

THE YOUNG OTTOMANS' APPROACHES TOWARD
ECONOMIC LIBERALISM (1860-1875)

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

BY

GÖZDE TOP

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

OCTOBER 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ömer Turan
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kayhan Orbay
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. M. Murat Baskıcı (Ankara Uni., İKT) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kayhan Orbay (METU, HIST) _____
Assist Prof. Dr. Ş. Akile Zorlu-Durukan (METU, HIST) _____



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

Name, Last name : Gözde Top

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE YOUNG OTTOMANS' APPROACHES TOWARD ECONOMIC LIBERALISM (1860-1875)

Top, Gözde

M.S., Department of History

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kayhan Orbay

October 2019, 86 pages

This thesis aims to examine the approaches toward economic liberalism of three members of the Young Ottoman Society (1860-1875); Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi, and Ziya Pasha who actively contributed to the development of the new literary area, newspapers in the Tanzimat period. The thesis tries to show that these intellectuals adopted a cautious stance toward economic liberalism which was the developing economic policy in Western Europe at that time. Although they fully supported the very cause of political liberalism in the empire, they had a pragmatist approach regarding the economic issues of the country. In other words, they did not supported economic liberalism which was harmful for the empire at that time. This study is important to follow the development of intellectual approach to economic liberalism throughout the nineteenth century. Moreover, as for evaluating the transition period, transition from implementing protectionist policies in the economy to adopting free trade conditions, as the representatives of both the Young Ottomans and their age, we can comprehend the mindset of the Ottoman intellectual who was also somehow associated with the central bureaucracy.

Keywords: economic liberalism, Young Ottomans, 19th century, Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi

ÖZ

GENÇ OSMANLILARIN İKTİSADİ LİBERALİZME YAKLAŞIMLARI (1860-1875)

Top, Gözde

Yüksek Lisans, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Kayhan Orbay

Ekim 2019, 86 sayfa

Bu tez, Genç Osmanlı Cemiyeti'nin (1860-1875)Tanzimat döneminde yeni yazın türünün gelişmesine aktif olarak katkıda bulunan üç üyesinin, Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi ve Ziya Paşa'nın iktisadi liberalizme yaklaşımlarını incelemeye çalışmaktadır. Tez, Genç Osmanlı entelektüellerinin 19. yüzyılın ikinci yarısında Batı Avrupa'da şekillenen iktisadi liberalizme karşı temkinli bir duruş sergilediklerini göstermeye çalışmaktadır. İmparatorlukta siyasi liberalizmi tam olarak desteklemelerine rağmen, ülkenin ekonomik meseleleri ile ilgili pragmatist bir yaklaşımları olduğu tezin temel argümanıdır. Tanzimat döneminde yeni yeni gelişmeye başlayan gazetecilik, Genç Osmanlı entelektüelinin muhalif fikirlerini yaymak için başlıca aracıdır. Bu nedenle, yayınladıkları gazetelerdeki yazıları bu çalışmanın ilk elden kaynaklarını oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışma, on dokuzuncu yüzyıl boyunca Osmanlı'da iktisadi liberalizme karşı entelektüel yaklaşımın gelişimini takip etmek açısından önemlidir. Dahası, ekonomide korumacı politikaları uygulamaktan serbest ticaret koşullarını benimsemeye yönelen geçiş dönemini, hem kendi dönemlerinin entelektüel dünyasının temsilcisi olarak hem de merkezi bürokrasi ile ilişkilendirilen Genç Osmanlı entelektüelinin düşünce yapısı üzerinden araştırmaya çalışmaktadır.

Keywords: iktisadi liberalizm, Genç Osmanlılar, 19. Yüzyıl, Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kayhan Orbay for his constant support throughout my thesis project. I also thank the other members of my thesis committee, Professor Murat Baskıcı and Assist. Prof. Dr. Akile Zorlu-Durukan who read the entire thesis, offering important suggestions to improve it.

I am also grateful to Professor Ömer Turan and Professor Recep Boztemur whose courses broadened my historical knowledge. It was an honour to learn from them.

My two mentors at my alma mater (Boğaziçi University), Yücel Terzibaşoğlu and Oya Pancaroğlu, have played vital roles in my academic life. Two-semester senior courses on historiography of Yücel Terzibaşoğlu have exposed me to the field of economic history, and this thesis reflects his inspiration on me.

Finally, I want to thank the staff of Beyazıt Library for their assistance during my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE GENERAL SITUATION IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AFTER THE TANZIMAT DECLARATION.....	7
2.1. The 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Trade Treaty.....	7
2.2. The Tanzimat Declaration of 1839.....	12
3. THE GENERAL FEATURES OF THE YOUNG OTTOMAN SOCIETY.....	17
3.1. The Establishment of the Society and the Leading Individuals.....	17
3.2. The Liberal Attitude toward the Ottoman Politics.....	20
3.3. The Opposition against the Political Elites.....	25
4. LIBERALISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	29
4.1. The Liberalism of John Stuart Mill.....	31
4.2. Friedrich List.....	32
5. NAMIK KEMAL AND ECONOMIC LIBERALISM.....	34
5.1. His Writings in <i>İbret</i>	36
5.2. His Writings in <i>Hürriyet</i>	47
6. ALI SUAVI ON THE OTTOMAN ECONOMY	51
7. THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE EMPIRE IN THE WRITINGS OF ZİYA PASHA.....	61
8. CONCLUSION.....	68
REFERENCES.....	73
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY/ TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	77
B. TEZ İZİN FORMU/ THESIS PERMISSION FORM.....	86

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to contribute to the understanding of the Ottoman intellectuals' attitude toward economic liberalism in the Ottoman Empire following the process of the 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Free Trade Treaty. The argument here is that in the 1860s, Ottoman intellectuals adopted a pragmatist approach to the economic developments in the Empire which had gradually adopted liberal economic policies after the series of free trade deals with the European countries. The Ottoman Empire was forced to accept free trade agreements following the political developments both in Europe and within the Empire which were disadvantageous to herself. Under these circumstances, the intellectuals of the Empire tried to discuss and develop a solution to the economic problems of the country aiming to prevent a predictable collapse of it. It is worth noting that the intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire were the children of the surviving empire, so their ultimate aim was to protect the interests of the country and to develop ideas to recover the country. For this reason, this thesis will try to show that they approached economic liberalism cautiously, and they were not in a tendency to receive and implement ideas or policies without any filtering. In other words, there was an approach among the intellectuals which can be called not adoption but adaptation.

The point in question is limited to the members of the Young Ottoman Society which existed between 1860 to 1875 as widely-accepted among the historians of the Ottoman Empire. The journalistic activities of three members of the society are chosen to limit the scope of the research: Namık Kemal (1840-1888), Ali Suavi (1838-1878), and Ziya Pasa (1825-1880) in particular. The reasons behind this selection are understandable when we think about their popularities among both the bureaucrats of the Bab-ı Ali and the people of the Empire and their productivities in their journalistic activities at that time. Beside their dabbling in the press which was used as their medium of manifestation of discontent of international and domestic situation of the Empire, they had been employed in the government offices for a while. The other reason is their knowledge of French which led to

the firsthand observation of Western Europe.¹ Roderic Davison counts them as the modern political agitators in the Ottoman Empire while also defining them as those “who wanted some sort of change, whether reactionary or progressive.”²

The date which is indicated excludes the time period which they returned to Istanbul after the death of Ali Pasha in 1871 and continued their journalistic activities in Istanbul. The reason for that after 1875 the society did not continue its existence although the disagreements among the members went back to their first meeting in Paris in 1867. For this reason, this study will exclude their articles published after 1875. Independently of the existence of the Young Ottoman society, the time period in question represents the great reform movements in the Ottoman Empire as well. The reform movements accelerated by the declaration of Tanzimat Edict which aimed to a political and socio-economic new order in the Ottoman society from that day on. While the reforms regarding the administration carried out the new class of bureaucrats, the intellectual revival, especially in the areas of clarification and simplification of the literary works with the introduction of more Turkish words into them, were put into practice by the members or the names which related to the society.³ It is valid to argue that this movement contributed to becoming popular of journals and newspapers leading to moulding public opinion in society.

Hürriyet newspaper which was published in London as the media outlet of Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasa, *Ulum* journal and *Salnames* (Almanacks) which were published in Paris by Ali Suavi, and *İbret* newspaper which was published in Istanbul by Namık Kemal will be used to grasp their mentalities on the issue of economics and economy of the Ottoman Empire, and in particular their attitude toward the liberal economic ideas which were on the rise in the Western European countries at that time. These names made a bid for their political struggles in these newspapers or journals at that time. İbrahim Şinasi Efendi (1826-1871) is also important name both for these literary innovations and for the political liberalism of the age. He is also closely associated with the Young Ottoman society. Many historians agree on the fact that he greatly contributed to the emergence of the independent

¹Roderic H. Davison. *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1876* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), 173.

² Davison, 173.

³ Davison, pg. 177.

Turkish journalism.⁴ In the coming chapters of this study, his name will be touched limited because of the scope of the study and his relatively non-political stance during the period, although his relation with the political organization is considerable. His education in Paris affected his ideas and his writings which affected Namık Kemal who wrote in Şinasi's *Tasvir-i Efkar*. Davison says that "These influences channeled Kemal's energies into translating articles from European newspapers, discussing current questions, and generally raising the level of Ottoman culture- his lifetime purpose."⁵ As it is seen, the writing occupations of the Young Ottomans had begun in the capital before their exiles to the provinces of the country and to European cities later. Although it will be challenging how these independent newspapers would affect the Ottoman public at that time, it is sure that their impact in Bab-ı Ali is obvious.⁶

The atmosphere of political and cultural formation of the Young Ottomans will be mentioned in this study to know and to understand the personalities and reactions of these intellectuals. First is the 1838 Balta Limanı Agreement which predestined for the economy of the empire in the coming years. Second is the declaration of the Tanzimat Edict which can be evaluated as the political aspect of the Balta Limanı Trade Agreement of 1838. The edict brought about a liberal political order to the country to some extent. These two developments prioritize the formation of the society; however, these prepared the political and sociological conditions which set the stage for the creation of such a political opposition group. Because of this reality, they were included in the study as a brief glimpse. The period of ruling of Ali and Fuad Pasa in the mid-1860s and the 1870s is also equally important to understand the mentality of Bab-ı Ali and those were the names the Young Ottomans were politically against. The Young Ottomans' critics against the new bureaucratic ruling of the period took shape around these two names. On the other hand, the study will include the political liberalism of the society parochially in another section of the study. The thematic scope of the study is limited to the discussion of the economic liberalism in the articles of the chosen names in the end.

⁴ Davison, pg. 183.

⁵ Davison, pg. 185

⁶ Davison, pg. 186

It will be tried to answer some questions related to their approaches to and their statements on the economy of the empire as well as their offers to solve the problems of the economy. Offering the solutions, it will be tried to investigate in this research how they observed and interpreted the economic affairs of the empire, what kind of policies they hoped to initiate, and to what extent they defended the cause of liberal economy regarding both international and domestic trade systems or regulations of the Empire. The starting point of this research question is their favor for political liberalism in the Ottoman politics which is a widely known fact. While they supported the very cause of political liberalism in the Empire, how did they interpret the economic liberalism? The question was discussed by the contemporary historians, although most of these studies failed to handle the subject in a holistic way. The studies adopted the approach which separates the sides as either the supporters of full-fledged free-trade system or the supporters of protectionist economic policies in the Ottoman Empire. As it will be tried to show that it will be wrong to label all members of the Young Ottomans as the supporters of free-trade and as the supporters of protectionism. When it is thought of their treatments of the issue of political liberalism and of many other issues related to the Ottoman politics, it will be understood that this kind of approach will be reductionist. As Roderic Davison points out that “The period of greatest cohesion of the New Ottomans came in 1867 when, in this fashion, they were gathered around Mustafa Fazıl Pasa.... But essentially the New Ottomans were a loose group of individualistic intellectuals who had some common attitudes toward the situation of the empire in the mid-1860s.”⁷ In addition to this, one of the members of the society cannot be representative of the whole society also. Some of the studies which concerned us here fell into this error. While this study does not pretend to reveal the views of all members of the society, it accepts that these three iconic names formed the so-called ideology of the society and created a public opinion in the Empire with their activities in journalism as Davison once defined as “intellectual and literary revival during the Tanzimat era.”⁸ Findley also appreciated the importance of the journalism activities at that time with these words, “This was an epoch-differentiation of the literary life from the bureaucratic service or at least patronage, on which writers traditionally depended.”⁹ As a result, none of the members of

⁷ Davison, pg. 175

⁸ Davison, pg. 175

⁹ Carter Vaughn Findley, “Economic Bases of Revolution and Repression in the Late Ottoman Empire.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 28/1, 1986, 154.

the society did not produce articles on the economy of the empire with the exception of three chosen names here.

This study is important to follow the development of intellectual approach to economic liberalism throughout the nineteenth century. There are many studies on the examination of the views of protectionist and liberal intellectuals of the empire in the last quarter of the 19th century. These were the times that the fruitful discussions on the Ottoman economy among the intellectuals were well-documented. Nevertheless, these studies mostly do not focus on the earlier stages of the intellectual development regarding economic liberalism. There isn't any systematic study on the economic ideas of Namık Kemal and the other Young Ottomans. Moreover, as for evaluating the transition period, transition from implementing protectionist policies in the economy to adopting free trade conditions, as the representatives of both the Young Ottomans and their age, we can comprehend the mindset of the Ottoman intellectual who was also somehow associated with the central bureaucracy. According to Deniz Kılınçoğlu, "The Young Ottomans did not suggest any economic strategy, but a sort of economic liberalism mixed with strong economic proto-nationalist tendencies. Nevertheless, their critique played a very important role in late Ottoman economic thought, because their polemical style raised these issues in late nineteenth-century Ottoman debates on reform and modernization."¹⁰ The Young Ottomans inspired to the establishment of other oppositional societies like Society of Union and Progress in 1889 against Hamidian regime. Findley argues that regarding the liberal elements, the similarity between them is "particularly conspicuous."¹¹ So, it is possible to talk about a continuity in their "reformist social and political thought in the Hamidian era."¹² Kılincoglu states that economic nationalism can be traced back to Young Ottoman thought.¹³ Furthermore, "In many respects, Ottoman economic protectionism, from its earliest stages in Young Ottoman thought to the Young Turks' post-1908 National Economy (Millî İktisat) program, had

¹⁰ Deniz Kılınçoğlu, *The Political Economy of Ottoman Modernity: Ottoman Economic Thought During the Reign of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909)*. Doctoral Thesis, Princeton University, June 2012, 192

¹¹ Findley, 156

¹² Kılınçoğlu, 193.

¹³ Kılınçoğlu, 194

strong parallels with Friedrich List’s national economy approach.”¹⁴ For these reasons, it is vital to understand their critiques regarding economic policies of the Empire, and this study aims to contribute to it.

¹⁴ Kılınçoğlu, 196

CHAPTER 2

THE GENERAL SITUATION IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AFTER THE TANZIMAT DECLARATION

2.1. The 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Trade Treaty

The 19th century was the era of the world turned upside down. After the Industrial Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, Great Britain had no rivals in world markets any more having the advantage of technological advancement and product diversification.¹⁵ Western European markets were no longer able to absorb the products of British industries.¹⁶ In accordance with this, the countries of continental Europe were implementing protectionist policies during the first half of the 19th century, so the British Empire turned towards the periphery to expand her trade¹⁷ because there was an overproduction crisis in Britain.¹⁸ These were also the times which the Ottoman Empire was at war with her own mayor, Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Pasa, the case which paved the way for losing her prestige at the international area. Moreover, the great powers intervened the issue while the Ottoman government desperately needed to help them. This situation set the stage for giving further political and economic concessions to those countries. The British Empire wanted to spread the free trade agreements, especially with the periphery countries. The 1838 Baltalimani and 1842 Nanking Agreements were signed with the Ottoman Empire and China respectively at this stage. As one of the examples of non-colonial integration with the capitalist world economy in the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire offers us to explore the specificity of non-colonial peripheralization. After the 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Trade Treaty

¹⁵ Reşat Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy: The Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, c1988), 39.

¹⁶ Kasaba, 39.

¹⁷ Şevket Pamuk. *The Ottoman Empire and European Capitalism, 1820-1913: Trade, Investment, and Production* (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 19.

¹⁸ Kasaba, 39.

which accelerated the capitalist transformation of the Ottoman Empire set the stage for the new kind of relationship between the British Empire and the Ottoman Empire as well as the relationship between the Ottoman central bureaucracy and the merchants and the export-oriented landlords.

The Ottoman Empire confronted a new enemy inside her territories, the mayor of Egypt, Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Pasha who revolted against the capital in 1832 claiming power in Syria to consolidate his power in Egypt by building his own modern army for a while. This incident brought about the truth that the Empire was wanting in military power to overcome a local rebellion. She desperately needed help to prevent further expansion of her mayor inside Anatolia. The hesitant attitude of Britain toward the situation in Egypt set the stage for the intervention of the Russian Empire which resulted in the Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi in July 1833. The treaty confirmed a pact of non-aggression between the Ottoman and the Russian Empires and also a secret article related with the straits which would be open for only Russian warships during a possible war between Russia and the other Western countries. This was unacceptable for the Western European powers, and they protested it. Although the Russian tsar assured that he would not fulfil the conditions of the treaty, it led to the emergence of the question of the straits. The Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi also led to the Crimean War of 1856 and “helped to deflect the 1833 Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi the tendency toward a general war in Europe for another 6 decades.”¹⁹ While the problems between Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Pasha and the Sultan II. Mahmud continued, the Ottoman Foreign Minister Mustafa Resit Pasha requested help from Britain to stop Kavalalı who openly declared his insistence about the independence of Egypt to the Western European powers in 1838.

Britain was now uncomfortable with the expansionist policy of Kavalalı Mehmet Ali into the Arabian peninsula and his control in the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf which threatened the roads to India, the most valuable colony of Britain. Britain and France followed the policy of maintaining the status quo since the Vienna Congress of 1815 and the amicable settlements throughout the 19th century. They involved the issue to protect their interests in the East. In return of solving the issue, Britain demanded further commercial privileges from the Ottoman Empire which resulted in the signing of the Treaty of Balta Limani

¹⁹ Kasaba, 40.

between the two empires in October 1838. With this agreement, the Ottoman Empire abolished all monopolies and ban on the export of the grain trade allowing British merchants the concession of full access to all Ottoman markets.²⁰ They will be taxed equally to local merchants. In addition to these, according to the articles of the treaty, the transit trade of Britain will no longer be taxed. For this reason, the trade policies of the agreement are accepted as the most liberal, open market settlements during that time. The Ottoman Empire had adopted the monopoly system (*yed-i vahid*) preventing to sell the raw materials out. This was a protectionist policy which was implemented since 1826. While the central bureaucracy of the Ottoman Empire was now forced to abandon the protectionist economic policies in an unequal way, Great Britain had enormous economic advantages because of the profitable custom duties in the Ottoman ports. For instance, duties were set at 12% on exports and 5% on imports while until 1838 both imports and exports are subjected to 3% duty.²¹ This can be closely associated with the abolishment of the Corn Laws in Great Britain in 1846 which allowed the grain imports, so the Ottoman Empire was forced to repeal the export of grain trade and most of its grain products sold in foreign markets.²² This means the beginning of the scarcity and human exploitation in the Ottoman Empire.²³ Moreover, according to Sevket Pamuk, thanks to this agreement (and also the Treaty of Nanking with China in 1842), the British cotton imports increased about five times within ten years.²⁴ To Bailey, "... between 1825 and 1852 exports to Turkey increased eightfold while imports ... remained relatively steady, gave England a most favourable trade balance in the two decades prior to the Crimean War."²⁵ These were the years of the beginning of the penetration of world capitalism, and between 1853 and 1876, the expansion for the industrialized economies and for the world economy in general accelerated.²⁶

²⁰ Çağlar Keyder, *Toplumsal Tarih Çalışmaları* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009), 122.

²¹ Pamuk, 20.

²² Stefanos Yerasimos, *Az Gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye* (İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1986), 26.

²³ Yerasimos, 26.

²⁴ Pamuk, 17.

²⁵ Frank Edgar Bailey, *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826-1853* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942), 75.

²⁶ Pamuk, 17.

The impact and the significance of the Treaty of Balta Limani do not only represent the Ottoman trade policies during the years of turmoil but also express “an important turning point in the integration of the Empire into the world economy.”²⁷ However, Pamuk warns us that “These documents by themselves cannot explain the increasing specialization of the Ottoman Empire in the production and exportation of primary commodities and in the importation of manufactures during the nineteenth century.”²⁸ In other words, they represent the products of the world economic conditions and political imperatives after the Industrial Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars²⁹ so they should not be overstated. Although their short-term consequences came in sight minor, the long-term consequences were more serious for Ottoman state finances since they prevented to adopt protective tariff structure for a long time.³⁰

The local administrators gained a considerable strength against the central bureaucracy at the beginning of the 19th century, and this led to the further expansion of the Western influence which resulted in the acceleration of the peripheralization of the Ottoman Empire.³¹ Pamuk writes that “As the economy opened to foreign capital and as the agriculture became more commercialized, the power of those classes increased.”³² The struggle between the central bureaucracy and those classes (merchants and landlords) which wanted more rapid and effective integration with the world economy was one of the key determinants of the Ottoman Empire as well as the other non-colonized periphery states. In the case of the Ottoman Empire, the central bureaucracy had never allowed any rival power against its autonomy. The Tanzimat Fermanı allowed the chance to strengthen the power of the central bureaucracy over these local powers.³³ For the European powers, it was not an easy task to deal with the merchants and the feudal lords and they could not

²⁷ Pamuk, 19.

²⁸ Pamuk, 19.

²⁹ Pamuk, 19.

³⁰ Pamuk, 19.

³¹ Keyder, 135.

³² Pamuk, 132.

³³ Yerasimos, 34.

develop reliable alliances with them. Stefanos Yerasimos argues that central bureaucracy was the practical ally of capitalism since the European powers could more easily monitor it than feudal lords of the empire.³⁴ So, the symbiotic relationship between the central bureaucracy and capitalism was established through the Free Trade Agreements in the 1840s.

During the Crimean War of 1851, the Ottoman Empire borrowed a great deal of money from Britain making way for the penetration of the foreign capital in the form of state borrowing and direct investments increased at this stage.³⁵ According to Kasaba, after the mid-19th century, Great Britain followed the policy of increasing their imports from the Ottoman Empire hoping that this would contribute to an increase of the amount of purchase of the Ottomans from Great Britain.³⁶ In accordance with this policy, direct payments to the Ottoman Empire in the form of loans and capital exports increased.³⁷ In this process, due to these loans, “Foreign creditors obtained ways of directly influencing the administration of the government.”³⁸ One of the most important developments in this stage was the establishment of the foreign-owned Ottoman Bank in 1863. This institution had the power of monopoly to print paper currency in the Empire, which also linked the Empire to the gold standard system and paved the way for the rights of foreigners to buy agricultural lands.³⁹ Between 1860 and 1862, these trade terms were extended to other European countries “following the weakened condition in which Turkey found herself after the Crimean War.”⁴⁰ Together with this second period, “Turkey became a free trading country in a very real sense.”⁴¹ Kasaba also says when it came to 1860, free trade policy was completely in place in Europe.⁴²

³⁴ Yerasimos, 14.

³⁵ Pamuk, 10.

³⁶ Kasaba, 48.

³⁷ Kasaba, 48.

³⁸ Kasaba, 53.

³⁹ Pamuk, 13.

⁴⁰ Vernon John Puryear, *International Economics and Diplomacy in the Near East: A Study of British Commercial Policy in the Levant, 1834-1853* (Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1935), 117.

⁴¹ Puryear, 117.

2.2. The Tanzimat Declaration of 1839

After the signing of the Anglo-Ottoman Trade Treaty in 1838, the Ottoman Empire declared the new regulations regarding the administration of the state called as the *Tanzimat* which can be counted as the effort of liberalization of politics together with the liberalization of economy of the empire. Resat Kasaba puts an emphasis on its supplementary features regarding Free Trade Treaties since the Tanzimat bureaucrats had no intentions to follow protectionist or mercantilist policies in the economy but took measure to bring about economic liberalization of the empire.⁴³ The main feature of the Tanzimat Edict was that the state promised for the protection of the property, life, and honour of the people without treating unequally between its Muslim and non-Muslim citizens. Besides, the Tanzimat bureaucrats aimed to strengthen central control over the state revenues simplifying the collection of revenues. They did it by centralising the treasury and delegating the state officials (*muhassıls*) to collect taxes which were collected by the local administrators and judges whose main incomes were largely this collection. This meant that the *iltizam* (tax farming) system was abolished. The Edict stated the necessity of the collection of taxes considering the ability to pay off a person. A uniform tithe was adopted, and market dues and urban taxes were combined into a single profit tax called *temettü* or dividend tax.⁴⁴ The poll tax, on the other hand, was changed into a military exemption tax in an effort to secularising the form of the tax. In accordance with this, everybody had the right to use his property at will. Muslims and non-Muslims would benefit from these regulations equally. It was agreed that this edict would be released to the public as well as to the foreign public opinion. Another striking aspect of this Tanzimat period lasting from 1839 to 1876 was a series of laws passed to consolidate the reforms. First of all, in 1838 and 1856 cadastral surveys were carried out in an effort to the limitation of the influence of the *ayan* (feudal lord) and assessing and registering the tax liability of

⁴² Kasaba, 48.

⁴³ Kasaba, 52.

⁴⁴ Kasaba, 50.

landed property in the provinces.⁴⁵ The Provincial Law of 1864 redefined the position of the local officials. A new penal code (1840), a land law (1858) and a Law of Transactions (1869- 1876) were amended during this period, and the rule of law was partially established as the result of the expansion of capitalism within the territories of the empire. All these regulations served to the purpose of forming a unified Ottoman *millet* disregarding ethnic and religious differences among the people. This policy called *Ottomanism* represents the domestic policies of the empire during the Tanzimat period aiming to prevent the autonomy and independence movements within the imperial territories.⁴⁶

According to Yavuz Abadan, the primary goals of these regulations are first the westernization and the second forming the domain of personal liberty within the territories of the empire.⁴⁷ Both the political and economic aspects of the Tanzimat Edict took measures to create this environment. Yet, there were those interest groups who have lost their economic and political privileges in the local levels. These were *ulamas*, *ayans*, and even some *mayors* who reacted against the equality between the Muslims and non-Muslims claiming the regulations opposing *shariah*.⁴⁸ The Tanzimat Edict did not end successfully since its stipulated system of collection of the state revenues could not be established. Kasaba explains this situation as the result of “*the divisions within the bureaucratic class, and the incongruity between the substantively new circumstances that surrounded the Ottoman state and the relatively old means with which the central bureaucracy tries to implement its reforms.*”⁴⁹ The state had to make a compromise with the feudal lords (*ayans*). This paved the way for further disturbances in the rural areas, especially in Balkans causing two important riots following such regulations in Nish (1841) and Vidin (1850). Nevertheless, İnalçık claims that the Edict caused deep traumas in the traditional social

⁴⁵ Kasaba, 51.

⁴⁶ Yavuz Abadan, *Tanzimat Fermanı'nın Tahlili*, in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, ed., Halil İnalçık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu. (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006), 40.

⁴⁷ Abadan, 41.

⁴⁸ Halil İnalçık. *Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri*, in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, ed., Halil İnalçık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu. (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006), 128.

⁴⁹ Kasaba, 53.

structure.⁵⁰ Moreover, this period created its own kind of bureaucratic elite group mainly called as *Tanzimat Man* who had both pragmatic and conservative worldview.⁵¹ Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, Ali, Fuat, and Resit Pashas were the prototypes of this *Tanzimat Man*.⁵² They followed the *modernization* in their policies which were similar to those of Metternich who defended that “The power of the empire in the foreign policy is closely associated with the strength of the internal order.”⁵³

Two important things in Donald Quataert’s article should be discussed in detail here. Quataert mentions an important point regarding the periodization of the economy of the Tanzimat era claiming that the turning point here was the year of the abolishment of *Janissary army* in 1826 since the army which was also closely related with the economic precautions of the state as well as military and political reforms.⁵⁴ This is because the Janissaries had the privileges of the guilds, and also the abolishment of the Janissary army created the environment for 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Trade Treaty and the abolishment of the monopoly system. In accordance with these developments, these were the steps to implement liberal economic policies to Donald Quataert.⁵⁵ Furthermore, he points out that the Tanzimat era coincides with the first big wave of the expansion of British manufactured exports which completely breaks free after the end of the Napoleonic Wars.⁵⁶ He asks vital questions regarding the problems of the Tanzimat economy which were mainly related to the production and distribution of the resources. The important point here is that now the empire followed the centralization policies in the economy interfering further in daily life its citizens on the one hand, and causing the emergence of liberalism as a reaction against the

⁵⁰ İncılık, 128.

⁵¹ İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat’ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri*, in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, ed., Halil İncılık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu. (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006), 301.

⁵² Ortaylı, 301.

⁵³ Ortaylı, 309.

⁵⁴ Donald Quataert, *Tanzimat Döneminde Ekonominin Temel Problemleri*, in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, ed., Halil İncılık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu. (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006), 479.

⁵⁵ Quataert, 479.

⁵⁶ Quataert, 480.

statist policies on the other.⁵⁷ The European countries wanted to benefit from the Ottoman middle east as the source of raw material and the consumer of manufactured goods.⁵⁸

In respect of Great Britain, the value of these regulations was appreciated since, with the words of Kasaba, “After all, a better-administered empire would make a more viable buffer against the Russians and better promote Ottoman territories both as reliable markets for the British commodities and as a haven for foreign capital.”⁵⁹ From the 1830s onwards, there was a political and economic competition between the two great empires of the world into Asia,⁶⁰ Great Britain *as the hegemonic power in the capitalist world economy*⁶¹ and the Russian Empire *as the strongest of the empires in Europe*.⁶² After the Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi of 1833, the British foreign policy, led by Stratford Canning and Lord Palmerston respectively, was more engaged in the Eastern Question, and Great Britain now forced to take steps to adopt a new policy regarding the Ottoman Empire.⁶³ In accordance with this, Lord Palmerston formulated a policy for Great Britain, and “The best way to wean the Porte away from the Tsar was to assist in the reformation of Turkey because only a strong state could assert its independence in the face of a powerful Tsar.”⁶⁴ There was a lack of continuity in British foreign policy regarding the Porte before the Crimean War of 1853, and moreover there was a little interest in the affairs of Turkey in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.⁶⁵ However, Frank Bailey mentions that the Tanzimat was “essentially

⁵⁷ Quataert, 480.

⁵⁸ Quataert, 481.

⁵⁹ Kasaba, 50.

⁶⁰ Yerasimos, 34.

⁶¹ Kasaba, 43.

⁶² Kasaba, 43.

⁶³ Frank Edgar Bailey, *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826-1853* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942), 132.

⁶⁴ Bailey, 136.

⁶⁵ Bailey, 39.

Turkish in origin,”⁶⁶ and the British influence was limited because of its “tardiness and ineffectiveness.”⁶⁷

The Tanzimat bureaucrats perceived the Western world as the ideal societal order to achieve and they aimed to establish the system which represents the Western institutions.⁶⁸ For this reason, all these reforms and the laws arrived during this period served to establish a liberal order. For example, 1840 Penal Code forbade the confiscation which prevented the capital accumulation while 1858 Land Law gave the *ayans* permission to acquire the lands which were held de facto by them. The Tanzimat Edict also stated that the state was responsible to protect the rights of heirs of a criminal abolishing the confiscation. This means that the edict represents the liberal programme protecting private property. The aim here was to come to a mutual agreement with the local sovereign powers⁶⁹ which soon became the ideological state apparatus in the country.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Bailey, 228.

⁶⁷ Bailey, 229.

⁶⁸ Cenk Reyhan. *Osmanlı'da Kapitalizmin Kökenleri: Kent-Kapitalizm İlişkisi Üzerine Tarihsel-Sosyolojik Bir Çözümleme* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008), 147.

⁶⁹ Ibid, 149.

⁷⁰ Ibid, 145.

CHAPTER 3

THE GENERAL FEATURES OF THE YOUNG OTTOMAN SOCIETY

3.1 Establishment of the Society and the Leading Individuals

The Young Ottoman Society was formed mainly against the new emerging bureaucratic class which represented and carried out the reform programs of the empire during the Tanzimat era. This new class was aware of the declining of the Ottoman Empire in the face of rising industrialised European countries, and in accordance with this new phenomenon, they intimately set to work implementing broad reform programmes, though their achievements were either criticised being not enough or challenged by those classes which were on the verge of losing their previous status in the society. The Young Ottoman Society was formed by those who were against “the tyrannical rule of Ali Pasha,”⁷¹ who was the grand vizier then and the follower of Mustafa Reshid Pasha who was the architect behind the Ottoman government reforms of 1839. Their harsh opposition against the rule of Ali Pasha huddled them together as well as sharing some important background features. Almost all of them worked in the Translation Bureau of the Porte for a while, had a common knowledge of the European civilization, and were concerned about the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire.⁷² Those names constituted the society had intellectual formation.

Mehmet Bey as the leading member had studied political science in France and learned more about constitutionalism.⁷³ Nuri and Resat Beys were also the founding members of

⁷¹Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of the Young Ottoman Thought: a study in the modernization of Turkish political ideas* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962), 141.

⁷²Ibid, 142.

⁷³ Ibid, 143.

the society, and Namık Kemal also took part in publishing Sinasi's newspaper, *Tasvir-i Efkar*. Another member was Ayatullah Bey grew up having both Eastern and Western features in his educational formation and admired the achievements of the Western civilization.⁷⁴ Refik Bey was the other founding member as the owner of the periodical *Mir'at*.⁷⁵ They formed the *Patriotic Alliance* (İttifak-ı Hamiyyet) inspiring the way of the organization of the secret society in Italy, Carbonari, which fought against the restoration in France and in Italy.⁷⁶ This way of the organization was that "The organization of society by cells of seven, each responsible to a leader, and the secrecy of its membership (no member knew more than the name of seven other members) is a sign which points in that direction."⁷⁷ The financial supporter of the society was Mustafa Fazıl Pasha (1829-75) who was the grandson of Muhammad Ali of Egypt. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha made an effort for the Europeanization of the finances of the empire once in the position of the minister of finance.⁷⁸ He withdrew from the office because of his opposition against Ali Pasha. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha was the name who helped Namık Kemal and Ziya Bey to escape Europe since they were exiled because of their accusatory writings against Ali Pasha in the newspapers. Also, the growing influence of Namık Kemal and Ali Suavi on the people and the closeness of Ziya Bey to the sultan were among the reasons behind their expulsion.⁷⁹ The motivation behind Mustafa Fazıl Pasha's support for this opposition movement was controversial because it was either his claim in mayorship of Egypt or his sincerity on the opposition against the rule of Ali Pasha. Nevertheless, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha was among the key figures forming the society and also contributing its programme.⁸⁰ Mustafa Fazıl Pasha financially backed this organization which was now searching for a common identity in Paris.⁸¹ Here, they called themselves the Young Ottomans while their European

⁷⁴ Ibid, 143.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 143.

⁷⁶ Ibid, 149.

⁷⁷ Ibid, 151.

⁷⁸ Ibid, 152.

⁷⁹ Christiane Czygan, "Reflections on Justice: A Young Ottoman View of the Tanẓīmāt," *Middle Eastern Studies* 46/6 (2010): 944.

⁸⁰ Czygan, 945.

⁸¹ Czygan, 944.

counterparts named them as Jeune Turcs.⁸² Meanwhile, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha wrote a letter published in *Liberte* which addressed to the Sultan demanding a constitution and this was distributed in Istanbul. According to Serif Mardin, this letter “had the effect of showing to a great many people that the decline of the Ottoman Empire.”⁸³ Because of a failed libel suit against the conservative journal *Le Memorial Diplomatique*, the society was looking for a new place to publish their journals, and London was chosen due to its more liberal laws concerning journalism activities.⁸⁴

Here, Ali Suavi began to publish *Muhbir* on his own because of the conceptual differences between Ali Suavi and Namık Kemal. Namık Kemal also got involved in the editorial staff of *Hürriyet* which appeared weekly from 29 June 1868 until 23 February 1879 until its 88th issue under Reshad Bey’s direction. When Mustafa Fazıl Pasha did not support the newspaper financially, Ali Pasha proposed financial assistance in return of the softer criticisms against Bab-ı Ali. This offer was not accepted. Hıdiv Ismail also offered financial assistance in return of harsher criticism of Ali Pasha. These offers did not correspond with the ideals of Namık Kemal, and he left the newspaper.⁸⁵ Ziya Pasha was now alone in the newspaper and he harshly criticized the government. Moreover, Ali Suavi published an article here defending the assassination of Ali Pasha. As a consequence of that Ziya Pasha forced to leave London to escape any trial.⁸⁶ The rest was published in Geneva between April and June 1870 until the 100th issue.⁸⁷ In the meantime, Namık Kemal returned to Istanbul accepting a meeting with Ali Pasha. In 1871, after the death of Ali Pasha, all of them returned to Istanbul.

⁸² Ortaylı, 331.

⁸³ Mardin, 153.

⁸⁴ Czygan, 945.

⁸⁵ Şerif Mardin, *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu* (İstanbul : İletişim, 2002), 63.

⁸⁶ Ibid, 67.

⁸⁷ Czygan, 945.

3.2 The Opposition against the Political Elites

Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha (1815-1871) and Kececizade Fuat Pasha (1814-1869) were close followers of the reforms of Mustafa Reshid Pasha (1800-1858) who prepared and declared the Edict of Tanzimat of 1839 which brought about broader regulations in the administration and the other aspects of the Ottoman society. The Tanzimat Era had two sultans whose political power broke apart in the hands of powerful grand viziers during the reformist era: Abdülmecid (1823-1861) and Abdülaziz (1830-1876). The primary goal of Ali and Fuat Pashas was to establish political stability in the country and to maintain it.⁸⁸ They had to chance to observe the political instability of the 1850s, and they took lessons from how the power struggles between the different groups of statesmen affected the domestic and foreign affairs empire in a bad way. The political turbulence of the early 1850s which they witnessed was related to the two political groups in the Porte which fought for the influence on the affairs of the state and on the sultan. One was the newly arriving bureaucratic class which based their power on administrative and political reforms, the second was a group of politicians which relied on their relationship with the palace and control over the army.⁸⁹ When Mustafa Reshid Pasha took the office of grand viziership in 1846, he confronted his opponents who had close relations with the palace. In the advancing years, Reshid Pasha was dismissed from his position several times by the Sultan because of the activities of this “palace group.” The political struggle between these two groups caused a period of harsh political instability in Istanbul.⁹⁰ Crimean War of 1853 resulted in the collapson of the “palace group”. The power was now in the hands of the new bureaucratic class. In the meantime, Ali and Fuad Pashas did not suffer from the competition of political struggle in the Porte. For this reason, their reputation did not harm, so they rose as the new statesmen in Bab-ı Ali. Moreover, they learned a great deal from this political struggle and they were now conscious of the very necessity of the strong government. According to Butrus Abu Manneh, Ali Pasha thought that the Crimean War

⁸⁸ Butrus Ebu Manneh, *Ali ve Fuad Paşaların Bab-ı Ali'deki Nüfuzlarının Kökenleri (1855-1871) in Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, ed., Halil İnalcık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006), 343.

⁸⁹ Ibid, 344.

⁹⁰ Ibid, 346.

was the result of the rivalry between Mustafa Reshid Pasha and the “palace group.”⁹¹ For this reason, it is possible to expect Ali Pasha to prevent the further intervention of the palace group, to suppress the opposition, and to censor the critics since he experienced the crisis of the 1850s.⁹²

Fuat Pasha as the grand vizier and Ali Pasha as the Foreign Minister aimed to westernise and to secularise the administrative system and supported the development of the transportation system building railways. In their political briefings to the Sultan before their deaths, Ali Pasha’s and Fuat Pasha’s *Vasiyyetnames* offer us the information related to how they grasped the realities of their own eras and how they responded the necessities of the conditions of the period. Fuat Pasha spoke mainly of the international conditions and the policies of the countries regarding the Ottoman Empire and warned the Sultan against not to be deceived by those who were against the reformist movements. He asks for the Sultan to continue to the advancement of the country cutting any relations with the past.⁹³ In accordance with this, we can safely argue that the Tanzimat Man was aware of the fact that dreaming of the glorious past would not provide any successful initiative to fix the affairs of the Empire. According to Fuat Pasha, “It is inexpiable mistake to expect that the Empire can be returned to the past with the old methods.”⁹⁴ Besides, regarding the domestic affairs of the country, the Sultan should follow the policy which reconciles various peoples without discriminating race and religion.⁹⁵ He also mentions the importance of road building and public education. Ali Pasha’s *Vasiyyetname*, on the other hand, involves more defensive statements regarding their policies and offensive arguments against those groups who criticised them during their rules. He presents their balance policy in the foreign affairs of the Empire as a must, “...Against some states’ power of attack, it ought to be used the other states’ power of defence.”⁹⁶ He also evaluates the situation which was forced to the Empire to adopt the order of the administration of Europe as “the trapping”.⁹⁷ As a result, it is

⁹¹ Ibid, 348.

⁹² Ibid, 348.

⁹³ Engin Deniz Akarlı, *Belgelerle Tanzimat: Osmanlı Sadrazamlarından Ali ve Fuad Paşaların Siyasi Vasiyyetnameleri* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1978), 1.

⁹⁴ Ibid,1.

⁹⁵ Ibid, 6.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 18.

⁹⁷ Ibid, 20.

possible to deduce that they tried to act with deliberation to the reforms which might cause the further damage for the Empire. Many historians agree that the Tanzimat bureaucrats had no ideological look though they continued to open up the economy to Europe. The policies of Ali and Fuat Pashas' seems quite pragmatic in the end.

Ali Pasha thought the state affairs ought to be maintained by a small elite group, and this was challenged by the Young Ottomans since, for example, Namık Kemal associates the limitation of freedom with the rise of this class.⁹⁸ Moreover, Ali Pasha disliked the idea that state affairs would be discussed in the newspapers. He was especially angry about the article series called "*Eastern Question*" written by Namık Kemal in Tasvir-i Efkar.⁹⁹ These activities of the Young Ottomans set the stage for their escape to Europe and to continue their journalist activities there. The reasons behind the opposition of these first modernist intellectuals of the Empire are complicated. The Young Ottomans were the allies of *ulema* who lost job opportunities in the state cadres after the Tanzimat declaration. The dynamics behind this movement derived from a kind of class conflict. Yet, this is not the only reason. The Young Ottomans were on the side of the declining groups in the face of the rising bureaucratic class which was on the rise from the beginning of the reforms movements of Ahmed III rule until the Tanzimat era.¹⁰⁰ It is obvious that the modernization movement was carried out by the bureaucrats during the Abdülaziz and Abdülmecid reigns.¹⁰¹ Moreover, Ali and Fuat Pashas strongly opposed to Sultan Abdülaziz, when the new Sultan was keen on having a more say in the state affairs and interfering Bab-ı Ali.¹⁰² They achieved this by resigning. When the Sultan could not find suitable people to replace them, he was forced to accept the situation.¹⁰³ Now, Bab-ı Ali had almost all power to govern the country.

The opposition to the Tanzimat bureaucrats might be derived from personal motivations also. Ziya Bey criticized Reshid Pasha (1800-1858), the architect of Tanzimat Edict of 1839,

⁹⁸ Mardin (2002), 130.

⁹⁹ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 1979), 55.

¹⁰⁰ Mardin, 158.

¹⁰¹ Mardin, 126.

¹⁰² Ebu Manneh, 349-350.

¹⁰³ Ebu Manneh, 350.

for his false strategy related to the European diplomats because his policies set the stage for the intervention of the European states to both the internal and foreign affairs of the Ottoman Empire.¹⁰⁴ Ziya Bey's political articles in *Hürriyet* Newspaper in London is full of this kind of oppositional writings. He constantly blamed this new group of bureaucrats as being greedy¹⁰⁵ and ruthless¹⁰⁶. Yet, Ziya Pasha's criticism against Reshid Pasha's policy might be adopted in retrospect due to his growing disappointment at having been excluded from political power after the death of Reshid Pasha once his office was now given to Ali Pasha.¹⁰⁷¹⁰⁸ When Reshid Pasha was the grand vizier, Ziya Bey gained access to the Sultan and the Porte through Reshid Pasha.¹⁰⁹ So, it is clear that there was a personal motivation for Ziya Bey to blame Reshid and his followers. Under these circumstances, not only Reshid Pasha but also Ali and Fuat Pashas who were the students of Reshid had their shares of these accusations. Moreover, for the above-mentioned reason, Ziya Bey directed his harshest criticisms toward Ali Pasha, the new grand vizier, after Namık Kemal left the *Hürriyet* newspaper.

Serif Mardin also draws our attention to the connection between the rise of the movement and the economic changes that preceded their appearance.¹¹⁰ The developments which prepared these conditions explained in the previous section regarding the 1838 Baltalimani Agreement and the Tanzimat Edict of 1839. The results of the economic privileges given to the European states "became worse in the age of imperialism when the European Powers adopted an attitude of racial and moral superiority towards the Turks."¹¹¹ According to Feroz Ahmad, "This attitude cut the ground from under the feet of the promised equality at the cost of Westernizing the 1860s, the Young Ottomans, who spoke for the social paid the price of

¹⁰⁴ Czygan, 947.

¹⁰⁵ Czygan, 947.

¹⁰⁶ Czygan, 947.

¹⁰⁷ Czygan, 948.

¹⁰⁸ Ebu Manneh, 349.

¹⁰⁹ Czygan, 947.

¹¹⁰ Mardin, 4.

¹¹¹Feroz Ahmad, "Ottoman Perceptions of the Capitulations 1800–1914," *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 11/1 (2000): 7.

increased subservience to the criticize the reformers.”¹¹² Furthermore, following the enacting of *Islahat Fermanı of 1856*, the legal transformation of the country brought about fundamental changes in the administration causing the increasing tug of Balkan nationalism, improved international relations, and so on.¹¹³ In Paris Peace Conference of 1856 following the Crimean War, Ali Pasha noted the Ottoman Empire accepted as a member of the Concert of Europe. However, the developments after that rebutted Ali Pasha. Although, Ali Pasha defended his policies during his position as the Foreign Minister of the Empire saying “... those lands which had already been lost... We pretended that we hardly accepted those losses to avoid further sacrifices...”¹¹⁴, they were blamed by the Young Ottomans regarding land losses.

Hilmi Ziya Ülken describes these two parties -the Young Ottomans and the new bureaucratic class- on the road of the modernization of the empire as one for the strict follower of freedom and constitutionalism and the second one for progress. While the former defended the very cause of revolutionism to achieve those gains, the latter, the Tanzimat bureaucracy, wanted to slowly transform the society to achieve these institutions.¹¹⁵ This attitude toward the modernization of the bureaucratic class was approved by Ali Pasha in his political briefing to the Sultan before his death. In his *Vasiyyetname of 1871*, he criticised those groups who wanted a faster modernization movement by these words, “...This was an importee civilization, not a usual, slow, and inescapable maturation.”¹¹⁶ Being aware of the impossibility of political compromise, he stated that the sameness of the economic interest with Europe could contribute to the integrity of the state.¹¹⁷

¹¹² Ibid, 8.

¹¹³ Mardin, 16.

¹¹⁴ Engin Deniz Akarlı, *Belgelerle Tanzimat: Osmanlı Sadrazamlarından Ali ve Fuad Paşaların Siyasi Vasiyyetnameleri* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1978), 19.

¹¹⁵ Ülken, 61.

¹¹⁶ Akarlı, 18.

¹¹⁷ Akarlı, 24.

In 1871, when Ali Pasha died, they hoped to return from Europe. According to İlber Ortaylı, “They thought that the era of despotism, in Ottoman Turkish “*istibdat*” which would express the strong governance in the Islamic political theory in the beginning, finished with the death of Ali Pasha. Soon, they understood that despotism was not related to the personality of Ali Pasha with the arrival of the rule of Mahmud Nedim Pasha as the new grand vizier.”¹¹⁸

3.3 Liberal Attitude Toward the Ottoman Politics

The modern forms of political thought together with political action in the Islamic world started with the rise of the Young Ottoman ideologues (1865) and the constitutional movement of the 1870s.¹¹⁹ The emergence of the Young Ottoman movement as the pioneers of political ideology is closely related to the introduction of Western ideas. Şerif Mardin defines the Young Ottomans as “...the first men to make the ideas of the Enlightenment part of the intellectual equipment of the Turkish reading public and the first thinkers to try to work out a synthesis between these ideas and Islam.”¹²⁰ Most of the historians agree that the Young Ottoman Society was lacking in a clear ideological standpoint regarding the social, political, economic and other issues of the Ottoman Empire.¹²¹ They were a group of intellectuals who aimed to follow Europe.¹²² Nonetheless, their demand for the constitutionalism and hatred against the new bureaucratic group led by Ali and Fuat Pashas were the most obvious bonds among them. İlber Ortaylı states that “It is impossible to think about the Young Ottomans’ ideological tendencies as the one and only. The thing which created this society was their strong attitude toward the constitutionalism while also on this

¹¹⁸ Ortaylı, 327.

¹¹⁹ Carter Vaughn Findley, “Economic Bases of Revolution and Repression in the Late Ottoman Empire,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 28/1 (1986), 81.

¹²⁰ Mardin, 4.

¹²¹ Mardin (2002), 29.

¹²² Mardin (2002), 29.

point, it is hard to determine their least common denominators.”¹²³ On the other hand, thanks to both the Tanzimat and following reforms, according to Tevfik Cavdar, the Ottoman intellectual had an opportunity to know better the liberal ideas.¹²⁴

Their opposition against Bab-ı Ali, the council of ministers -not against the Sultan or his office- was highlighted above, and we know that Ali Pasha once had publicly declared his views on the ruling of the country with the hands of “five or six persons.”¹²⁵ This was the mentality behind the Tanzimat bureaucrats, and now they were challenged by the Young Ottomans in the newspapers. The Young Ottomans introduced to the nationalist revolutionary groups in Europe and Marxist socialist revolutionaries. However, according to Niyazi Berkes, they could agree with neither of them on the constitutional monarchy.¹²⁶

Notions related to the political liberalism entered into the political life with İbrahim Şinasi (1826-1871) who was the owner of the *Tasvir-i Efkar* and according to some sources,¹²⁷ was one of the leaders of the Young Ottoman movement. He was the first intellectual who used the terms like *citizens' rights, freedom of expression, public opinion, liberal ideas, national consciousness, constitutional government, liberty, natural rights of the people*, etc.¹²⁸ He affected others with his ideas, though his active involvement in the *Jeune Turcs* is controversial. Whether he involved in the movement will not be discussed here. Notwithstanding, his acquaintance with the members of the movement is well-known.

Namık Kemal in his *İbret* which started to publish in 1872 expressed the Ottoman patriotism and willingness of the establishment of constitutional monarchy. He criticised Tanzimat since the reforms brought the system of the replacement of Bab-ı Ali despotism with the

¹²³ İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri*, in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, ed., Halil İnalcık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006), 331.

¹²⁴ Tevfik Çavdar, *Türkiye'de Liberalizm (1860-1990)* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1992), 13.

¹²⁵ Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1973), 245.

¹²⁶ Ibid, 245.

¹²⁷ Hilmi Ozan Özavcı, “Liberalism in the Turkish Context and Its Historiography: Past and Present,” *Anatolian Studies*, 62, (2012):143.

¹²⁸ Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: Hurst & Co., 1998), 197-98.

sovereign despotism. Since the legislative, executive and judicial functions of government were undertaken by one organ of the state which was Bab-ı Ali, this kind of regime was even worse than the old regime of the Ottoman Empire.¹²⁹ This regime could not solve the economic problems of the Empire. Moreover, the Tanzimat Edict created an environment in which the European states could easily intervene in the domestic affairs of the country. According to Namık Kemal, this was the result of the lack of constitutional monarchy which could represent the national will. In accordance with this, Namık Kemal also reached the thought of natural rights which was the philosophical basis of Western civilization.¹³⁰ Furthermore, Namık Kemal defended the view of “progress” rather than “collapsion” which was represented by Ibn Haldun in the Islamic political thought for so long. The duty of the state is to protect these natural rights of the people.¹³¹ The limitation of the duties of the government will also be shown in Namık Kemal’s approach to the economic liberalism on the following pages. Namık Kemal formed his political liberalism in his article series called *Letters On The Methods of Consultancy* (Usul-i Meşveret Hakkında Mektuplar) written in London. He purposefully used the word *consultancy* bringing the already existence of *consultancy councils* (meşveret meclisi) into the forefront to justify his demand of parliamentary regime in the Empire.¹³² In the example of the Ottoman Empire, consultancy councils served to discuss the affairs related to the administration of the country, although it was far from being a legislature which was now demanded by Namık Kemal and the others in the Young Ottoman movement. Nevertheless, Berkes argue that Namık Kemal did not bring conceptual innovations to the Ottoman political thought; he only re-formed the existent concepts in the Islamic thought.¹³³ In addition to this, some views of Namık Kemal were in conflict with each other. Berkes mentioned this issue in detail.¹³⁴ Yet, this may be the issue of another study. The thing which is related to the issue here is that Namık Kemal and the other members found common ground on the issue of parliamentary regime and constitutionalism.

¹²⁹ Ibid, 257.

¹³⁰ Ibid, 257.

¹³¹ Ibid, 257.

¹³² Ibid, 258.

¹³³ Ibid, 258-259.

¹³⁴ Ibid, 260-61-62.

One of their features approaching the various issues is that they “appealed to Islamic tradition in a highly significant way.”¹³⁵ In other words, they took the religious and legal studies of the ulema seriously. Namık Kemal treated parliamentary system in his article associating liberal political philosophy with Islamic tradition.¹³⁶ On the other hand, the scope of these references to the Shari’a law changed from one member to the other and with various purposes. For example, while Ziya Bey “underlined the *raison d’être* of the Shari’a and used it to petition for the old order, Namık Kemal tried to link the constitution with the Shari’a.”¹³⁷ These shows us there was not a monolithic conception in their minds regarding the features of the possible constitutional monarchy in the Empire. It is understandable also to do so because these views were introduced by them who were also new to these ideas. In other words, we can say that in the issue of political liberalism there was no other antecedent formation to lead them. For this reason, the disagreement among themselves and the inconsistency between their articles seem ordinary. İlber Ortaylı argues that “It is possible to find the elements of modernist Islamism, immature Turkism, and even socialism in the Young Ottoman thought, and the most surprising fact that all these views can be found in one member of the society.”¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Carter V. Findley, “The Advent of Ideology in the Islamic Middle East (Part I-II).” *Studia Islamica*, no. 55 (1982): 149.

¹³⁶ Ibid, 151.

¹³⁷ Czygan, 949.

¹³⁸ Ortaylı, 327.

CHAPTER 4

LIBERALISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The nineteenth-century is the blossoming age for the economic liberalism since the liberal ideas accumulated and manifested itself in the economic policies of the governments, especially of Great Britain and France. The foundations of liberalism had been laid in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries together with David Hume, Adam Smith, and others. This was the time for the succeeding economists to gain seats in the parliaments in the aforementioned countries and to become popular in the decision making processes. However, this age also witnessed serious rejections to those ideas regarding free-trade which harmed the continental economies in the face of Great Britain which was the major economy at that age after the Napoleonic Wars of 1803. As mentioned earlier in this study, Great Britain had no rival in the world markets anymore after the war. Moreover, the *laissez-faire* idea had been seen as the policy of Great Britain by the other European states. In other words, economic liberalism seemed to be uniquely suited to the economy of Great Britain. This set the stage for the development of alternative economic doctrines in continental Europe which will be touched later. Before that, it is necessary to explain what kind of liberalism and economic liberalism came into question in this century since it is obvious that the nineteenth-century liberalism differs from the twentieth and twenty-first centuries liberalism.

Economic liberalism will be used as the policy that directs a liberal economy while the liberal economy can be defined as “an economy in which individuals decide what is to be produced, how goods shall be distributed, and by what means production and distribution shall be carried on.”¹³⁹ In accordance with this, the one thing distinguishes liberal economy from other economic doctrines is the authority of individuals to make decisions. In a liberal economy, people have authority. They use this authority through the government. Moreover,

¹³⁹ William Dyer Grampp, *Economic Liberalism* (New York: Random House, 1965), viii.

in a liberal economy, the state may do whatever the people want it to do and that it is able to do. However, there is an inconsistency among the ideas. William Grampp writes that “A fundamental discrepancy between the classicists’ believing in universal economic freedom but not in universal political freedom and in their being advocates of both free trade and political nationalism.”¹⁴⁰

So, how and why the nineteenth century is so important for economic liberalism is worth to discuss here to grasp the atmosphere of the world economy. William D. Grampp counts several reasons for that and they are enough to understand the general situation for economic liberalism. First of all, the nineteenth century witnessed the greatest intellectual authority for economic liberalism.¹⁴¹ Second, the principles of economic liberalism were still ambiguous. For many, especially in the first half of the nineteenth century, there was no consensus on the issue of what kind of interventionism of a government could be accepted for a liberal economy. Third, economists had the greatest influence on the policies of the government in this century. Moreover, there were economists in the cabinets having an influence on the economy of their countries. The fourth particularity of this century was to produce more comprehensive statements in the principles of the ideology. Sayings of John Stuart Mill were greatly contributed to economic liberalism after 1848. The fifth feature of liberalism in this age was substantial opposition to that. The sixth was to challenge with the economic problems which arose at the result of the implementation of economic liberalism. William Grampp writes that

The depression of 1819 initiated a cyclical movement that has continued ever since and is unlike the irregular and spasmodic fluctuations prior to the nineteenth century. There were severe depressions in the 1840s, 1870s, and 1890s. Early in its history, the cycle acquired an international aspect. In the 1830s, the deflationary measures of President Jackson were one cause of the contradiction in Britain -probably the first instance of the exporting of unemployment by the United States. Monopolies were another problem. Before the nineteenth century, most of them originated in the grant exclusive rights by the state. Now they originated in the market, and the classical remedy for them was thereby weakened. The remedy had been particularly in Smith to abolish government

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, x.

¹⁴¹ Ibid, 75.

protection of firms and to allow the market to force them to be competitive. Now it was the harshness of the competition itself that was a cause of monopoly.¹⁴²

4.1. John Stuart Mill (1806-73)

Having an exceptional educational formation, John Stuart Mill greatly contributed to the classical economy in the nineteenth century. He once was an employee of the India Office in London and a member of Parliament for a short time. He wrote on political liberalism and economic liberalism and his works marked a turning point in the history of economic ideas. He learned from Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) who influenced economists for many generations with his utilitarian pain-and-pleasure calculus.¹⁴³ Ebenstein writes that “Bentham’s promotion of the social and political changes that went on in the nineteenth century England had results comparable in significance with those achieved by the Webbs during the twentieth century.”¹⁴⁴ Mill defended the principles of individual liberty and free competition and one principle which governs the relations between society and its individuals¹⁴⁵ saying that “That principle is, that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant.”¹⁴⁶ The nineteenth century liberalism had many inconsistencies and Mill’s works also. For example, his general rule of non-interference excepted certain matters from it like education of children which according to Mill should be under the government control. Mill had had an sympathy with the weak and exploited classes¹⁴⁷ which later caused to develop “some form of socialistic

¹⁴² Ibid, 80.

¹⁴³ William Ebenstein, *Modern Political Thought: The Great Issues* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), 184.

¹⁴⁴ Ebenstein, 184.

¹⁴⁵ Eric Roll, *A History of Economic Thought* (London: Faber and Faber ltd, 1954), 358.

¹⁴⁶ J. S. Mill, *On Liberty*, ed., Fawcett, World’s Classics, 1924),15.

¹⁴⁷ Roll, 358.

cooperation.”¹⁴⁸ His desire for reform and desire to justify certain restrictions of competition can be explained this sympathy. Moreover, we witness his warm attitude toward trade unions evaluating their existences under the general rule of freedom of contract. This set the stage for the inconsistencies in his ideas, however.

Mill was thus a radical and a social reformer: the first distinguished liberal with ‘Fabian’ leanings. He maintained close contacts with the Chartists; and it was with the help of his working-class followers that he secured a seat in Parliament. He relied on restriction of inheritance, spread of co-operation, extension of peasant proprietorship, education, and similar measures to remove the evils of capitalism without sacrificing its basis. If Malthus was urging on the industrial capitalist concessions in favour of the landowning class, Mill was pleading for similar concessions to the labourers.¹⁴⁹

In his *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy* (1844), he “described the nature of the nature of the principal hypothesis which economics make. This is the abstraction of the ‘economic man’.”¹⁵⁰ *Principles of Political Economy* (1848) is “an elaboration of the classical system.”¹⁵¹ The chapter on competition and custom tackles with the competition which is “a comparatively new social force, restricted in its operation by tradition.”¹⁵²

4.2. Friedrich List (1789-1846)

As the writer of *National System of Political Economy* which published in German in 1841, Friedrich List is counted as the earliest critic of the tenets of classical economics. In his work, List “develops a theory of productive forces in contrast with the classical doctrine of

¹⁴⁸ Ebenstein, 184.

¹⁴⁹ Roll, 360.

¹⁵⁰ Roll, 361.

¹⁵¹ Ebenstein, 184.

¹⁵² Roll, 362.

exchange value.”¹⁵³ Individualism and cosmopolitanism for List lead to nationalism and production. He emphasizes the importance of the concrete historical situation and government intervention. In this manner, he is seen as the opponent of economic liberalism although this is not the case. List did not oppose to economic liberalism, but he observed the achievements of already industrialised Great Britain commenting that continental European states can protect themselves against Britain’s economic expansionism adopting protectionist economic policies. In other words, the backward condition of Germany could be overcome by economic nationalism. This means that List opposed to Smith’s doctrines with nationalism.¹⁵⁴ Roll explains this as a “rejection of liberal cosmopolitanism on the ground that it ignored the nation, without which individuals could not exist.”¹⁵⁵ To List, the strength of the national power goes hand in hand with the individual’s position. List maintained the importance of ‘the ability to replace’ against ‘the amount of material wealth’ proposing an equilibrium between the different branches of production.¹⁵⁶ This equilibrium can be brought about by the state which had to act. For this reason, List opposed *laissez-faire*. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, Germany was not a politically unified state splitting into a number of independent states which kept customs barriers against each other. This created a weakness against the British products at that time.

¹⁵³ Ebenstein, 241.

¹⁵⁴ Roll, 227.

¹⁵⁵ Roll, 227.

¹⁵⁶ Roll, 229.

CHAPTER 5

NAMIK KEMAL AND ECONOMIC LIBERALISM

Namık Kemal(1840-1888) is one of the most productive intellectuals of his era and among the Young Ottomans. His writings have varied from literary texts which were put on the stage to socio-economic articles about the Ottoman Empire in the columns. He did not belong to the political elite class of his era of which he always attacked its policies and its way of administration. This is the fact that every member of the Young Ottomans agreed upon despite their lack of clear ideological standpoint.¹⁵⁷ Many historians also think that the thing which held them together was this opposition against the political elites of the era, especially against Ali and Fuad Pashas of the Tanzimat era.¹⁵⁸ He and his group of intellectuals constitute the early organization of intellectual society which forms the basis of future organizations such as the Committee of Union and Progress of the 1880s. While the Young Ottomans were interested in a wide variety of issues regarding the country, the point in question is here their liberal economic ideas which are more clearly represented in Namık Kemal's writings. Although it is hard to say that all members of the society shared the same ideas with Namık Kemal, because of the fact that none of the members of the society wrote on the economy as much as him, one can assume that his ideas on taxes, internal customs, loans and other issues related to the Ottoman economy can represent the economic ideas of the society to a certain degree. They did want the implementation of the free-trade model - although they were against the imperialism- since they thought that the liberal economy represented the freedom and the parliamentary regime which they wanted for so long.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of the Young Ottoman Thought: a study in the modernization of Turkish political ideas* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962), 67.

¹⁵⁸Ibid, 67.

¹⁵⁹ Tefik Çavdar, *Türkiye'de Liberalizm (1860-1990)* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1992), 16.

Namık Kemal, as one of the most important representatives of the Young Ottomans, wrote about the Ottoman economy in the media outlets of the society, like *İbret*, *Hürriyet*, and *Tasvir-i Efkar*. His ideas on the Ottoman economy and on economics overall are surprisingly consistent although their feasibility can be sometimes questionable. It is rather controversial that to what extent Namık Kemal was pro-free trade and to what extent he defend the cause of the liberal economy for the Ottoman Empire. Those who argue that there was a strong consensus on the necessity of adoption of capitalism in the post-Tanzimat Ottoman thought¹⁶⁰ maintain that there were two ways to do that: free-trade model (*serbest-i ticaret*) and protectionism (*usul-ü himaye*). The problem here was that which way was more convenient for the Ottomans.¹⁶¹ For this reason, the discussion on Namık Kemal's economic ideas will be analysed in this direction.

Some intellectual historians like Tevfik Çavdar and Ahmed Güner Sayar argue that the liberal economic approach in the writings of Namık Kemal is clearly represented. According to Tevfik Çavdar, Namık Kemal claimed that it was necessary to follow the full-fledged free-market system to boost the economy of the empire¹⁶². Ahmet Güner Sayar also maintains that Namık Kemal adopted the free market trade advocating the abolition of the internal customs in the territories of the empire¹⁶³. Hilmi Ziya Ülken mentions Namık Kemal with Ohannes Pasha whose liberal economic ideas were beyond dispute. He criticizes their argument since they promoted liberty untimely in a pre-capitalist environment which was yet dissolving and unconsciously defended the system which defeated the Empire.¹⁶⁴ It seems that there is an agreement upon Namık Kemal's economic liberalism together with his political liberalism. This kind of definite judgement seems a little bit controversial, however. Contrary to these names, Ahmet Insel argues that the Young Ottomans sided with the '*moderate interventionism*' in the economy although they fully defended the political

¹⁶⁰ Ahmet Insel, "*Türkiye'de Liberalizmin Soy Çizgisi*" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, ed., Murat Belge (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001. vol. 7.), 45.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, 45.

¹⁶² Çavdar, 51.

¹⁶³ Ahmet Güner Sayar, *Osmanlı İktisat Düşüncesinin Çağdaşlaşması: Klasik Dönemden II. Abdülhamid'e* (İstanbul: Der Yayınevi, 1986), 247.

¹⁶⁴ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 1979), 40.

liberalism.¹⁶⁵ He demonstrates that the Young Ottomans mainly affected by those names, Lord Palmerston and David Urquhart. While Palmerston mainly relied on the views of Edmund Burke who defended relatively more state interventionist liberal economic policies which are not counted as pure liberal economics, Urquhart reflected a kind of benign and self-generated approach of a liberal economy.¹⁶⁶ Since the state-interventionist approach suggested those economic reforms which were towards the strengthening of the state, this kind of liberalism could be more accepted among the Ottoman intellectuals.¹⁶⁷ Şerif Mardin also maintains their cautious stance toward the free-trade model saying “... The Young Ottomans predicates interventionism upon foreign trade.”¹⁶⁸ One of Mardin’s claims is that in the articles of Namık Kemal, we come across the idea of *national economy*¹⁶⁹ which marked in the last quarter of the nineteenth century in the empire and also in the republican period. The more extensive explanations of these historians on the issue will be tried to show together with the writings of Namık Kemal.

5.1. His Writings in *İbret*

Namık Kemal wrote their articles in various newspapers. Here, his articles in *İbret* newspaper will be analysed in regard to the chronology of the articles. The importance of *İbret* and the articles here is huge, and Ülken argues that Namık Kemal’s major political struggle started with *İbret* newspaper which was published in Istanbul between 1870 and 1873.¹⁷⁰ The article called *Tekaliif*¹⁷¹ of Namık Kemal is the most scientific and comprehensive discussion of the issue of the collection and the distribution of taxes in the territories of the Ottoman Empire. Thanks to this article, we can know to what extent Namık

¹⁶⁵İnsel, 43.

¹⁶⁶İnsel, 44.

¹⁶⁷İnsel, 44.

¹⁶⁸Şerif Mardin, “Türkiye’de İktisadi Düşüncenin Gelişmesi (1838-1918)”, in *Siyasal ve Sosyal Bilimler, Makaleler II*, (İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 1992 (1990), 83.

¹⁶⁹Mardin, 85.

¹⁷⁰Ülken, 94.

¹⁷¹Namık Kemal, “*Tekaliif*”, *İbret*, No:87, 7 Zilkade 1289 / 6 Ocak 1873, pg.1-2

Kemal was pro-liberal on the issue of excising the people. He clearly points out the principles of economics (called *fenn-i servet* in Ottoman Turkish) and explains the cores of the tax issue answering the possible opposite arguments as well. Furthermore, we grasp his ideas on the existence of and the maintaining of the body of the government, and we have a chance to learn his views on the scope of the duties and the responsibilities of the state to the people through this article. His ideas here often seem to be in conflict with his nationalist identity which has come to be known for so long among the people and the intellectuals of Turkey. As Hilmi Ziya Ülken emphasizes the fact that there is a clear difference between his men of letters identity (which identifies with his *romantic* attitude) and his political thoughts (which came to be known as *progressive*).¹⁷² Hence, it is very surprising to learn how much he is dubious about the responsibilities of the state and we can luckily learn his thoughts on taxes from his article which published in *İbret* on 5 June 1872. Though the question of to what extent one can assert liberal economic ideas were represented in the Young Ottoman thought is somewhat controversial among the historians, we can safely say that Namık Kemal's article *Tekalif* answers most of the question. In his article, he talked about certain types of revenues of the state dividing them into five. According to him, these are the rightful revenues of a government.¹⁷³ First of them is tax and customs duty. Second is the revenue from some ministries. Another revenue is from the sale and rent and use of some public goods such as forest, mine, and state lands. The fourth is every kind of loans. The other is booties. Namık Kemal continues with the detailed explanation of the regularisation and the distribution of the taxes as well as tax collection according to the principles of economics. This article is a very organized and scientific investigation of the issue of tax, so it deserves a close reading to comprehend the scope of the liberal economic views of Namık Kemal.

The most striking element of his views is reducing the duties of government. In respect to this, the first principle here is that *taxes should be collected accordingly with the indispensable necessities (the principle of lüzum-ı kat'i) of the government*.¹⁷⁴ He describes the core duties of the government as justice, security, and the continuation of the

¹⁷² Ülken, 9.

¹⁷³ “*Tekalif*”, 1.

¹⁷⁴ “*Tekalif*”, 1.

independence of the nation. Since the duties of the government are limited to these responsibilities, the government should determine the amount of taxes to meet these needs. The existence of government does not mean anything rather than the meeting the very needs of the society. For this reason, the government must find a repayment while excising the people. This approach suits the classical liberal finance which ranks in priority of the legality of spending to the legality of taxes.¹⁷⁵ At this point, Namık Kemal argues that other than these necessities, in some areas for example in education, however, the government is expected to meet the requirements of the society which requires '*tutelage*' like the Ottoman society. However, he believes in the last instance that this kind of tax collection is against the principle of economics because "It is absurd to demand things from the government which can be satisfied by the individuals or by the private enterprises."¹⁷⁶ This seems a quite radical approach to the issue of government spending policy because many can argue that the education issue is closely related to the public sphere and the very scope of this kind of investment cannot be expected from any kind of private enterprises or individuals. The Ottoman society, according to him, relied more on the state intervention or the '*guardianship*' of the government in related issues. Hence, it seems he accepted the peculiarities of the society which he lived in, although he ideologically rejects this '*absurd*' public spendings. Another core element of his views on the tax issue is that *tax is not a right for the state but an essential expense to maintain its existence*. For this reason, he asserts that the rightful ratio of tax is not an amount which everybody can pay but an amount which everybody should pay.¹⁷⁷ The duties of government to the people is now clear, and everyone without the differences in income can expect the same things -namely the justice, security, and the continuation of the independence of the country- from the government. For this reason, everybody should pay the same amount of tax, he tries to demonstrate in his *Tekalif*. At that point, he also answers a possible opposite argument which asserts the government should always consider the amount which people can always pay. Kemal answers this claim putting forward the economics which does not approve this because "If the amount which everybody can pay is redundant, it cannot be rightful. If the amount is necessary for the

¹⁷⁵ Insel, 46.

¹⁷⁶ "*Tekalif*," 1.

¹⁷⁷ "*Tekalif*," 2.

expenditures of government, it will not be helpful to think whether or not people can pay that amount.”¹⁷⁸

The third principle related to the collection of tax is that *tax should be determined at a moderate level (hiffet-i mümkin)*. He explains that the principle of vital need (*lüzum-i kat’i*) does not contain the principle of moderate tax, however. In other words, if the amount which will be taken from the people does not come to agree with the rules of economics, it will not be possible to provide the rule of moderate tax although the tax is taken from the public within the frame of vital need. So, this is the reason behind the principle of moderate tax is accepted as a different rule of economics from the principle of vital need. According to him, the principle of the moderate level is vital because the lack of moderation in taxes paves the way for the injustice. It is the responsibility of the government that her fictitious needs should not take precedence over the unavoidable necessities of the individuals. If this is the case, this can lead to loss of public capital. The second problem with the immoderation in taxes is that it obstructs the saving and the accumulation of wealth in the hands of individuals. Namık Kemal argues that businessmen should be able to hold more than their livings. The government has to allow for the capital accumulation which enables the craftsmen to enlarge their businesses and to maximize their profits. Thanks to this, the government can collect more tax in future. Kemal thinks that heavy-duty also prevents the development of commerce which results in the decrease in the public capital and the income of the state respectively. Since the heavy tax in goods causes a slowdown in transactions, commerce and public revenues get harm in the end. The fourth is that heavy taxes prompt smuggling and covering up the amount of income from the state. Hence, it results in moral corruption in society. Moreover, people might resort to exact a tribute to pay their taxes. All lead to the moral breakdown among the individuals since everyone is now forced to exploit illegal means to lighten their burdens. From now on, it becomes impossible to levy tax fairly. In conclusion, Namık Kemal wants to demonstrate the disadvantages of heavy taxation which ends in the loss of state incomes and the moral breakdown in the society. For this reason, he warns the state against short-run gains since the decrease in tax burden is more beneficial both for the state and for the enterprises in the long-run.

The fourth principle of economics is that *everyone is supposed to pay their taxes and the state has to designate a moderate amount of tax for everybody*. If this is not the case, the

¹⁷⁸ “*Tekalif*,” 2.

others are forced to pay more and this is unfair. Namık Kemal explains that everyone is equal to obey the law, hence people are equal to pay their taxes. Related with this principle, the main legality of tax relies on the people's right of utilization from the government. Here, paying taxes is a sacrifice and people who pay their taxes should be able to take advantage of the government.

On the question of determining the amount of tax which people must pay, Namık Kemal defends that *the amount of tax should not be based on the income of people*. He criticizes those people who claim that person and capital should form the basis of tax. If the individual income tax is based on the ground of the wealth of the person, this will mean a capital or a dividend tax, so it will be a misattribution. On the other hand, if this tax is collected equally from everyone, it will be not fair to excise the rich and the poor. Although the capital tax is an easier way to designate the wealth, it cannot always reflect the actual potency of the taxpayer. It is questionable because first, whether the capital is used to invest, it is supposed to be excised twice. Second, those capitals which temporarily differ from their amount of investment are equally excited. Third, it is supposed to excuse professors or lawyers who are not relied on the capital from paying tax. Fourth, the tax taken from the capital is not reliable way than the tax taken from dividend (*temettü*). Namık Kemal at this point evaluates the opposite argument. According to some authorities, if the capital forms the basis of tax, those who possess it will lean to investing it which is more beneficial for the economy. Namık Kemal finds this argument wanting because no one voluntarily holds the capital which can bring more prosperity if it is invested. The other issue which is questioned under this principle is that some people argue that the harmful habits of the individuals should be the basis of the tax. In other words, the government should impose more tax on the goods or entertainments which harms the individuals. Namık Kemal claims that this idea can be seemed beneficial but can have some disadvantages. First, to excise these habits cannot make them lawful. If the purpose here is to make them lawful, what is the purpose to excise heavily them to prohibit? Second, this sets the stage for the elimination of the bad habits of the society which it provided the government with the sources which it needs. If these habits do not exist anymore, how the government provided herself with the sources which she needs. In the end, if the tax cannot eliminate these habits from the society, the state will sell these habits.

Another discussion is here that the *tax should be one kind*. Namık Kemal claims that the reason behind is that this is the most cost-free way to do it. Second is that in this way the distribution of the tax burden will be fairer since it is not possible to know who actually undertakes the burden of a tax. According to some economists, he explains, the burden of the tax is undertaken by the consumer eventually. They prove their points demonstrating the fact that the burden of the tax (for a dealer) is overcome by the new markups. However, the value of goods subject to the norms of sale by auction and the demand for the good. The need and the demand, in addition to this, always change from time to time and person to person. Therefore, it must be known by the state how much of the state tax on a good is undertaken by the taxpayers of each process of production, distribution, and consumption of the good, and how these taxpayers divide the amount of the tax among themselves. Also, compared to these conditions, those who need more pay most of the tax, yet this is unfair for Namık Kemal claiming “Tax should be taken from surplus to requirement.”¹⁷⁹

Namık Kemal also argues that *direct taxes are more reliable than indirect taxes*. The indirect taxes in the Ottoman case are called as *rüsum* which includes taxes on animals, stamps, customs, and so on. Namık Kemal argues that these taxes are vulnerable to cheats and they are costly. The direct taxes, on the other hand, since everybody will know how much tax burden is on their shoulders, and this results in having a grasp of the government spending, are more credible for the individuals. Here we see that he clearly opposes arbitrary excising which prevents the development of the free-trade model.¹⁸⁰ Namık Kemal’s thoughts and offers on the tax issue, as one can see, are consistent although they were hard to achieve in the Ottoman Empire. His ideas involve more leaning towards the principles of economic liberalism of that age.

Kemal insists that government has no distinctive requirements other than the common public necessities.¹⁸¹ For this reason, it has to consider its expenses when it excises people.¹⁸² His article “Our Expenses and Incomes”, Namık Kemal criticises the overall tax system of the

¹⁷⁹ “*Tekalif*,” 2.

¹⁸⁰ İnsel, 46.

¹⁸¹ Namık Kemal. “*Masraf ve Iradımız*”, *İbret*, No:90, 10 Zilkaide 1289 / 9 January 1873.

¹⁸² Çavdar, 51.

government.¹⁸³ While he reflects his worries about vast public borrowings of the government (“*Ah! Niçin bu kadar borç alınmış?*”), he also proffers some ways to achieve an increase in the incomes of the state: the advancement of public wealth, imposing new taxes, and increasing the existing taxes. Even if the last point which he asserts seems contradictory with his previous thoughts, he explains that the principle of an increase in proportion can be beneficial only in customs duties. On the other hand, increase in proportion in other taxes which are already moderate and heavy, set the stage for a decrease in yields. He refers that this idea, a moderate level in taxes was already promoted in his article related to the taxes - *Tekalif*. Moreover, according to him, good governance is connected with an increase and a decrease in ratios. The increase in the income of the government is possible if and only with the discount in the ratio of the taxes. In this way, the consumption increases since the demand for a good depends on its cheapness, and the cheapness is determined by the ratio of the tax on the good.¹⁸⁴ Namık Kemal suggests that if the government cuts down the ratio of the tax on the goods by one or one and a half per cent, its amount of incomes increases.¹⁸⁵ He proves his point giving examples from foreign countries, such as Britain and France. These countries abolished some taxes, but this did not cause the downturn of the incomes of the countries. Surprisingly, the incomes of the states rose. He says that in 1842, the tariff revenue of England was eighteen million lira (the currency of the Ottoman Empire). The government abolished and increased customs of the amount of eight million lira though the income boosted tax receipts to twenty million lira. Another example is from France of Turgot. Although Turgot lowered the fishing taxes in half in 1775, the income of the state did not shrink. The examples of Namık Kemal are many though are limited in the British Empire and France which were the countries implemented full-fledged liberal economy. He concludes his arguments suggesting that the Ottoman state can also undertake this measure. By doing this, he demonstrates the fact that the incomes of the Ottoman government did not shrink when the export duty lowered by one per cent from twelve per cent. The state can swiftly get a favourable result in this way.¹⁸⁶ Notwithstanding, he warns that these measures are not valid in the estate tax and the personal income tax since the decrease in tax in estate and income taxes does not maximize the estate and properties.

¹⁸³ Çavdar, 46.

¹⁸⁴ “*Masraf ve Iradımız*,” 1.

¹⁸⁵ “*Masraf ve Iradımız*,” 1.

¹⁸⁶ “*Masraf ve Iradımız*,” 2.

Another issue which was tackled by Namık Kemal was the problem of internal customs duty. He questions the existence of the customs duty which was implemented on goods which were sent one place to another in the territories of the country by sea to be processed. Its harmful effects are much more than the concession agreements with the foreigners which gave them permission to commerce within the territories of the empire.¹⁸⁷ It was obvious to him, and the principles of economics he says, that this affects the prices of goods which was detrimental to the national industry. In economics, he often highlights, when the tax on a good is decreased, the demand for the good increases. This results in an increase in the amount of the tax income of the state in the long run.¹⁸⁸ It is indisputable that if the internal customs duty is abolished, both the industry of the country and the commerce revives and the incomes of the state do not reduce. He exemplifies the tax on export duty which formerly excised by twelve per cent. He suggests that “When this ratio was reduced by eight per cent and one per cent gradually, the amount of export duty was never diminished. Counter to those years which the export duty was set by twelve per cent, now the incomes of the export duty occur equal to or above the amount of income of those years which was set by twelve per cent.”¹⁸⁹ While he offers his solutions related with the internal customs duty, and the other questions related with the economy of the country, he insists that the rules of economics are clear and since these rules rely on the calculation, they do not change anywhere and in no case. For these reasons, the Ottoman Empire had to adopt the rules of economics. Furthermore, in the same article, Kemal mentions the political conditions of the country to clarify the reasons for and the consequences of some harmful economic regulations of the government. One of them was the given of the concession of the Ottoman domestic commerce to the Europeans by Reşit Paşa. Although the political consequences of this act provided the government with the purpose which the government sought, the economic repercussions of those privileges precipitated the existing domestic trade and industry. In the same manner, under these conditions, the Ottoman artisans and merchants now had to find the other way of living.

¹⁸⁷ Namık Kemal, “*Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*”, *İbret*, No. 57, 19 Ramazan 1289 / 20 November 1872, pg.1-2.

¹⁸⁸ “*Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*,” 1.

¹⁸⁹ “*Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*,” 1.

In the meantime, he warns that it is wrong to believe if the balance of trade is provided and foreign goods are not bought, the wealth of the state increases. This idea does not seem as valid to him. He believes that even if this were possible, the Europeans would not let this happen; in other words, they would insist to impose the free trade conditions upon the Ottoman government, since they also did this in China which is far away from Europe. This is interesting to think of since this article of Namık Kemal belongs to November 20, 1872, which is after the 1838 Free Trade Agreement between Great Britain and the Ottoman government. It seems that the full-fledged implementation of free trade conditions is not possible to speak of in those years since Namık Kemal argues that the Europeans would not “leave us alone”¹⁹⁰ to determine our own economic policies. For this reason, the Ottoman state ought not to resist the “winds of progress.”¹⁹¹

Şerif Mardin links the Young Ottomans’ attitudes toward the knowledge to their desire of the Empire’s perpetuity.¹⁹² For this reason, they gave huge importance to consciousness, working, and comprehension.¹⁹³ We confront this feature of the society in Namık Kemal’s article, called “*İbret*.” Namık Kemal evaluates the progress of humanity within the recent century. Advancement in technology, specifically the technology of the steam engine which made easier the transportation between the continents. Progress in medicine and law together with the appearance of the press improved the living standards of the human being all around the world. In accordance with this progress, the talent of human beings competes against the borders of imagination. He thinks that it is vital to look at and learn from the progress in the Western countries consciously.¹⁹⁴ Namık Kemal describes this progress worthily with his talent of men of letters in his article called “*İbret*” or “*Lesson*”¹⁹⁵. He concludes the topic of advancement in economics. Thanks to the newly arrived notion of division of labour in economics, an unskilled worker had a chance to become versed in his task.¹⁹⁶ Moreover, he asserts that the unskilled worker is now more adept than the old

¹⁹⁰ “*Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*,” 2.

¹⁹¹ “*Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*,” 2.

¹⁹² Mardin, 450.

¹⁹³ Mardin, 450.

¹⁹⁴ Ülken, 94.

¹⁹⁵ Namık Kemal, “*İbret*”, *İbret*, No: 3, 11 Rebiülahir 1289 / 18 Haziran 1872, pg. 1-2.

¹⁹⁶ “*İbret*,” 1.

polymath (*hezarfen*, which means in the Ottoman Turkish, a person who is talented in many skills in different disciplines). Also, he produces ten or fifteen more times than the old competent.

This article also shows us the awareness of big corporations of Namık Kemal. Together with this awareness, he is not also unable to hide his astonishment on the spread of commerce (“*Ticaret bir garip itibar buldu.*”¹⁹⁷) As a strong observer, Namık Kemal infers that this new order gave rise to individuals who were now wealthier than a thousand corporations and also corporations more powerful than a state. In the end, the Ottoman Empire also should learn her lesson from this enormous progress in every aspect of life. Although the advancement in law as such in *Mecelle* and *Tanzimat* which all are progressive steps and the advancement in the military, the school in medicine and military college in the country, there is not enough progress in education, Namık Kemal complains of. The reasons behind the lagging behind of the Ottoman Empire are the lack of factory, the inability to establish a corporation, and the absence of a Muslim bank. The non-existence of these institutions gave rise to the lagging behind in industry, commerce, and capital accumulation.¹⁹⁸ The wealth of the country depends on the meeting of these requirements. In other words, the unimproved commerce, industry, and banking system prevented capital accumulation in the country. In the end, we can draw a conclusion that Namık Kemal believes that private enterprise, the establishment of Western-like corporations are necessary to enhance the country.¹⁹⁹ Şerif Mardin interprets this article as the increasing awareness of the importance of the materialistic conception both in historical development and in historical and societal problems among the Young Ottomans.²⁰⁰

One of the most striking arguments of Namık Kemal is his thought of the limitation of the duties of the state.²⁰¹ It is intriguing to hear from a widely-accepted nationalist intellectual of the country that “It is surely beyond doubt that the state is not a father, or a master, or a

¹⁹⁷ “*İbret,*” 1.

¹⁹⁸ “*İbret,*” 2.

¹⁹⁹ Çavdar, 45.

²⁰⁰ Mardin, 451.

²⁰¹ Çavdar, 51.

guardian, or a tutor of the people.”²⁰² This ‘tutelage’ reflects the patrimonial features of the Ottoman society, and Namık Kemal strongly opposes that system which hinders the society from being productive.²⁰³ Not only Namık Kemal but also the other members of the Young Ottomans society often express their annoyance about the tutelage of the society. According to Şerif Mardin, Namık Kemal’s approach to the government as ‘*invention*’ reflects his progressive and activist side of his political liberalism.²⁰⁴ He claims that the state should serve her people, the improvement of the country, and the progression of civilization. This is the best way to contribute to the benefit of both his people and the whole of humanity. In addition to this, he recommends that people also should relieve themselves from a tutor and a guardian. To him, “Labour is the only way to achieve anything.”²⁰⁵

The expansion of trade with the Western countries in the nineteenth century necessitated new regulations in the trade laws and in the courts of the Ottoman Empire. Especially after the 1838 Baltalimani Trade Agreement between the Ottoman state and Britain, foreign merchants and goods invaded the markets of the country and the new precautions to prevent any discordance between the parties came into prominence. Namık Kemal, in his article *On the Justice and the Courts*²⁰⁶, speaks of the disorder of the commercial courts in the country. The missions of the new courts are not truly clear. He explains the conditions of the courts all around the country and the reasons behind this disorder specifically. The issue concerns us here is related to the commercial courts of the country which say a lot about the nature of the commerce with the foreigners and the commercial policies of the Ottoman state. He complains about that the domain of the commerce of the country became the administration of the foreigner (“*Ticaret bir ecnebi hükümeti haline girmiş.*”²⁰⁷) The commercial courts in those places where are crowded with the foreigners are now haunted by the Frenchs; otherwise, they are dysfunctional.²⁰⁸ The bifurcation of the courts as the sharia courts and

²⁰² “*İbret,*” 2.

²⁰³ İnsel, 46.

²⁰⁴ Mardin, 331.

²⁰⁵ “*İbret,*” 2.

²⁰⁶ Namık Kemal, “*Adalet ve Mahkemeler Hakkında*”, *İbret*, No:54, 15 Ramazan 1289 / 16 Kasım 1872. pg. 1-2

²⁰⁷ “*Adalet ve Mahkemeler Hakkında,*” 1.

²⁰⁸ “*Adalet ve Mahkemeler Hakkında,*” 1.

thenezamiyeh courts had a lot to answer for the disorder of the court system. As for the commercial courts, they only hear the cases of those foreigners as long as the concession agreements are permanent. Accordingly, Namık Kemal maintains that the existence of the concession agreements with the foreigners do harm further the justice system of the country. According to him, the only way to recover the commercial courts is to abolish the concession agreements. As one can see, there is strong opposition against both the concession agreements and the functions of the commercial courts in the country. Yet, Hilmi Ziya Ülken writes that “... As an indispensable result of the idea of freedom, the new generation defended the liberty of the customs since the first economist of the country Sakizli Ohannes Pasha. Namık Kemal also did so. Yet, they could not estimate the harmful consequences of the expansionism of the foreign capital in economically underdeveloped countries. Moreover, since the foreign capital protected the minority groups in the territories of the Ottoman Empire and provided them with economic development, the free-customs system would totally destroy the economy of the empire.”²⁰⁹ Ülken does not give which article of Namık Kemal proves that yet he continues “...and this poses a huge mistake for the Turkish economy.”²¹⁰ This claim seems a little bit controversial, however. As mentioned above, in his article *Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*, he accuses the political authorities of signing 1838 Trade Treaty which set the stage for the impoverishment of the craftsmen of the country. It is more acceptable to argue that Namık Kemal might want to be prepared more favourable terms for the development of free trade system in the country, yet this kind of approach is hard to get from his writings.

5.2. His Writings in *Hürriyet*

Hürriyet is another newspaper in which we come across the writings of Namık Kemal on the economic issues of the empire. He published this newspaper in London between June 1868 and June 1870 together with Ziya Pasa thanks to the financial assistance of Mustafa Fazıl Paşa. Kemal wrote in this paper until the fifty-fifth issue. The writings of him in *Hürriyet* predates those in *İbret* in which we witness more analytical and theoretical views on the

²⁰⁹ Ülken, 98.

²¹⁰ Ülken, 98.

economy of the empire and economics overall. In the seventh issue of Hürriyet, he published an article called An Article On the Wealth of Our Country and the Existent Administration in August 1868. Kemal tries to figure out why the Ottoman Empire could not use its rich resources efficiently while the other nations did.

All authors who write on economics accepted the measure of “*Laissez-faire laissez-passer*” which means the absolute freedom in commerce and business. Yet, no matter what the job (is), freedom is beneficial since the virtue of nature is freedom. However, due to some failures, freedom in trade (*hürriyet-i ticaret*) became a harmful thing for the Ottomans.
(*Tesiri bizde zıddına düştü devaların*)²¹¹

The reason for the above-mentioned situation is the timing of the acceptance of free-trade of the Ottoman state for Kemal. He does not reject the cause of the free-trade but rejects the timing which was the time of the decline of business and skills in the country. Moreover, he complains about the domestic trade which changed hands after the certain treaty. Kemal does not refer to the agreement by name but it is supposed to be the Balta Limani Treaty of 1838 with Great Britain. Afterwards, he writes that this led to an increase in the taxes and the borrowing foreign debt. In the next issue, he continues to explain the reasons for fiscal deficit counting wars, waste, and the incomes which were held out on the state by the officers.²¹² Another article is on the tax of Istanbul. His views are explained here will mention also in later years in Ibret newspaper. The essential thing here is the policy of the government not to tax foreigners who do business in Beyoğlu, Pera, Kadıköy and other places of Istanbul.²¹³ Also, these foreigners do not pay tax to the state for their properties in these districts of İstanbul. Kemal repeats one of the principles of economics which states that the tax should be collected from the capital but from income from the capital. This is essential because the property of people does not decrease. In the sixty-second and sixty-third issues of the newspaper, there is an article called Fiscal Balance I- Service in which he

²¹¹ Namık Kemal. “*Servet-i Mülkiyeye ve İdare-i Hazıraya Dair Bir Makale*,” Hürriyet, 21 Rebiyülahir 1285/ 10 Ağustos 1868. No. 7. pg. 3 “*Fenn-i servet müelliflerinin kaffesi “Bırakın geçsin, bırakın yapsın” mislini –ki mana-yı lazımsı ticaret ve sanatın hürriyet-i mutlakası demektir-şiar ittihaz eylediler. Vakıa her ne işte olursa olsun menfaat hürriyettedir, çünkü muktezyı tabiat hürriyettir. Lakin bazı arızalarla bu hürriyet-i ticaret Osmanlılar için ayn-ı mazarrat oldu.*”

²¹² Namık Kemal. “*Mülkümüzin Servetine Dair Geçen Numerodaki Makaleye Zeyl*,” Hürriyet, 28 Rebiyülahir 1285/ 17 August 1868. No: 8. pg. 2

²¹³ Namık Kemal. “*İstanbul Vergisi*,” Hürriyet, 7 Ramazan 1285 / 21 December 1868. No. 26, pg. 3

commentates the necessity of the balance in the incomes and expenses of the state complaining about the lack of or inefficacy of books of the treasury.²¹⁴ The Department of Finance claims that the incomes of the state increased thanks to the incomes from the salt and tobacco monopolies and customs which means also the raise in agriculture and commerce. Namık Kemal opposes this claim of the Treasury saying that the monopolies created later.²¹⁵ He adds that one-fifth of tithe incomes disappears under the responsibility of the *mültezims* (taxmen). In the next issue, he continues the balance of the budget issue comparing the budget of France and the budget of the Ottoman Empire.²¹⁶ Two of the most important incomes of the Ottoman Empire are provided with tithe and tax respectively while tax is the most important income of the treasury of France. Kemal states that the Ottoman state excises the agriculture which is essential for life. Although the range of tax is beneficial because it helps to divide the time of payment, it is harmful for the Ottoman empire due to the oppression of receivers and *mültezims*. Kemal also criticizes the existence of the tithe tax suggesting that the state can excise estates and assesses instead of excising agriculture.²¹⁷ Moreover, he later on asserts that education and liberty give rise to trade.

The hot topic of the 1860s is foreign borrowing of the empire. *Hürriyet* includes several letters of protest for borrowings of the government. These letters seem to be written in the name of all writers of the newspaper. For this reason, they will be examined in the section belongs to Ziya Paşa.

In conclusion, it is more acceptable that although Namık Kemal believed the cause of political liberalism, he approached with caution to liberal economic regulations in the Ottoman economy. The reasons for this are clear in the economic relationship between the Ottoman Empire and Western European countries especially throughout the nineteenth century which will be explained in the other part of this work. Together with this, he leans towards the liberal economy and free trade, and he believed if the Ottoman Empire implements these policies, she can achieve economic development. It is vital for him, as he

²¹⁴ Namık Kemal. “*Muvazene-i Maliye I- Hizmet.*” *Hürriyet*, 22 Cemaziyelevvel 1286/ 30 August 1869, No. 62, pg.1

²¹⁵ “*Muvazene-i Maliye I- Hizmet,*” 1.

²¹⁶ Namık Kemal. “*Muvazene-i Maliye-II İbret,*” *Hürriyet*, 29 Cemaziyelevvel 1286/ 6 September 1869, No. 63 pg.1

²¹⁷ “*Muvazene-i Maliye-II İbret,*” 2.

explained in his article *İbret*, the empire must keep up with the age. Also, this is an inevitable process since the European powers do anything to incorporate the Ottoman empire in the world economic system. Yet, this does not mean he is not aware of the realities of the state. While he explains what is necessary to achieve economic development, he also discusses to what extent these measures can be implemented in the Ottoman society. Contrary to those arguments, which include those of Hilmi Ziya Ülken and Tevfik Çavdar, Namık Kemal is somewhat indecisive about the consequences of free trade model and is more close to the necessity of the implementation of protective customs duties. As for the state intervention in education and labour, all drew the attention of the Young Ottomans and occupied centre stage in the debates of the Ottoman intellectuals. Namık Kemal, in this case, was aware of the necessities of the Ottoman society. In accordance with this, he adopted a pragmatic approach to the issue asserting the backwardness of the society. This attitude shows us despite their closer intellectual ties with European countries and their ideological closeness to political liberalism, Namık Kemal thought that economic pragmatism was much more sustainable in the Empire. Moreover, his statements on the new legislative regulations (particularly on foreign capital and investment) and the commercial courts of the Empire show us how he is concerned about the expansion of commercial privileges to the European countries which has resulted in the decrease in the living standards of the Ottoman artisans and merchants and harmed the justice system of the country. His awareness of historical developments which were not favourable to the implementation of free trade policies in the Ottoman Empire necessitated a cautious stance against the liberal economy.

CHAPTER 6

ALI SUAVI ON THE OTTOMAN ECONOMY

Ali Suavi started to write for *Muhbir* newspaper which was published by Filip Efendi in 1867 in Istanbul. Here, Suavi wrote contrarian pieces on the policies of the Ottoman government criticising Ali Pasha's policies on Crete and Egypt issues which occupied the Ottoman government agenda in those days. The Ottoman bureaucrats, especially Ali and Fuat Pashas, saw this kind of oppositional writings as harmful for the state, so the government declared *Kararname-i Ali* in 1867 which was a censor law and declared the closure of *Muhbir*. Later on, Suavi went to Paris on May 1867, and he continued to publish *Le Mukhbir* in August 1867 in London, later changed to *The Mukhbir*. The first sentence of this new newspaper was "*Muhbir finds a country where saying the truth is not unlawful and continues its publication.*" This was a strong sign that Ali Suavi was determinant to continue his oppositional writings against the policies of Ali Pasha and the Ottoman government, *Bab-ı Ali*. Here in Paris, he also met with Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha, and attended their meetings, although their friendship did not last long. İsmail Doğan writes that one of the things which held them together, in the beginning, was their common response to the government action in Crete issue and the decision to leaving off Belgrad castle to Serbians. In other words, the common view on the political issues of the country set the stage for the common political opinion among them.²¹⁸ In the meantime, they held a meeting in Mustafa Fazıl Pasha's mansion in Paris in 1867 and they decided that Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha will publish *Hürriyet* and Suavi will publish *Le Mukhbir* on his own. The disagreements among the Young Ottoman began in this first meeting.²¹⁹ After 1870, Ali Suavi had almost no relationship with the Young Ottoman society.

²¹⁸İsmail. Doğan, *Tanzimatın İki Ucu, Münif Paşa ve Ali Suavi: Sosyo-pedagojik Bir Karşılaştırma* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1991), 198.

²¹⁹ Ibid, 201.

Le Mukhbir was financially supported between 1867 and 1869 by Mustafa Fazıl Pasa who later agreed with the Porte. In this occasion, Ali Suavi did not want his help and in Paris, he began to publish his own newspaper *Ulum* (Science). *Ulum* served the dissemination of Ali Suavi's ideas on education, philosophy, economy, religion rather than focusing only on the policies of the Porte. In other words, this newspaper contained intellectual and scholarly articles which reflects the views of Ali Suavi. *Ulum* was published in Paris from July 1869 to September 1870 ran for 25 issues. Its formation is more like a journal rather than a newspaper. Entirely under Suavi's editorial control, *Ulum* had 1416 pages in total in which the page numbering is continuous. We also encounter here with his role of instructor.²²⁰

His views on the Ottoman economy are found in *Ulum*. Here, he wrote about the foreign debts of Bab-ı Ali, railways, taxes, interests in a detailed way. He also offers solutions to these problems. However, most of his writings on the problems of the Ottoman economy in newspapers do not go beyond to state the problems and to warn the bureaucrats of Bab-ı Ali. His yearbook formats books on the Ottoman economy are important sources representing his ideas and his ways of solution to economic problems of the country. The articles in *Ulum* and these yearbooks for Turkey, namely *Türkiye fi Sene 1288* and *Türkiye 1290* will be used here to grasp his ideas on the economy.

Ulum newspaper contains some articles related to the problems of the Ottoman economy. In the 1860s, the burning issue was foreign borrowing of Bab-ı Ali. The first foreign loan had been borrowed from Great Britain during the Crimean War of 1853-56. The Ottoman Empire continued its borrowing from this date on whilst she was carrying on the broad reform movement. Ali Suavi in his articles in *Ulum* often brought into question the foreign loan. In his article series called "*Saving (1)*", he defined what is saving and what kind of measures were specified in the official regulations.²²¹ In "*Saving (2)*", he complained of the lack of any institution to direct low-income people to save showing what kind of policies implemented in Britain and France to encourage people to save.²²² While highlighting the importance of saving, he mentions that Islam is based on saving and Koran criticised waste.

²²⁰ Ibid, 270.

²²¹ Ali Suavi, "*Tasarruf 1*", *Ulum*, No: 8, 31 Ekim 1869. pg. 423-424.

²²² Ali Suavi, "*Tasarruf 2*", *Ulum*, No: 10, Aralık 1869. pg. 607-612.

According to him, the government policies prevent people to save, and especially the taxes like tithe, *iltizam*, and other taxes hinder people from saving their earnings.²²³ Suavi mentions the burden of the taxes on the people without specifying what kind of steps ought to be taken off by the government on this issue. Another article of Suavi tackles with the situation of the commerce in the Empire. Here, he explains that trade is not in demand among the Muslim population, and the Muslim people are also ignorant of how to do business.²²⁴ Even merchants have no idea about the set of accounts, and those moneychangers who have the capital to invest do not prefer investing in commercial enterprises.²²⁵ Non-Muslim people, on the other hand, have the ability and wish to do business. Thanks to this tendency, according to Ali Suavi, they could get wealth while Muslims invest in farming which is less lucrative than trade. Since the Ottoman Empire situated in the most suitable geography for commerce, the foreign merchants and magnates are everywhere in the country. Suavi also mentions another drawback of the lack of industry. It causes the exportation of the huge amounts of raw material. This results in the importation of processed goods which are more valuable than the raw materials.

In his “*Sanayi-i Der Memalik-i Osmaniye*”, Suavi evaluates the situation of the industry in the Empire touching again Islam. Islam is not against industry, on the contrary, it appreciates it. He criticises Turks who have always been inclined to be “pasha” rather than learning a craft and doing business.²²⁶ Muslim people encourage their children to be state officers. In the circumstances, the domain of trade changed hands, and Christians got wealth. Here, we come across a discriminative comparison of Muslim and non-Muslim population of the society in Ali Suavi’s articles. While doing this and evaluating the economic issues, he mainly relies on Koran, hadiths, and Islamic law. Europeans take advantage of their discoveries of the machinery, and they expanded their markets. He continues his argument giving examples from the industrial cities of the Empire and argues that the production of the industrial goods such as cotton and textile industries in Diyarbakır and Bursa declined due to the abolishment of the monopoly and state

²²³ “*Tasarruf 2*,” 611.

²²⁴ Ali Suavi. “*Memalik-i Osmaniye’de Ticaret*”, *Ulum*, No: 12, no date- 1870. pg. 739 (735-743).

²²⁵ “*Memalik-i Osmaniye’de Ticaret*,” 741.

²²⁶ Ali Suavi. “*Sanayi-i Der Memalik-i Osmaniye*”, *Ulum*, No: 12, no date-1870. pg. 728 (727-732).

subsidies.²²⁷ Although he does not explain to what extent monopolies and state subsidies are necessary for industrial development, it is clear that he approves the existence of the state intervention in the economy to a certain degree. According to him, to sustain the weak industrial development of the country, the state subsidies are essential. The security of the country also does matter to do business and to maintain good treasury. Maintaining security in the country contributes to the increase of commerce, industry revenues, and general expenditures ameliorating the treasury.²²⁸ Moreover, maintaining security in the country is related to producing good politics. The thing attracts the attention in the articles of Ali Suavi - the same with the articles of Namık Kemal- is his examples chosen from the British Empire and France. He gives examples of French politics classifying them as good and bad for the treasury.

The other factor to maintain good treasury is the reputation of the state both at home and abroad.²²⁹ Suavi claims that this financial measure is a science, but Eastern nations do not know that. The Ottoman treasury has been commanded badly borrowing from foreign creditors and failing to pay it on time. Since the money could not be used in an effective way and the state failed to pay the loans on the stock to people, the state fell into disgrace at home.²³⁰ Furthermore, he speaks of the Ottoman Bank which did not lend at interest to the Empire although it had teeth. This caused borrowing from other states at much more interest rates. This was because of the disreputability of the state. According to Ali Suavi, there were three reasons for the inability of the Ottoman Empire benefitting from the capital. First, the sources of wealth were hypothecated to foreigners to cover the expenses of today. Second, there are not enough ways and transportation facilities to take advantage of the resources. Third, the financial administration is bad and there are many corruptions in the administration.²³¹

²²⁷ “*Sanayi-i Der Memalik-i Osmaniye*”, pg. 731.

²²⁸ Ali Suavi. “*İyi Maliye İyi Politikadan Olur*”, *Ulum*, No: 13, 16 February 1870. pg. 774 (772-777).

²²⁹ Ali Suavi. “*İtibar-ı Kredi*”, *Ulum*, No: 17, 17 April 1870. pg. 1049 (1049-1058).

²³⁰ “*İtibar-ı Kredi*”, 1052.

²³¹ “*İtibar-ı Kredi*”, 1057.

Ali Suavi also published several yearbooks (*salnames*) in the early 1870s which were devoted to Turkey and Egypt following European usage referring to the Ottoman Empire as Turkey. These yearbooks contain a wealth of information about geography, trade, climate, coinage, and communications of the Ottoman Empire and Egypt. However, Suavi does not indicate from which sources he benefitted when he writes these almanacks.²³² There is a section in the first yearbook for Turkey devoted to the industry in which Suavi discusses the decline of industry in Turkey claiming the same reasons led to the decline of the agriculture as well. The reasons for this decline are the guarding of old practices, the high cost of labour, and the tax on exports.²³³ Suavi is concerned about the fact that the foreigners have control over the foreign trade of the country.²³⁴ In the second yearbook, he reestablishes his explanation for the decline of industry and agriculture in Turkey. He argues that the legal regulation of the country led to the wealth and prosperity of the nation.²³⁵ In other words, legal arrangements of a country are essential for the advance of wealth, industry, and trade. He insistently emphasizes the fact that the foreign trade of the country is dominated by foreigners which supports there are many faults in the area of trade.²³⁶ The section called *Trade of Turkey* includes the interpretations of Suavi on agriculture and trade of the country. He writes that “Turkey is a country of agriculture. As the demand for the goods of agriculture is high, the supply will be high as well.”²³⁷ In Turkey, “There is no science of trade and people are ignorant of how and what methods foreigners use to profit, such as the principles of saving, the benefit from interest, and the measures to profit from foreign capitals.”²³⁸

Le Mukhbir also includes his articles mentioned on the economic problems of the empire. Here, it will be tried to reflect his some articles on the issue benefitting mostly from the

²³² İsmail Doğan, *Tanzimatın İki Ucu, Münif Paşa ve Ali Suavi: Sosyo-pedagojik Bir Karşılaştırma* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1991), 252.

²³³ Ali Suavi, *Türkiye fi Sene 1288*. Paris: Victor Goupy, 1871. pg.12

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 47.

²³⁵ Ali Suavi. *Türkiye 1290*. Paris: Victor Goupy, 1873.pg. 37.

²³⁶ *Ibid*, 74.

²³⁷ *Ibid*, 74.

²³⁸ *Ibid*, 74.

secondary sources which were written on either Ali Suavi or *Muhbir*. On October 1867, he offers some solutions for the financial crisis of the empire in the six-numbered *Le Mukhbir*. First of them is to save the treasury the “plunder” of both the bureaucrats who spend money on unnecessary expenses and moneylenders who embezzle. The rearranging of the taxation system is another solution for Suavi because he explains that it is unfair to expect the same amount of money from a village of which population could be declined recently. He warns the government to be careful when taxing the people. Suavi also raises the question of the recovery of debts. The government should be fair on the recovery of the debts, and it should not be sold oxen of the people. The fourth is related to the collection of duties. The government should collect duties on time. The fifth is that the government should not take the cap round because subsidies are harmful to the treasury.²³⁹ The problem related to these subsidies is that the people do not know how and where these subsidies are spent. Suavi defends that Bab-ı Ali should be transparent on this issue and should not misuse this amount of money without the consent of the people.²⁴⁰ In the next issue of *Le Mukhbir*, he speaks internal and foreign borrowing which run into the ground. Unfortunately, the government could not use them as the revenue-generating investment instrument. This also causes bringing the state into discredit.²⁴¹ The bureaucrats should give up wasteful spending which led to the miserableness of the masses. If the government regulates the incomes and the expenses considering the people’s “patience” and provides the continuity with its policies, the state would prosper.²⁴² On the issue of “continuity in the bureaucracy, Suavi speaks of the relations between successor and predecessor and defends that “The successor should not be capable of crossing the predecessor’s path.” (*“Halef, selefin işini bozmağa asla muktedir olmamalıdır.”*)²⁴³ Moreover, he accuses the bureaucrats of holding their money in the banks of France and Britain.²⁴⁴ He blames the statesmen for the poorness of the masses and the dire straits of the empire stating that “We are all in the same boat. How

²³⁹ Ali Suavi. “*İslah-ı Maliyenin Tevakkuf Ettığı Esbab-ı Seb’a*,” *Le Mukhbir*, 5 October 1867, no: 6, pg. 3-4

²⁴⁰ “*İslah-ı Maliyenin Tevakkuf Ettığı Esbab-ı Seb’a*,” pg. 1-2

²⁴¹ Ali Suavi. “*6 Numaralı Muhbir’de İslah-ı Maliyenin Tevakkuf Ettığı Esbab-ı Seb’a’nın Mabadı*,” *Le Mukhbir*, 12 October 1867, no: 7, pg. 4

²⁴² “*6 Numaralı Muhbir’de İslah-ı Maliyenin Tevakkuf Ettığı Esbab-ı Seb’a’nın Mabadı*,” 2.

²⁴³ “*6 Numaralı Muhbir’de İslah-ı Maliyenin Tevakkuf Ettığı Esbab-ı Seb’a’nın Mabadı*,” 2.

²⁴⁴ Ali Suavi. *Le Mukhbir*, 14 November 1867, no: 12, pg. 2

can one expect from us not to scream?”²⁴⁵ He again expresses his annoyance on that only Muslim people affect from these dire conditions, not non-Muslims who are protected by foreign states. The reasons for this situation in the empire include the oppression of the taxmen and the officers against the people while there is any authority for the people to complain about the administrative infractions. Ignorance is the most important cause of this.²⁴⁶ On the issue of borrowing, he warns both the bureaucrats of Bab-ı Ali and the foreign states that these debts do not belong to the people because nobody knows where the money is spent and the government did not inform the people of the borrowing.²⁴⁷ Here we encounter the transparency principle of a democratic government. Suavi claims that people should be informed about government expenditures and the government should receive the people’s approval on the usage of subsidies.

To conclude, when compared to those of Namık Kemal, Suavi’s articles on the economy of the empire remain more observational pieces calling the bureaucrats to account for the failures of the economy and aim to form public opinion to the detriment of newly arriving political elites. The most common themes in these writings were foreign and domestic borrowing of the government, subsidies, commerce and industry of the country, security issues, and to a lesser degree, agriculture. While he treats these subjects, he often uses religious principles to explain issues referring to sharia, Koran, and hadiths. He criticises the statesmen being extravagant, for him, they misused the money which they borrowed in the name of the people, however, without their consent. It is clear that he demands more transparency in the economic policies of the government and thinks that this is the right of the people. The tax issue is another problem regarding the poorness of the “Muslim” subjects of the country. Because of the burden of taxes, people could not save their earnings. However, Suavi does not express his thought further on this issue as in the example of Namık Kemal’s writings which are more theoretical relying on economics. He does not touch the issue of the necessity of capital accumulation to do business, for example. Still, when considered from this point of view, especially on the issue of transparency, we can argue that this reflects the liberal attitude toward economic issues. Suavi’s criticisms against Muslim people’s tendencies regarding the occupation are also

²⁴⁵ Ali Suavi. *Le Mukhbir*, 14 November 1867, no: 12, pg. 3

²⁴⁶ Ali Suavi. *Le Mukhbir*, 28 November 1867, no: 14, pg. 3-4

²⁴⁷ Ali Suavi. *Le Mukhbir*, 28 November 1867, no: 14, pg. 2

worth noting here. Muslim population shows a tendency to either becoming a civil servant or being engaged in agriculture. This causes the enrichment of non-Muslim subjects who invest in a trade which is the moneymaking venture. The differentiation between Muslims and non-Muslims starts with the political and social privileges given by the government:

They [non-Muslims] have privileges that the Muslims also demand but cannot obtain. For example, a Christian is not conscripted if he pays a fee. The Muslims have to give soldiers, but [the Christians] do not. As for the equality in terms of laws and treatment, the Christians are not equal to the Muslims, rather they are superior because the Christians have their local notables [çorbacı], their representatives in the parliament, and their own national assembly under the Patriarch. They have patrons in Europe. Whenever a Christian is harassed by a district governor, he complains to a local notable, and the Patriarchate is informed immediately. The Patriarch appeals to the Sublime Porte. Meanwhile, the embassies also adopt the case, and finally, they have the district governor [who had mistreated this Christian] dismissed.²⁴⁸

Suavi is not comfortable with the idea of the wealthiness of Christians, and he inclines to blame the officials for this situation. The hatred against non-Muslims and the political elites of the era is a common theme in all his economic evaluations. Bernard Lewis writes on Ali Suavi that

A man of strong religious convictions and a pilgrim to Mecca, he is described by a modern Turkish writer as a liberal theologian, by another, perhaps more accurately, as a turbanned revolutionary. Namık Kemal and Ziya were also sincere and devoted Muslims, but they were not prepared to support him in his insistence on a religious reform as the starting-point of a revived Islamic state and law nor in his attacks on the Christians.²⁴⁹

Suavi's these attacks on Christians and othering efforts may have many reasons. Considering the economic direness of the country, he might feel discomfort with unfair resource allocation. At this point, it is valid to assume that he combines his political

²⁴⁸ Ali Suavi, *Le Mukhbir* 2 (1867): 2–3, 8; quoted in Deniz Kılınçoğlu, *The Political Economy of Ottoman Modernity: Ottoman Economic Thought During the Reign of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909)*. (Doctoral Thesis, Princeton University, June 2012), 198.

²⁴⁹ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London; New York [etc.]: issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs [by] Oxford U.P., 1965), 151.

approach on the issue of the inferior position of non-Muslim subjects of the empire considering sharia law and his concerns about the poverty of Muslim population. In addition to this, as Bernard Lewis points out that Namık Kemal and Ziya do not share the same ideas with Suavi in some respects. His *Good Treasury Comes Through Good Policy* expresses his thought on how the trust in government affects the recovery of the economy. He brings the security issue into the forefront if the state wants more investment. Although he is aware of the fact that economic development is dependent on the stability of the government, he does not reach the conclusion of the right combination of political liberalism and economic liberalism. On the issue of the development of industry, he complains of the abolishment of monopoly and state subsidies which set the stage for the decline of the already existent industry in certain regions of the country. This shows us his expectation from the state to regulate certain sectors of the economy. It seems he defends the cause of these subsidies and monopolies without clearly expressing his thought on this matter, for example, what kind of monopoly the country wants for. İsmail Doğan who wrote a valuable source about Ali Suavi argues that Suavi believes in state intervention in the economy. To do this, the government in the first place should assure its people.²⁵⁰ Doğan gives an example from Suavi's writing in *Ulum*, *Cotton Revenue in the Ottoman Empire*²⁵¹, where Suavi speaks of the tax exemption for five years for the cotton production as an incentive in January 1862 and the free cotton seeds for the producers. Suavi writes that many people did not accept cotton seeds for free because they did not trust the government doubting there goes amiss.²⁵² Suavi says that this distrust against the government hurts the industry, agriculture, and trade in the country, and the government's moral support is more important than financial incentives of the government. Doğan concludes that Ali Suavi believes the very cause of government intervention on the economy. This argument seems right for many aspects when it is considered that Ali Suavi actually does not have any referring to the liberal economy doctrine or economics as a scientific discipline. He only considers the necessities of the economy of the empire, writes on what should be done to straighten out everything in the economy. These solutions are closely associated with the Ottoman economy rather than relying on popular economic

²⁵⁰ Doğan, 296.

²⁵¹ Ali Suavi. "*Memalik-i Osmaniye'de Pamuk Hasılatı*", *Ulum*, No: 12, pg. (724-726); quoted in Doğan, 296.

²⁵² "*Memalik-i Osmaniye'de Pamuk Hasılatı*," 726.

doctrines of the day. It is also worth noting that he does not seem that he comprehends the direction of the development of world economy and the gradually increasing integration of the Ottoman economy into the world economy in the middle of the 19th century.



CHAPTER 7

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE EMPIRE IN THE WRITINGS OF ZIYA PASHA

Ziya Pasa as the protégé of Resid Pasa served in the civil service for many years and he also appointed as the third secretary to the Sultan.²⁵³ He had a great political experience in the Imperial Palace, close to the Sultan Abdülmecid (1823-61). As the most distinguished and the eldest member of the Young Ottoman society, he took advantage of his civil service career establishing connections with important persons. During his education and his career, he concentrated on French translating important political texts from this language. Moreover, his experience in the business of the state affected his political ideas, and he constantly laid stress on better administration and administrative practices in his political articles.²⁵⁴ This was mostly because of the abuses he witnessed during his civil service career.²⁵⁵ When Ali Pasha became the grand vizier, things for Ziya Pasa changed. In 1867, Ziya Pasa exiled in Paris because of his oppositional stance against the new bureaucratic class heading by Ali Pasa. In the meantime, Ziya Pasa joined Patriotic Alliance, met with Namık Kemal and Ali Suavi in the house of Mustafa Fazıl Pasa in Paris. Bernard Lewis describes Ziya Pasa as a “consistent Westernizer.”²⁵⁶ He mostly showed himself in his political satires and his support for literary revival during the Tanzimat era. As the supporter of liberal constitutional ideas, here in Paris began to publish *Hürriyet* with Namık Kemal. Although he was well-known with his cultural and religious conservatism²⁵⁷, he followed Frankish ideas throughout his life.

²⁵³ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London; New York [etc.]: issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs [by] Oxford U.P., 1965), 134.

²⁵⁴ Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of the Young Ottoman Thought: a study in the modernization of Turkish political ideas* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962), 337.

²⁵⁵ Mardin, 339.

²⁵⁶ Lewis, 135.

²⁵⁷ Lewis, 136.

His political liberal ideas, especially those concerning the state, resemble in many aspects those of Namık Kemal. Yet, Şerif Mardin states that Namık Kemal was more a theorist while Ziya Pasa produced more on the better administrative practices.²⁵⁸ His distinguishing proposals are related to the political and educational reforms in the Ottoman Empire. However, he gained recognition with his poems. Roderic Davison writes on Ziya Pasa,

From this time on, Ziya produced a fair number of other translations from French, as well as original poems influenced in their modes of thought, though not yet in language, by French example. The most famous of these, his *Terciiibend*, exhibits the influence of western science and agnosticism, a cry of intellectual bewilderment in a world of confusion and injustice.²⁵⁹

Although his political ideas have been studied adequately, his evaluations on the Ottoman economy were not investigated by historians. There is no secondary source on this issue. In Turkish literature, he is always famous with his poems which are mostly political satires. Although his writings on economics and the Ottoman economy, in particular, are very limited, they are worth noting here. His articles in *Hürriyet* published between 1868 and 1870 in Paris and in Geneva respectively will be used in this study to analyse his approach toward the developments in the Ottoman economy at that time. Also, his petition to Sultan Abdülaziz will be used because it includes important economic statements of him.

The twenty-first issue of *Hürriyet* began with a letter of protest for borrowings of Bab-ı Ali.²⁶⁰ This letter seems to be written in the name of all writers of the newspaper because the first-person plural is used throughout the article. They express that they prepared the letter of protest with the signings of one hundred-two people from Istanbul stating that the people of the Ottoman Empire do not accept this borrowing. The reasons for this specified. They assert that this amount of money is not used for the people or investments but for the wasteful spending of the bureaucrats of Bab-ı Ali. Also, foreign borrowing causes bringing into disrepute the state. Since this money will not be used for the benefit of the people,

²⁵⁸ Mardin, 338.

²⁵⁹ Roderic H. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1876* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), 191.

²⁶⁰ (Un-named) "*İstikraz Protestosu*," *Hürriyet*, 2 Şaban 1285/ 26 November 1868. No. 21, pg. 1

Bab-ı Ali cannot borrow in the name of the people. In the next issue, the newspaper also mentions the new borrowing of Bab-ı Ali.²⁶¹ Here, they use the expression of “spendthrift” for the bureaucrats of Bab-ı Ali and draw a parallelism between the wasteful spending of a spendthrift and the bureaucrats of the empire. They repeat the same statements in the letter of protest claiming that nobody knows how what for this amount of money is spent. This is vital for our evaluation since they claim that if people do repay this debt, they have a right to know what for this loan of money will be spent. In other words, this approach represents a liberal form of relations between the state and the people who are taxpayers. The people in their eyes are not “subjects” of the Sultan anymore, on the contrary, since they pay the expenditures of the state, they are citizens who have the right of calling the government to account for how it spent their money.

We come across Ziya’s views on the Ottoman economy in his article called *Salt Monopoly* in which he evaluates the significance of salt for the health of human beings and animals together with the cruelty of taxing this foodstuff by the government in the name of increasing state revenues.²⁶² While he doing this, he reflects his political opinions regarding the administrative malpractices by the grand viziers and the position of the Sultan which is getting worse before his people. He agrees that the state is obliged to collect its direct and indirect taxes from the people. According to him, goods which are essential for life are not taxable, and the amount of tax should be moderate considering the value of a good. If the government fulfils these conditions, it would not have to use force to collect taxes, and in this way, the torture of tax eases off. However, it is the cruelty to try to take advantage of a good which is essential not only for the life of humans but also for animals. He also claims that the state cannot benefit from this tax because the revenue from salt monopoly is gradually decreasing and it cannot cover the expenses anymore. For him, salt monopoly is one of the reasons behind the revolt in Crete. He also forges a link between monopolies which cause people to suffer and councils which help suffering people to complain about this issue as in the examples of European states. There isn’t any authority to complain about in the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, it is the Sultan who is blamed for these malpractices by

²⁶¹ (Un-named) “İstikraz-ı Cedid Üzerine Yeni Osmanlılar Cemiyeti’nin Mütalaatı,” *Hürriyet*, 13 Şaban 1285/ 23 November 1868. No. 22, pg.1

²⁶² Ziya Paşa. “Tuz İnhisarı,” *Hürriyet*, 2 Rebiyülahir 1286 / 12 Temmuz 1869, no: 55, pg. 1

his subjects, not the bureaucrats who established the bord of monopoly in the reign of Sultan Abdülaziz.²⁶³

Another article which reveals the statements of Ziya on the economic situation of the country has an idiosyncratic style of him. In this writing, Ziya Pasa sees Sultan Abdülaziz and Ali Pasa in his dream and talks the Sultan over the reasons for the dismissal of Ali Pasa and the situation of the empire so to say.²⁶⁴ Here, he often speaks of the “plunder” of the bureaucrats or deputies when they overtax the people and borrow from foreigners. This overindebtedness causes foreigners to think of either the totally unawareness of the Sultan of the situation of the country or his “defeat” by his bureaucrats. Because he had served as a state officer in some provinces of Anatolia, he has a knowledge about the livings of the peasants. He often refers to his experiences to describe the situation of the people and the malpractices in the administration of these places. He complains the Sultan that Anatolia is in ruins because of the abuses in the collection of taxes, tithes, duties, and others. He writes that

Before the declaration of Tanzimat, each region was subjugated by feudal lords, now they replaced by notables and council members. They are a law unto themselves. Local administration cannot deny this torture to them. If it denies them, they (the local administrators) undergo what happened to me in Amasya. Since the people of Rumelia and Anatolia are deprived of the ability to grasp the reality behind their troubles, they father these troubles on you (the Sultan). In brief, I had torn your heart out since your subjects knew that you were to blame for salt monopoly and their miserable situations.²⁶⁵

He also mentions the livings of the state officers in İstanbul. He says that because their salaries are not paid for months, they almost hit up for money. Ulema and the employees of

²⁶³ “Tuz İnhisarı,” 2.

²⁶⁴ Ziya Pasa. “Sultan Abdülaziz Han, Ziya Bey, Ali Pasa.” Hürriyet, 5 Recep 1286/ 11 October 1869, No. 68, pg.1

²⁶⁵ “Sultan Abdülaziz Han, Ziya Bey, Ali Pasa,” 2. “Her memleketi kabl t-tanzimat birkaç derebeyi zaptettiği gibi şimdi de vücu ve aza-i meclis istila etmişlerdir. Bunlar ahaliye istedikleri zulüm ve teaddiyi ederler. Hükümet-i mahalliye men'ine kadir olamaz. Eğer men'e tesaddi ederse Amasya'da bendenize vuku bulan hale uğrarlar. Gerek Rumeli ve gerek Anadolu ahalisi çektikleri belaların hepsini Zat-ı Şahanenizden bilirler. Ez cümle tuz inhisarı asr-ı şahanenizde icra olunduğundan bundan dolayı mazhar olduğunuz inkısar hasbe'l-ubudiyet her yerde derunum dağdar ederdi.”

pious foundations are in the same boat as officers. Shopkeepers went bankrupt at the rate of 70-80 per cent since there is no shopping.

The rest of Ziya Pasa's dream publishes in the next issue. Here, he continues to deal with the same issues. He tackles with the problem of additional duties and monopolies which cause the collapsion of moral and physical conditions of the people saying that "The world becomes beggar now." (*Cihan dilenci oldu.*)²⁶⁶ The borrowing of the empire also bothers Ziya Pasa. The borrowings destroy the honour and the reputation of the state. In his petition to Sultan Abdülaziz, he emphasizes the fact that debt of the country is covered by another borrowing.²⁶⁷ Every year, half of the revenue is sent to foreign states. To him, the bureaucrats are to blame for this situation, especially Ali Pasa. It is worth noting that in this petition, he clearly explains his observations of how feudalism or feudal order becomes reality in Anatolia and how the collection of taxes is carried out. According to him, although governor, *mutasarrıf*, or district governor (*kaymakam*) are capable in their jobs, they cannot save the country from feudal lords and they are forced to try to get along with them (feudal lords). This is the result of this practice: If a consul writes a letter of complaint to the embassy, Bab-ı Ali decides to the removal of the related officer. Under these circumstances, it is not possible to reform the current situation of the provinces. In the end, the interests of feudal lords get the upper hand. The statement of Ziya Pasa is that the problem is mostly not related with the official or direct tax of the state but is closely related with the other indirect taxes and the way of the collection of the taxes in the provinces.

There is a common say among deputies: The subjects of the other states pay more tax than our subjects, so they (our people) should thank to (the state). In fact, this statement would be true if they pay to only the state. However, this is not the case. Although the other states excise their subjects more, they (the people) do not have the oppression of feudal lord or consul. For this reason, people take advantage of the paid tax. In our country, on the other hand, if a peasant (*rençber*) earns a hundred *kuruş* in a year, he pays thirty *kuruş* to the state as tax, tithe, duties, and fine which this is the amount of money held by the treasury. An overall spending of the peasant is ten *kuruş* for the living of him and his family. He is

²⁶⁶ Ziya Pasa. "Sultan Abdülaziz Han, Ziya Bey, Ali Pasa." *Hürriyet*, 12 Recep 1286/ 18 October 1869, No. 69 pg.1

²⁶⁷ Ziya Pasa. Cennetmekan Sultan Abdülaziz Han'ın Londra'ya azimetinde takdim olunan Merhum Ziya Paşa'nın Arzuhali. Dersaadet (İstanbul), 1327 (1991), 36.

obliged to give the rest of the amount to the gentry, notables, usurer, *zaptiye*, and *cerime*.²⁶⁸

This malfeasance is one of the reasons behind the miserableness of the provinces. Moreover, these so-called tax collectors did not use measuring devices to calculate the tithe of the good, they often take the eighth, or one-seventh, or even one-fifth of the good as a tax. The second reason according to Ziya Paşa is related to the way of collecting.²⁶⁹ He says that “Whenever Bab-ı Ali is urgent with the officers in the provinces for collection of revenues, governor and tenants are pleased.” During the process of collecting, peasants have to meet their expenses, and if a peasant has nothing to give them, they take all his domestic belongings. If these are not sufficient to cover the debt, they sentence the peasant to imprisonment for months. In the meantime, his family has great difficulty. Ziya Paşa explains the conditions which are experienced by the debtor peasant and his family in detail. Thanks to his career as a state officer in several provinces of the empire, he has a great knowledge both of livings of peasants and of governmental malpractices behind the scene of. The third reason for the poorness in Anatolia is outstanding taxes of peasants.²⁷⁰ The gentry and notables are commonly Christians having land, estate, and property and they get along with the governors and officers. They also are exempt from any kind of tax. For this reason, the burden of tax is on the shoulders of peasants who are helpless. While outstanding taxes increase every year, they become impayable.

To conclude, Ziya tackled with the economic problems of the country, though less than political problems. He associated these two problems with each other defending if there were a parliament in the country, there would not be such problems and nobody would blame the Sultan for the troubles which the economic conditions made way for. He often

²⁶⁸ Ziya Paşa'nın Arzuhalı, 55. “*Beyne'l- vükela mu'tad olan sözlerden biridir ki: düvel-i saire tebaasının mütehammil oldukları tekalife nisbetle bizim ahalinin devlete verdikleri muayyenat pek cüz'î olmağla teşekkür eylemeleri iktiza eder. Filhakika eğer bizim ahali yalnız devlete verdikleri şey ile kurtulsalar bu söz pek doğru olurdu. Halbuki iş böyle olmayıp eğerçi düvel-i saire tebaası devletlerine ziyadece vergi ve rüsumat verirlerse de onlarda derebeyleri ve konsolos mezalimi olmayıp herkes fazla-i hasılat temettuatından kendisi müstefid olur. Bizde ise mesela bir rençberin yılda yüz kuruş geliri var ise onun otuzunu vergi ve aşar ve rüsumat ve ceza-yı nakdilere verir ki devlet hazinesine giren ancak budur. On kuruşunu dahi çocuğuyla kendi havayicine sarf eder ki ancak kedd-i yemininden zatının istifadesi de bundan ibarettir. Geriye kalan altmış kuruşunu vücuh ve mutebarın ve fazici ve zaptiye ve cerime için vermeğe mecburdur.*”

²⁶⁹ Ziya Paşa'nın Arzuhalı, 56.

²⁷⁰ Ziya Paşa'nın Arzuhalı, 59.

chose to address directly to the Sultan who once was close to. Using an interesting style of writing such as dreams of him or imagined dialogues with the Sultan on the economic and political problems of the country and on the policies of Ali Pasa, he tried to appeal to the sentiments of the Sultan. This shows us to what extent the Sultan is important to Ziya. For example, this expression of Ziya Pasa is a general theme in his writings: “*I had torn your heart out since your subjects knew that you were to blame for salt monopoly and their miserable situations.*” He tried to persuade the Sultan of dismissal of Ali Pasa and the abolition of the office of grand viziership. On the other hand, it is hard to associate his economic views with any economic school, although it is safer to say that he positioned himself as more pragmatic in line with the interests of the state. His views on the economy may be linked up to a liberal form of government at least. It is clear that he defended the rights of taxpayers against the government in the issue of borrowings which were taken on behalf of the people of the Ottoman Empire.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

When we talk about the nineteenth century, it is hard to not to mention of the inevitable incorporation of the countries into the world economic system regardless of what kind of incorporation is a matter. The Ottoman experience in this case offers us an example of non-colonial peripheralization in the 19th century. As Namık Kemal wrote this process was inevitable since the Europeans were insistent in their pursuit of their expansion of commerce.²⁷¹ The Ottoman Empire would adopt either more protectionist policies in her economy or free trade system. However, it was not possible to decide this in her own because of political reasons as it explained in the first chapter. The political weakness of the empire set the stage for the signing of Free Trade Treaty of 1838 with Great Britain. Now, latter choice was imposed upon her by the European countries with this liberal trade treaty. The importance of economic power in determining her political and social policies both in foreign and in domestic affairs was more obvious than before, and the economic issues had wide press coverage through fledgling literary revival of the Tanzimat period. The Young Ottomans were firsts of their kind in creating public opinion in politics via their media outlets in the capital. This study aimed to investigate how the Young Ottomans approached economic liberalism, and it reached a conclusion that they adopted a pragmatist approach regarding the economic problems. They were cautious about the liberal economy and they stated the harmful effects of full-fledged free trade system both for the state and the people.

The Young Ottomans prioritized on several counts other political opponent groups later in the 19th century like the Committee of Union and Progress and started first political and social discussions in the Ottoman intellectual life. Moreover, as Deniz Kılınçoğlu cited in his doctoral thesis on the Ottoman economic thought that “Yusuf Akçura asserted that even though Abdülhamid II seemed to be the Young Ottomans’ archenemy, he was actually their student with regard to some of his political ideas and actions, as can be observed in his pan-

²⁷¹ Namık Kemal, “*Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*”, *İbret*, No. 57, 19 Ramazan 1289 / 20 November 1872, 2.

Islamist policies.”²⁷² Their writings in economic issues concern us here, though their views on the economics and the Ottoman economy are not systematic like their approaches any other issues. The contemporary historians often have not reached an agreement on what kind of economic policies the Young Ottomans supported to follow in the Ottoman Empire. Some blamed them as the supporters of free trade system which was the harmful way for the empire in that age and some of them labelled them protectionist. The latest study on the issue, although it is very limited on the Young Ottomans, belongs to Deniz Kılınçoğlu (2012). He claims that

Unlike Möser and other similar conservative economists, the Young Ottomans and their followers did not favour traditional industries or the social structure that it went with them, but they supported a native path to industrialization and a parallel modernization of social life. In other words, Ottoman-Muslim modernists did not resist capitalism per se, but they strove to maintain control of the economy against the increasing power of foreign capitalists. In many respects, Ottoman economic protectionism, from its earliest stages in Young Ottoman thought to the Young Turks’ post-1908 National Economy (Millî İktisat) program, had strong parallels with Friedrich List’s national economy approach.²⁷³

To what extent they supported free trade system and/ or protectionist economic policies in the Ottoman economy is still controversial though. None of these members of the society wrote on or prioritised the issue of economy when we compared it with the political issues. However, one cannot assert that politics and economics are rather different areas from each other. They mentioned five main issues of the problems of the Ottoman economy of the 1860s and the 1870s. These were taxation, trade, agriculture, foreign debts, and the concessions given to the foreigners. Also, it is worth noting here that “To make their point, and to justify a reform program of their own, the Young Ottomans then appealed to Islamic tradition in a highly significant way.”²⁷⁴ The more systematic approach to these issues

²⁷²Yusuf Akçuraoglu, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*. İstanbul: Kader Matbaası, R.1327 [1911]. pg. 8; quoted in Deniz Kılınçoğlu, *The Political Economy of Ottoman Modernity: Ottoman Economic Thought During the Reign of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909)*. (Doctoral Thesis, Princeton University, June 2012), pg. 194.

²⁷³ Kılınçoğlu, 196.

²⁷⁴ Findley, 149.

belongs to Namık Kemal. In his article called “*Tekalif*” (*Taxes*), he clearly takes up a position in the direction of the rightfulness of the laissez-faire approach in theory. He complained of the collapse of traditional industries with the huge concessions given to the Europeans. He concludes that this was the reason for the wrong political decisions of the government. In addition to this, he criticized the 1838 Free Trade Treaty which set the stage for the foreign domination of the trade. Namık Kemal also states that this is because of the Muslims’ laziness and imprudence since they left their own natural wealth to foreigners. In the end, foreigners get rich by exploiting the sources of the Ottoman Empire.²⁷⁵ Ali Suavi, on the other hand, puts emphasis on the difference between Muslims and non-Muslims which was created by the reform movements of the empire. He insistently states that non-Muslim subjects of the empire invested in a more lucrative business with the help of their links with the European countries while Muslims “bury their money in land-ownership.”²⁷⁶ He chooses to treat non-Muslims as “others” complaining of their privileged position in the socio-political life. His this attitude can be explained by his excessive religious approaches in many issues. It is also worth noting that he is also annoyed with the extravagance and wasteful spending of the Ottoman bureaucrats. He puts into words his complaints about this wasteful spending together with his emphasises on the immense foreign debts of the empire which was the hot topic of the day. The same as Namık Kemal, he highlights the importance of the development of trade and industry in the country stressing the Koranic orders in this direction.

The quote in the below was written in 1869 in *Hürriyet* without name indicates the chronic illness of the economy of the empire very well:

The first reason is external interference. ... Upon [receiving] the concessions, the European merchants saw that the commerce in Turkestan [i.e., Ottoman territory] was much more profitable and easier than other places. Besides, they enjoyed the low cost of water and air [i.e., cost of living] in the country. As a result, they loaded the ships with cheap rubbish produced in the European factories and came and settled in Istanbul with their families. Since our people have an interest in such cheap and flashy things, they preferred [shoddy European cloth to that of Damascus]. ... The rugs of Uşak

²⁷⁵ Namık Kemal. “Ticaret,” *İbret* 22 (1872), 1; quoted in Kılınçoğlu “*The Political Economy of Ottoman Modernity...*” pg. 195.

²⁷⁶ Kılınçoğlu, 197.

and Gördes, and the clothes from Salonica and Bursa began to seem coarse to us; meanwhile, the Europeans developed an interest in [our goods]. In return [for our rugs], we purchased their flowery French rugs and towels that are made of grass, assuming that they were both cheap and good in quality. Yet, since they were made of poor quality materials and thus wore out in a short time, we had to change them frequently. As a result, we wasted our money thinking that we were saving money. This situation was not limited to printed cloth and rugs. Due to our ignorance, we preferred the products of European factories to our own products of all sorts of clothes and upholstery. Moreover, as our government supported this trend as it increased and expanded such concessions, our industries collapsed. Our merchants went bankrupt, and manufacturers who had lived on their industries became miserable and wretched. Our money that had circulated in our country began to flow abroad, and our state finances went into crisis. The government had to print more money and issue bonds with interest. Nevertheless, since the real reason for all these ills continued to exist, such measures proved to be ineffective and the situation worsened every day. Finally, we ended up with today's much-feared situation.²⁷⁷

The writer here explains the situation of the economy of the country after the given concessions to foreigners. As a good observer, he complains about the collapse of traditional industries which was caused by free trade treaties with foreigners. In other words, while the Ottoman Empire exported raw materials to foreign countries, her import goods became processed goods. In return for this, the industry of the country collapsed while the merchants went bankrupt. One can observe from this quotation that the Young Ottomans were against this kind of free trade treaties with more developed and industrialised countries. All of these intellectuals of the day aimed to be pedagogic in economic matters giving statistics, the information of newly developing discipline of economics, advices on the development of education in trade and industry in the Ottoman Empire. While doing this they considered the position of Muslim Turks who were both economically and politically disadvantageous people of the country.

In the end, all of these intellectuals of the day aimed to be pedagogic in economic matters giving statistics, the information of newly developing discipline of economics, advices on the development of education in trade and industry in the Ottoman Empire. While doing

²⁷⁷ (untitled), *Hürriyet* 42 (April 12, 1869), 7–8; quoted in Kılınçoğlu “*The Political Economy of Ottoman Modernity...*” pg. 195.

this they considered the position of Muslim Turks who were both economically and politically disadvantageous people of the country. They inspired later intellectuals and politicians in various ways, as Kılınçoğlu states that “In short, the economically as well as politically disadvantageous position of the Muslim Turks and the importance of encouraging and educating them for commerce and industry were staple topics of the Ottoman reformists in the late nineteenth century. This became a major educational policy for the Hamidian governments of the 1880s and 1890s.”²⁷⁸

²⁷⁸ Kılınçoğlu, 199

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Beyazıt State Library

Ali Suavi, “*Tasarruf 1*”, Ulum, No: 8, 31 Ekim 1869 (423-424).

Ali Suavi, “*Tasarruf 2*”, Ulum, No: 10, Aralık 1869 (607-612).

Ali Suavi. “*Memalik-i Osmaniye’de Ticaret*”, Ulum, No: 12, no date- 1870 (735-743).

Ali Suavi. “*Sanayi-i Der Memalik-i Osmaniye*”, Ulum, No: 12, no date-1870 (727-732).

Ali Suavi. “*İyi Maliye İyi Politikadan Olur*”, Ulum, No: 13, 16 February 1870 (772-777).

Ali Suavi. “*İtibar-ı Kredi*”, Ulum, No: 17, 17 April 1870 (1049-1058).

Ali Suavi, *Türkiye fi Sene 1288*. Paris: Victor Goupy, 1871.

Ali Suavi. *Türkiye 1290*. Paris: Victor Goupy, 1873.

Ali Suavi. “*İslah-ı Maliyenin Tevakkuf Ettiği Esbab-ı Seb’a*,” Le Mukhbir, 5 October 1867, no: 6, 3-4

Ali Suavi. “*6 Numaralı Muhbir’de İslah-ı Maliyenin Tevakkuf Ettiği Esbab-ı Seb’a’nın Mabadı*,” Le Mukhbir, 12 October 1867, no: 7.

Ali Suavi. Le Mukhbir, 14 November 1867, no: 12.

Ali Suavi. Le Mukhbir, 28 November 1867, no: 14.

Namık Kemal, “*Adalet ve Mahkemeler Hakkında*”, İbret, No:54, 15 Ramazan 1289 / 16 Kasım 1872. pg. 1-2

Namık Kemal, “*İbret*”, İbret, No: 3, 11 Rebiülahir 1289 / 18 Haziran 1872, 1-2.

Namık Kemal, “*Sanayi ve Ticaretimiz*”, İbret, No. 57, 19 Ramazan 1289 / 20 November 1872.

Namık Kemal. “*Masraf ve Iradımız*”, İbret, No:90, 10 Zilkaide 1289 / 9 January 1873.

Namık Kemal, “*Tekalif*”, İbret, No:87, 7 Zilkaide 1289 / 6 Ocak 1873.

Namık Kemal. “*Servet-i Mülkiyeye ve İdare-i Hazıraya Dair Bir Makale*,” *Hürriyet*, 21 Rebiyülahir 1285/ 10 Ağustos 1868. No. 7.

Namık Kemal. “*Mülkümüzün Servetine Dair Geçen Numerodaki Makaleye Zeyl*,” *Hürriyet*, 28 Rebiyülahir 1285/ 17 August 1868. No: 8.

Namık Kemal. “*İstanbul Vergisi*,” *Hürriyet*, 7 Ramazan 1285 / 21 December 1868. No. 26.

Namık Kemal. “*Muvazene-i Maliye I- Hizmet*,” *Hürriyet*, 22 Cemaziyelevvel 1286/ 30 August 1869, No. 62.

Namık Kemal. “*Muvazene-i Maliye-II İbret*,” *Hürriyet*, 29 Cemaziyelevvel 1286/ 6 September 1869, No. 63.

(Un-named) “*İstikraz Protestosu*,” *Hürriyet*, 2 Şaban 1285/ 26 November 1868. No. 21.

(Un-named) “*İstikraz-ı Cedid Üzerine Yeni Osmanlılar Cemiyeti’nin Mütalaatı*,” *Hürriyet*, 13 Şaban 1285/ 23 November 1868. No. 22.

Ziya Pasa. Cennetmekan Sultan Abdülaziz Han’ın Londra’ya azimetinde takdim olunan Merhum Ziya Paşa’nın Arzuhalı. Dersaadet (İstanbul), 1327 (1991).

Ziya Pasa. “*Sultan Abdülaziz Han, Ziya Bey, Ali Pasa*,” *Hürriyet*, 5 Recep 1286/ 11 October 1869, No. 68.

Ziya Pasa. “*Sultan Abdülaziz Han, Ziya Bey, Ali Pasa*,” *Hürriyet*, 12 Recep 1286/ 18 October 1869, No. 69.

Ziya Paşa. “*Tuz İnhisarı*,” *Hürriyet*, 2 Rebiyülahir 1286 / 12 Temmuz 1869, no: 55.

Secondary Sources

Ahmad, Feroz. “Ottoman Perceptions of the Capitulations 1800–1914.” *Journal of Islamic Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2000, pp. 1–20. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26198461.

Akarlı, Engin Deniz. *Belgelerle Tanzimat: Osmanlı Sadrıazamlarından Ali ve Fuad Paşaların Siyasi Vasiyyetnameleri*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1978.

Bailey, Frank Edgar. *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826-1853*. Cambridge: Harvard university press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942.

Berkes, Niyazi. *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1973.

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

- Czygan, Christiane. "Reflections on Justice: A Young Ottoman View of the Tanzīmāt." *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 46, no. 6, 2010, pp. 943–956., www.jstor.org/stable/27920329.
- Çavdar, Tevfik. *Türkiye’de Liberalizm (1860-1990)*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1992.
- Çavdar Tevfik. *Türkiye’de Liberalizmin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: Uygarlık Yayınları, 1982.
- Çelik, Hüseyin. *Ali Suavi ve Dönemi*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1994.
- Davison, Roderic H. *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1876*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Kılınçoğlu, Deniz. *The Political Economy of Ottoman Modernity: Ottoman Economic Thought During the Reign of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909)*. Doctoral Thesis, Princeton University, June 2012.
- Doğan, İsmail. *Tanzimat’ın İki Ucu, Münif Paşa ve Ali Suavi: sosyo-pedagojik bir karşılaştırma*. Merter, İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1991.
- Ebenstein, William. *Modern Political Thought: The Great Issues*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
- Ebu Manneh, Butrus. "Ali ve Fuad Paşaların Bab-ı Ali’deki Nüfuzlarının Kökenleri (1855-1871)," in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* ed. İnalcık, Halil and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006, (343-352).
- Eric Roll, *A History of Economic Thought* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1954),
- Findley, Carter Vaughn. "Economic Bases of Revolution and Repression in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 28, no. 1, 1986, pp. 81–106. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/178681.
- Findley, Carter V. "The Advent of Ideology in the Islamic Middle East (Part I-II)." *Studia Islamica*, no. 55, 1982, pp. 143–169. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1595435.
- Grampp, William D. *Economic Liberalism* (New York: Random House, 1965),
- İnalcık, Halil. "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire." *The Journal of Economic History*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1969, pp. 97–140. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/2115500.
- İnalcık, Halil and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu. *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006.

- İnsel, Ahmet. “*Türkiye’de Liberalizmin Soyçizgisi*” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*. vol. 7, ed. Murat Belge. İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2001.
- Kasaba, Reşat. *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy: The Nineteenth Century*. Albany: State University of New York Press, c1988.
- Keyder, Çağlar. *Toplumsal Tarih Çalışmaları*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. London; New York [etc.]: issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs [by] Oxford U.P., 1965.
- Mardin, Şerif. *The Genesis of the Young Ottoman Thought: a study in the modernization of Turkish political ideas*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Mardin, Şerif. “*Türkiye’de İktisadi Düşüncenin Gelişmesi (1838-1918)*”, in *Siyasal ve Sosyal Bilimler, Makaleler II*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 1992 (1990).
- Ortaylı, İlber. “Tanzimat’ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri,” in *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* ed. İnalcık, Halil and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, c2006. pg. 301 (301- 334)
- Özavcı, Hilmi Ozan. “Liberalism in the Turkish Context and Its Historiography: Past and Present.” *Anatolian Studies*, vol. 62, 2012, pp. 141–151. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/42657284 .
- Pamuk, Şevket. *100 Soruda Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadi Tarihi, 1500-1914*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1990.
- Reyhan, Cenk. *Osmanlı’da Kapitalizmin Kökenleri: Kent-Kapitalizm İlişkisi Üzerine Tarihel-Sosyolojik Bir Çözümleme*, İstanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008.

APPENDICES

A.TURKISH SUMMARY/ TRKE ZET

Bu alıřma, Gen Osmanlılar Cemiyetine dahil yelerin, Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi ve Ziya Pařa'nın, liberal ekonomiye nasıl yaklařtıklarını, zellikle 1838 Balta Limanı Serbest Ticaret Anlařması ile devamı gelen ticaret anlařmalarından sonra ykselen iktisadi liberalizmi nasıl deęerlendirdiklerini, nasıl algıladıklarını ortaya koymaya alıřmaktadır. Bu erevede, Osmanlı İmparatorluęunun ekonomik durumunu cemiyetin medya organı olan gazetelerde nasıl iřledikleri ve nasıl deęerlendirdikleri, Bab-ı Ali'ye ekonomik kt gidiřat hakkında nasıl zm nerileri sundukları da alıřmanın ilk niyetini desteklemeye ynelik cevaplanmış sorulardır. Tanzimat dneminin getirdięi toplumsal ve ekonomik geliřmeler doęrultusunda ortaya ıkan ilk rgtl siyasi muhalif grup olma zellięini taşıyan bu cemiyetin siyasi liberalizmi yazılarında sıklıkla iřlemiş olmaları ve Osmanlı Devletinin iine dřtę siyasi ve ekonomik bunalımlardan kurtuluř reetesi olarak meřruti rejimi savunmalarından hareketle, ekonomik liberalizmi nasıl algıladıkları ve ne derece savunucusu oldukları sorusu tezin ıkıř noktasını oluřturmaktadır. Tezin ana argmanı, Gen Osmanlılar Cemiyetine dahil bu entelektellerin iktisadi liberalizme kuřkuyla yaklařtıkları ve Osmanlı iktisadına dair daha pragmatist bir tavır takındıklarıdır. Dnemin Osmanlı enetelektelinin asıl amacı imparatorluęu ayakta tutmak iin Batı'daki geliřmeleri yakından takip ederek Osmanlı iin uygulanabilir politikaları ortaya koymaktır. Dolayısıyla, bir fikri benimsemekten ok o fikrin Osmanlı toplumuna adaptasyonu sz konusudur. Bu durum, cemiyetin bu  isminin yazıları gz nnde tutularak ortaya konulmaya alıřılacaktır.

alıřma, Gen Osmanlı cemiyetinin yazın alanında en ok retim yapan dolayısıyla da Osmanlı kamuoyunu daha ok etkileyen  yesi ile, Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi ve Ziya Pařa ile sınırlandırılmıştır. Namık Kemal ve Ziya Pařa'nın Londra'da ıkardıkları *Hrriyet* gazetesi, Ali Suavi'nin aynı yıllarda Paris'te yayınladıęı *Le Mukhbir* ve *Ulum* gazeteleri ile Namık Kemal'in İstanbul'a dndkten sonra yayınına bařladıęı *İbret* gazetesi bu alıřmanın birincil kaynaklarını oluřturmaktadır. Avrupa'nın eřitli řehirlerinde ıkardıkları gazetelerle Bab-ı Ali'nin ekonomi politikalarını eleřtiren, sorunun zm iin

fikirler ileri süren ve hem imparatorlukta hem de Avrupa’da kamuoyu oluşturmaya çalışan cemiyetin en tanınmış bu üç ismi diğer cemiyet üyeleriyle beraber ortak bir takım özellikler taşımaktaydı. Bunların başında hepsinin Bab-ı Ali’de tercüme odasında çalışmış olmaları, yabancı dil bilmeleri ve böylelikle Avrupa’daki gelişmeleri yakından takip edebilmeleri, yeni fikirlere daha açık olmaları gelmektedir. Ancak, Ali ve Fuad Paşaların sadrazamlık dönemlerinde bazı imtiyazlardan yoksun kalmaları onların yeni gelişen bürokratik çevreden uzakta kalmalarına neden oldu. Bu durum daha sonradan onların muhalif bir çatı altında birleşmelerine neden olan bir diğer etmendi.

Çalışma, 1875’ten sonra yayınlanan makalelerini hariç tutmaktadır. Bunun nedeni, üyelerin İstanbul’a döndükten sonra cemiyetin varlığını muhafaza edememesidir. Söz konusu dönem Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndaki büyük reform hareketlerini de temsil etmektedir. Reform hareketleri, Osmanlı toplumunda o günden itibaren siyasal ve sosyo-ekonomik yeni bir düzen hedefleyen Tanzimat Fermanı’nın ilan edilmesiyle hızlandı. İdare ile ilgili reformlar yeni bürokratlar sınıfını gerçekleştirirken, daha çok Türkçe kelimelerin tanıtılmasıyla, özellikle edebi eserlerin açıklığa kavuşturulması ve sadeleştirilmesi alanlarında entelektüel canlanma üyeler veya isimler tarafından uygulamaya konmuştur. hangi toplumla ilgili. Bu hareketin toplumda kamuoyunu şekillendirmeye yol açan dergilerde ve gazetelerde popüler olmaya katkıda bulunduğunu iddia etmek geçerlidir.

Bu çalışma, on dokuzuncu yüzyıl boyunca ekonomik liberalizme entelektüel yaklaşımın gelişimini takip etmek açısından önemlidir. 19. yüzyılın son çeyreğinde imparatorluğun korumacı ve liberal aydınlarının görüşlerinin incelenmesi üzerine birçok çalışma var. Bu dönem, 19. yüzyılın son çeyreği, entelektüeller arasında Osmanlı ekonomisine ilişkin verimli tartışmaların iyi belgelendiği zamanlardı. Bununla birlikte, bu çalışmalar çoğunlukla ekonomik liberalizmle ilgili entelektüel gelişimin ilk aşamalarına odaklanmamaktadır. Namık Kemal’in ve diğer Genç Osmanlıların ekonomik fikirleri hakkında sistematik bir çalışma yoktur. Dahası, Tanzimat dönemini değerlendirerek, ekonomide korumacı politikaları uygulamaktan, serbest ticaret koşullarını benimsemeye, Genç Osmanlı düşünürlerinin ortaya koydukları fikirlerin daha sonraki aşamalarda nasıl değiştiği ve geliştiğini takip edebilmek mümkündür.

Sonrasında Mustafa Fazıl Paşa’nın finansal desteği ile Avrupa’da çıkardıkları bu gazetelerle yeni bürokratik grubun siyasi ve ekonomik politikalarına karşı muhalefet etmeye başladılar. Bu kısmen zorunlu sürgün yılları onların Avrupa başkentlerinde gelişen yeni fikir akımlarını

daha yakından takip edebilmelerine imkan tanıdı. Genç Osmanlı Derneği, esas olarak Tanzimat döneminde imparatorluğun reform programlarını temsil eden ve yürüten yeni ortaya çıkan bürokratik sınıfa karşı kuruldu. Bu yeni sınıf, yükselen sanayileşmiş Avrupa ülkeleri karşısında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki düşüşün farkındaydı ve bu yeni olguya uygun olarak, geniş başarı programlarını uygulamak için çalışmaya başladılar, ancak başarıları ya yeterli değildi ya da toplumdaki önceki statüsünü kaybetmek üzere olan sınıflar tarafından sorgulandılar. Genç Osmanlı Derneği, dönemin veziri Ali Paşa'ya ve onun yönetimine karşıydılar. Ali Paşa'ya karşı olma, cemiyet üyelerinin bazı önemli ortak özelliklerini paylaşımlarıyla birlikte önem kazandı. Neredeyse hepsi bir süre Tercüme Bürosunda çalışmıştı, Avrupa medeniyeti hakkında ortak bir bilgiye sahipti ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun dağılması konusunda endişeliydi. Bu isimler toplumun entelektüel formasyonunu oluşturuyordu. Önde gelen üye olan Mehmet Bey, Fransa'da siyaset bilimi okudu ve anayasacılık hakkında daha fazla şey öğrendi. Nuri ve Reşat Beyler de toplumun kurucu üyeleriydi ve Namık Kemal de Şinasi'nin gazetesi Tasvir-i Efkar'ın yayıncılığına katıldı. Bir diğer üye ise Ayatullah Bey, eğitim oluşumunda hem Doğu hem de Batı özelliklere sahip olarak büyüdü ve Batı medeniyetinin başarılarına hayran kaldı. Refik Bey, periyodik Mir'at'ın sahibi olarak diğer kurucu üyeydi. İtalya'daki restorasyona karşı çıkan Carbonari, İtalya'da ve İtalya'da restorasyona karşı mücadele eden Carbonari'yi vatanseverlik ittifakını (İttifak-ı Hamiyyet) kurdular. Toplumun maddi destekçisi, Mısır'ın Muhammed Ali'nin torunu olan Mustafa Fazıl Paşa idi (1829-75). Mustafa Fazıl Paşa, imparatorluğun maliyesinin Avrupalılaştırılması için bir kez maliye bakanı konumunda bulundu. Ali Paşa'ya muhalefet etmesi nedeniyle ofisten çekildi. Mustafa Fazıl Paşa, gazetelerdeki Ali Paşa'ya yaptıkları suçlayıcı yazılar nedeniyle Namık Kemal ve Ziya Bey'in Avrupa'dan kaçmalarından beri sürgün edilmelerine yardım eden isimdir. Ayrıca, Namık Kemal ve Ali Suavi'nin halk üzerindeki artan etkisi ve Ziya Bey'in padişahlara olan yakınlığı da ihraç edilmelerinin arkasındaki nedenler arasındaydı. Mustafa Fazıl Paşa'nın bu muhalefet hareketine verdiği desteğin arkasındaki motivasyon tartışmalıydı çünkü ya Mısır belediye başkanlığı iddiası ya da Ali Paşa yönetimine karşı muhalefet konusundaki samimiyeti idi. Yine de, Mustafa Fazıl Paşa, toplumu oluşturan önemli isimlerden biriydi ve programına katkıda bulunuyordu. Mustafa Fazıl Paşa, şu anda Paris'te ortak bir kimlik arayışındaki bu kuruluşu finansal olarak destekledi. Burada Avrupalı meslektaşları onları Jeune Turcs olarak adlandırırken, kendilerini Genç Osmanlılar olarak adlandırdılar. Bu arada, Mustafa Fazıl Paşa, Liberte'de yayınlanan ve Sultan'a anayasa talep eden bir mektup

yazdı ve İstanbul'da dağıtıldı. Şerif Mardin'e göre, bu mektup Osmanlı'nın çökmekte olduğunu göstermesi bakımından önemlidir.

Mehmed Emin Ali Paşa (1815-1871) ve Keçecizade Fuat Paşa (1814-1869), 1839 yılındaki Tanzimat Fermanı'nı hazırlayıp ilan eden Mustafa Reshid Paşa (1800-1858) reformlarını yakından takip etti. Tanzimat Döneminde siyasi iktidarı güçlü vezirlerin ellerinde parçalayan iki padişah vardı: Abdülmecid (1823-1861) ve Abdülaziz (1830-1876). Ali ve Fuat Paşaların öncelikli hedefi, ülkede siyasi istikrara kavuşmak ve onu korumaktı. 1850'lerin politik istikrarsızlığını gözlemleme şansları vardı ve farklı devlet adamları arasındaki iktidar mücadelelerinin iç ve dış ilişkiler imparatorluğunu kötü yönde nasıl etkilediğinin dersleri aldılar. Tanık oldukları 1850'lerin başındaki politik çalkantı, devlet ve sultan üzerindeki etkiler için mücadele eden iki siyasi gruba ilgiliydi. Biri, iktidarını idari ve siyasi reformlara dayanan yeni gelen bürokratik sınıftı, ikincisi ise saray ile ilişkilerine ve orduyu kontrol etmelerine dayanan bir grup politikacıydı. Mustafa Reshid Paşa, 1846'da görkemli başkanlık bürosuna girdiğinde, saray ile yakın ilişkileri olan muhalifleriyle yüzleşti. İlerleyen yıllarda, Reşid Paşa, bu “saray grubunun” faaliyetleri nedeniyle, Sultan tarafından birkaç kez görevinden alınmıştı. Bu iki grup arasındaki siyasi mücadele, İstanbul'da sert bir siyasi istikrarsızlığa neden oldu. 1853 Kırım Savaşı, “saray grubunun” yıkılmasına neden oldu. Güç şimdi yeni bürokratik sınıfın elinde idi. Bu arada, Ali ve Fuat Paşalar Bab-ı Ali'de devam eden siyasi mücadele rekabetinden etkilenmediler. Bu nedenle itibarları zarar görmedi ve Bab-ı Ali'de yeni devlet adamları olarak yükseldiler. Dahası, bu siyasi mücadeleden çok şey öğrendiler ve şimdi güçlü hükümetin gerekliliği bilincindeydiler. Bunu da muhalefeti bastırarak ve sansürleyerek yaptılar. İşte Genç Osmanlılar bu politikalarla karşı karşıya kalan ilk örgütlü muhalif grup oldular ve yazılarında Ali ve Fuat Paşalar'ın bu tür politikalarını eleştirdiler.

İslam dünyasında siyasi eylemle birlikte modern siyasi düşünce biçimleri, Genç Osmanlı ideologlarının (1865) yükselişi ve 1870'lerin anayasal hareketi ile başladı. Genç Osmanlı hareketinin siyasi ideolojinin öncüleri olarak ortaya çıkışı, Batı fikirlerinin tanıtımıyla yakından ilgilidir. Şerif Mardin, Genç Osmanlıları, Aydınlanma fikirlerini Türk halkının entelektüel dünyasıyla tanıştıran ilk düşünürler olduğunu söyler. Tarihçiler, Genç Osmanlı Cemiyeti'nin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun sosyal, politik, ekonomik ve diğer meseleleri ile ilgili açık bir ideolojik bakış açısı bulunmadığı konusunda hemfikirdir. Avrupa'yı takip etmeyi amaçlayan bir grup aydın idiler. Bununla birlikte, Ali ve Fuat Paşaların önderlik

ettiği yeni bürokratik gruba karşı anayasaya ve nefret talepleri, aralarında en belirgin tahvildi.

Namık Kemal, Genç Osmanlılar cemiyetinin yazın alanında en üretken üyelerinden olmakla birlikte imparatorluğun ekonomi meselelerine de hem kendi çıkarttığı hem de katkıda bulunduğu gazetelerde büyük bir yer ayırmıştır. Yazılarında Namık Kemal'i meseleleri ele alış biçiminde daha teorik, diğerlerine oranla meselelere daha sistematik yaklaştığı görülür. Devletin vergi, iç ve dış borçlar, dış ticaret ve gümrük meselelerini ele aldığı yazılarda göze çarpan ilk şey ekonomi disiplinine ve onun kurallarına atıfta bulunması ve ekonomik kötü gidişata yönelik çözüm önerilerini yeni ilim dalının kurallarına dayandırarak açıklamasıdır. Osmanlıların fenn-i servet olarak adlandırdığı ekonomi bilimi hem Namık Kemal'in hem de Ali Suavi'nin yazılarında ifadesini bulduğu şekliyle yeni gelişen ve Batılı devletlerin hüner sahibi olduğu Osmanlıların ise hakim olmadığı önemli bir alandır. Tekalif adlı makalesinde hem devletin sorumluluk alanını çizen ve daraltan Namık Kemal, hem de devletin verginin toplanması ve refahın yeniden dağıtımını konularında bu yeni bilim dalının kurallarına uyulduğu takdirde başarı göstereceğini iddia eder. Bunu kanıtlayan örnekleri de İngiltere ve Fransa'daki uygulamalardan alır. Bu makale Namık Kemal'in sadece liberal ekonomi ile olan yakınlık derecesini göstermekle kalmaz aynı zamanda liberal devletin sorumluluk alanlarını da belirler. Ona göre devlet halkın ne babası ne de lalasıdır, yükümlülükleri sadece devletin varlığını devam ettirmek olduğu için de toplanacak vergileri bu amaç uğruna sadece bunu gerçekleştirecek miktarda toplamalıdır. Fenn-i servetin kurallarına aykırı olarak toplanacak vergi halkın üstündeki vergi baskısını artırmakla kalmaz aynı zamanda devletin halkın gözündeki itibarının düşmesine neden olur. Vergiler makalesi Namık Kemal'in liberal ekonomi politikalarına fikren en yakın olduğunu gördüğümüz yazısıdır. Namık Kemal her ne kadar liberal ekonominin gerekliliklerine inanıyor gibi görünse de bu yaklaşımın Osmanlı için ekonomik kötü gidişata çare olacağından emin değildir. Bu durumu Hürriyet'te yayınlanan bir yazısında görmek mümkündür. Ona göre ticarete olduğu gibi her işte hürriyet esastır, ancak bazı nedenlerden ötürü ticarete serbestlik kuralı Osmanlı'da aksi sonuçlara neden olmuştur. Burdan anlaşılan şudur ki Namık Kemal ticarete serbestliğe inanmakla birlikte bunun Osmanlı için iyi sonuçlar vermediğinin farkındadır.

Namık Kemal'in politik liberalizmin nedenine inanmasına rağmen, Osmanlı ekonomisindeki liberal ekonomik düzenlemelere tedbirli yaklaşması daha kabul edilebilir. Bunun nedenleri, Osmanlı Devleti ile Batı Avrupa ülkeleri arasındaki ekonomik ilişkide, özellikle bu çalışmanın diğer bölümünde açıklanan on dokuzuncu yüzyıl siyasetince açıktır. Bununla

birlikte Namık Kemal bazı yazılarında ikileme düştüğünü görüyoruz. O liberal ekonomiye ve serbest ticarete inanmakla, Osmanlı Devleti bu politikaları uygularsa ekonomik kalkınmayı başarabileceğine inandığını ifade eden yazılar kaleme almıştır. İbret adlı makalesinde açıklandığı gibi, imparatorluğun çağa ayak uydurması gerekmektedir. Ayrıca, Avrupalı devletler, Osmanlı imparatorluğunu dünya ekonomik sistemine dahil etmek için her şeyi yaptığı için bu kaçınılmaz bir süreçtir. Oysa bu, devletin gerçeklerinin farkında olmadığı anlamına gelmez. Ekonomik kalkınmayı sağlamak için neyin gerekli olduğunu açıklarken, bu önlemlerin Osmanlı toplumunda ne ölçüde uygulanabileceğini de tartışır. Hilmi Ziya Ülken ve Tevfik Çavdar'ı içeren argümanların aksine Namık Kemal, serbest ticaret modelinin sonuçları konusunda biraz kararsız ve koruyucu gümrük vergilerinin uygulanması gerekliliğine daha yakın görünmektedir. Namık Kemal, bu durumda, Osmanlı toplumunun gerekliliklerinin farkındaydı. Buna göre, toplumun geri kalmışlığını iddia eden konuya pragmatik bir yaklaşım benimsemiştir. Avrupa ülkeleriyle olan yakın entelektüel bağlarına ve siyasi liberalizme ideolojik yakınlıklarına rağmen Namık Kemal, ekonomik pragmatizmin imparatorlukta daha sürdürülebilir olduğunu düşünmektedir. Ayrıca, yeni yasal düzenlemeler (özellikle yabancı sermaye ve yatırımlar konusunda) ve imparatorluğun ticaret mahkemeleri hakkındaki açıklamaları, ticari ayrıcalıkların Avrupa ülkeleri lehine, Osmanlı'da yaşam standartlarının düşmesine ilişkin endişelerini bize göstermektedir. Osmanlı esnafı ve tüccarları zarar gördü. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki serbest ticaret politikalarının uygulanmasına elverişli olmayan tarihsel gelişmeler hakkındaki farkındalığı, liberal ekonomiye karşı temkinli bir duruş gerektiriyordu.

Ali Suavi'nin ekonomi üzerine yazıları gündeme dair yazılardır. 1860'larda Bab-ı Ali dış borçlanmasını giderek artırmak durumunda kalmıştı. Bu yüzden de Ali Suavi'in yazılarının çoğu dış borçlar meselesi üzerinedir. Bab-ı Ali bürokratlarını savurganlıkları yüzünden eleştirir. Borçların doğru yerde ve doğru amaçlarla kullanılmaması Suavi'nin en önemli konusunu oluşturmaktadır. Dış borçlar konusunda Ali Suavi'nin birçok yazısında savunduğu ve liberal ekonomiye yakınlığı açısından en önemli nokta devletin ekonomiye dair aldığı kararlarda halka karşı daha şeffaf olmasını istemesidir. Ali Suavi bu yargısını gerekçelendirirken, alınan borçların halk tarafından ödeneceği için halkın borçların neden alındığı ve nereye kullanıldığı konusunda bilgilendirilmesinin önemini ortaya koyar. Aynı durum Ziya Paşa'nın yazılarında da görünür. Ele aldığı diğer konular ise tarım, sanayi ve vergi meseleleridir. Namık Kemal'in yazılarıyla karşılaştırıldığında, Suavi'nin imparatorluğun ekonomisine ilişkin makaleleri, bürokratları ekonominin başarısızlıklarını

hesaba katmaya ve yeni gelen siyasi elitlerin zararına yönelik kamuoyu oluşturmaya amaçlayan daha gözlemsel yazılar olarak karşımıza çıkıyor. Bu yazılarda en yaygın temalar, devletin, iç sübvansiyonların, ülkenin ticaret ve sanayisinin, güvenlik konularının ve daha az ölçüde tarımın dış borçlanması ve iç borçlanmasıydı. Bu konuları ele alırken, genellikle şeriat, Kur'an ve hadislerle atıfta bulunan sorunları açıklamak için dini ilkeleri kullanır. Devlet adamlarının savurgan olduklarını eleştirirken, onun için, halk adına ödünç aldığı parayı, rızası olmadan kötüye kullandıkları üzerinde durur. Hükümetin ekonomik politikalarında daha fazla şeffaflık istediği ve bunun halkın hakkı olduğunu düşündüğü açıktır. Vergi konusu, Müslüman tebaanın fakirliğine neden olan bir başka sorundur. Ona göre, vergilerin yükü nedeniyle insanlar kazancını koruyamadı. Ancak Suavi, Namık Kemal'in ekonomiye daha teorik dayanan yazılarındaki örneğinde olduğu gibi, bu konudaki düşüncelerini daha fazla ileriye götürmemektedir. Örneğin, iş yapmak için sermaye birikiminin gerekliliği konusuna değinmiyor. Yine de, bu açıdan bakıldığında, özellikle şeffaflık konusunda, bunun ekonomik sorunlara yönelik liberal tutumu yansıttığını iddia edebiliriz. Suavi'nin Müslümanların meslek seçimleri ile ilgili eğilimlerine yönelik eleştirileri de dikkat çekmektedir. Müslüman nüfus ya devlet memuru olma ya da tarıma girme eğilimi göstermektedir. Bu, para kazanma girişimi olan bir ticarete yatırım yapan gayrimüslim tebaanın zenginleşmesine neden olmaktadır. Müslümanlar ve gayrimüslimler arasındaki ayrım, hükümetin verdiği siyasi ve sosyal ayrıcalıklarla başlar. Suavi Müslümanlar ve gayrimüslimler arasındaki ekonomik farklılıkların sıklıkla üstünde durur.

Resid Paşa ile usta-çırak ilişkisi olan Ziya Paşa, kamu hizmetinde uzun yıllar görev yaptı ve Sultan'ın üçüncü sekreteri olarak atandı. Sultan Abdülmecid'e (1823-61) yakın olan Ziya Paşa İmparatorluk Sarayı'nda büyük bir siyasi deneyime sahipti. Genç Osmanlı cemiyetinin en seçkin ve en yaşlı üyesi olarak, önemli kişilerle bağlantı kurarak kamu hizmeti kariyerinden faydalandı. Eğitimi ve kariyeri boyunca, politik metinleri Fransızcadan çevirdi. Dahası, devletin ticaretindeki tecrübesi politik düşüncelerini etkilemiş ve politik makalelerinde daha iyi idare ve idari uygulamalar önermiştir. Buna daha çok kamu hizmeti kariyeri boyunca tanık olduğu suiistimaller neden olmuştur. Ali Paşa veziriazam olduğunda, Ziya Paşa için işler değişti. 1867'de Ziya Paşa, Ali Paşa'nın yeni bürokratik sınıfının karşısındaki tutumundan dolayı Paris'te sürgüne gönderildi. Bu arada, Ziya Paşa İttifak-ı Hamiyyet'e katıldı, Paris'te Mustafa Fazıl Paşa'nın evinde Namık Kemal ve Ali Suavi ile bir araya geldi. Ziya, siyasi sorunlardan daha az olsa da, ülkenin ekonomik sorunlarıyla da mücadele etti. Bu iki sorunu, ülkede bir parlamento olsaydı, böyle bir sorun olmazdı ve hiç

kimse Sultan'ı ekonomik koşulların yol açtığı sorunlar için suçlamayacaktı, diyerek birleştirdi. Yazılarında sıklıkla bir zamanlar yakın olduğu Sultan'a doğrudan hitap etmeyi seçti. Ülkenin ekonomik ve siyasal sorunları ve Ali Paşa'nın politikaları hakkında Sultan'la rüyalar ya da hayali diyaloglar gibi ilginç bir yazı tarzı kullanarak Sultan'ın duygularına hitap etmeye çalıştı. Bu bize Sultan'ın Ziya için ne kadar önemli olduğunu gösteriyor. Aynı zamanda yazılarında ülkenin ekonomik ve siyasi olarak çöküşünü hazırladığını düşündüğü Ali Paşa'nın görevden alınması gerektiğini işledi. Öte yandan, ekonomik görüşlerini herhangi bir ekonomi okulu ile ilişkilendirmek zor olsa da, kendisini devletin çıkarları doğrultusunda daha pragmatik olarak konumlandığını söylemek daha güvenlidir. Ekonomiye ilişkin görüşleri, en azından liberal bir hükümet biçimine bağlanabilir. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu halkı adına alınan borçlanmalar konusunda vergi mükelleflerinin hükümete karşı haklarını savunduğu açıktır. Yazılarında daha çok Suavi gibi dış borçlar meselesine, devletin memurlarının maaşlarını alamadığına ve düştükleri sefil duruma değindi. Ayrıca Anadolu'da varlığını devam ettiren feodal yapılanmayı hem iktisadi hem de siyasi boyutlarıyla ele aldı. Tuz tekeli eleştirdi ve bu tekel dolayısıyla halkın çektiği sıkıntıları konu aldı.

Ondokuzuncu yüzyıldan bahsettiğimizde, ne tür bir birleşimin meselesi olduğuna bakılmaksızın, ülkelerin dünya ekonomik sistemine kaçınılmaz bir şekilde dahil edilmesinden bahsetmek gereklidir.. Bu konuda Osmanlı deneyimi bize 19. yüzyılda sömürgecilik dışı çevreselleşme örneği sunuyor. Namık Kemal'in yazdığı gibi, bu durum kaçınılmazdı, çünkü Avrupalılar ticareti genişletmek için ısrar ediyorlardı. Osmanlı Devleti, ekonomisinde ya da serbest ticaret sisteminde daha korumacı politikalar benimsemek istese de, birinci bölümde açıklandığı gibi, siyasi nedenlerden dolayı buna kendi başına karar vermesi mümkün değildi. İmparatorluğun siyasi zayıflığı, 1838 tarihli Büyük Britanya ile Serbest Ticaret Antlaşması'nın imzalanmasına zemin hazırladı. Şimdi, bu liberal ticaret anlaşmasıyla, bu seçim Avrupa ülkeleri tarafından kendisine uygulandı. İktisadi gücün hem dış hem de iç ilişkilerdeki politik ve sosyal politikaları belirlemede önemi bu yüzyılda daha açıldı ve ekonomik konular, Tanzimat döneminin edebi canlanmasıyla birlikte geniş bir kamuoyu yaratma gücüne sahipti. Genç Osmanlılar, başkentteki medya kuruluşları aracılığıyla siyasette kamuoyu oluşturmada türlerinin ilkleriydi. Bu çalışma, ekonomik sorunların o dönemde dergilerdeki aydınlar tarafından nasıl tartışıldığını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Üstelik bu dönemde yeni bir sosyal ve siyasal güç olarak gazetecilik Bab-ı Ali'nin yeni bürokratik elit sınıfına karşı yükseldi.

Genç Osmanlıların Osmanlı ekonomisi için serbest ticaret sistemini ve / veya korumacı ekonomik politikaları ne ölçüde destekledikleri yine de tartışmalıdır. Toplumun bu üyelerinin hiçbirisi politik meselelerle karşılaştırdığımızda ekonomi meselesine yazı yazmamıştır veya öncelik vermemiştir. Ancak, politika ve ekonominin birbirinden oldukça farklı alanlar olduğu söylenemez. 1860 ve 1870'lerin Osmanlı ekonomisinin sorunlarının beş ana meselesinden bahsettiler. Bunlar vergilendirme, ticaret, tarım, dış borçlar ve yabancılara verilen imtiyazlardı. Bu konulara daha sistematik bir yaklaşım Namık Kemal'e aittir. “Tekalif” adlı makalesinde (Vergiler), teoride laissez-faire yaklaşımının doğruluğu yönünde açıkça bir pozisyon alıyor. Avrupalılara verilen devasa tavizlerle geleneksel sanayilerin çöküşünden şikayetçi oldu. Bunun, hükümetin yanlış siyasi kararlarının sebebi olduğu sonucuna varmıştır. Buna ek olarak, ticaretin dış tahakkümüne zemin hazırlayan 1838 Serbest Ticaret Antlaşmasını eleştirmiştir. Öte yandan Ali Suavi, imparatorluğun reform hareketlerinin yarattığı müslümanlar ile müslümanlar arasındaki farka vurgu yapıyor. İmparatorluğun gayrimüslim tebaasının, Avrupa ülkeleriyle olan bağları sayesinde daha kazançlı işlere yatırım yaptığını, Müslümanların ise daha az kazançlı toprak işine yatırım yaptığını belirtiyor. Suavi, Müslüman olmayanları “başkaları” olarak şikayet etmeyi seçmektedir. Bu tutumu birçok konuda aşırı dini yaklaşımlarıyla açıklanabilir. Ayrıca Osmanlı bürokratlarının savurganlığı ve israf harcamalarından da rahatsız olduğunu belirtmekte fayda var. Bu israf harcamalarına ilişkin şikayetlerini, günümüzün en önemli konusu olan imparatorluğun muazzam dış borçları üzerine yaptığı vurgularla birlikte dile getiriyor. Namık Kemal ile aynı şekilde, bu yöndeki Kuran emirlerini vurgulayan ülkedeki ticaret ve sanayinin gelişiminin önemini vurgulamaktadır.

Günün tüm aydınları, istatistik veren, pedagojik olmayı, istatistik veren yeni ekonomi disiplininin bilgisini, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda ticaret ve sanayide eğitimin geliştirilmesine ilişkin tavsiyelerde bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bunu yaparken, ülkenin hem ekonomik hem de politik olarak dezavantajlı insanları olan Müslüman Türklerin konumunu değerlendirdiler.

B.TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Social Sciences

☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Informatics

☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Marine Sciences

☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı/ Surname : TOP

Adı / Name : Gözde

Bölümü / Department : Tarih

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : The Young Ottomans' Approaches Toward Economic Liberalism (1860-1875)

TEZİN TÜRÜ/ DEGREE:Yüksek Lisans/ Master

☒

Doktora / PhD

☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.

☒

2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. /** Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. *

☐

3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. /** Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. *

☐

** Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*

A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih/ Date

