society with different beliefs and creeds who were spread over a vast area which made the maintenance of the order and the security through the control mechanism of centralization very costly if not impossible.

All these indicate that the successful application and the operation of any system depend on the existence of the right mixture of conditions (environment). If any one of the conditions which are necessary for the operation of system misses, the system does not produce its expected outcome.

And the implication of this fact is that a good policy for the country "A" can be bad policy to adopt for the country "B" if the conditions in their environments differ from one another.

Sabahaddin's stand and his insistence for the system of decentralization can be understandable when one excludes the effects of other factors (e.g. political). He was only interested with the administrative benefits of the system. The evidence for this, comes from his writings in which he says that the local people are better placed to know their own affairs while in one of other writings he openly criticizes those who went to use decentralization for their own political ends. He wanted decentralization because he could accommodate it with the needs and the structure of the Ottoman Empire for he was a dedicated Ottoman who wanted all the minorities to remain under the Ottoman rule. But in his over occupation with the political affairs of his country and the teachings of La Science Sociale he missed the opportunity to understand the real factor that caused some countries to become more powerful than others. It was not the transformation of the social

structure of a society from the one based on communal formation to a one based on particularistic formation as he argued fiercely but it was the transformation of the economic structure of a country from the one based on agriculture to the one based on industry. (*)

He unfortunately underrated the important effects of the economic matters over social affairs. The evidence for this comes from one of his writings in which he argued that the economic matters were the end results of the social activities of the societies so that economics could not have any value as a science. But the experience of the industrial revolution clearly proved that the application of different economic methods in fact causes the development of different new social structures and phenomena. For example the application of the factory system as a method of production directly caused the evolution of so many new social phenomena e.g. industrial towns, transport facilities etc, the effects of which have totally changed and transformed the old social structures as people moved from villages to towns and changed their behaviour patterns by developing new habits and new life styles. Other examples can be the new means of transport such as trains, new communication habits as the use of the telephone, new cooking methods like the use of gas ovens, and the use of new sources of energy as electricity which made possible night visits and works.

However his failure to appreciate the importance of the economic matters does not reduce the value of the other ideas he advocated. For example his structural approach to find the cause of social problems were not only original but proved to be correct and were essential in order to understand the behaviour and the subsequent performance of the societies. However his observation of the fact that different methods of administration generate different types of individuals were not incorrect but incomplete as he only pointed out the positive sides of the system of decentralization and the negative side of centralization. For example when we look at the issue of incentives examined earlier in the Conclusion, we see that in the rest of his sociology, he fails to mention the positive sides of collective motivation which is known to be a precondition for the success of any work and which does not require any initiative and creativity but only teamwork.

(*) To be fair with him, we have to mention the fact that even most of the economists of his time failed to realize this very important economic phenomenon. In order to understand properly this economic phenomenon one should at least witnessed or had the knowledge of the economic events that the countries of West and East had experienced after the two World wars of the 20th century.

But as we know that both systems generate personalities with characteristics both good and bad depending on their application of methods and existing conditions.

His emphasis on the need for better education and training methods may not sound very striking today but if we consider his time and environment we find out that there were not many people around who realized this fact, especially nobody except him pointed out the need that the educational methods should be based more on experimental rather than theoretical teaching. This fact is even today fiercely being debated and recommended by the educationalists.

Similarly his findings and his recommendations in the field of government administration are still valid for the governments of today who are currently debating how far they can decentralize or deregulate their systems of government administration, e.g. U.S.A, U.K., and even U.S.S.R.

As we know decentralization (who decides what to do) is associated with the power of making decisions locally while deregulation (=less rules and less regulation= less bureaucracy) is associated with the reduction of the size of those governmental rules. In other words the former represents the method of administration and the latter the control mechanism of that administration. These were the things Prince Sabahaddin meant when he talked about the system of centralization. For decentralization he argued that good results could only be obtained if the decisions were made locally by the local people for they would be the right people who would know the existing conditions better as the conditions would differ from one region to another, and also they could act immediately instead of waiting for long periods for confirmation by the central government.

He was justified from the technical point when the size of the Empire and the existing transport and communication facilities were concerned. But more importantly his emphasis was upon motivational factors as the people would respond more to the decisions made by themselves than to the decisions made by someone in the central government who would be distant and impersonal.

Unfortunately his idea of decentralization was diverted from its real course and exploited by his opponents as well as his supporters according to their own respective needs. From time to time he argued that he meant decentralization for the administrative method of government, and not for the political independence of the minorities. But he failed to make them understand his intentions. The reason could be his mistiming for it can not be technically right for the experiment of that

sort when the country's national security or rather her survival was at stake. It may be so. But the real reason may be that a country can not adopt a system of administration if it is structurally (economic, education, etc.) not ready for the workings of that particular system.

But again all these do not make any difference about the value of his ideas. In fact it shows his vision and courage. His choices which were mostly predetermined by the events of his environment, never showed any diversion from the beliefs he sincerely held. If we look at his political performance we see that he had been one of the dominant personalities of the opposition for over 15 years. During this period he could have easily got any government office if he wanted so for he definitely had the right qualifications, in this condition he would have of course to give up some of his ideas, e.g. on decentralization. For his own political ends, like any other member of the opposition he could have at least entered into arrangements with other politicians. But we observe nothing of that sort of a behaviour except his anti Abdulhamid activities.

What we observe is his constant dedication and determination for the cause of his country as he was acting more like a statesman than a politician, always trying to defend the interest of Ottomans when he was in Europe either by giving lectures or writing articles in the European press.

His argument was that particularistic type of societies produces individuals stronger with characteristics of private initiative, self confidence and independence for they often live and thrive under the conditions of competition where the number of rules tend to be few all of which motivate them to be more incentive and productive as they reap the fruits of their own efforts.

Where as in the communal type of societies which are often associated with the system of centralization the adverse conditions exist. The individuals of this type of society often display characteristics of over reliance, timidity, and unproductivity for the respective reasons that they work in teams, not allowed to display initiative unless by the consent of the group they belong, and can not reap the benefits of their own personal efforts since the allocation of the rewards are predetermined by the central authority according to the social status of the individual in his group.

It must be for this reason that Prince Sabahaddin wanted Science Sociale to be taught at schools. Science Sociale or his sociology are nothing but the study of the evolution and the relationships of the structure, the behaviour, and the performances of the human organizations.

He believed that people would be more conscious if they are taught this type of knowledge, so that they could choose the best working methods and also would be less inclined to have wars as the final solution. The evidence comes from the way how he criticised so heavily the sociologists of his period for they failed to explain these facts to their people.

Finally his recommendation of the idea of combining the teachings of La Science Sociale together with the teachings of La science spirituelle and his call for more compassion and affection from the politicians in their approach to social conflicts, proves again his concern that he felt for his fellow people all his life and again his vision as we witness today that the politicians and the like who are run out of ideas and solutions are also talking about the need for more compassion and sympathy when they make deals with each other...

But probably Prince Sabahaddin will be remembered today not by his political works but with his contribution to the science of sociology as being the first man in Turkey to introduce the teachings of La Science Sociale. What made Science Sociale and Sabahaddin's own version of Science Sociale (his sociology) so significant was their elaboration of two main types of social structure together with their associated types of their individual characteristics.

NOTES AND REFERENCES TO PART II

- (1) Şerif Mardin, **Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri: 1895-1908**, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınevi, 1983, p. 212.
- (2) Ibid., p.211.
- (3) Ziyaeddin Fahri Findıkoğlu, **Le Play Mektebi ve Prens Sabahaddin**, İstanbul 1962, p. 17.
- (4) Ibid., p. 97.
- (5) Sabahaddin, **Türkiye Nasıl Kurtarılabılır? Meslek-i ictimâî ve Programı**, İstanbul 1334, p. 17.
- (6) Ibid., p.18.
- (7) Ibid., p.18-20.
- (8) For the letters presented in this thesis as original sources see appendixes for their original as well as turkish copies.
- (9) Letter of Prince Sabahaddin dated 20 February 1948 and written to Nezahet Nureddin Ege, see appendix A.
- (10) Ibid.
- (11) Ibid.
- (12) Findıkoğlu, op.cit., p. 96.
- (13) Ibid.
- (14) Ibid, pp. 96-97.
- (15) Paul Descamps, **Deneysel Sosyoloji**, prefaced and translated by Nurettin Şazi Kösemihal, İstanbul 1965, p.15, (Kösemihal's preface).
- (16) Sabahaddin, **"İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık Mektuplar: Mesleğimiz Hakkında Üçüncü ve Son Bir İzah"**, İstanbul: Mahmud bey Matbaası, 1327H. p.70.
- (17) Ali Erkul, "Prens Sabahattin," **Türk Toplum Bilimcileri I**, Ed. by Emre Kongar, İstanbul 1982, p.115.
- (18) Sabahaddin, **Türkiye Nasıl ...**, pp.21-22.

- (19) Ibid., p.27.
- (20) M. Sabahaddin, "Gençlerimize Mektup İntibah-ı Fikrimiz," Terakki, No. 1, p.8.
- (21) Sabahaddin, İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık, pp.70-71.
- (22) Ibid., p.71.
- (23) Sabahaddin, Türkiye Nasıl, p.77.
- (24) Ibid., p.30.
- (25) Ibid., p.47.
- (26) Ibid., p.15.
- (27) Sabahaddin, "Gençlerimize Mektup İntibah-ı Fikrimiz," Terakki, No.1, p. 7.
- (28) Ibid.
- (29) Sabahaddin, "Demokrasinin İctimâî ve Vicdânî Yeni Bir İhtası Luzumu," Nezahet Nureddin Ege, Prens Sabahaddin Hayatı ve İlmî Müdafaaları, İstanbul 1977, p. 479.
- (30) Sabahaddin, Türkiye Nasıl, pp. 39-40.
- (31) Ibid., p.45.
- (32) Ibid., p.27.
- (33) Ibid., p.72.
- (34) Ibid., p.74.
- (35) Ibid., p.38.
- (36) Ibid., p.13.
- (37) Sabahaddin, İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık, pp.65-66.
- (38) Ibid., p.65
- (39) Sabahaddin, Türkiye Nasıl, p.85.
- (40) Ibid., pp.86-87.

- (41) Ibid., p.87.
- (42) Ibid., p.79.
- (43) Ege, op.cit., p.403.
- (44) Ibid., p.406.
- (45) Ibid., p.407.
- (46) Mardin, op.cit., p.203.
- (47) Sabahaddin, İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık, p.80
- (48) Sabahaddin, Türkiye Nasıl, pp.33-34.
- (49) Ibid., p.103.
- (50) Sabahaddin, Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Tevsi-i Mezuniyet Hakkında Bir İzah, İstanbul, no date, p.16.
- (51) Sabahaddin, "Nasıl Hristiyanlar Vatanımızda Adem-i Merkeziyetten Müstefid Olageldikleri Halde Müslümanlar Merkeziyetin Mahkumu oluyorlar?," Terakki, No. 6, p.6.
- (52) Ege, op.cit., p.455.
- (53) Sabahaddin, "Demokrasinin ictimâî ve Vicdânî Yeni Bir İhtası Luzumu," Ibid., p.481.
- (54) Sabahaddin, Türkiye Nasıl, p.57.
- (55) Ibid.
- (56) Ibid., p.52.
- (57) Ibid., p.30.
- (58) Ibid.
- (59) Sabahaddin, Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Tevsi-i Mezuniyet..., p.17.
- (60) Sabahaddin, Türkiye Nasıl, p.32.
- (61) Sabahaddin, Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Tevsi-i Mezuniyet..., p.18.
- (62) Ibid.

- (63) Sabahaddin, "Nasıl Hristiyanlar Vatanımızda Adem-i Merkeziyetten Müstefid Olageldikleri Halde Müslümanlar Merkeziyetin Mahkumu oluyorlar?," Terakki, No. 6, p.8.
- (64) Sabahaddin, Türkiye Nasıl, p.32.
- (65) Sabahaddin, Teşebbüsü Şahsî ve Tevsi-i Mezuniyet..., p.17.
- (66) Sabahaddin, İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık, p.106.
- (67) Ege, op.cit., p.452.

[illegible]

Bir hülâsa :

Bu satırları isterseniz muhafaza buyurabilirsiniz. 20 Şubat ..48

Aziz ve âlicenab meslektaşım,

Gerek evvelki mektubum, gerekse bu seferkinin ictimâiyat sahasında ihtiva ettiği bazı düşünceler dolayısıyla sosyoloji ile uğraşan muhterem aşına ve dostlarınızla-bir fırsat düşerse-etrafılı ve samimi bir müdavele-i fıkriyyede bulunaklığınızı kaidevî bir teşebbüs telakki ediyorum. Hassaten Rural Sociologie meselesine dair. Başka ilimlerin hiçbirinde kullanılmayan bir garip ünvan justifie ise ortada hakiki bir ilm-i ictima yok. Fakat sadece muhtelif ekollerin muhtelif nazariyeleri ve güvenilemeyecek metodlarla yaptıkları kabataslak anketler var! Neticesine varmak icab eder. Halbuki siyans sosyalin metodları ve müselsel keşifleri ictimâî bir ilmin mevcudiyetini sarahaten isbat ediyor.

Bu binlerce sosyal reperküsyonlar, sosyal bir tasnif ve binaenaleyh ictimâî teşekküller hakkında bu ilmin ortaya koyduğu hakikatleri bu ana kadar tanıyabildiğim sosyolojik ekollerin hiçbirinde bulamadım, fakat tanımadıklarım elbette mevcud. Şüphesiz bunları tetkik hassaten siyans sosyal'in tefevvukunu göstermek bakımından elbette lazımdır. Bu itibarla muhtelif sosyolojik ekollerin mesâî ve nazariyelerini vatandaşlarına tanıtan ve ictimaiyat ile meşgul olan münevver ve değerli vatandaşlarınızın yazıları takdirlere layıktır. (x) Fakat bunu dedikten sonra, tanıyamadığım yeni sosyolojilere -aksi isbat edilinceye kadar- niçin emniyet edemediğimi şu sual ile bir kere daha telhisan arza çalışayım!

Amerika devlet adamları, Amerika efkar-ı umumiyyesi hatta isviçre gibi bir iki küçük demokratik memleketler bir dereceye kadar istisna edilmek şartıyla (x) hemen bütün şark ve garb münevverlerinin ekseriyeti, Alman ve Rus diktatörlükleri arasındaki, o derin hasımlığı, ez cümle en koyu işkenceciliği yüzbinlerce ve milyonlarca insanlara teşmil etmeği bir meslek-i siyasî add ettiklerini göremiyecek, anlamıyacak derecede, şaşılacak bir körlük ve vicdansızlığa kapıldıkları bir sırada

(X) Bir dereceye kadar diyorum. Çünkü burada da bazan cehalet, bazen vicdansızlık yüzünden diktatörlüğü seven, harb esnasında nazizim ve şimdi de kominizm rejimlerine tapınmak suretiyle kendi memleketlerine ihanet eden epeyce tehlikeli bir ekalliyet var.

yerden mantar gibi türeyen mütenevvi sosyoloji ekolleri ve hassaten Amerikalı ictimaiyât doktorları ne yapıyorlardı acaba? Harvard Üniversitesinde yahut şurada burada okutulan Siyans Sosyal, onun ruhuna arzunuz vechile nüfuz edecek bir surette okutulabilseydi, Rural Sociology tabiri bile kullanılamazdı. Çünkü bu tabir, talebenin ve diğer münevverlerin kısm-ı azamını aldatıyor. Siyans Sosyal de bitmez tükenmez ictimaiyât nazariyelerinden birisi gibi telakki ettirmeğe sebep olabilir. Bu ise, insaniyet üçüncü bir harbe ve şimdiye kadar bir mislini daha göremediği sosyal ve cihanşumul bir afete sürüklenirken, mütenevvi sosyoloji alimlerinin(?) ne vatandaşlarını ne de diğer hemcinslerini ikaz edememeleriyle büsbütün meydana çıkan bir hakikat olsa gerek! Çünkü, bu muhayyel ictimaiyat alimlerini - layuhtilik davasına kalkışmamakla beraber - bizzat muhtac-ı ikâz sanıyorum.

X

ikinci Dünya Harbi esnasında Amerika ordusunun başkumandanı olan Eisenhower'in daha şimdiden üçüncü bir dünya harbine gidildiği, binaenaleyh Amerika ordusunu dağıtmamak lüzumu hakkında vatandaşlarını, daldıkları o derin ve mühlik uykudan uyandırmak maksadıyla neşrettiği raporu elbette görmüşsünüzdür....

Tehlikenin en basit bir iz'an ve vicdanla derhal anlaşılabilir ve vehametini galiba çok geç anlayan bu eski kumandan, davasında esas itibariyle elbette haklıdır. Çünkü Amerika efkar-ı umumiyesinin mühim bir kısmı göz önünde duran tehlikenin derecesini el'an anlayamadıkları için, (!!) Amerika ordusunu dağıtmak suretiyle hem kendi memleketlerini, hem de bütün dünyayı bir intihara sevk etmek istiyorlar. Onun için Einsenhower, raporunu Birleşik Amerika hükümetinin de teşviki ile neşr etmiş olsa gerek... Fakat hangi sebepten olursa olsun hakikatin bir cüz'ünü söylediğinden dolayı takdire şüphesiz layıktır. Yalnız bunu söylerken yeni bir dünya harbinin sebebini hemen hemen dünya efkar-ı umumiyyesi ile birlikte (bir ideoloji) farkına atf etmek gafletinde bulunuyor. Bu gafletle de hali maziye bağlayamadığı (X) anlaşılıyormu?

-
- (X) Bununla, 1914 harbini ve onu kazananların, kaybeden milletlere karşı son derece cahilane ve zalimane muahedeli kastediyorum. O muahedeleri, içimden kan ağlayacak bir keder ve isyan issi ile takib etmiş olduğum için hiç olmazsa bir imada bulunmağa bir hakkım olsa gerek... Çünkü o muahedelere sebep olan halet-i ruhiyye ve dehşetli gaflet, cehalet ve vicdansızlıklar dır ki ikinci dünya harbini hazırladı, şimdi de bir üçüncüsünü hazırlıyor kanaatindeyim.

Kremlinin tahakkümü altına aldığı memleketlerin hükümetlerinde (ideoloji) namına hiç bir şey yok, yok, yok. Meğerki en hazm edilmez yalanlar, en bariz haydutluklar... Hayvan viviseksiyonunu şimdi mükemmelen tetvice gelen insan viviseksiyonları ideolojik davalar telakki edile!! Hamakâtin son ifadesi!!

iki dünya harbinden sonra sulhün her zamandan ziyade uzaklaşması, ve yeni katliamların her zamandan ziyade yaklaşması, elbette bir ideoloji farkından değil, fakat bütün insanîyetin çoktan beri düştüğü materyalizm uğurumuzun hakikatte bir iz'an ve vicdan uğurumu olmasından doğuyor... Bu musibetten kurtulmak için yalnız siyans sosyal ve ona müstenid ilmî bir islahat konsepsiyonu da kifâyet etmez. Bugünkü üniversitelerde okutulan ilimlerin hiç birisi maddeyi yaratan espirinin, okült manada, varlığından haberdar olmadığı ve bu ilimlerden bazılarının mütehassısları şuursuzca birbirinden kahir, felâket keşiflerine daldıkları için maddi ilimleri manevîsi ile, hakiki esprî ilmiyle tamamlamak icap etmek icab etmez mi?... Hatta bugün tedris edilen dinlerde bile ne (esprî) bilgisi var, ne de manevî alemler vukufu!... Halbuki şuur ve moralite seviyelerinin yükselebilmesi için devr-i hazırda bu vukuf elzem görünüyor!

X

Mantıkî ve hatta (okült) ihtimallere göre, kat kat daha feci bir tarzda başlamak üzere zahiren bitmiş görünen son harpte, Alman ordusunun bozulmasına sebep olan amillerin başlıcaları meyanında bittabî nazilerin hamakatleri haricinde, Almanların hava kuvvetlerinin, harbin sonlarına doğru kaybetmeleri ve şimendiferin daimi bir bombardıman tesiri altında hâkile yeksan olmaları ve nihayet ordu sevkîyatını gereken süratle yapamamaları olduğu besbelli hakikatlerden birisi değildir.

Fakat bundan eski vatanım acaba ibret alabildi mi? Aldıysa, icabeden derinlikte yeraltı şimendiferleri ve halkın ilk hücumda katliama uğramaması için mükemmel yer altı şehirleri ve büyük ölçüde küflenmeyecek bir tarzda yer altı zahire anbarları ve ilh. hazırlamaya çalışması ilk vazifelerinden birisi idi. Bunun yapamadını sanıyorsam, inşaAllah aldanıyorumdur aziz dostum.... Fakat Türkiye'nin ne kadar elzem olursa olsun sayılan tedbirleri almağa yine kendi gafleti neticesi olarak, istitaat-i maliyesi katiyyen müsâit değil. Bu takdirde Amerikanın yardımına şiddetle muhtaçdır. Bu mutasavver yardım mahud yüz milyon dolarlık küçük bir avansla yapılamaz. Yüzlerce milyonluk dolar daha lâzım. Bu yardımı basîretli bir şekilde yapmak sa, Amerikalıların da en basit menfaatleri icabıdır ama kâfi derecede anladıkları yok! Binaen aleyh Türkiye, Ruslar tarafından maruz olabileceği ilk hücumda mahvolmak istemiyorsa, haklı davasını Amerika efkar-ı umumîyesine, (metodikman), vukuf, dirayet ve ferasetle anlatmağa çalışması gerekmezmiydi.

Fakat bunca yıldan beri mehafil-i siyasiyye sizleri bile Amerikaya göndermek ve memleket lehine faideli bir suretle çalışabilmekliğiniz için lüzumu derecesinde ikdar etmeğe bir türlü yanaşamadı. Aldanmıyorsam, bu sü-i niyet değil, yalnız bir takdirsizlik ve tehlikeyi olduğu gibi görememekten doğma bir âmâ-ı fikrî neticesi olsa gerek! Fakat siz de bu derece sevdiğiniz milletinizi, tamamen hayırhah-ı olduğunuz hükümetini ve dayandığı fırka erkânını azâmî hayâtî menfaatleri namına tenvire çalışabilmek maksadıyla, acaba muntazam bir sa'ye girişmek imkânını bulabildiniz mi? Yoksa fazla bir tevazu ile ve istisna haricinde sükût mu ettiniz?... Bittabii bilmiyorum.... Herhalde aziz vatanınızla birlikte ailetlen hakiki bir saadete kavuşmaklığınızı bütün kalbiyle özleyen ve en derin hürmet ve teşekkürlerinin yeniden kabûlünü ricaya gelen minnettâr meslektaşınız.

*(There is also the below note on the edge of the first page)

Unutmayalım ki Bolşeviklerle ilk askeri ittifakı akd eden (daima evvelki harbe girişmek yüzünden) cumhuriyet Türkiyesi olmuştu.

• 119

هر یازده ساله در پوزه دولای دهلیز که دنیا را از این برهمن عجمیه دوزخ سوخته میسازد کیبوی نه
 کوزه زن و باطنی آورده بر نهان صفا بر طرفه سانس سید دیگر فرقه در *spirituelle* عکس
 دنیا حقیقی بر و قوه ملک برایش در غار او و مکن او قوت برایش کوه یار . سحر زینت و قوت
 کوه مکنند مهجود اما آواز او را فایده ی سیاسی یاریده و کل ، حیات قصه ی نرسد او ستودند
 و خیره یکن بود او ستودند قمار یا سوخته کی ؟ ... اگر سید و موال یکنه یار نامه سید شود
 سامن کیه سید ؟ عکس تغییر ایر و خنیم ... هر طایفه احمد اسید بک کیه و غرضه
 خبر یازده علیه و صفت آئینی در به برقت و صفت یازده فارسیار ... تقریباً او کوزه او را
 (محمد حیات و صفت برکت الهیه) دیر بر آرم الله با صفت یازده صفت الهیه دی ... سیاست
 هر صفت موالیه و سید یابی و ایمان او کوزه خان و صفت یازده بر آرم موالی کیه و کله او کل صفا
 انسانیت ! ... احمد اسید و صفت بر فعال شده بر جوده زنده و صفا صفت یازده تقاسم ... بر و صفت یازده
 این سید او نامه یکن سو تجار و صفت کل بر صفا سید عاقل و صفت کوه کیه صفت
 انتمات فایده یکن
 ص

Kisa bir izah

Ahmed Emin Bey Efendinin mevzubahs olan makalesinin bir cümlesi dolayısıyla arz edeyim ki, ben hiç bir zaman Hürriyet ve itilâf fırkasına girmemiştim. Bu partinin başına geçmek için vuku bulan mükerrer ısrarlara rağmen de beyan-i itizar ettim. Hiçbirşey çıkmayacağından emin olduğum için! Arkadaşlarımdan bazılarının eski Hürriyet ve itilâf partisine intisap etmiş oldukları elbette doğrudur. Fakat bir taraftan şahsi ve ictimâî hürriyeti müdafaa ederken, diğer taraftan en yakın dostlarımdan, hatta efrad-ı ailemin bile serbest kararlarına müdahaleye kalkışamazdım. Bu fikrimce bir tenakuz olurdu. İnsanın düşünce yahud kanaatlerini müdafaya koyulması başka, diğerlerinin hürriyetlerine müstebidâne bir şekilde müdahaleye kalkışması da bambaşkadır kanatindeyim. Maziye ait bir hatıra kabilinden arz edeyim ki, Hürriyet ve itilâf Partisi en parlak görünen bir devrinde siyasi bir ziyafet tertib etmiş ve ona iştirakım rica edilmişti. (Amikâlman) reddettim. Bu red üstüne ittihatçılardan hususi tebrikler yağmıştı. Öbür taraftan da hiddet ve isyan, Fikrimce ikisi de mûsâvî. Neticede mahud ziyafete bürokrasi mümessili ve görenek esiri olan Kamil Paşa riyaset etti. Bu o zamanki gazetelerde neşredilmiş bir hadisedir. Meslek-i ictimâî mensuplarının hepsi bilirlerki sosyal teşekkül üstünde ilmî bir vukuf ve metodik bir terbiye sayesinde tesir edecek esaslı bir islahat konsepsiyonuna dayanmadan sadece politik gayeler takip eden partilerin hiçbirisi, âzamî bir hüsnüniyetle de olsa kominiter bir memleketi kurtaramazlar. Bu zavallı memleketler, arasira muvakkat bir refaha erişseler bile ergeç yine de beceriksizlik ceryanına şîkâr olurlar. Bundan dolayı değilmidir ki, dünya yavaş yavaş üçüncü bir harb-i umumiye doğru sürüklenip gidiyor. Fakat günün birinde ve bittabiî uzun bir zaman sonra bir taraftan siyans sosyal ve diğer taraftan da "Science Sprituelle"den doğan hakiki bir vukufa mâlik bir parti doğar ise, o ve yalnız o, müsbet bir iş görebilir. Şüphesiz müsbet ve tanzimkâr işler gören memleketler mevcut ama, onların fâikiyetleri siyasi partilerden değil, hayat-i hususiyelerinin üstünlüğünden doğuyor. Yalnız bu üstünlük mütemadiyen sürecek mi? Eğer sosyal ve moral yüksekliği yaratan sebebler şuur sahasına girerse bu üstünlük devam eder. Aksi takdirde bu üstünlük devam edemez zannındayım. Takriben otuz sene evvel (Mihver-i hayatımız mütefessih bir garaza değil, alemşûmul bir muhabbet olmalıdır) diyen bir adam elbette başka bir hisle müsehassis olamazdı. Siyasetin her memlekette moraliteye ve sempatiye dayanması lüzumuna kani olmakla beraber burada mevzubahs olan o değil, münhasiran insaniyet.

(10 Mart 1948)

Note: In this letter the main part which concerned with my subject was translated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmad, Feroz, The Young Turks, Oxford 1969.
- Akşin, Sina, Jön Türkler ve ittihat Terakki, İstanbul 1987.
- "31 Mart Olayına Değın Sabahaddin Bey ve Ahrar Fırkası," Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, Vol. 27, pp.541-560.
- Alpkan, Bahaeddin and Yücel Yükselen, Milli Savunma Bakanlığında 150 yıl 1826-1976, Ankara 1976.
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, Makedonyadan Orta Asya'ya Enver Paşa, vol I, İstanbul 1972.
- Bayur, Yusuf Hikmet, Türk inkılâb Tarihi, vol I Part II and vol II Part IV, Ankara 1983.
- Bozdağ, İsmet, Sultan Abdulhamid'in Hatıra Defteri, İstanbul 1985.
- Bulletin de la Societe International De Science Sociale, 122 Livraison, December 1911.
- Descamps, Paul, Deneysel Sosyoloji, Prefaced and translated by Nurettin Şazi Kösemihal, İstanbul 1965.
- Ege, Nezahet Nurettin, Prens Sabahattin Hayatı ve İlmî Midafaaları, İstanbul 1977.
- Erkul, Ali, "Prens Sabahattin", Türk Toplum Bilimcileri I. Ed. by Emre Kongar, İstanbul 1982.
- Fesch, Paul, Constantinople aux Derniers Jours d'Abdul-Hamid New York 1971.
- Fındıkoğlu, Ziyaeddin Fahri, Le Play Mektebi ve Prens Sabahattin, İstanbul 1962.
- Gökalp, Ziya, Küçük Mecmua, no. 20, Diyarbakır 1922.
- Göze, H. Nejdett, "Modernism and Traditionalism in the Ottoman Empire, 1790-1922", Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, American University 1962.

Hanioğlu, Şükrü, "The Genesis of the Young Turk Revolution of 1908", Osmanlı Araştırmaları Dergisi (The Journal of Ottoman Studies), No. 3, 1982.

"Jön Türk Basını" Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, vol. II, İstanbul 1985.

Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti ve Jön Türkler 1889-1902, İstanbul, no date

İkdam, 8 September 1908.

23 August 1908, No. 5117.

5-6 October 1908.

İnal, İ. Emin Mahmut Kemal, Son Asır Türk Şairleri, vol. I-II İstanbul 1930.

Katiboğlu, Hasan, "İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık Mektuplar-Mesleğimiz Hakkında Üçüncü ve Son Bir İzah (Prens Sabahattin), (Unpublished M.A.thesis), İstanbul University, 1975.

Kuran, Ahmed Bedevi, "Damad Mahmud Paşa", Resimli Tarih Mecmuası, vol III. no 28, April 1952.

"Damad Mahmud Paşa", Resimli Tarih Mecmuası, no 31, July 1952.

İnkılab Tarihimiz ve İttihad ve Terakki, İstanbul 1948.

İnkılab Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler, İstanbul 1945.

Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyetinde İnkılab Hareketleri, İstanbul 1959.

Letters of Prince Sabahaddin dated 20 February 1948 and 10 March 1948 written to Nezahet Nureddin Ege.

Lewis, Bernard, The Emergence of Modern Turkey, Oxford 1968..

Mardin, Şerif, Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri: 1895-1908, İstanbul 1983.

Mayer, Ann Elizabeth, "Abbas Hilmi II: The Khedive and Egypt's Struggle for Independence", Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan 1978.

Mert, Nuray, "A Young Turk Journal Terakki", Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, İstanbul 1985.

Mümtaz, Semih, "Tarihimizde Hayal Olmuş Hakikatlar", İstanbul 1948.

Osmanlı, 8 April 1900 No. 57.

Osmanlı, April 1901. no. 81.

Osmanlı, 15 February 1902. No 102

"Osmanlı Muhalifin Fırkaları Kongresinin Beyannamesi", Terakki, No. 17.

"Rauf Orbay'in Hatıraları" Hatıralar, Vesikalar, Resimlerle Yakın Tarihimiz, vol III. no 33.

Sabahaddin "Demokrasinin ictimâî ve Vicdânî Yeni Bir İhtatı Luzumu," see. Nezahet Nurettin Ege, Prens Sabahattin Hayatı ve İlmî Müdafaaları, İstanbul 1977.

----- "Gençlerimize Mektup İntibah-ı Fikrimiz". Terakki No 1.

----- "İttihad", Terakki, No 10.

----- "İttihad-ı İslam", Terakki, No. 4.

----- İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetine Açık Mektuplar: Mesleğimiz Hakkında Üçüncü ve Son Bir İzah, İstanbul 1327 H (1911).

----- "Nasıl Hristiyanlar Vatanımızda Adem-i Merkeziyetten Müstefid Olageldikleri Halde Müslümanlar Merkeziyetin Mahkumu Oluyorlar? Terakki, No 6.

----- "Onüçüncü Terakkide Tenkidinizi Okurken", Terakki, No. 15.

----- "Şark Meselesi", Terakki, No. 9.

Sabahaddin

"Tenkidinizi Okurken", Terakki, No. (19-20).

Teşebbüsü Şahsi ve Adem-i Merkeziyet Hakkında
İkinci Bir İzah, İstanbul 1324 (1908).

Teşebbüsü Şahsi ve Tevsi-i Mezuniyet
Hakkında Bir İzah, İstanbul no date.

Türkiye Nasıl Kurtarılabilir? Meslek-i
İctimâî Programı, İstanbul 1334 (1918).

"Vilayetler Ahalisine Bir Davet", Terakki,
No 12

"27 Teşrin-i Evvel 1328 Tarihiyle Huzur-ı
Mualla-yı Padişahiye Takdim Edilen Açık Bir
Ariza", (A pamphlet).

Shaw, J. Standford and Ezel Kural Shaw, History of the Ottoman
Empire and Modern Turkey; vol II, USA:
Cambridge University Press 1977.

Şahiner, Necmeddin, Bilinmeyen Taraflarıyla Bediüzzaman Said
Nursi, İstanbul 1979.

Topuz, Melehat, "Prens Sabahaddin ve Adem-i Merkeziyet"
Unpublished M.A. Thesis, İstanbul
University, no date.

Toros, Taha, "Prens Sabahattin" Milliyet Journal, 16-22
February 1978.

Tunaya, Tarık Z. Türkiyenin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşıma
Hareketleri, İstanbul 1960.

Türkiye'de Siyasi Partiler 1859-1952, Vol.
I, (ikinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi) Hürriyet Vakfı
Pub. İstanbul 1952.

Tütengil, Cavit Orhan, Prens Sabahaddin, İstanbul 1954.

Unat, Faik Reşit, ikinci Meşrutiyetin İlânı ve Otuzbir Mart
Hadisesi, II. Abdülhamid'in Son Mebusan
Başkatibi Ali Cevcet Bey'in Fezlekesi,
Ankara 1985.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya, Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi, İstanbul
1979.

"Büyük Bir Yol Gösterici" Yeni Bilgi, vol.
IV No 40, 1 August 1950., İstanbul.

Vatan, 1. 1. 1949.

Yalçın, Hüseyin Cahit, Siyasal Anılar, İstanbul: Türkiye İş
Bankası, 1976.

"İntihabat Entrikaları", Tanin, 26 Teşrin-i
Sani 1324/9 December 1908, No 129.