

THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL THOUGHTS OF SATI BEY:
EXPLORING THE IDEOLOGY OF AN OTTOMAN PATRIOT

Thesis submitted to the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish Institute
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by

Ertuğrul Zengin

Boğaziçi University

2010

An Abstract of thesis of Ertuğrul Zengin for the degree of Master of Arts from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University to be taken in December 2010

Title: The Political and Social Thoughts of Satı Bey: Exploring the Ideology of an Ottoman Patriot

This thesis scrutinizes the political and social thoughts of an Ottoman intellectual Satı Bey who defended Ottomanism as a remedy to the problems of the collapsing Empire. Satı Bey besides being a successful bureaucrat was also an influential thinker who revised the old ideology of Ottomanism by placing the “individual” as the center of his thought. He synthesized the Young Turk ideology which prioritized a modernization program guided by the notions of “science” and “progress” with the Young Ottoman theme of *vatan* as the basis of the allegiances of the citizens to the state. He attached great importance to primary education to nurture “a new individual,” who as a loyal citizen of Ottoman Empire would be the bearer of modern thinking. Satı lived in an age of social and political turmoil when different agendas were formulated by the different ideological camps. As a committed Westernist and Ottomanist, he clashed with the leading intellectuals of his period, like the Turkish nationalist Ziya Gökalp, the thinker and educationist İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu and the Minister of Education of his period, Emrullah Efendi. Especially his discussions with Ziya Gökalp are revealing to observe the similarities and differences, converging and diverging points of Turkish nationalism and Ottoman patriotism of his period. Satı’s discussion with Ziya Gökalp on the objective of education was transformed into a broad-based discussion of the existence of national consciousness as an entity.

Satı objected the existence of any transcendental entity above the realm of individual. He rested on the will of the individual independent from the all external forces or ideological construction. However, Satı also recognized the shortcomings of such an individualistic formulation of Ottomanism while the Empire was confronting the danger of the dissolution in the ethnic lines. He was aware of the necessity to accommodate to his individualist and materialist ideology an idealist construction which would serve as a source of loyalty to Ottoman state. At this point he broke with the leading Westernist Young Turk intellectuals of Prince Sabahaddin and Abdullah Cevdet who regarded federalism a practical option for the state against dissolution. Although he criticized explicitly Committee of Union and Progress after the departure of the leading cadre of the Committee for conducting harsh centralization policies, he never declared an open support for federalism as a solution. To the contrary, he sought for a new loyalty which would not instigate any ethnic or religious cleavages, but at the same time would provide the ground of legitimacy for the state. Thus he utilized and revised the Young Ottoman notion of *vatan* for the end of offering an inclusive ground for the people of Ottomans as an alternative to the exclusionist project of nationalism. Based on this analysis, the thesis argues that Ottomanism, which was perceived as a state policy after the Gülhane Receipt, and was theorized by an Ottoman intellectual Satı Bey in the Second Constitutional period remained a vital political alternative at least intellectually just before the dissolution of the Empire.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılapları Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans Derecesi için Ertuğrul Zengin Tarafından Aralık 2010'da teslim edilen tezin kısa özeti

Başlık: Satı Bey'in Siyasi ve Toplumsal Fikirleri: Bir Osmanlı Vatanseveri'nin Fikriyatının İncelenmesi

Bu tez, Osmanlıcılığı çözülmekte olan İmparatorluğun sorunlarına ilişkin bir çözüm olarak savunan Osmanlı aydını Satı Bey'in siyasi ve toplumsal fikirlerini incelemektedir. Satı Bey başarılı bir bürokrat olmasının yanı sıra, Osmanlılık ideolojisini, "birey" i düşüncesinin merkezine alarak yeniden düzenleyen döneminin etkili bir düşünürüdür. "Bilim" ve "ilerleme" kavramlarının kılavuzluğunda bir çağdaşlaşma programını önceleyen Jön Türk ideolojisiyle, Genç Osmanlıların vatandaşların devlete olan bağlılıklarının temeli olarak ürettiği bir kavram olan "vatan" kendi Osmanlıcılığında sentezlemiştir. Çağdaş düşüncenin taşıyıcısı ve Osmanlı Devleti'nin sadık bir vatandaşı olacak "yeni bireyin" yetiştireceği için ilköğrenime özel bir önem vermiştir. Devrinin kararlı bir Batıcısı ve Osmanlıcısı olarak, Türk milliyetçisi Ziya Gökalp, düşünür ve eğitimci İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu ve Maarif Nazırı Emrullah Efendi gibi döneminin önde gelen düşünürleriyle çeşitli fikir çatışmaları yaşamıştır. Özellikle Ziya Gökalp'le olan tartışmaları Türk milliyetçiliğiyle Osmanlı Vatanseverliği'nin benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları, yaklaştıkları ve ayrıldıkları noktaları gözlemlemek açısından açıklayıcıdır. Satı'nın Ziya Gökalp'le eğitimin amacı üzerine başladığı tartışma milli bilincin bir varlık teşkil edip etmediği geniş tartışmasına dönüşmüştür.

Satı bireyin üzerinde var olacak toplum veya millet gibi her hangi bir aşkın varlığı kabul etmemektedir. Onun düşüncesinde bireyin varlığı, dışsal güçler ve fikri temellendirmelerden bağımsız olarak kendi öz iradesine dayanmıştır. Buna rağmen Satı Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun etnik kökenler doğrultusunda dağılma tehlikesiyle karşı karşıya olduğu bir zamanda Osmanlıcılığın bu denli bireyci tanımlanmasının getirebileceği noksanlığın farkındadır. Bireyci ve materyalist fikriyatında Osmanlı Devleti'ne sadakatın kaynağı olabilecek bir tasarıma yer açmak gerektiğinin bilincindedir. Bu noktada, federalizmi dağılma karşısında pratik bir çözüm olarak gören önde gelen Jön Türk fikriyatçıları olan Prens Sabahaddin ve Abdullah Cevdet'ten ayrılıyordu. Tam tersine etnik ya da dini farklılıkları tahrik etmeyecek fakat aynı zamanda devlete bir meşruluk zemini kazandırabilecek yeni bir sadakat arayışına girdi. Neticede ayrımcı bir proje olarak gördüğü milliyetçiliğe alternatif olarak Genç Osmanlıların ürettiği bir kavram olan "vatan" ı Osmanlı halkı için kapsayıcı ve içerici bir zemin teşkil etmesi için yeniden değerlendirdi ve kullandı. Bu incelemeye dayanarak bu tez Gülhan Fermanı'ndan sonra bir devlet politikası olan ve II. Meşrutiyet Devrinde bir Osmanlı aydını olan Satı Bey tarafından kuramsallaştırılan Osmanlıcılığın en azından fikri manada Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun dağılmasından hemen önce güçlü bir siyasi alternatif olarak kaldığını ileri sürmektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Zafer Toprak for his guidance and assistance. I also owe my special thanks to my jury members Prof. Dr. Çağlar Keyder and Assist. Prof. Cengiz Kırılı for their contributions to the thesis. I want to also thank to Prof. Dr. Gökhan Çetinsaya for his advices and warnings.

I would like to thank to my parents, my mother Semra Zengin and my father Hüseyin Zengin for their presence and continuous support throughout my education.

I owe my special thanks to Lord Tracy Şen who is the kindest person I have ever met. Without her sincere assistance and encouragement, I could not complete the thesis. I also thank Kathryn Kranzler for her care while editing the whole thesis.

I want to express my deepest gratitude to my friends. I am thankful to Alaaddin Tok who also prepared master thesis have listened my concerns patiently and encouraged me to overcome the process. I also thank to one of my sincere friends Abdullah Enes Tüzgen who motivated me when the times I felt desperate. I want to express my gratitude to Abdullah Saçmalı who helped me to reach some important sources for my thesis. I also thank İbrahim Kuran and Gülseren Duman for their friendly conversations.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: THE HISTORY AND TRANSITION OF OTTOMANISM.....	13
Authoritarian Centralist Ottomanism (1839-1875).....	14
Constitutionalist Ottomanism and the Young Ottomans	24
The Ideology of Namık Kemal as An Ottoman Patriot	27
The Ottomanism of the 1876 Constitution.....	33
The Ottomanisms of Abdullah Cevdet and Prince Sabahattin.....	40
CHAPTER THREE: OTTOMANISM AS A POLITICAL AGENDA	45
Satı in Mülkiye: The Background of an Ottomanist.....	47
Satı as a Revolutionary Bureaucrat: A Unionist in the Balkans	49
Satı after the Constitution: The Footsteps of an Ottomanist.....	52
Satı in the Pursuit of Progress: The Early Political Thought of Satı Bey.....	55
Satı as an Ottoman Patriot during the Balkan Wars.....	63
Satı Criticizes the Harsh Centralization Policies of CUP during the World War I	75
CHAPTER FOUR: OTTOMANISM AS A PROJECT OF SOCIALIZATION	78
The Politics of Education: Primary Schools and the Criticism of the Elitist View	79
The Clashes of the Intellectuals: The Discussion from Education to Nation	81
The Two Rival Methods: The Roots of the Controversy between Satı Bey and Ziya Gökalp.....	85
Satı as an Evolutionist: His Views on the Origins of Society and Morality.....	89
The Fathers and Sons: Spencer and Durkheim as the Forefathers of the Old Discussion.....	93
Nation or Individual: The Discussion between Gökalp and Satı.....	96
Solidarist and Individualist Moralities: Gökalp and Satı Discusses the Problem of Morality	103
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	109
APPENDICES	115

BIBLIOGRAPHY 130

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Mustafa Satı Bey was the leading theoretician of Ottomanism in the Second Constitutional Period. His Ottomanism, which was theorized as an alternative to the Turkish nationalism of the period, should be examined for two reasons. The first is to reveal in what respects Ottomanism differed from the other alternative political ideologies of the period. The second is to investigate the transformation of Ottomanism, which was first formulated as a state ideology in the Tanzimat Charter during the different stages of İlber Ortaylı's "long century" of the Ottoman Empire. In other words, studying the thought of Satı Bey enables a researcher both to locate his distinctive mode of thought in the Young Turk intellectual history and to trace the development of the ideology of Ottomanism in the Second Constitutional Period by examining the views of one of the most qualified and reformist defenders of it.

It should be stated that this thesis does not comprise all of the works of Satı Bey, who declared his views on a variety of topics from pedagogy to natural sciences and sociology. The thesis is not a monographic study of the intellectual, but is constructed around a research question. The main goal of the thesis is to identify the basic tenets of the Ottomanism that was theorized by the Ottoman intellectual in the Second Constitutional Period. This goal bears an implicit suggestion that nationalism, which became the dominant ideology after the creation of the nation state, should not be seen as the only politically viable ideology of the Second Constitutional Period. It should be stated clearly that religiously and ethnically pluralistic environment of the late Ottoman public was the arena of different political

agendas of “saving the Empire.” Thus, the examination of Ottomanism of the Second Constitutional Period which has been neglected in the literature of Ottoman intellectual history is important for post-republican researchers not only to determine the alternative political trajectories of the period, but also understand how the nationalist thought was developed along the clashes of the ideologies.

Methodological and Theoretical Issues

The challenge which the researcher has to confront during her investigation of Satı Bey’s thought is to cover the variety of topics which the intellectual issued in a one consistent framework. In another words, the researcher has to offer an effective methodology to deduce a consistent and coherent ideology from the views of an intellectual who responded to immediate political and social crises in his articles. The intellectual’s views on political issues and his theoretical articles concerning the issue of social transformation should be distinguished analytically. Such a distinction would enable the researcher to unfold the intellectual’s project of modernization by tracing the continuities and discontinuities of the intellectual’s respond to the different political cases. To put it more clearly, it seems to me that Satı’s Ottomanism can be distinguished as a) Ottomanism as a social project and b) Ottomanism as a political agenda. Ottomanism as a project of modernization could be defined as a consistent project of transforming society along the lines of the individualization of the community based society. His Ottomanism as a political agenda, on the other hand, involved different political objectives which changed according to different contexts.

The Ottomanism of the Second Constitutional Period as a political ideology needs to be constructed theoretically before the other political ideologies of the period. The theoretical question with which the researcher must engage is whether Ottomanism as an ideology can be defined and understood as an alternative to Turkish nationalism. If it is regarded as an autonomous ideology distinct from nationalism, how can they be distinguished? What is the main difference between the two?

Theoretically, it should be underscored that Ottomanism, which was defined as a “creation of a transcendental identity which grounds itself on the common bond of love of fatherland” should be assessed as an example of patriotism.¹ The question which examines the intention behind such a reference to the ideology of patriotism is a legitimate one. However, identifying Ottomanism as an Ottoman patriotism could enable the researcher to seek a theoretical framework which can attribute a limited discussion to a broad-based literature. The existing literature on the nationalism-patriotism debate can provide a theoretical space in which the quarrel between Ottoman patriotism and nationalism can be located.

Patriotism As an Alternative to Nationalism

Scholars have compared and contrasted nationalism and patriotism to explicate the differences between the two. Cabellero defines nationalism as “an expression of the shared history, ethnicity, and cultural characteristics of a nation. In times of social pressure, the ideology of nationalism intensifies its exclusion of the

¹ Şükrü Hanioğlu, “Osmanlıcılık” (Ottomanism), *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (The Encyclopedia of Turkey from Tanzimat to Republic) vol. 5, edited by Murat Belge (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985) p. 1389.

foreign and focuses more and more on the homogeneity or purity of national group.”² He also says, patriotism “is also politically useful for creating unity of sentiment and purpose, and like nationalism it emphasizes the shared history and cultural characteristics of a nation, but it does so without regard to the ethnicity of its members.”³ Thus for Caballero the main difference between patriotism and nationalism is the nationalism’s emphasis on ‘ethnicity’. Nationalism dwells on ethnicity as the basis of identity whereas patriotism stresses the culture and shared identity as the unifying bond. For Habermas, the difference between patriotism and nationalism is significant. According to him while patriotism addresses “the political loyalty of citizens to the free polity they share, whereas nationalism is a matter of ethnicity and culture.”⁴ Habermas suggests ‘cosmopolitan constitutional patriotism’ that complies with the universal liberal values which can be a model for the multi-cultural countries.⁵

Maurizio Viroli who analyzes ‘nationalism’ and ‘patriotism’ in a comparative perspective suggests that patriotism should be distinguished from nationalism: He declares the intention of his book to distinguish patriotism as an alternative to the nationalism: “In scholarly literature and common language, ‘love of country’ and ‘loyalty to the nation’, patriotism and nationalism, are used as

² Carlo Caballero, “Patriotism or Nationalism? Fauré and the Great War,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32, no.3 (Autumn 1999), p. 595.

³ Ibid., p. 595

⁴ Jürgen Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 500-507.

⁵ Margaret Canovan, “Patriotism is Not Enough”, *British Journal of Political Science* 30, no.3 (July, 2000), p. 416.

synonyms. And yet, as I hope to show in this study, they can and must be distinguished”⁶

The scholars who defines patriotism as an alternative to nationalism attributes it the humanitarian and liberal qualities that nationalism lacks. For them, patriotism is not an exclusivist ideology that demands homogenization of ethnicities and cultures. It is compatible with humanitarian ideals and tolerant to diversity.⁷ Viroli asserts that “the language of republican patriotism could serve as a powerful antidote to nationalism.”⁸ For Viroli, contrary to nationalism, “patriotism works on bonds of solidarity and fellowship that like feels toward like to transmute them into forces that sustains liberty instead of fomenting exclusion or aggression”⁹

On the other hand, patriotism meets with criticisms which underscore its incapacity of mobilizing the emotions of people. For these criticisms patriotism cannot mobilize or enforce people because it cannot utilize the necessary power to legitimate the political regime.¹⁰ As Conavan objects to the idea patriotism founds a patriotic loyalty to prevent the ethnic rivalry: “The claim that an impartial state can form a benign umbrella soaring above rival national or ethnic identities and attracting patriotic loyalty ignores the most crucial political question. Where is the state to draw its power from? What holds up the umbrella?”¹¹ The critical question that

⁶ Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Nationalism and Patriotism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p.1.

⁷ Margaret Canovan, “Patriotism is Not Enough,” *British Journal of Political Science* 30, no.3 (July, 2000), p. 416.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

¹⁰ For the criticisms, look at Margaret Canovan, “Patriotism is Not Enough,” *British Journal of Political Science* 30, no.3 (July, 2000), pp. 413-432; Cécile Laborde, “From Constitutional to Civic Patriotism,” *British Journal of Political Science* 32, no.4 (October 2002) , pp. 591-612.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

Canovan asks addresses the problem of legitimacy and integration. Precisely, the question is what will make the people participate in the political system? For Canovan it is not easy for a political system which is founded only on liberal political rights and humanitarian principles without demanding pre-political ties to secure its legitimacy and enforce its rule over the people.¹²

Satı Bey's Patriotism As an Alternative Political Agenda

In the case of the Ottoman Empire, we see that after the emergence of nationalist movements the main problem that engaged Ottoman bureaucrats and intellectuals was “how to keep people from various ethnic origins, religions and cultures together.”¹³ Ottomanism was first developed as a secular ideology to construct a broad-based identity transcending the communal identities in the Tanzimat period.¹⁴ Although it had a limited success at disrupting old communal loyalties, it failed to develop institutions to ensure the participation of the people in the political system. Tanzimat Ottomanism could not go beyond its authoritarian character which was restricted itself to the top down policies of the Tanzimat bureaucrats.¹⁵ The Young Ottomans, on the other hand, intended to found Ottomanism as a political ideology both to ensure the legitimacy of the the political regime and to mobilize the people around a transcendental idea. However, the

¹² Ibid., p. 427.

¹³ Selçuk Akşin Somel. “Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)” (The Idea of Ottomanism in the Age of Ottoman Reform), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce* (Political Thought in Modern Turkey), vol. 1, edited by Murat Belge (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları: 2001), p. 88.

¹⁴ Hanioglu, p. 1390.

¹⁵ Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: Hurst & Co, 1998), p. 201.

legitimization and mobilization aspects of Young Ottoman Ottomanism could not be formulated in a consistent ideological framework.¹⁶

For the legitimization of the regime, the Young Ottomans suggested a constitution with the representational organs to secure the political rights of the individuals.¹⁷ However, the Young Ottomans also intended to mobilize the Muslim population as the agents of the struggle against the European economic and political domination. They utilized the notion of fatherland (*vatan*) with Islamic overtones to gather the people around a common idea.¹⁸ The Islamic Ottomanism of the Young Ottomans was transformed into the Union of Muslims (*ittihad-ı İslam*) in the period of Abdülhamid. The Young Turks emerged as an oppositional movement against the Abdülhamid regime and took the idea of “progress” as the centre of their ideology.¹⁹ They appropriated “science” as the method of and guide to realizing social change and progress. Prince Sabahattin and Abdullah Cevdet, who were the leading intellectual figures of the Young Turk movement, dwelled on an Ottomanism which was based on the “mutual benefits” of the ethnic groups to remain under the umbrella of the Ottoman Empire.

Satı Bey intended to synthesize the Young Turk’s theme of social progress and the Young Ottoman Ottomanism, which aimed to mobilize the people by addressing the emotional bonds of the people to the fatherland. As a Young Turk intellectual who prioritized social change, he attributed education the role of transforming the collective formation of Ottoman society into the individual-based

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 222.

¹⁷ Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought* (Syracuse NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000), pp. 308-313.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 326-332.

¹⁹ Şükrü Hanioğlu, *The Young Turks in Opposition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 25.

order. He insisted on the project of the creation of the modern individual by designing an effective scheme of education. In this way he challenged the views that envisaged the top down policies prioritizing the construction of an elite class which had the special mission of enlightening the masses. However, his sociological approach to the Turkish modernization did not solve the question of integration. The challenge which Satı had to confront was creating the sources of motivation to mobilize the new modern individual as an Ottoman. Thus, he had to formulate a political agenda distinct from his sociology. He formulated a new synthesis of Ottomanism based on the unifying force of Islam, loyalty to the fatherland and the notion of “the spirit of the Oriental people”. Satı’s social and political thought had the same basis in that they were both individualistic; however, one can also find differences between the two. Satı’s sociology was founded on his materialist epistemology. His Ottomanism however was a political ideology that utilized idealist constructions like the love of fatherland.

Satı Bey was the intellectual who theorized Ottomanism as a political ideology as an alternative to the nationalism of Ziya Gökalp. The split between nationalism and patriotism of the late Ottoman period was not due to their intention, but their method. Both Ziya Gökalp and Satı advocated the mobilization of the people around a common idea. Gökalp argued that only nationalism could persuade people integrate into the political system, whereas Satı Bey grounded his patriotism on the individual who would identify himself as an Ottoman. Satı opposed nationalism because in a multi-ethnic Empire nationalism only disintegrated the state. However, Gökalp argued that the emergence of the Turkish nation did not mean the exclusion of the other ethnic groups. The differing views of the two intellectuals appear on a variety of topics from pedagogy to sociology. Thus, I am

going to examine the tension between patriotism and nationalism in the late Ottoman period by placing Satı Bey's thought before Ziya Gökalp's nationalism.

From Prejudice to Empathy: Satı Bey in Turkish Literature

The publications on Satı Bey in Turkish can be divided into two groups according to their approach:

First the blameful approach: This approach accuses Satı Bey of being a hidden Arab nationalist before his departure from Istanbul to Syria. The two representatives of this approach are Mehmet Erişirgil and Ali Çankaya. Mehmet Emin expresses his suspicion of Satı Bey's acquiring an effective position in Syrian public instruction after his departure: "It can be argued that Satı Bey when he was in Turkey had an indirect relationship with the Sherif Huseyin movement. His sudden departure and playing an effective role administrate public education in Syria as an advisor of Faysal strengthens this claim."²⁰ Ali Çankaya also expresses the same suspicion: "Because he was ethnically Arab and an Arab nationalist he decided to serve Syria."²¹

The second approach was revisionist: In this approach, researchers distance themselves from the ideological atmosphere of the early republican era and took a sympathetic before Satı Bey. Osman Kafadar gives back the prestige of Satı Bey in

²⁰ "Satı Bey'in Türkiye'deyken Şerif Hüseyin hareketi ile dolaylı ilgisi olduğu tahmin edilebilir. Zira, birdenbire Suriye'ye giderek Kral Faysal'ın eğitim işlerini yöneten danışmanı olması, daha sonra onunla birlikte Irak'a geçmesi bu görüşü destekler niteliktedir." Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, *Bir Fikir Adamının Romanı: Ziya Gökalp* (A Novel of a Man of Ideals: Ziya Gökalp) (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1984), p. 131.

²¹ Ali Çankaya, *Son Asır Türk Târihinin Önemli Olayları İle Birlikde Yeni Mülkiye Târihi Ve Mülkiyeliler Mülkiye Şeref Kitabı* (A New History of Department of Politics and its Graduates with the Significant Events of the Turkish History in the Last Century), vol. II (Ankara: Mars Matbaası, 1968), p. 416.

his article *Türk Aydınının Satı Bey Hakkında Kimi Yanılgıları Üzerine* (Opinions on Some Delusions of Turkish Intellectuals Concerning Satı Bey.) In this article, Kafadar argues that Satı Bey should be assessed as an Ottoman intellectual who served the Empire intimately before 1919.²² Ercüment Kuran's article on Satı Bey also attempts to uncover the importance of Satı Bey in Turkish modernization.²³ Kuran in another article hails Satı Bey as an "Ottoman Patriot."²⁴

Independent from these two groups, another important study that deals with Satı Bey's thought in Turkish is Hilmi Ziya Ülken's *Türk Tefekkür Tarihi* (Turkish Intellectual History.) In this important book, Hilmi Ziya enlists the works of Satı Bey, by presenting important details about his polemics with the leading intellectuals of the period Ziya Gökalp and İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu.²⁵ Another important book is Niyazi Berkes' *Arap Dünyasında İslamiyet, Milliyetçilik ve Sosyalizm* (Islam, Nationalism and Sosyalizm in Arab World), which especially gives important information about Satı Bey's life in the Ottoman Empire by conducting an interview with him. Although Niyazi Berkes approached Satı Bey with suspicion, he did not abandon his respectful attitude toward him during the interview.

The most important book on Satı Bey is William Cleveland's *the Making of an Arab Nationalist: Ottomanism and Arabism in the Life and Thought of Sati' al-*

²² Osman Kafadar, "Türk Aydınının Satı Bey Hakkında Kimi Yanılgıları Üzerine Düşünceler" [Thoughts on some Delusions of Turkish Intellectuals Concerning Satı Bey], *Türkiye Günlüğü*, no. 46 (Summer 1997), pp. 97-105.

²³ Ercüment Kuran, *Türkiye'nin Batılılaşması ve Milli Meseleler* (Westernization of Turkey and National Issues), comp. Mümtazer Türköne (Ankara: Türk Diyanet Vakfı, 1997), pp. 191-196.

²⁴ Ercüment Kuran, "Osmanlı Vatansveri Satı Bey" [Satı Bey as an Ottoman Patriot], *Türkiye Günlüğü*, no. 34 (Mayıs-Haziran 1995), pp. 18-20.

²⁵ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (The History of Modern Turkish Intellectual Thought) (İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 1979).

Husri.²⁶ In this book, Cleveland presents a complete description of Sati' al-Husri's Arab nationalist thought after 1919. Although Cleveland summarized Satı Bey's life and thought before 1919 successfully, he does not intend to analyze Satı Bey's Ottomanism in detail.

Two master theses have been done on Satı Bey at Marmara University. Although both of the theses are successful at introducing Satı Bey's thought, they lack of a view point to investigate Satı Bey' thought systematically. Hatice Başar's thesis²⁷ concentrates on Satı Bey's contributions to Turkish public education and studies Satı Bey's views on pedagogy in detail. Her thesis is important for learning Satı Bey's role in the Ottoman education. She does not study Satı Bey's political and social thought in a consistent framework. Fatma Çil's thesis²⁸ is a successful one sought to discover Satı Bey's bibliography in Turkish, which I made use of this bibliography in this study. However she also does not develop a perspective from which to evaluate Satı Bey's thought in a particular framework. She succeeds at discovering the views of the intellectual with a careful survey of the journal articles however she does not attempt to build her massive research around a critical question.

This thesis will examine Satı Bey's thought within a particular framework of the ideology of Ottomanism. However, I do not define Ottomanism as only a practical political device "to hold the Empire around the very identity of

²⁶ William Cleveland, *The Making of an Arab Nationalist: Ottomanism and Arabism in the Life and Thought of Sati' al-Husri* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977), pp. 3-46.

²⁷ Hatice Başar, "Satı Bey'in eğitim ile ilgili görüşleri" (The Opinions of Satı Bey regarding pedogogics) (M.A. Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2001).

²⁸ Fatma Çil, "Satı Bey'in Hayatı, Eserleri ve Türk Eğitimine Katkıları" (The Life of Satı Bey, His Works and Contributions to the Turkish Education) (M.A. Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002).

Ottomanness (*Osmanlılık*).”²⁹ Beyond this political prescription I refer to Ottomanism as a social program that sought to construct a modern society based on an individualist and secular morality. Thus, Satı Bey’s project of Ottomanism is studied with regards to both aspects of Ottomanism.

The first chapter of the thesis looks at the history and transition of Ottomanism in order to understand how Ottomanism as an ideology emerged and changed across the different periods. Such a review of the transformation of Ottomanism will exhibit both the historical and intellectual background of Satı’s Ottomanism. In the second chapter, the political views of the intellectual will be discussed by tracing the chronological line to detect how his political Ottomanism was shaped across the various political crises of the period. In the chapter, the ideological background of his political stance is going to be examined; his involvement with the popular debates of the period will be analyzed and his ideological position will be located in the political movements of the period. In the third chapter, Satı’s views concerning the social transformation will be studied. In the chapter, the Turkish nationalism of Ziya Gökalp and patriotism of Satı Bey will be compared and contrasted by referring to the methodology which undergirded the social and political views of the two intellectuals. In the conclusion part, the significance of the discussion of Ottomanism for contemporary researchers will be emphasized. Moreover, the outcomes of the discussion will be examined by working over the main traits of Satı’s Ottomanism.

²⁹ It is one of the definitions of Ottomanism. Look at, Hanioglu, “Ottomanism,” p. 1389.

CHAPTER TWO

THE HISTORY AND TRANSITION OF OTTOMANISM

Şükrü Hanioglu defines Ottomanism as a political and intellectual movement that intended to create a super identity over the communal and religious identities of the peoples of the Empire to protect the Empire from disintegration.³⁰ As the existing literature on Ottoman modernization indicates, Ottomanism, which was declared a political program in the Gülhane Receipt in 1839, did not remain the same throughout the century. It was so transformed by the new political and social conditions that it can be argued that the periodization of Ottomanism is important to tracing the continuities and discontinuities in the ideology.

Selçuk Akşin Somel, in his article “In the Age of Ottoman Reform, the idea of Ottomanism”, separates Ottomanism into four distinct periods from 1839 to 1913: First the Authoritarian Centralist Policies of Bab-ı Ali (Ottoman central bureaucracy) from 1839 to 1875; second the Constitutionalist pragmatism by Young Ottomanist opposition between 1868-1878; third The Ottomanism that was advocated by Young Turk opposition against Abdülhamid II’s autocracy; and last the Ottomanism that was seen in the Second Constitutional Period.³¹ Somel’s periodization of Ottomanism is so useful for understanding Ottomanism that this thesis makes use of it. However, I am going to merge the third and fourth periods under the title of “Young Turk Ottomanism” because I could not determine a significant difference between the Ottomanisms of before and after the July Revolution. The thoughts of Satı Bey, who was a theoretician of the Second Constitutional Period Ottomanism, cannot be

³⁰ Hanioglu, “Osmanlıcılık,” p. 1389.

³¹ Somel, pp. 88-97.

understood without referencing early Young Turk political thought. To state it clearly, as Satı Bey was an affiliated member of the Young Turk ideology, his Ottomanist ideology should be evaluated as a part of Young Turk thought.

Authoritarian Centralist Ottomanism (1839-1875)

The Ottoman State was confronted with huge crises in the beginning of the nineteenth century. The impact of the nationalist ideology which stemmed from the French Revolution triggered the non-Muslims in the Balkan region to rebel against the Ottoman State. The Greek uprising against the Ottoman rule (1812-1829) had important consequences.³² It was the first rebellion against the Empire motivated by nationalist sentiments. When the Greeks acquired independence, the Ottoman government worried that the nationalist ideology might spread to other non-Muslim ethnic groups. As Hanioglu puts it, this means that the Empire faced the risk of being scattered.³³ Faced with the challenges of nationalism, Ottoman government had no choice other than inventing political instruments to prevent the state from disintegration.³⁴ As Hanioglu concludes, the first period of Ottomanism can be regarded as an ideological underpinning of pragmatic political agenda which intended to create a transcendental identity to impede the nationalist uprisings of the non-Muslim communities.³⁵

After the Greek rebellion, the Ottomans realized the impotency of the traditional community-based structure of the Empire. This system could no longer

³²Hanioglu, "Osmanlıcılık," p. 1390.

³³ Ibid., p. 1390.

³⁴ Somel, p. 88.

³⁵ Hanioglu, "Osmanlıcılık"..., p. 1390.

provide the legitimacy that the Empire had enjoyed in its glorious ages. Drawn from the existing literature, the main goal of the authoritarian centralist Ottomanism can be put as transforming the community-based structure of the old order by creating a secular super identity detached from the religious identities of the community-based structure of the classical age; centralizing and modernizing the country to encounter new social and political conditions.³⁶

As was argued, the Authoritarian Centralist Ottomanism endeavored to prepare the grounds of a modern nationality by dissolving the communitarian identities of the old order and by modernizing and centralizing the state apparatus by applying a substantial reform program. The reform program and construction of a secular political identity could be two consequences: One was the creation of an autonomous class of bureaucracy which functioned according to registered rules and regulations to carry out the reform program.³⁷ The second was the necessary secularization in administration, law and education. For Berkes, secularization was necessary because the old order that depended upon religious identities was no longer intact; thus, new regulations had to be made to construct a new identity detached from religious law.³⁸

The program of the Authoritarian Centralist Ottomanism was proclaimed in the *Tanzimat Fermanı* (Charter of the Orders) which announced in the name of the Sultan in 1839. Judicially, as Abadan writes, *Tanzimat Fermanı* was regarded not as a Constitution but as a Charter because it had been declared by the Sultan unilaterally

³⁶ For the details of centralization and secularization policies of the *Tanzimat* look at Berkes, pp. 89-192.

³⁷ Creation of the Porte as the centre of the government began in the period of Mahmut II and then identified with *Tanzimat*. *Ibid.*, p. 97.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

without putting himself in any judicial obligation.³⁹ However, the Sultan assured the validity of the decree by swearing not to violate the principles declared in it. Thus, unless the authority changed the provisions of the Charter, the principles that the Charter imposed were valid judicially.⁴⁰ The Charter as Abadan writes did not command codes of law in a strict manner; however, it ordered the basic principles which legislators had to obey.⁴¹ Berkes sums up the principles as follows: The old disordered system had to be replaced by one based upon new laws (*kavanin-i cedide*). These laws would be in accordance with the Şeriat, and they would be based upon the inviolability of life, property, and honor as legal fundamentals, finally they would be equally applicable to all Muslims and to the peoples of the *millets*⁴²

The Tanzimat Charter and its ideological underpinning Ottomanism bore both the traditional and modern minds of governing. Somel warns us that Ottomanism had its roots in classical Ottoman political thought. He concludes that the Tanzimat Charter and its ideological program of Ottomanism in some respects were in conformity with the Ottoman state tradition.⁴³ With its commitment to the Şeriat and its emphasis on “Fairness”, the Tanzimat Charter signified a continuity of Ottoman governmental thought.⁴⁴ Somel further argues that the theory of “Circle of Justice” had occupied a central place in Ottoman political thought in the classical age. According to this theory, executive classes should behave justly to the subjects in

³⁹ Yavuz Abadan, “Tanzimat Fermanı’nın Tahlili” (An Analysis of Tanzimat Decree), *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (Tanzimat: Ottoman Empire in the Process of Change), edited by Halil İnalçık, Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2006), p.48.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁴² Berkes, p. 144.

⁴³ Somel, p. 89.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p.89.

order to achieve good levels of tax revenue. The good revenue enables the government to build a strong army. A strong army would guarantee the permanence of the state. Thus, just behavior to the subjects was crucial for the existence of the state.⁴⁵

Somel shows the parallels between the emphases on fair treatment of the subjects in the Charter which complied with the classical Ottoman manner of governing. In the Charter, it was argued that if persons felt that their lives and honor were in danger, they could behave properly to their country; however, if persons felt that their lives and honor were in safe, they would not deviate from the true path. They began to love their country.⁴⁶ Thus, it can be concluded that the Charter presupposed the idea that the fair treatment of the subjects could prevent the nationalist movements which was in conformity with the traditional idea of the prosperity of the subjects would secure the permanence of the state.

However, besides the traditional elements in the Charter, it is clear that it attempted to modernize and secularize the conventional Ottoman political and social system. One can suppose that the idea of the equality of persons of all religions before the law might have had a revolutionary effect on traditional Ottoman state ideology. Before 1839, the Ottoman state mechanism had been organized around the principles of segregation of the subjects from the executive classes and segregation of the non-Muslim religious communities from the Muslims in *Millet* system.⁴⁷ According to Hanioglu, *millet* had been defined as a nation or ethnic community, but

⁴⁵ Ibid., p.89.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p.93.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 90.

as a religious community by the Ottomans before the Charter.⁴⁸ According to the *millet* system, Kenanoğlu argues, non-Muslims in the Ottoman political system were granted a large measure of autonomy in their internal communal affairs.⁴⁹ However, Lewis dwells on the notion of “toleration” and concluded that the idea of toleration was predicated on the assumption that the tolerated communities were separate and inferior, and were moreover marked as such.⁵⁰ As a result, it can be argued that the idea of the equality of people of all religions meant the loss of the traditional superiority of Muslims over the non-Muslims in the Empire. Thus, it seems that the Ottoman government decided to transcend the communal loyalties of the ethnic groups in order to construct a higher loyalty of the subjects to the state by accepting the equality of its citizens before the law.

After the dissolution of the community based structure of the Empire, a new reference of legitimacy had to be invented according to Somel.⁵¹ He further argued that in the new era, only three bases of legitimacy could be constructed to replace the older communal bonds in order to grasp the society without considering ethnic and religious differences: The first was, attributing sacredness to the State, party or Sultan to bind the Muslims and non-Muslims together. The second was to attribute sacredness to the common land (*vatan*) by developing the feeling of patriotism. The third was constructing a nation by designing a secular identity which transcended the ethnic and religious identities.⁵² Somel argued that the first basis of legitimacy, that

⁴⁸ Hanioglu, “Osmanlıcılık”..., p.1389.

⁴⁹ M. Macit Kenanoğlu, *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek* (Ottoman System of Religious Communities: Myth and Reality) (İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2004), p. 34.

⁵⁰ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford, 1961), p. 105.

⁵¹ Somel, p. 91.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp, 91-92.

is, creating a Sultan cult as a binding force dominantly used as a political device by the Ottoman government from the 1830s to 1913. Somel's approach proves that the discourse of common land was not often used by the officials, but was taken in consideration by the Young Ottoman and Young Turk opposition. However for him, the model of nation as a source of secular identity was not asserted before 1908.⁵³

Somel's analytic differentiation of the three bases of legitimacy of the new order is very useful to understanding the changes in the reference of legitimacy that Ottomanism had undergone. I will trace the main lines of this differentiation. In the authoritarian centralist Ottomanism, Somel by quoting from Sadık Rıfat Pasha's book, *Ahlak Risalesi* (Ethics Booklet) showed how the Sultan was presented as the protector of the Muslims and non-Muslims. Sadık Rıfat Pasha, who can be assumed as the theoretician of the Tanzimat Period prayed: "The God Almighty endows Our Majesty the long life, and does not deprive all the classes of his subjects from his shadow of mercy."⁵⁴

After the 1860 incidents in Syria, Fuat Pasha addressed Syrians as the equal citizens in civil and judicial rights whom the Sultan with its compassionate rule was seeing as his own children.⁵⁵ It seems clear that the paternalistic role of the Sultan as the protector of his subjects irrespective of their religion was asserted in the Tanzimat Period. Thus, the Sultan, who was close to all his subjects regardless of their religion, should be regarded as the savior of the people according to the Tanzimat creed.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 92.

⁵⁴ Cited in, Ibid., p. 94. "*Cenab-ı Hak cümlemizin velinimetini olan Şevketli Padişahımız Efendimiz Hazretlerine pek çok vakit tükenmez ömürler ihsan buyursun ve saye-i merhametini her sınıf tebaası hakkında eksik etmesin*"

⁵⁵ Adil Baktıaya, *Osmanlı Suriye'sinde Arapçılığın Doğuşu* (The Emergence of Arabism in the Ottoman Syria) (İstanbul: Bengi Yayınları, 2009), p. 197.

Besides the ideological significance attributed to the Sultan, as Mardin dwells on this point that the novelty that the Tanzimat introduced was the attempt to build a rational bureaucracy which functioned according to specific rules and regulations.⁵⁶ It seems clear that creating a neutral and rational bureaucracy class which had been educated in secular schools and would act accordingly to registered rules and regulations could be the guarantor of the new identity of Ottomanism. It seems evident that the creation of the bureaucracy as a protector of the rights of Muslims and non-Muslims was a revolutionary development because before Tanzimat Charter the life and property of bureaucrats had not been secured before the arbitrary rule of the Sultan. Şerif Mardin argues that the main intention of Tanzimat Charter is to strengthen the bureaucracy before the Sultan:

If the charter of Gülhane had been primarily prepared as an instrument to make the Ottoman state function with greater efficiency and to eliminate the wastefulness of uncontrolled imperial fiat, a special aspect of this purpose was that the charter was aimed at giving more extensive powers than they hitherto wielded to the Ottoman “men of the pen”, the bureaucrats of the Porte who, as the state machinery was gradually streamlined, had become progressively indispensable.”⁵⁷

The Tanzimat bureaucrats intended to establish the “rule of law” on solid foundations as Mardin puts it.⁵⁸ The establishment of the “rule of law” initially secured the status of bureaucrats, because not the Sultan but established bureaucracy can guarantee the permanence of the state: The spokesman of the Tanzimat period, Sarik Rifat Pasha, argued that the continuity of a state was not only the product of the good administration of a given sovereign. However, laws would secure the

⁵⁶ Mardin, p. 156.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p.157.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 184.

permanency of the state after the demise of the Sultan.⁵⁹ Sadık Rifat Pasha also argued for the necessity of the “rules and regulations rather than the “personal factors” that dominated the Ottoman administration. For him the life, honor and property of bureaucrats should be secured.⁶⁰ However, the bureaucracy as a class should not continue their traditional role as the masters of the subjects. They should acknowledge that they were the servants of the people and should treat the subjects gently and equally.⁶¹

The policy of creating a political identity that superseded religious identities and the emergence of a bureaucracy that functioned according to specific rules and regulations culminated in the secularization of the Ottoman political and social system, as Berkes discusses in his great book *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Berkes concludes that the secularization process created a dual system because while the Tanzimat reformers were founding new institutions, the older institutions were also operating. He maintains:

The policy of secularism brought forth a differentiation between the “temporal” and “religious” in the Turkish-Islamic context. The developments in administration, law, system, or a series of dichotomies that would eventually plunge the separationist or dualist secularism of the Tanzimat into the insoluble dilemma of the Constitution of 1876⁶²

It could be concluded that although the duality continued throughout the Tanzimat period, secular institutions grew and became increasingly more effective because of the changing economic and political conditions. Berkes shows us that codification became the central instrument of reform in the Tanzimat period in order to adjust the changing status of non-Muslim communities and to accommodate the

⁵⁹ Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 182-183.

⁶¹ Somel, p. 95.

⁶² Berkes, p. 155.

new economic and social conditions.⁶³ Before the codification two normative systems had prevailed:

Up to the proclamation of *hatt*, the two normative systems had existed side by side which determined the “limits of the permissible” of which he was speaking. One of them was the law of the Koran, the Şeriat, with all its appendages for elucidation, interpretation, and exegesis- theoretically the supreme and ultimate statement of the law. The second body of law operative in the Ottoman Empire was derived from the power of the sovereign to make law by edict- the ancient ‘Urfi prerogative of the sultan⁶⁴

The Tanzimat Charter pledged the equality of all the persons before the law, which was written, declared and accessible to the public, as Mardin puts it.⁶⁵ However, neither Şeriat nor Urfi law fulfilled these conditions. Berkes further argued that for the first time it appeared that laws should be framed on the basis of a superior law. Codification is for him the first attempt to differentiate between law and religion and to legislate, after deliberation and selection, from among the available sources and upon certain rational or secular criteria.⁶⁶

The secularization reforms were implemented progressively by the government. However, the secularist reform movement and creation of Ottomanism as a secular identity detached from religious identities encountered oppositions. It seems to me fairly evident that after examining the existing literature on this topic, the opposition sides can be divided into three groups. First, the reactionary groups in the periphery; second, the conservative statesmen who were disturbed by the rapidity of the reform movement, and tried to restore the old status quo; and the Young

⁶³ Ibid., p. 160.

⁶⁴ Mardin, p. 183.

⁶⁵ Berkes, p. 160.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 161.

Ottomans who criticized the authoritarian conduct of the bureaucracy and argued for constitutionalism as the only choice for the salvation of the State.⁶⁷

It may be argued that the reactions against the Ottomanist reforms of the Tanzimat raise in the periphery mainly for two reasons: First, is the centralist policies to establish direct control over the subjects. The groups who enjoyed the benefits of the previous system opposed the reforms. Especially the elimination of tax farming system and the direct collection of the taxes by the State were met with resistance by the benefiting groups who would have to pay more in the new system.⁶⁸ The second reason was the abolition of the conventional hierarchy between the Muslims and non-Muslims. As Baktiaya shows in the Arab lands, the new situation caused huge unrest. Muslims, who had been traditionally regarded as the dominant religious group in the Empire protested the new situation.⁶⁹ As Baktiaya reports, the violence began immediately between the religious groups in Syria and evolved into civil war in 1860 in Lebanon. The Ottoman government immediately intervened in the incidents and harshly punished those responsible for the events, however many Christians were killed.⁷⁰ With the intervention of the French army, the Ottomans had to accept the autonomy of Lebanon in 1861.⁷¹

⁶⁷ For the details look at; Halil İnalçık, “Tanzimat’ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkiler, Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu”(Implementation of Tanzimat Reforms and Social Repercussions) *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (Tanzimat: Ottoman Empire in the Process of Change), edited by Halil İnalçık, Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2006) pp.109-131; Yavuz Abadan, “Tanzimat Fermanı’nın Tahlili” (An Analysis of Tanzimat Decree), *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (Tanzimat: Ottoman Empire in the Process of Change), edited by Halil İnalçık, Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2006), p. 48.

⁶⁸ İnalçık, *Tanzimat...*, p. 120.

⁶⁹ Baktiaya, p. 180.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 191

The second reaction came from the officials who looked at Tanzimat reforms with doubt because of the rapid secularization and Westernization. Cevdet Pasha was the well known Tanzimat bureaucrat who opposed Ali and Fuat Pasha's secularizing attempts. He protested the idea of adopting the French Civil Code by arguing:

Certain persons took up the idea of translating French (civil) codes into Turkish for judgment in the *nizami* courts. This idea was not acceptable because changing the basic laws of a nation would entail its destruction. The *ulema* believed that those who had gone astray to hold such Frankish ideas were unbelievers. The Franks, on the other hand, used to say 'bring forth your code; let us see it and make it known to our subjects',⁷²

Cevdet Pasha became successful in his struggle against the Pashas who wanted to adopt French civil code as the Ottoman civil code and headed the group to write a civil code (*Mecelle*) the provisions which were derived exclusively from the Hanafi School of law."⁷³ Somel argued that the preparation of an Islamic *Mecelle* instead of adopting a secular civil code obstructed the opportunity to provide the judicial unity of Muslims and non-Muslims.⁷⁴ Thus, the opportunity of the creation of the secular Ottoman political identity by adapting a secular civil law was impeded.

Constitutionalist Ottomanism and Young Ottomans:

Tanzimat reforms were successful at abolishing the old system which had been founded on religious identities; however failed to establish a modern nationality which was organized around an idea of a secular Ottomanism. Berkes writes it:

Ottoman sovereignty was no longer based upon Islam. It no longer meant rule over a number of a number of subordinate theocracies called *millets*. It was not even a sovereignty sustained by a Turkish "nation" as that did not exist either in

⁷² Cited in Berkes, p. 167.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 168.

⁷⁴ Somel, p. 102.

the modern sense of nationality, or in the sense of religious community. And it was not based upon the interests of an economic class, because the usurer-capitalists and adventurous speculators did not constitute a rising class capable of creating a modern nation⁷⁵

Berkes argues that the Tanzimat failed to construct a “modern sense of nationality” because it could not ground itself on a social stratum⁷⁶. It intended to abolish communal bonds and could not formulate a new ideology to mobilize people around the identity of Ottomanism. Moreover, as Mardin argues the Tanzimat reformers also could not dwell on the articulation of a secular ethic to bind the people of the different religions to a unitary moral code.⁷⁷ To conclude, the Ottomanism of the Tanzimat reformers, were unable ground ground itself on a social stratum, lacked an ideology to mobilize people to participate in Ottoman society instead of enjoying their community based identities and did not offer a theoretical stance on which to ground the moral values that bind the people.

The Young Ottomans emerged as an oppositional movement to the authoritarian policies of the Tanzimat executives Ali and Fuat Pashas. As Mardin puts it, they all worked in the Translation Bureau of the Porte, and most of them were acquainted with the European political systems.⁷⁸ They demanded “liberty” against the authoritarianism of the Tanzimat pashas.⁷⁹ According to Mardin, their criticism concentrated on two issues: surrendering the Empire to the economic imperialism of

⁷⁵ Berkes, p. 201.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 201.

⁷⁷ Şerif Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi: Makaleler IV* (Turkish Modernization: Articles IV) compiled by Mümtaz'er Türköne, Tuncay Önder (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991), p. 89.

⁷⁸ Mardin, *The Genesis...*, p. 163.

⁷⁹ Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi...*, p. 88.

Western states by declaring the Reform Receipt (*Islahat Fermani*), and the degenerating Muslim culture as a result of the imitation of Western ways.⁸⁰

The Gülhane Receipt had promised the equality of subjects; however, the unanticipated developments disrupted the balance between Muslims and non-Muslims. As Mardin argues,

The more extensive commercial relations between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, the growth in missionary activities, the influence of the secular ideas of the Enlightenment on the Christian populations of the Empire, the rising national and political consciousness of these same people, the growing interest taken by the European Great Powers in the protection of Christians in the Empire provided non-Muslims an advantageous economic and social status before the Muslims.⁸¹

It can be concluded that the Muslims, who had lost their traditional status of the dominant nation in the Empire (*millet-i hakime*), now was exposed to the economic and social hegemony of the non-Muslims by rapid secularization and the expansion of new capitalist relations. As Mardin argues the rapid secularization and expansion of capitalist relations also caused the emergence of a Westernized class which adopted Western ways without any reservation. This Westernized class was alienated from the upper and lower classes of Ottoman society because of their excessive spending.⁸² Although, as Mardin puts it, Ottoman cultural life was divided into the behavior of the elites who had enjoyed the culture of the Palace, and the culture of the people, the upper classes had to confine themselves to a limited consumption pattern.⁸³ Thus, it seems that the new Westernized class disrupted the conventional patterns of consumption. The Young Ottomans harshly criticized the new class as “snobs” who were rootless imitators of Western culture. They accused

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 88-89.

⁸¹ Mardin, *The Genesis...*, p. 14.

⁸² Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi...*, p. 57.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 57.

the Tanzimat officials of applying a false Westernization, adopting only the consumption patterns of the Westerners not the useful qualities.

It seems evident that Young Ottomans who felt responsible for the maintenance of the state and the improvement of the conditions of the Muslims against the European powers, had to determine a political agenda to construct an ideology to mobilize people around the idea of an Ottoman nationality, to offer a theoretical stance to ground the moral values that bind the people and to constitute a social stratum which appropriated the new Ottoman identity. To sum up, the Young Ottomans were searching for ideology, ethics and social class with which to construct the Ottoman nationality.⁸⁴

As a response to the lack of an ideology in the Tanzimat period, to mobilize the people around Ottomanism, as Berkes argues Namık Kemal developed two distinct ideologies which could be reconciled easily. The first was Ottoman patriotism as a secular ideology based on the idea of the allegiance to the fatherland (*vatan*) that presupposes the fusion of the *millet*s (*imtizac-ı akvam*).⁸⁵ The second was an Islamic nationalism which addressed the “Muslims’s need for change and development of a new sense of solidarity”⁸⁶(*ittihad-ı islam*). Although Namık Kemal did not regard the two objectives contradictory,⁸⁷ they could be distinguished analytically:

⁸⁴ For the ideology of Young Ottomans, look at Mardin, *The Genesis...*, pp.287-336, Berkes, *The Development...*, pp. 208-222.

⁸⁵ Berkes, p. 221.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

The Ideology of Namık Kemal as an Ottoman Patriot:

Namık Kemal emphasized the idea of loyalty to the fatherland as a common bond to unite the people from different religious communities. As Mardin argues, Namık Kemal, who was the most influential figure of the Young Ottomans defined *vatan* not as a “geographical unit but as an emotional bond in which the memories of ancestors, the recollections of one’s own youth and earliest experiences all had a place.”⁸⁸ Kemal argues that:

The fatherland is not composed of the vague lines traced by the sword of a conqueror or the pen of a scribe. It is a sacred idea resulting from the conglomeration of various noble feelings such as the people, liberty, brotherhood, interest, sovereignty, respect for one’s ancestors, love of the family, and childhood memories”⁸⁹

The creation of the idea of fatherland was a noble development to replace the two competing bases of identity; communal identity and ethnic identity. As Bernard Lewis puts it, “The idea of country- of the national territory as the basis of identity and the focus of loyalty- has had chequered history in the Middle East. It has in particular had to compete with two very powerful rivals. One was the old, deep – rooted and now renascent religious and communal loyalty to Islam; the second was another importation from Europe, defined by language, culture, and real or imagined descent”⁹⁰ Although the term *vatan* had been used earlier in the Gülhane Receipt as “the inescapable duty of all the people to provide soldiers for the defense of the

⁸⁸Mardin, *The Genesis...*, p. 327.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Bernard Lewis, “Watan,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, v. 26, no. 3/4, (Sep. 1991), pp. 530-531.

fatherland,”⁹¹ it became the source of an identity in Young Ottoman political thought.

Namık Kemal advocated the fatherland as a source of identity to activate the “individuals’s allegiances to the *vatan*, i.e., to the territory contained within the borders of the Ottoman Empire.”⁹² However, the question emerged of how these individual allegiances could be translated into a common identity. Kemal argued that a representative assembly could provide the necessary uniting force.⁹³ Thus, it can be concluded that, according to Kemal, by the representation of the people in a National Assembly, the feeling of the common identity could succeed.

As Mardin writes, Namık Kemal’s important contribution to the ideology of Ottomanism was the idea of “the harmonious symbiosis of ethnically and religiously differing populations.” Mardin emphasizes that Kemal’s contribution, which should not be overlooked, was that the idea of union of people (all to be known as Ottomans) replaced the previous conception of people living side by side in peace, but still separated by religious barriers in the absence of a feeling of nationality. Securing the union of people was based on two conditions for Kemal, Mardin argues, “equal guarantee of the political rights of the entire Ottoman population” and a system of education accessible to everyone.⁹⁴

It can be argued that Namık Kemal invented the idea of the people as sovereign as the basis of the legitimacy of the new order to replace the sovereignty of the Sultan. In order to understand how he managed to construct the idea of the people as sovereign, one should analyze the political system that Kemal envisioned. Analyzing

⁹¹Ibid., p. 526.

⁹² Mardin, *The Genesis...*, p. 328.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 330.

this political system is also necessary to understand the Islamic nationalism of Namık Kemal which was based on the solidarity of Muslims and the Şeriat, which provided the basis of a common moral code of the citizens. Thus the main lines of Kemal's political ideology should be examined to determine his efforts to synthesize Islam and constitutionalism and Islamic nationalism that Kemal attempted to construct.

Namık Kemal as an Islamic Nationalist

Before discussing the political ideology of Namık Kemal, it should be acknowledged that Kemal was not a committed Westernist. He took a critical position against both traditional conservatives and imitative Westernists. As Berkes puts, it he was a synthesizer who struggled against both the elements of traditional culture that were resisted progress and the elements of Western culture that should not be absorbed.⁹⁵ Although Namık Kemal was highly influenced by Western thinkers and adopted the idea of popular sovereignty from Rousseau,⁹⁶ he as Mardin argues, took an Islamic approach to the problem of government, and religion was given a significant role in his program of government.⁹⁷

As Mardin writes Namık Kemal founded his theory on the idea of the liberty of the individual. He stressed the Islamic theory of the inviolability of the person by referring to the saying in the Koran which made man "sovereign over things."⁹⁸ For Kemal, the liberty of the individual should be granted because "man is free. He

⁹⁵Berkes, p. 215.

⁹⁶ Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis...*, p. 333.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 287.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 298.

always required freedom. To deprive humanity of it was as if one were to deprive it of food.”⁹⁹

Mardin states that according to Kemal, the freedom of man can only be protected in society because, only in society can the individuals be secured from the attacks of their kin.¹⁰⁰ Thus, in Kemal’s political system, the right of sovereignty belonged to the people because individuals who were free in the nature of the state decided to form a state. For Kemal, as Berkes stresses, “the function of the state was to provide the authority necessary to the preservation of these rights.”¹⁰¹ Kemal continued to argue that after the creation of society, because everybody could not deal with the governmental issues, the members of the community should be represented by a government.¹⁰² Thus, the creation of a government was a necessity in Kemal’s political ideology.

The delegation of the right of sovereignty seems to have been a critical problem in Kemal’s political thought. He solved this problem by referring to the Islamic concept of *Biat*. *Biat* is a way of confirming the authority of the caliph by the notables of Islamic society.¹⁰³ Kemal stressed that “if the people of a country gather and pledge allegiance to a man for the Sultanate or Caliph preceding him is invalidated, for the imamate is a right of the community.”¹⁰⁴ Thus, it seems clear that

⁹⁹ Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 297.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

¹⁰¹ Berkes, p. 210.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 291.

¹⁰³ For the details look at Cengiz Kallek, “*Biat*” (Obeisance), *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol.6 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988), pp. 120-124.

¹⁰⁴ Cited in Mardin, *The Genesis...*, p. 294.

for Kemal, the Sultan did not have a divine right to rule the people, but the *Biat* which is granted to him legitimated his rule.”¹⁰⁵

After the creation of a government with the mediation of *Biat* institution, a new problem arises. It is, while in the state of nature, individuals enjoyed the natural rights, what would guarantee the rights of individuals before the state after the creation of the government. Namık Kemal argued that Şeriat, which was in conformity with the natural law would take the role of natural law. Şeriat, after the construction of society would organize the pattern of interaction between individuals.¹⁰⁶ For him, the ethics also should be based on Şeriat, which was a partial and perfect law that objected to the secularization of law.¹⁰⁷ He argued that because Şeriat was the law ordained by God, it put the perfect standard of good and bad.¹⁰⁸ He stressed the perfection and impartiality of Şeriat over the secular laws; the jurisdiction of God was superior to the jurisdictions of humans.¹⁰⁹ He said that morality could not be considered without religion so that secular laws could not be the basis of ethics. Therefore, in Kemal’s political philosophy, as Mardin stresses, Şeriat which determined abstract good and bad, should be the source of ethics

¹⁰⁵ “*There is no quality of the Padişah which gives him the right to govern men other than that which, under the name of Biat is granted to him and with which the ministers are vested by way of appointment*” Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 297.

¹⁰⁶ “*When societies became larger, states and governments were formed and it became necessary to enact a binding thread which would elicit common opinion in matters of general administration for the individuals who made up every society. This binding thread is Şeriat which is the political law serving to protect and govern the members of society jointly and severally. Its interpretation is determined by the assent of the community but its basis is natural law. For us that natural law is the same as divine justice as has been set by the Koran*” Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 293.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 315.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

¹⁰⁹ Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 315.

because morality without a religious basis cannot check and control the deeds of the people.¹¹⁰

The contradiction in Namık Kemal Ottomanism stemmed from two irreconcilable intentions, as Berkes notes: The first was the unification of Muslims (*İttihad-ı İslam*) and the fusion of millets (*imzac-ı akvam*).¹¹¹ Although Kemal himself did not regard the two of his objectives irreconcilable, it seems clear that the two objectives, patriotism with Islamism at its base which intended to mobilize Muslims and Ottomanism as a secular super ideology that intended to construct people as the sovereign regardless of religious and ethnic differences were difficult to reconcile. He relied on the power of the constitution that secured and guaranteed the political rights of the non-Muslims:

If a correct policy were pursued, that is, if all peoples enjoyed rights and liberties, if common education inculcated all with the worth of the fatherland, if it were shown that those who pursued separation would fall victims to the exploitation of the European powers, then all would subordinate their religious or national sentiments to a higher sentiment of patriotism.¹¹²

Kemal's equation was simple. For him, common education would inculcate the consciousness of fatherland to the Ottoman people. The Ottoman people, who were enjoyed rights and liberties and who saw their benefit to remain under the umbrella of the Empire did not consider segregation. In the last instance, it can be formulated that Kemal synthesized constitutionalism and Islam under the ideology of Ottomanism, he determined Şeriat as the theoretical ground of his ethics, and the people as a sovereign as the social stratum. However, as Somel argued, Kemal's attempt to formulate a secular Ottomanism based on the idea of fatherland and

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 314.

¹¹¹ Berkes, p. 210.

¹¹² Cited in Ibid., p. 221.

constitutional liberal political rights gradually took the shape of Islamic patriotism which appealed to the sentiments of Muslims against the European domination and Westernized elites.¹¹³

The Ottomanism of 1876 Constitution

The text of the 1876 Constitution was the formal declaration of Ottomanism. In Article 8, Ottomanism was defined as “Without exception, all the people who belong to the Ottoman state regardless of their religion and sect are called as Ottomans.”¹¹⁴ The Constitution was meant to reconcile the Islamic identity of the State and Ottomanism. In Article 15, it asserted that although the religion of the state was Islam, the right of prayer for all the communities also was secured by the Constitution.¹¹⁵

The Constitution achieved important gains for the Ottomanism; however as Somel argued, it could not succeed in transferring the sovereignty from the Sultan to the people. Berkes asserted that in the new condition after the promulgation of the Constitution sovereignty still belonged to God, the law remained the Şeriat so that the constitution was only a part of the divine law.¹¹⁶ According to constitution the National Assembly was not an independent organ that it could make decisions without the approval of the Sultan. The Constitution gave the ruler the right to dismiss the National Assembly and suspend the Constitution whenever he wants.¹¹⁷

¹¹³ Somel, p. 104.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 105.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p. 106.

¹¹⁶ Berkes., p. 246.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 246.

As Berkes writes, instead of creating the abstract bonds of identity such as loyalty to the fatherland or citizenship, the cult of the Sultan was reinforced by attributing religious justification to its order.¹¹⁸ Berkes suggests that the Constitution, which was declared by the efforts of the Young Ottomans, prepared the autocratic rule of Sultan Abdülhamid after the dismissal of the National Assembly in 1878.¹¹⁹

The Basic Lines of Young Turk Political Thought

Young Turk political thought is a broad issue to discuss here; however, before going on to examine the views of the two influential Ottomanists, Abdullah Cevdet and Prens Sabahaddin, we must dwell on the question of what the characteristic of Young Turk political thought were or, put another way what distinguished Young Turk political thought from the earlier periods.

Tarık Zafer Tunaya stresses that the only political intention of the Young Turks was to save the Empire.¹²⁰ Şerif Mardin agrees saying that the thing that motivated them was not their passion for liberty (*hürriyet*) but to prevent the Empire from disintegration.¹²¹ For Mardin, the Young Turks failed to develop a systematic theory, an original political formulation or a consistent ideology.¹²² He further stresses the

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 247.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 248.

¹²⁰ Tarık Zafer Tunaya, “Türkiye’nin Siyasi Seyri İçinde İkinci ‘Jön Türk’ Hareketinin Fikri Esasları” (Intellectual Principles of Second ‘Young Turk’ Movement in the Journey of Turkish Politics), *Tahir Taner’e Armağan* (The Gift to Tahir Taner) (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1956), p. 185.

¹²¹ Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri, 1895-1908* (Political Ideas of Young Turks, 1895-1908) (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1983), p. 305.

¹²² Ibid., p. 24

lack of philosophical speculative thinking among Ottoman intellectuals in the nineteenth century:

If I have to summarize the things that I have learned from my examination of nineteenth century intellectual history are: It is impossible to talk about a Turkish intellectual thought in the nineteenth century. However one can only mention nineteenth century “sociology of thought.”¹²³

Mardin concedes that despite the lack of a tradition of secular-philosophical thought, the Young Turks developed a pragmatic, short-term political agenda to modernize the country in order to “save the State.”¹²⁴ The main objective and motive of the Young Turks was the disparity between their imagined society, which was grounded on abstract principles and Hamidian society which is grounded on personal relationships.¹²⁵ The understanding of new honor was developed after the Tanzimat period among Turkish intellectuals to replace patrimonial relationships based on personal ties. Mardin stresses that the “new honor” required the guarantee of the political and social rights of the individuals.¹²⁶ He further states that the main objective of Turkish modernization was passing from the community-based social structure to the individual-based society.¹²⁷ However, how this transition would be achieved was still a matter of discussion. Thus, the need for understanding the pillars of Young Turk thought is compelling.

Şükrü Haniöğlü examined the ideological roots of Young Turk thought and uncovered the basic pillars of their pretensions. Haniöğlü marks the important break

¹²³ “Özetlemem gerekirse, 19. Yüzyıl düşünce tarihimiz üzerindeki incelemelerimin, bana öğrettikleri şunlardır: 19. Yüzyıl düşünce tarihinden bahsetmek mümkün değildir. Ancak bir 19. Yüzyıl “düşünce sosyolojisi” nden bahsedebiliriz.” Ibid., p. 18.

¹²⁴ Ibid., p. 17.

¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 19.

¹²⁶ Şerif Mardin, *Türkiye’de Toplum ve Siyaset: Makaleler 1* (Society and Politics in Turkey: Articles 1), compiled by Mümtaz’er Türköne, Tuncay Önder (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991), p. 185.

¹²⁷ Şerif Mardin, *Türkiye’de Din ve Siyaset: Makaleler 3* (Religion and Politics in Turkey: Articles 3), compiled by Mümtaz’er Türköne, Tuncay Önder (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991), p. 89.

in Ottoman political thought, which was the acknowledgement of the adoption of Western systems because of the irrefutable challenge of Westerners by the Ottoman intellectuals.¹²⁸ Hanioglu writes that the Ottoman intelligentsia was dissociated in every way from the traditional world view, and the new era of intellectual history of the Empire had begun.¹²⁹ For him, before the Young Turk period “modernization was to be stitched into an Islamic jacket, and the only purpose of Westernization became the attainment of superiority over the West through the adoption of western technology”¹³⁰ As far as understood from his evaluations, in the new era Islam, which had been alienated from its religious message was only utilized as a social function. So that it can be stated that Westernization was acknowledged as a total project of adopting Western ideas, institutions and styles.

Hanioglu argues that the idea of progress became dominant in the Ottoman thought and “science” was acknowledged as the method of controlling and leading the social change.¹³¹ He determines the main pillars of Young Turk thought as biological materialism as the ideology of understanding social change, Islam as an instrument of social change and elites as the agents of social change.

Hanioglu writes that in the 1850s the concept of modern science became independent from the authority of religious thought.¹³² With the foundation of Imperial Medical School, biological materialist thought had acquired an institution. The school became the central place for developing materialist thought student read

¹²⁸ Hanioglu, *The Young Turks...*, p. 9.

¹²⁹ Ibid., p. 10.

¹³⁰ Ibid., p. 8.

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 12.

¹³² Ibid., p.11.

the works of the famous materialists of the period, like Büchner.¹³³ Hanioglu says that the Young Turks did not need to embrace science and Islam as the earlier generations had tried,¹³⁴ but utilized scientific thinking to investigate social facts.¹³⁵ It seems clear that biological materialism was the dominant ideology that was seen by Young Turks as an alternative to Islam for examining social problems. Hanioglu writes that Ahmet Rıza¹³⁶ and Abdullah Cevdet, the two leading intellectual figures who led Young Turk movement between 1895 and 1908, regarded society as a complex organism prone to illnesses.¹³⁷ They defended organismic views and offered biological materialism as a remedy to the problems of the Empire. The two intellectuals stressed the incompetence of Islam before biological materialism. For Cevdet, Islam also should be considered a part of biological materialist thought.¹³⁸

As Hanioglu notes the Young Turks did not attach importance to Islam as a divine revelation; however, they imputed a functional role to Islam as a tool of modernization of the masses.¹³⁹ Abdullah Cevdet distinguished the pure religious aspects of Islam from its social aspects and tried to attract the attention of the Muslims to the social functions of Islam.¹⁴⁰ Ahmet Rıza also attached importance to the social function of Islam as a unifying bond between Muslims.¹⁴¹ Hanioglu

¹³³ M. Şükrü Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak Doktor Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi* (As a Political Thinker Dr. Abdullah Cevdet and His Period) (İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1981), p. 13.

¹³⁴ Şükrü Hanioglu, *The Young Turks...*, p. 9.

¹³⁵ Şükrü Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak...*, p. 12.

¹³⁶ For his political views; Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri...*, pp. 177-223.

¹³⁷ Cited in Hanioglu, *The Young Turks...*, p. 208.

¹³⁸ Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak...*, p. 136.

¹³⁹ Hanioglu, *The Young Turks...*, p. 200.

¹⁴⁰ Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak...*, p. 131.

¹⁴¹ Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri...*, p.187.

summarizes the two functional roles attributed to Islam as follows: “First, the Young Turks as modernists thought that the only way of fusing modernization and westernization into their Empire was to present them to Muslim masses as Islamic concepts... Second, the Young Turks perceived their society as being an *umma* of Muslims and so they sincerely undertook to develop the means of converting the ‘psychology of Muslims’.”¹⁴² Islam as a political tool was important to the Young Turks because only the discourse of Islam could convince the masses to adopt the modernizing reforms.¹⁴³

As Hanioglu notes Abdullah Cevdet argued for the conformity of Islam with Western political thought by referring to the life of the Prophet. He supported the modernist Islamist view which sought the reformation of Islam in order to return to the essence of the religion.¹⁴⁴ While degenerated Islam hindered the progress Cevdet said pure Islam did not.¹⁴⁵ It is interesting to note that, as Ismail Kara finds the idea of resorting to the essence of Islam by distinguishing genuine Islam from traditional Islam was a common theme for the Westernists and Islamists. For both Westernists and Islamists traditional Islam, which was blurred with superstitions was seen as the cause of the decline of Muslims; however genuine Islam carried the basic themes of modernizing reforms.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴²Hanioglu, *The Young Turks...*, p.201.

¹⁴³“Cited in Şükrü Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak...*, pp. 130-131. *Uzun tecrübelerimizle biz Müslüman kafasının doğrudan doğruya Hristiyan aleminden geldiği takdirde aydınlığa bütün girişleri kapayacağını müşahade etmiş bulunuyoruz. Binaenaleyh bizler, Müslüman damarlarına yeni bir kan nakletme görevini üzerlerine alan bizler, İslamiyette çok miktarda bulunan terakkiper ver prensipleri arayıp bulmalıyız”*

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 138.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p.137.

¹⁴⁶ İsmail Kara, *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında* (Between the Religion and Modernization) (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2003), p. 37.

The Young Turks, drawing from the theories of Gustave Le Bon, perceived the people as “senseless” masses which had to be shaped by the elites.¹⁴⁷ They criticized the people for not approving of their efforts.¹⁴⁸ Thus, the Young Turks intended to create elites who would impose new reforms on the people.¹⁴⁹ The elitism also was nourished by social Darwinism, as Hanioglu explains according to social Darwinist thought, the selection of the fittest would lead to the government of the elites.¹⁵⁰ For Abdullah Cevdet, the main criterion that distinguished the elites from the ordinary people was the volume of the skull.¹⁵¹ For Cevdet, social progress could only be realized by the nourishment of the elites.¹⁵²

To summarize, although the Young Turks did not develop a consistent and coherent political ideology, they aimed to modernize the country by implementing practical reforms. They envisioned a society grounded on abstract norms and regulations to replace the patrimonial relationships based on personal ties. Progress and social change were the key concepts to achieve the imagined society. They attributed science a guiding role in carrying out the social change; they divorced religion from its divine revelation, but utilized its social role to convey the new ideas to people; and last, but not least, they entrusted the role of carrying out the modernizing reforms to the elites.

¹⁴⁷ Şükrü Hanioglu, *The Young Turks...*, p. 206.

¹⁴⁸ “*To whom does the guilt belong? To the people! Because every nation is worthy of the government that administrates it*” Cited in Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 206

¹⁵⁰ Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak...*, p. 16.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid., p. 17

Ottomanisms of Abdullah Cevdet and Prince Sabahattin

As discussed above, Ottomanism as an ideology from its declaration as a state policy in the Gülhane Receipt to the Young Turk period had two intentions. The first was to achieve socialization by superseding communal bonds, and the second was to construct a secular political identity to ensure the loyalties of the people. However, the two intentions contradicted at some points. The Tanzimat reforms intended to implement modernization policies; however they could not succeed at ensuring the loyalties of the people because their authoritarian character closed the channels of participation to the system by the people. Young Ottomans were successful at designing a constitutional system to ensure the participation of the people in the political system with the invention of people as the sovereign. However, the 1876 constitution unfortunately lagged behind the desired political system because of the placement of the status of the “Sultan” above the constitutional system.

The Young Turks, different from the Young Ottomans, did not attribute “the people” a revolutionary mission. For Young Turks, the elites would be the agents of social progress. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Ottomanisms of Prince Sabahattin and Abdullah Cevdet did not dwell on the project of the integration of people of different ethnic and religious origins. The two leading Young Turk intellectuals relied upon the liberal notion of the utility that was expected to be provided by remaining under the political umbrella of the Ottoman Empire.¹⁵³ For the Young Turk intellectuals, the Ottoman state should be seen as an upper political entity under which people from different ethnicities and religious lived. For Abdullah

¹⁵³ Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 216. Cevdet argues: “The bond that binds the various elements cannot be the dynasty of the throne. It is the benefit and the common prosperity of various elements. It can be realized only by the participation of every element and the people of the Book to the sovereignty of Turkish Empire by the means of the Constitution and National Assembly.”

Cevdet, ethnic groups should protect their own cultural identity, and while doing that not clash with the universal citizenship. Hanioglu writes that for the Young Turks, Turkishness as an upper political identity did not weaken the religious or ethnic identities.¹⁵⁴ It seems interesting to note that the Young Turk intellectuals, instead of using the Young Ottoman's patriotic argument which attributed the fatherland a sacred status, brought realist arguments that pointed out the mutual benefits of the people to remaining within the Ottoman Empire.

As Berkes writes, Prince Sabahaddin argued that the Hamidian regime was not responsible for all of the grievances of Ottoman society.¹⁵⁵ For him, the real problem behind the underdevelopment of the society was its collectivistic formation that prevented private initiative. Nevertheless, the real revolution was not a political one but a social one formulated as transforming society from collectivistic formation (*tecemmüi*) to an individualistic (*infiradi*) order.¹⁵⁶ As Berkes indicated, in order to pass to the individualistic order, Prince Sabahaddin and his friends proposed a new form of government and a new education system. For progress, Sabahaddin argued that an individualistic education based on the Anglo-Saxon model should be accommodated, and as a governmental system, decentralization (*adem-i merkeziyet*) should be accepted.¹⁵⁷ His views on decentralization were met a reaction in the CPU

¹⁵⁴ Cited in, *Ibid.*, p. 217. Cevdet argues: "Look at me I am Kurdish. I like Kurds and Kurdishness. However since I am a Turkish citizen with equal in rights and duties, I am a Turk before everything else... Form these words; it should not be thought that since I am a citizen of Turkey, I argue that Kurdish language should be forgotten, Kurdishness should be forgotten. On the contrary, let's Kurds invigorate Kurdish, Armenians invigorate Armeniano. Some people, who thought that these damage Turkey, are baldheaded and betrayers"

¹⁵⁵ Berkes, p. 311.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak ...*, p. 200.

congress in 1902 from Ahmet Rıza Group who defended centralization to destroy the local powers.¹⁵⁸

After the promulgation of the Constitution, Prince Sabahaddin clarified his Ottomanist thought. As Somel argued for him, similar to Abdullah Cevdet, Ottomanism should be based on the “mutual benefit” of the elements in the Empire.¹⁵⁹ He pursued the logic of his argument that the ethnic groups in the Empire were not mature enough to demand independence. For Sabahaddin, if the ethnic groups gained independence they would necessarily fall under the hegemony of a great power. So for Sabahaddin decentralization was only an administrative policy, not one involving the giving of autonomy to the ethnic groups.¹⁶⁰

The Ottoman patriotism from the Tanzimat era to 1913 attempted to construct an ideology grounded on the idea of the unifying effect of a political identity that transcended communal identities. Ottomanism had revolutionary effects on the traditional Ottoman political system in that it sought to abolish the archaic *millet* system in order to found a new political system based on the equality of subjects regardless of religious differences. Despite the success of the secularizing policies of the Tanzimat era to disrupt the communal religious bonds, it failed to find a source of new identity. Tanzimat reformers could not articulate political ideology with which to mobilize the people around the idea of Ottomanness.

The Young Ottomans, who criticized the authoritarian policies of the Tanzimat bureaucrats, proposed a constitutionalism that would secure the political and social rights of all citizens. However, the syncretic political system which was

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 201.

¹⁵⁹ Somel, p.109

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

the amalgamation of constitutionalism and Islam also intended to mobilize Muslims against European domination. The two irreconcilable political objectives undermined the effect of the Young Ottoman constitutionalism. However, men such as the important actor of the Young Ottoman movement, Namık Kemal, made a crucial contribution to Ottoman political thought by presenting the people as the only sovereign. Kemal also dwelled on the idea of fatherland as the unifying bond between the Ottoman people. Although *vatan* had been used as a political category as early as Gülhane Receipt, he elaborated on the concept and determined its content. He argued that *vatan* is not a mere geographical place, but the bearer of the memories of the people that constituted the Empire. In other words, for the Young Ottomans, *vatan* as an ideal above the societies of the Empire had the potential to incorporate the different religious and ethnic identities. In the Young Turk political thought, on the other hand, one can not see such an idealist conception of fatherland. The Young Turk intellectuals who dealt with the problem of “progress” saw decentralization as a reasonable option which might halt the total disintegration. They regarded the bond of citizenship adequate to solve the contradiction between the local ethnic identities and the Ottomanness as a super identity.

Satı Bey was the one of the most important intellectual figures of the Second Constitutional Period. He sought to synthesize the Young Turk ideology which prioritized a modernization program guided by the notions of “science” and “progress” with the Young Ottoman theme of *vatan* as the basis of the allegiances of the citizens to the state. In the following chapter, the political thought of Satı will be discussed

CHAPTER THREE

OTTOMANISM AS A POLITICAL AGENDA

Ottomanism as argued before, from its adoption as a state policy had two objectives. The first was the creation of a super identity to transcend the communal identities of the subjects. The second was the construction of a modern society which would ground itself on the “individual.”¹⁶¹ According to the Ottomanist project, a new individual who had gained autonomy from the religious-communal bonds would be bound to the Empire by the political and social rights ensured by the state. The promulgation of the Constitution in 1876 and opening up the parliament were progressive steps of realizing the project of Ottoman patriotism by strengthening the political allegiance of the subjects. However, only opening up the channels of political participation could not ensure the unity of Empire because of the attractive promises of nationalism. Thus, Ottomanism could not restrict itself to mere political rhetoric. It had to attract the emotions of the people by creating the common grounds for political allegiance to the Empire.

Satı’s political Ottomanism can be seen as a sophisticated endeavor to develop the objects for arousing an emotional loyalty to the Empire. However, the attempt to attract political allegiance to the state was affected by the political events of his era. His Ottomanism was shaped strongly by his experiences in the atmosphere of the Balkan Wars and World War I. Thus, this chapter is organized to unfold the intellectual route of the thinker who was confronted with huge crises in his career. As a researcher, I traced the intellectual and factual career of the thinker together to

¹⁶¹ I discussed the objectives of Ottomanism in the second chapter by referencing Selçuk Akşin Somel’s article on Ottomanism; however the analytical distinction of the political and social Ottomanism is my own deduction from the secondary resources on the Ottoman modernization.

disclose how the political developments of his period and his Ottomanism shaped each other.

The route of Satı Bey's thought can be divided into three periods. The first period is from the promulgation of the Constitution to 1913, when he developed his epistemology, which was determined strongly by the materialism of the period. It involved the application of the methodology of natural sciences (empiricism) as instruments of investigation of the social facts. In this period he also contemplated the theory of education. The second period was the relatively shorter period during the Balkan Wars when he theorized patriotism around the ideas of "common land" and "shared memory." The third period began after the seizure of the government by the Committee of Union and Progress in 1913 and continued until the departure of the higher officials of the Committee from the country in 1919. In this period he theorized his social Ottomanism, which was grounded on the individualist sociology of Spencer against the collectivism of Gökalp. The individualism of the third period also affected his political thought so that he espoused the decentralist position of Prince Sabahaddin against the centralism of the CUP. After the fall of the CUP from power, he declared his decentralist views with a greater voice.

This chapter will interweave the political developments of the period and Satı's responses to these developments. His personal biography as a frame will be used with which to follow the continuities and discontinuities of his political views. Before going to the discussion, it must be noted that, the three occasions deeply affected Satı's Ottomanism: his early dissociation from the local identities because of his father's job; his years in *Mülkiye* (The School of Political Science) which gave him the feeling of being an Ottoman; and his post in the Balkans, where he observed nationalist movements.

Satı in *Mülkiye*: The Background of an Ottomanist

Satı Bey was born on 5 August 1884 in Yemen. His parents, who were ethnically Arab, were from Aleppo.¹⁶² His father, Muhammed Hilal, who had served as a *qadi* in Aleppo before the judicial reform, took the necessary examination, became successful and was appointed Director of the Court of Criminal Appeals (*Mahkeme-i İstinaf Reisi*).¹⁶³ Satı Bey left Yemen when he was one year old. Because of his father changing posts, the first thirteen years of his life were spent in constant travel. He was unable to receive a regular education until his enrollment in *Mülkiye Mektebi* (School of Political Science) in 1893 in Istanbul.¹⁶⁴ Satı Bey, like the other members of the family, was directed toward a career in the Ottoman bureaucracy.¹⁶⁵ In his *Mülkiye Mektebi* years, he was not interested in administrative sciences but he studied mathematics and natural sciences so that his friends called him “Archimed.”¹⁶⁶ In *Mülkiye*, although he became acquainted with the views of Ahmet Rıza and read Tevfik Fikret, he did not join any secret communities.¹⁶⁷

The *Mülkiye Mektebi* had been in service since 1859. During Abdülhamid’s reign, the importance attached to the school grew due to the increasing need to train a

¹⁶² Niyazi Berkes, *Arap Dünyasında İslamiyet, Milliyetçilik, Sosyalizm* (Islam, Nationalism, Sosyalizm in the Arab World) (İstanbul, Köprü Yayınları, 1969), p. 88.

¹⁶³ Celeveland, p. 13.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 14; *Mülkiye Mektebi* was a college which was founded to raise qualified and devoted officials to the state. For its history look at; Ali Çankaya, *Son Asır Türk Târihinin Önemli Olayları...*

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 15. It is important to note that Satı Bey’s brothers Badi Nuri and Bashir Majdi also served in the Ottoman bureaucracy

¹⁶⁶ Çankaya, *Son Asır Türk Târihinin Önemli Olayları...*, vol.3, p. 854.

¹⁶⁷ Celeveland, p. 16.

new bureaucracy ¹⁶⁸ Şerif Mardin argues that the two new perspectives were developed at the school. The first is a new perception of nature based on the natural sciences, called positivism; and the second was the new perception of society based on labor, called realism. ¹⁶⁹

Satı Bey acquired two characteristic of his thought from Mülkiye Mektebi: His commitment to positivism and empiricism and his commitment to the Ottoman state. The two characteristics of his thought would determine the general shape of his political and social quests after the promulgation of the Constitution. However, he firmly asserted that no particular professor had affected the minds of the students, but rather the tradition of the school was the real determiner of the progressive and revolutionary atmosphere there. He described how the tradition of Mülkiye and the atmosphere of the school affected him and his colleagues:

When we were in the lower classes, we were exposed to the impacts of the students from the higher classes, when we came to higher classes, we constantly affected the students from the lower classes. When the older students were telling each other what they had heard, what they had read, what they thought, when they were discussing various courses they got, various issues, we, the young were listening them sometimes closely, sometimes remotely, but always with huge curiosity and concern”... ¹⁷⁰

We learned the words and legends of professors who had retired many years earlier or who were already dead in the same way, we get the legacy from the older students and delivered it to the younger... For this reason after the passing of the generation of grand professors, the generation of qualified students continued. At that time, not the living professors’ words but the souls of the old professors prevailed. Students were educated not because of the care of the professors and directors but because of the spirituality of the greats.

¹⁶⁸ Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri...*, p. 48.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 49.

¹⁷⁰ Satı, “Mekteplerde Cemiyet ve Cemaat Hayatı”, [The Life of Society and Community in the Schools], *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no.4, 24 Teşrinievvel 1334, (14 October 1918), pp. 159-160. “Biz küçük sınıflarda iken büyük sınıflar müdavimlerinin mütemadi tesirlerine ma’ruz kalır; büyük sınıflara geçince de küçüklerimiz üzerinde daima te’sirler yapardık. Onlar, büyükler, birbirlerine işittiklerini, düşündüklerini, okuduklarını anlatırken, birbirleriyle muhtelif dersleri müzakere, muhtelif dersleri münakaşa ederken, biz küçükler onları bazan uzaktan bazan yakından ekseriya büyük bir merak ve alaka ile dinlerdik.”

They were enlightened by the organic and moral environment. Thus the school has such a vigorous history and memory. The thing that makes Mekteb-i Mülkiye is its social life and moral environment.”¹⁷¹

The political atmosphere of Mülkiye in 1890s was against the existing despotic regime. From the memoirs of Satı Bey, we see that at the school, an oppositional mind against the despotic rule of Sultan Abdülhamid was dominant. He witnessed the typical occasion of passive resistance to the Sultan:

When the Director of Mülkiye, Hacı Recai Bey, invited the students to shout “Long live the Sultan!”, somehow nobody participated in this prayer and cry. This general rebellion and opposition occurred suddenly without discussion or alliance. Everybody spoke inside himself “if I do not shout who would recognize it.” Thus, because everybody thought like this without any exception, the invitation was responded to with deep silence.¹⁷²

It is clear that Satı, like his colleagues opposed the despotic regime of Abdülhamid. This oppositional mind and his search for change and progress would make him sympathetic towards the Unionist in the Balkan years just before the Revolution.

¹⁷¹ Satı, “Mekteplerde Cemiyet ve Cemaat Hayatı”, [The Life of Society and Community in the Schools], *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no.5, 14 Teşrinisani 1334 (14 November 1918), p. 189. “*Mektepten senelerce evvel çekilmiş ve hatta hayata bile senelerce evvel veda etmiş bulunan bazı muallimlerin bazı sözleri ile bazı menkabelerini de aynı suretle öğrenir; onları bizden evvel gelen talebeden bir miras gibi alarak bizden sonra gelenlere bir miras gibi verirdik... İşte bunun içindir ki Mekteb-i Mülkiye’de büyük muallimlerin nesli kesildiği zaman bile iyi talebenin nesli devam etti. O zaman talebe muallim ve müdirlerinin ihtimamlarından ziyade, uluların maneviyatı sayesinde yetişiyorradaki uzvi ve manevi muhitten feyz alıyordu. Mektebin işte böyle canlı bir tarihi, kuvvetli bir hafızası vardı. Mekteb-i Mülkiye’yi Mektebi Mülkiye yapan şey asıl ondaki bu içtimai hayat, bu manevi muhit idi.*”

¹⁷² Satı, “Mekteplerde Cemiyet ve Cemaat Hayatı”, [The Life of Society and Community in the Schools], *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no.4, 14 Teşrinievvel 1334 (14 October 1918), p. 154. “*Mektep müdürü Hacı Recai Bey bizi davet ederek “Padişahım Çok Yaşa” diye bağırmıştı. Fakat, nasılsa bu dua ve nidaya içimizden bir fert bile iştirak etmemişti. Bunun için aramızda evvelden bir müzakere ve ittifak vuk’a gelmiş değildi. Herkes içinden “Ben bağırmasam kim arkına varacak” demişti. Bunu bila istisna herkes söylemiş olduğu için vuku’ bulan da ‘vet umumi bir sükuttan başka bir mukabele görmemişti.*”

Satı as a Revolutionary Bureaucrat: A Unionist in the Balkans

After his graduation from Mülkiye, he was appointed as teacher of the natural sciences at a secondary school in the province of Yanya (Ioannina) in the Balkan region of the empire. He served there in that capacity until 1905; however he felt the urgent need of political reform and decided to take administrative roles.¹⁷³ He was appointed as a *kaymakam* (district governor) in Radovic in the province of Kosova in 1905 and in Florina in the province of Manastır in 1907. Although he collaborated with the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) against the despotic rule of Abdulhamid II in these years, he did not become a member of the Committee.¹⁷⁴ After the Young Turk revolution and proclamation of the Constitution in July 1908, the CUP assigned him the task of receiving the delegations which came to announce their support of the *Meşrutiyet* (Constitutional Monarchy).¹⁷⁵ Two of Satı Bey's speeches during these ceremonies on the *Meşrutiyet* were published in the Manastır Journal of *Neyyir-i Hakikat*.¹⁷⁶ Because of a dislike for political maneuverings, Satı resigned his position in Manastır and returned to İstanbul¹⁷⁷ where was welcomed by substantial prestige and power by the Young Turk circles because of his contributions to the Young Turk opposition against Abdülhamid II's rule.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷³ Cleveland, p. 16.

¹⁷⁴ Şit Tufan Buzpınar, *Satı' el-Husri, İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol.36 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988), p.176.

¹⁷⁵ Cleveland, p. 20

¹⁷⁶ Mustafa Ergün, "Satı Bey Hayatı ve Türk Eğitimine Hizmetleri" [The Life of Satı Bey and His Services to Turkish Education] *İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no.1, 1987, p. 4.

¹⁷⁷ Cleveland, p. 21.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 21.

The Balkan experience gave Satı Bey the chance to observe the nationalist movements. It was a novel experience for him to observe the impact of nationalist devotion which transcended religious antagonisms:

When we were in *Mülkiye*, we supposed that every movement in Europe was the movement of the Christian Europeans against the Muslims. I saw in Ioannina (*Yanya*) that, the differences in nationality are more important than the differences between Islam and Christianity. Among the Albanian nationalists, there are also Muslims.¹⁷⁹

The observations in Ioannina were the first experiences of the intellectual in understanding the role of nationalism in shaping the emotions of the people. It can be argued that he first felt the need to create of a new source of loyalty to accommodate nationalist fervor with a new allegiance which was not exclusionist. The challenge for the intellectual is how to sustain the consciousness of being Ottoman by not appealing to religious or linguistic bonds.

Satı Bey visited Ionnina years after its conquest by the Greeks and recognized that Ionnina had never been culturally Ottoman. He complained that even the Muslims did not talk “Turkish” which could have been the unifying force for the Muslim people. His emphasis on religion and language is important to understand his mentality. He acknowledged the difficulty in incorporating the non-Muslims into a super entity above the religious bonds and also he acknowledged language as the principal signifier of identity:

It was politically and administratively ours, but economically and culturally belonged to others. Everybody spoke Greek there, the mother tongue of Muslims was also Greek. Old women who could understand Turkish were minority in numbers. The persons who knew Turkish also spoke Greek, when

¹⁷⁹ Berkes, *Arap Dünyasında...*, p. 95. “*Mülkiye’deyken Avrupa’daki her hareketi Müslümanlara karşı Hristiyan Avrupalıların yaptığını zannederdik. Yanya’da gördüğüm kadarıyla ırklar arasındaki fark İslam’la Hristiyanlık arasındaki farktan daha büyükmüş. Arnavut isyancıları arasında Müslüman olanlar vardı.*”

they encountered objection they did not hesitate to respond like “but, it is our national language.”¹⁸⁰

The criticism against the Muslims who spoke Greek signified the primary role which was given Turkish as the part of the Ottoman identity. The interesting thing is that the theme of the language as the unifier was also the theme of the Turkish nationalists of the period.¹⁸¹ However, Satı was so aware of the difficulty in assigning a unifying role to the language that his articles dwelled on this point. He would seek to clarify the boundaries between his Ottomanism and Turkism by emphasizing other concepts as unifiers, as will be examined in the following pages.

Satı after the Constitution: The Footsteps of an Ottomanist

Satı supported the Young Turk Revolution as a political revolution which removed the political obstacles before the actual social revolution. Before 1913, although he did not take a post in the inner circles of the Committee, he maintained his commitment to the Party by defending the CUP against the criticisms of the opposition. The oppositional camp against the CUP claimed that members of the Committee were inexperienced young officials knew nothing about administrating the country. Satı responded to these criticisms by discussing the notion of “experience.” He tried to prove that being inexperienced was not necessarily a disadvantage for the new revolutionary cadres. To him, “experience” should be

¹⁸⁰ Satı, “Yanya ve Yanyalılarımız”, [Ionnina and Our Ionians], *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 3, 15 Nisan 1330 (15 April 1914), pp. 97-98. “*Orası siyasetçe ve idarece bizim iken, iktisadça, örfünce ne kadar başkalarının idi! Orada herkes Rumca konuşuyordu; İslamların da mader-zıdleri Rumca idi; yaşlı kadınlar arasında Türkçe’yi anlayabilenler pek nadir bir istisna teşkil ediyordu; Türkçe bilenler bile Rumca konuşmaktan bir zevk duyardı, aralarında itiraza uğrayınca “fakat efendim bu bizim lisan-ı millimiz!, demekten çekinmeyenler bile olurdu.”*

¹⁸¹ For instance for Gökalp “language is the touchstone of nationality”, look at Uriel Heyd, *Foundation of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, (London: Luzac, 1950), pp. 115-121.

evaluated in its own conditions.¹⁸² He argued that the man who observed situations with great attention could gain equal experience in two years time as the man who dealt with the surrounding circumstances in idleness (*atalet*) for twenty years.¹⁸³ Thus, the duration of experience was not as important as the quality of experience. Long experience in fact may be disadvantage for the officials to comply with the changing circumstances.¹⁸⁴ Satı valued the determination (*azim*) over the unproductive experience.¹⁸⁵

After returning to İstanbul, Satı continued to work for *Neyyir-i Hakikat* as a reporter: “I began to work as a reporter in İstanbul, even that the first person who reported the 31 March Incident was me in the journal of *Neyyir-i Hakikat*”¹⁸⁶ Besides working as a reporter for *Neyyir-i Hakikat*, he also started to publish the journal of *Envar-i Ulum*. *Envar-i Ulum* (Lights of the Sciences) was a journal where a variety of topics from history to natural sciences were discussed. Unfortunately, the journal did not sell, “because nobody was interested in those things.”¹⁸⁷

He was appointed as the Director of *Darülmüallimin-i Aliye* (Teacher’s Training College) in 1909.¹⁸⁸ He implemented many important reforms to modernize education such as applying a new system of teaching the alphabet, putting gymnastic courses in the schedules, and encouraging musicians to compose songs for the

¹⁸² Satı, “Tecrübelilik Tecrübesizlik Meselesi”, [The Issue of Experience and Inexperience] *Mülkiye*, no: 20, 1 Eylül 1326, (14 September 1910), p. 51.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 54

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

¹⁸⁶ Cleveland, p. 92. “İstanbul’da muhabirlik de yapmağa başladım. Hatta 31 Mart vakasını Neyyir’i Hakikat gazetesine ilk veren ben oldum.”

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Çankaya, *Son Asır Türk Târihinin Önemli Olayları...*, vol.3, p. 844.

children. He also established a School for Practicing in the Darümuallimin to enable the teacher candidates to practice the new methods on the students ¹⁸⁹ He was so successful in his modernizing attempts that the pan-Turkist intellectual of the era Yusuf Akçura appreciated lauded reforms:

When I visited Darümuallimin the year following Satı Bey's assumption of the Directorship, I found it basically transformed as if by a miracle. Although I differed with Satı Bey in his views on Ottomanism, I believed that the sound precepts with which he instilled his students would make them understand this error by their own accord. Therefore, whenever I met a Turkish youth coming from Russia or the Caucasus to study in Constantinople, I said to him: 'Try to enter the Darümuallimin of Satı Bey'¹⁹⁰

It is very interesting to note that Satı, whose father was Arab and who defended Ottomanism as a political ideology, was appreciated by the Turkish nationalist circles of the day. Later, Yusuf Akçura, who was writing in *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Home) the organ of Turkish nationalist circles, would celebrate Satı as Turkist because he put Turkish names on the schools which he founded,¹⁹¹ such as *Yeni Mektep* (New School) and *Çocuk Yuvası* (Nursery School). This shows how difficult it was to locate an intellectual in any one of the political camps of the period.

Satı Bey, besides conducting his critical post in Darümuallimin, also began to publish *Tedrisat-i İbtidaiyye Mecmuası* (The Journal of Elementary Education). The journal was divided into theoretical and practical sections. In the theoretical section, he published political articles such as "*Niçin Geri Kaldık*" (Why We Lagged Behind) and "*Ümit ve Azim*" (Hope and Determination). In the practical section, he published articles on the methodology of education such as *İlm-i Hal Nasıl Öğretilmelidir* (How to Teach Islamic Catechism) and *Coğrafya Nasıl Tedris Olmalıdır* (How to

¹⁸⁹Ibid., pp. 846-847.

¹⁹⁰ Cited in Cleveland, p. 29.

¹⁹¹ Mustafa Gündüz, *II. Meşrutiyet'in Klasik Paradigmaları: İçtihat, Sebilü'r-Reşad ve Türk Yurdu'nda Toplumsal Tezler* (The Classical Paradigms of Second Constitutional Period: Social theses in İçtihat, Sebilü'r Reşad and Türk Yurdu) (Ankara: Lotus Yayınevi, 2007), p. 423.

Teach Geography). He dominated the journal with his articles in 1909-1912 periods¹⁹².

Satı in the Pursuit of Progress: His Early Political Thought

“Hope and Determination” (*Ümit ve Azim*) and “Why We Lagged Behind” (*Niçin Geri Kaldık*) are one of the most important pieces of the early political writings of Satı which engaged the basic problems of the Young Turk political thought.¹⁹³ In both articles, he tried to find the reasons why the Ottomans could not progress while Europe, America, and Japan even Bulgaria did. The central problem of the two articles was “why Ottomans lagging behind in the race of progress?”¹⁹⁴ Satı responded the two charges of Europeans that were Islam impedes the progress of the Empire and Turks are ethnically incapable of making progress.

Satı, although he accepted the actual underdevelopment of the Muslim countries, refused to acknowledge Islam as the reason for the underdevelopment. He argued that in order to determine Islam as the reason for the underdevelopment, one had to investigate two things. One was, whether Islam had commands that could be evaluated as obstacles to the development. The second was whether Muslim countries in the past had progressed.¹⁹⁵ Satı, by giving examples from the history of the Muslim people, proved that Muslims had founded great civilizations and produced many prominent intellectuals. As a result, for him, the charge of Islam as

¹⁹² Cleveland, p. 30.

¹⁹³ These two articles have been discussed discussed by Hilmi Ziya Ülken, look at. Ülken, pp. 179-180.

¹⁹⁴ Satı, “Niçin Geri Kaldık,” [Why We Lagged Behind], *Tedrisat-ı İptidaiye Mecmuası*, no.2, 15 Mart 1326 (28 Mart 1910), p. 37. Ülken, p. 179.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

the reason for underdevelopment of the Muslim people was disproved. However, he acknowledged the reactionaries who were trying to prevent progress used the Islamic discourse by appealing to the false beliefs and superstitions of the masses. Especially the belief of fate was manipulated by those reactionaries as “waiting for everything from God.” However, for him, the true Islamic creed commanded work for the world to ensure the material development of the Muslims.¹⁹⁶ Thus, the idleness of the Muslims was not the consequence of the Islamic creed, but of the ignorance (*cehalet*) of the people. The medium for resolving this problem was enlightening the thoughts of the Muslims.¹⁹⁷

Satı’s views on Islam were not different from those of the Westernists, the Turkish nationalists and Islamists of the Second Constitutional period.¹⁹⁸ These camps argued that Islam was not an obstacle in the way of progress; however, they insisted on a true understanding of Islam based on the holy Kuran. Thus they explicitly distinguished the popular understanding of Islam from the book-based Islam.¹⁹⁹ Satı also emphasized the necessity of true education of Islam by writing articles like “How to Teach Catechism” (*İlmihal Nasıl Öğretilmelidir*) to struggle against the ignorance of the people.²⁰⁰ However, the nuance between Satı and the Islamists and reformist Westernists was that, Satı was not interested in the

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 41. Ülken, p. 180.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ It is interesting to note that the prominent journals of the period *İçtihat*, *Sebilü’r-Reşad* and *Türk Yurdu* which represent the axes of Young Turk thought respectively Westernism, Islamism and Turkish nationalism are in accord with the Islam’s role in the underdevelopment of the country. All these journals blame the false beliefs of the masses for the underdevelopment of the country but not accuse Islam as a religion. Look at; Mustafa Gündüz, *II. Meşrutiyet’in Klasik Paradigmaları...*, pp. 505-510.

¹⁹⁹ Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak...*, p. 367.

²⁰⁰ Cited in Fatma Çil, “Satı Bey’in hayatı...,” p. 61., Satı, “İlmihal Nasıl Öğretilmelidir”, [How to teach Catechism], *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 7, 15 Ağustos 1326 (28 August 1910), pp. 11-14.

reformation of Islam by returning to the original sources of Islam. In his article “Islamic Civilization” (*Medeniyet-i İslamiye*), after mentioning the past achievements of the Muslims, he distinguished his position from the reformists by arguing that the achievements of the Muslims in history should not mislead the contemporary Muslims in saying that Muslims should not aim at turning to the past, but they should search for the new possibilities of the progress.²⁰¹ Muslims should adjust to the requirements of contemporary Western civilization because unfortunately Muslims, despite their past achievements had lagged behind Western civilization for centuries. He differentiated between the matter and spirit of Islam and said that Muslims should act according to the spirit of Islam that commanded Muslims appropriate the advanced sciences of the contemporary civilizations.²⁰² Thus, for him, Muslims should obey the spirit of Islam but that they should not seek nostalgic past glories. Now, Western civilization was the dominant civilization, Muslims could not escape from this fact by commemorating the early successes of Islamic civilization.

Satı opposed the claim that Turks were incapable of making progress. By giving examples from the history of the Muslim people he proved that Turks also had contributed much to the Islamic civilization.²⁰³ Moreover, the Ottoman Turks did not come from a pure Turkish blood so that the different bloods by way of marriages and other means intermingled with it.²⁰⁴ Thus for him, one could not blame Turkish blood for the underdevelopment of the Empire because one could not mention any

²⁰¹ Satı, “Medeniyet-i İslamiye”, [The Islamic Civilization], *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 11, 15 Mart 1327, (28 March 1911), p. 184.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, p.189.

²⁰³ Satı, “Niçin Geri Kaldık”..., p. 41.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p.42.

pure Turkish race. For the intellectual, another reason for denying race as a category to determine the level of progress of a nation was history itself. The histories of the nations showed that these nations had undergone great shifts in their way of progress. For instance, the Japanese and Germans had lived through dark ages for centuries with constant civil strife but after the accomplishment of their national unification, they had succeeded at realizing a huge transformation.²⁰⁵ In the article “Race and Education” (*Irk ve Terbiye*) also dwelled on this issue and tried to prove that not ethnic qualities but social environment determined the level of progress. He puts it firmly: “The problem is not in our blood, vessels, origins and races; but in our environment, habits, customs and manners.”²⁰⁶

Satı suggested that the main obstacle on the way to progress was the lack of hope and determination which were the fundamental conditions of success.²⁰⁷ The Ottomans were not incapable of progressing; however they lacked a perception of systematic work. However, the only medium that the Ottomans had to resort to for their development was systematic work. For him, the Ottomans worked but not for a particular goal. However, work which lacked of an ultimate goal, strong determination and constant patience did not serve the development of the Ottomans. For progress, Ottomans had to work with determination and patience for the determined goal.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 41.

²⁰⁶ Satı, “Irk ve Terbiye”, [Race and Education], *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 17, 15 Kânunuevvel 1327 (28 December 1911), p. 167. “*Fenalık bizim kanımızda, damarımızda, aslımızda değil, muhitimizde, adetimizde, itiyadlarımızda, ananelerimizde, terbiyelerimizdedir.*”

²⁰⁷ Satı, “Ümit ve Azim”, [Hope and Determination], *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 4, 15 Mayıs 1326, (28 May 1910), p. 106. Ülken. p. 180.

²⁰⁸ Satı, “Niçin Geri Kaldık”..., p. 45.

Satı's early political writings were on the common problems of the reasons for the Ottoman underdevelopment. He tried to prove that being Islamic and Turk were not potential obstacles for development. Although his views were not different in essence from those of the Islamists and Westernists of the period, the two distinct points that he put forward should be asserted. One is that he ruled out Islam as the source of Ottoman reformation and progress. For him, turning to Islamic civilization was no longer a useful option that Islam itself now also commanded the Muslims to seek out advanced civilizations in order to progress. The second is, although he asserted the plurality of ethnic backgrounds of the Ottomans, he admitted the Turkish race as the legitimate ruler of the Empire. His early political thought did not imply any decentralist idea so that during the Balkan Wars, his patriotism would come close to the centralist-nationalist ideology of Gökalp.

In 1910, Satı Bey took two-month trip to Europe to observe the developments in the methodology of education. During his journey, he visited Italy, Germany, Switzerland, France, Belgium, England and Romania.²⁰⁹ After his return, in order to observe the difficulties the teachers confronted, he travelled to the prominent cities of the Empire, Izmir, Damascus, Beirut, Adana, Konya and Salonika.²¹⁰

Although he implemented a successful reformist program to modernize the Ottoman education system, Satı had to resign in 1912 from his post because of a disagreement with the policies of the Minister of Education. Emrullah Efendi

²⁰⁹Mustafa Ergün, "Satı Bey Hayatı ve Türk Eğitime Hizmetleri"... , p.5

²¹⁰ Ibid.

advocated a view called “the theory of the *Tuğba* Tree” (*Tuğba Ağacı Nazariyesi*).²¹¹

He explained his resignation from the College with the following words:

I remained at the *Darülmüallimin* (Teacher’s Training College) for three years, and resigned in the fourth year. My reason for resigning was my disagreement with the Ministry of Education in the policies of public education. In those days, Emrullah Efendi was the minister. He was also graduated from Mülkiye. However, he does not know pedagogy. He was insisting on the theory of the *Tuğba* Tree.²¹²

The theory was developed by the Minister of Education Emrullah Efendi, who argued that reform in the education should be started in the university, not in the elementary school. Emrullah Efendi argued that because the resources of the Empire were scarce, the existing resources should be spent to educate the elites.²¹³ Satı Bey opposed this idea and argued that “every institution of knowledge (*ilim*) and instruction (*talim*) needs a base. I do not know any knowledge or institution of instruction which stands on emptiness.”²¹⁴ However, the reason for Satı Bey’s resignation could not have been restricted to a mere disagreement. With the atmosphere of the Balkan Wars, Turkish nationalism had gained dominance in *Darülmüallimin*.²¹⁵ His resignation signifies an ideological split between him and the CUP.

²¹¹ According to Islamic creed, *Tuğba* Tree is a tree which is living in paradise whose roots are in the air. This metaphor was used to allude that the reform in education should have begun from the universities.

²¹² Berkes, *Arap Dünyasında...*, p. 92.

²¹³ Osman Nuri Ergin, *İstanbul mektepleri ve ilim, Terbiye ve San'at müesseseleri dolayısıyla Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, (Turkish History of Education According to Schools of Istanbul and Science, Education and Art), vol.4, (İstanbul: Eser Neşriyat ve Dağıtım, 1977), pp. 1276-1280.

²¹⁴ Satı, “*Tuğba Ağacı Hakkında*”, [On *Tuğba* Tree], *Muallim*, no. 13, 1 Ağustos 1333, (1 August 1917) , p. 386.

²¹⁵ Çil, “*Satı Bey’in hayatı...*”, p. 100.

When CUP Left Ottomanism and Satı Break with the Party?

When the CUP abandoned Ottomanism as a political ideology is a matter of discussion in the literature. For Tunaya, it was before the Balkan Wars. Because of the need for keeping the people of different ethnic origins together, the CUP had to propagandize the idea of a “common fatherland” (*vatan-ı umumi*).²¹⁶ In 1911, Halil Bey, who was the Minister of Interior, rejected the criticism of the Turkification of the people by the policies of government, asserting that “The government finds it harmful for the country to efface the nationalities of the people in order to construct one nation by Turkifying the Ottomans or any other means.”²¹⁷ However, for Tunaya, after the Balkan Wars, the CUP abandoned the policy of Ottomanism and began to advocate Turkish nationalism.²¹⁸ Şükrü Hanioglu agrees with Tunaya that after the Balkan Wars and CUP’s seizure of the power by military coup in 1913, the possibility of following Ottomanist policies was limited.²¹⁹

Sina Akşin Somel, on the other hand, argues from the very beginning of the CUP’s coming to power, Ottomanism was used by the opposition parties to criticize the centralization policies of the CUP. He writes that to examine the programs of the oppositional parties is adequate to understand this fact.²²⁰ However, he also marks 1913 as the final date in the policy of Ottomanism. The most radical argument is

²¹⁶ Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler* (Political Parties in Turkey), vol.3 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000), p. 373.

²¹⁷ “*Hükümet, Osmanlıları Türkleştirmek suretiyle yahut başka surette, bütün kavmiyetini unutturarak bir kavim haline getirmek üzere teşebbüslerde bulunmak ve bu suretle icraatta bulunmayı bu memleket için bir mazarrat, bir tehlike telakki eder.*” Cited in Ibid.

²¹⁸ Ibid., p. 381

²¹⁹ Hanioglu. “Osmanlıcılık”..., p. 1389.

²²⁰ Somel, p. 110.

asserted by Hasan Kayalı, Kayalı boldly states that Ottomanism as a political agenda was never left by the CUP. He does acknowledge that after the loss of the Balkan territories, Ottomanism addressed to non-Muslims was no longer advocated by the CUP. A new interpretation of Ottomanism which was grounded on Islamic sensibilities to affiliate the Arap population of the Empire took the upper hand.²²¹

Despite the different views in the literature on the issue of the Ottomanism of CUP, 1913 is acknowledged as a turning point. After 1913, whether the CUP took a nationalist or Islamist policy, all the scholars who study the period acknowledge that the Party left the policy of Ottomanism, which was based on the loyalty to the fatherland. Satı Bey, as an Ottomanist, did not get an important office from the government after 1913. He rejected the post that was proposed by the Ministry of Foundations by criticizing the CUP for their harsh behavior towards intellectuals: “Even under the minister whose performance I appreciate I find it contrary to my conscious to admit an office in the government which permitted the illegality and banish intellectuals without judgment.”²²²

Satı harshly criticized the Party for not taking lessons from the past experiences and imitating Abdülhamid II to violate the law. He accused the high officials of the party of guarding not the benefit of the country but the benefit of the party.²²³ He complained that a new morality had emerged after the promulgation of the

²²¹ Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 141

²²² Satı, “İki Mektup” [Two Letters], *İçtihat*, no. 129, 7 Teşrinievvel 1334 (7 October 1918), p. 2785. It is important to note that Satı published this article in *İçtihat* after the deportation of the cadres of the CUP. The original later has the date of 27 Haziran 1329 “*Hükümet’in kanunsuzluğa bu kadar revac verdiği (kıymet verdiği), bu kadar muharrirleri muhakemesiz hükümsüz nefi ve tağrip ettiği sırada-velev icraatını takdir ettiğim bir nazırın maiyetinde bile olsa – bir “hükümet-i memuriyeti” kabul etmeği vicdanımın emirlerine muhalif görüyorum; onun için mazur görülmeğimi ricaya mecbur bulunuyorum*”

²²³ *Ibid.*, p. 2786.

Constitution that was the morality of the Party: “After the Second Constitution Period, a strange thing called “party morality” emerged. It becomes a convention to evaluate the moral value of the all the deeds and behaviors not according to ‘being a citizen’ or ‘foreign’ like in the other countries, but according to ‘the allegiance’ or ‘opposition’ to a party.”²²⁴ He further complained that allegiance to the party had become a command of a conscience (*emr-i vicdan*), like a religion or fatherland which should be understood by feeling, not reason.

It seems that Satı played a role in the promulgation of the Constitution during the years he served as *kaymakam* and established intimate relations with the CUP. His good relations with the party continued during his office in *Darülmüallimin* (Teacher’s Training School); however after the seizure of the government by the CUP, the good relations ceased. The arbitrary administration of the party and the abandonment of Ottomanism by the CUP made Satı Bey suspend his relationships with the party.

Satı Bey as an Ottoman Patriot during the Balkan Wars

Satı Bey declared his patriotism during the conferences at he participated as a spokesman during the Balkan Wars. As an initial step, he defined patriotism (*vatanperverlik*) as a feeling (*his*) and a character (*seciye*): “Patriotism is one’s feeling of fondness (*muhabbet*) and loyalty (*merbutiyet*) to her country.” However,

²²⁴ Satı, “Fırkacılık ve Ahlak”, Vakit Gazetesi, no. 372, 5 Teşrinisani 1334 (5 November 1918). “*Filvaki memleketimizde, Meşrutiyet’ten beri garip bir “firka ahlakı” vücut buldu. Her fill ve hareketin ahlaki kıymetini, failinin- yalnız başka memleketlerde olduğu gibi “vatandaş” veya “ecnebi” olmasına göre değil, “fırkadaş” veya “muhalif” olmasına göre de başka ölçülerle ölçmek adet oldu.*”

for Sati, before defining patriotism, one should define fatherland.²²⁵ He asserted that defining the fatherland was not so easy because its meaning changed from country to country and time to time. He examined two other concepts which also were related to fatherland: nation and state. For him, the boundaries between these concepts also were changeable according to time and place.²²⁶

Sati examinee the different styles of development of the nation states. He tried to compare and contrast the elements that formed the nation sates to understand the different dynamics of the nation state building. Before studying different cases, he presented the striking contrasts between the French and German experiences. He showed that in the German experience, where patriotism had emerged as an ideology, the German nation state did not exist. The only bond between the Germans was language. Thus, the German nation state would be based on the bond of language.²²⁷ In the French, there was a strong state which dominated many different nations, and French patriotism was grounded on the idea of maintaining the strong state. Thus state and history would be the base of the French nation state.²²⁸ Sati formulized the creation of the French and German nation states:

In French case, the state and the history constructed the nation, however in German case, the nation created the history and state. For this reason, the idea of fatherland, in France to a great degree depends upon the concepts of state and history, but in Germany mostly depends upon the concepts of nation and language.²²⁹

²²⁵ Sati, *Vatan İçin* (İstanbul: Kader Matbaası,1329), p. 6.

²²⁶ Ibid., p. 7.

²²⁷ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

²²⁸ Ibid., p. 9.

²²⁹ Ibid. “Fransa’da devlet ve tarih millieti vücuda getirmiş idi, Almanya’da ise bilakis millet tarihi ve devleti yapmıştır. Onun çin vatan fikri, Fransa’da en ziyade tarih ile devlet mefhumuna istinad ettiği halde Almanya’da en ziyade lisan ile millet mefhumuna istinad etmiştir.”

Satı also looked at the Japanese and Swiss cases. He found that the unifying element in the Japan nation building was the identification of family and the state in Japanese culture. According to the beliefs of the Japanese people and inculcations of Japanese teachers, the Japanese were like the members of a family and the Mikado (the king of Japan) was the head of this family. This belief enabled the Japanese to unite around the cult of the king, according to which the king, the country and the nation were intertwined in the Japanese case.²³⁰

The Swiss case was an interesting one for him to explore because between the Swiss people, there was no racial or linguistic commonality. Some Swiss people spoke French, while some others spoke German. Moreover, Switzerland was divided into autonomous parts which called Cantons. A Swiss person identified himself first with his canton and second with his country Switzerland. However, for Satı, this does not prevent a Swiss person from fulfilling his duties to his country.²³¹

By examining these different models of nation building Satı came to conclusion that there was no unique definition of fatherland. Different elements and different factors may play role in determining the definition of fatherland. He argued that before determining the exact definition of fatherland for the Ottomans and founding Ottoman patriotism on this definition, one had to study which elements to what degree played roles in the constitution of patriotism.²³²

Satı's main question was, in particular, the case of the Ottoman Empire, the elements could be utilized to constitute patriotic feelings. For him, there could be various bonds between people such as language, religion, blood and state, the

²³⁰ Ibid., p. 11.

²³¹ Ibid., p. 10.

²³² Ibid., p. 13.

partnership, the shared memories, the benefits of the present, and hopes of the future and the closeness of feelings and habits.²³³ However in the Ottoman case in particular which kind of bond could be utilized required a further examination of these bonds.

He first of all dwelled on the bond of blood and concluded that blood could not be the necessary determiner of a nation because many people had formed nations regardless of the unity of blood, such as the USA and France. Satı secondly examined the element of language as the unitary force. He acknowledged the importance of the unity of language as a strong ground for the formation of a nation state; however, he also showed counter examples in which people who spoke different languages had come together and founded a single nation. For instance, in Switzerland three different languages were used in the different regions of the state. However, this plurality of languages did not prevent the people of Switzerland to be tied to one nation-state.²³⁴ Thus, for him although language was an important factor of constituting nation state, it was not the necessary and unique one.

Satı emphasized that different factors in different degrees could play roles in arousing feelings of patriotism. In one case, language could be common ground for a nation, in another case state can be the source of the allegiance of the people. It is clear that in the Ottoman case many different factors could be effective in constructing allegiance between the people to the state.

In order to find out which factors could be more effective in arousing the loyalty of the people to the Ottoman Empire Satı dwelled on the major unifying forces. He examined the bond of language and compared the Ottoman case with that

²³³ Ibid., p. 17.

²³⁴ Ibid., p. 20.

of Germany. According to him, in Germany, language served as the unifying force; however, in the Ottoman case, language could not fulfill this mission because in the Empire, many different languages were spoken.²³⁵

Being Ottoman, living under the flag of the Ottoman Empire should be the bases of Ottoman patriotism, according to Satı, because the Ottoman people had shared the same lands for centuries under the protection of the Ottoman state.²³⁶ However, he was aware of the inadequacy of the state as the source of common identity. He saw the danger of nationalists' insistence on the bonds of race and language as the unifying force of the people.²³⁷ Thus, he had to differentiate himself from the nationalist-Turkist circles by finding out new common grounds of identity among the people.

Satı proposed Islam as the unifying force of the Ottomans. He argued that because after the separation of the Balkans from the Empire, the population the Ottoman Empire was mostly Muslim, Islam could be a medium of solidarity between Muslims. For him, Islam was different from Christianity in that it had social functions besides moral teachings. The other reason for utilizing Islam as the social bond for the intellectual was the existing situation of the Muslims. The Ottoman Empire remained the only sovereign Muslim state in the world. Muslims had a duty to preserve the state.²³⁸

Satı's crediting Islam as the unifying force of Muslims had only practical reasons. It should not be forgotten that in the Young Turk political thought, Islam had been given a functional role to bind the people together. Islam as a source of

²³⁵ Ibid., p. 24.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Ibid., p. 25.

²³⁸ Ibid., pp. 26- 27.

identity had an attractiveness to the masses. Thus, the intellectuals of the Second Constitutional period whether they were Islamists or Westernist attached to Islam the function of ensuring solidarity between the Muslims. Satı, who was a committed Westernist, also utilized an Islam that was isolated from its theological doctrine only as a social function. However, he was aware of the risk that only crediting Islam as the source of identity would exclude non-Muslims. Thus, he had to formulize a secular form of identity that also addressed the non-Muslim population.

In order to address the loyalties of the non-Muslims, Satı referenced the common experiences that the people of the Ottoman Empire shared. He argued that the Turks should not be blamed for the grievances of the non-Turk people of the Empire. All of the people shared the common catastrophes and lived under the wicked administration.²³⁹ He also concluded that not only these miseries but also the future of the people was bound together. In other words he said that the Ottoman people, regardless of religious or ethnic bonds, shared the common benefit of living together.²⁴⁰ To him, Ottoman intellectuals had a mission to explain these facts to the Ottoman people.²⁴¹

Satı was aware that referencing the shared experiences of the people was not difficult compared to explaining the common future benefits. The void in Satı's Ottomanism was the very motivation that why people from different religious and ethnic identities who had lived under the harsh conditions for centuries would want to continue to live under the umbrella of the Ottoman Empire. He did not address this question, but he emphasized the common bonds of the Ottoman people, by inventing

²³⁹ Ibid., p. 27.

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

a new notion to reference the common culture of the Ottoman people this was the “spirit of the orient” (*şarklı ruhu*):

Despite the differences of religion and language, between all the Ottomans, especially between the ordinary men, there are many common feelings and habits that constitute the “spirit of orient” or “oriental temperament.”²⁴²

It can be argued that Satı’s most interesting contribution to the discussion of Ottomanism was this idea of “the spirit of orient”. According to him, the Muslims and non-Muslims who lived under the flag of the Ottoman Empire shared many cultural elements such as tales, jokes, songs and proverbs. The memories of these people bore the elements of living together for centuries. Thus, for him this common oriental culture would keep them together.²⁴³

Arguing for the existence of a common culture that could serve as a cement between the Ottomans, Satı explicitly opposed the arguments of the Turkish nationalists, who did not accept a distinct Ottoman fatherland or Ottomanism as a real political option. He distinguished between “love of nation” and the “love of fatherland,” defending superiority of the “love of fatherland” over the “love of nation”:

In the states composed of many different nations like us, the ideas and the love of fatherland and nation do not correspond, because of this reason, for the welfare of common fatherland, the love of nationality and fatherland should be compatible and cooperative.²⁴⁴

Satı criticized the Turkish nationalists who argued that “the Ottoman fatherland is a myth, that not the fatherland, the care should be given to the nation.”²⁴⁵ He

²⁴² Ibid., p. 28. “*Bütün Osmanlılar arasında bilhassa avam tabakalarında, müşterek bir çok hisler ve itiyadlar vardır, hepsi arasında lisan ve hatta din farklarına rağmen müşterek bir “şarklı ruhu” bir “şarklı şimesi” mevcuttur.*”

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 29.

argued that any nationalism Turkish, Armenian or Arab which did not consider the benefit of the common fatherland (*vatan-ı müsterek*) committed a crime against the fatherland.²⁴⁶ He openly protested any nationalist movements which would harm the unity of the Empire. He defended patriotism against the segregationist movements of his period.

As was discussed above, Satı's Ottomanism consisted of many different themes and elements which are not so easily reconciled. At this point, with the help of Table 1, I want to show the main elements of Satı's Ottomanism, Gökalp's nationalism and Namık Kemal's Ottomanism. This table will provide the ground of determining the main concepts of Satı's political ideology and give a chance to compare it with his rival contemporary ideologue Gökalp and show the continuities and discontinuities with Young Ottoman Ottomanism:

Table 1: The Comparison of the Patriotisms of Satı, Namık Kemal and Ziya Gökalp

	Satı's Ottomanism	Gökalp's Nationalism	Kemal's Ottomanism
Language	Ottoman Turkish as a unifier	Purified Turkish as the bearer of original Turkish culture	Ottoman Turkish as a unifier
Religion	Islam as the means of solidarity among Muslims	Islam as a part of Turkish culture.	Islam as the source of the legitimacy of political system
End of their ideology	A unified Empire	Turkish nation	A unified empire
Unifying elements	Islam, the spirit of orient and the fatherland	National consciousness and culture	Parliament and the constitution as the source of rights and

²⁴⁵ Ibid. “Bizim gibi müteaddit milletlerden müteşekkil devletlerde vatan ve millet fikirleri, vatan ve millet muhabbetleri birbirine intibak etmez; onun için milliyet muhabbeti vatan muhabbeti ile, vatan-ı müsterek selameti endişesiyle mukit ve müterafık olmak lüzum gelir.”

²⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 30.

			duties.
The Quality of Fatherland	Bearer of memories and culture	Turkish national territory with the harmonious Turkish culture	Bearer of memories and culture

Source: Drawn by the author, benefited from Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*, (Syracuse NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000) and Uril Heyd, *Foundation of Turkish Nationalism: the Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, (London: Luzac, 1950)

The issue of language was important in Satı Bey's thought. As seen in his article, "İonnia and İonnians," he suggested Ottoman Turkish as the unifying force, at least for the Muslim people, of the language. He also dwelled on the Ottoman script, arguing contrary to the radical Westernists of the period who were pushing for the adaptation of Latin script, defended it as a bond between the people.²⁴⁷ According to Satı, the societies that composed the Ottoman Empire had contributed to the development of the common Ottoman language. Removing the Ottoman script would be abandoning this common heritage.²⁴⁸ He said that although he advocated a radical change on many of the issues; however the issue of the Ottoman alphabet was different in character. Such a radicalism, which ignored the complex relations that constituted a language, would harm the Ottoman heritage which bore the characters of different societies.²⁴⁹

Gökalp, on the other hand, opposed the unifying mission of the Ottoman language and declared that the Ottoman language was an artificial language which

²⁴⁷ Look at for the views of radical Westernists who were defending the adaptation of Latin script M. Şinasi, "Elif Ba Meselesi", [The Issue of Elif-Ba], *İçtihat*, no. 62, 18 Nisan 1329, (1 May 1913), pp. 1352-1356.

²⁴⁸ Satı, "Elif Ba Meselesi", [The Issue of Elif-Ba], *İçtihat*, no. 61, 11 Nisan 1329, (24 April 1913), p. 1328.

²⁴⁹ Satı, "Elif Ba Meselesi Hakkında Bir İzah", [An Explanation On the Issue of Elif-Ba], *İçtihat*, no. 64, 2 Mayıs 1329, (15 May 1913), p. 1387.

had no use among the people.²⁵⁰ He formulated his common approach to the problem of the Turkish language:

In order to develop our national language, one has to write in conformity with the spoken language of the people of Istanbul, especially the spoken language of the ladies of Istanbul by leaving aside the Ottoman language – as if it did not exist- and by acknowledging the Turkish language, which serves as the basis of folk literature.²⁵¹

It seems evident that while Satı intended to preserve the cosmopolitan character of Ottomanism, which bore the contributions of multiple languages and cultures, Gökalp advocated a turn to the folk languages as the basis of written language. Satı attached a mission to Ottomanism as a unifier between the people of Ottomanism while Gökalp, while he opposed the radical purification of the language, by addressing the language of the Turkish people as the written language, tried to found a future nation state on the reformed Turkish language.

Regarding religion Satı and Gökalp both intended to utilize the social function of Islam. Uriel Heyd writes that although Gökalp defended the separation of Islam and State, by arguing the independence of state affairs from the religious sphere²⁵² he also accommodated Islam as a part of his Turkish nationalist thought by opposing the view that orthodox Islam was fundamentally contradictory to Turkish nationalism.²⁵³ Although, as Heyd asserts that Gökalp was also advocating the elimination of foreign elements (Arabic and Persian) which had corrupted the original Islam, he valued the customs and traditions which had developed around the rituals of Islam in

²⁵⁰ Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (The Principles of Turkism) prep. Mehmet Kaplan, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1970), p. 114.

²⁵¹ “İbid, p. 138. “*Milli dilimizi vücuda getirmek için, Osmanlı dilini- hiç yokmuş gibi-bir tarafa atarak, Halk edebiyatına temel vazifesini gören Türk dilini aynıyla kabul edip, İstanbul halkının ve bilhassa İstanbul hanımlarının konuştukları gibi yazmak.*”

²⁵² Uriel Heyd: *The Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, (London: Luzac, 1950), p. 88.

²⁵³ Ibid., p. 98.

Anatolia.²⁵⁴ Satı, on the other hand, as was discussed before, was not interested in the reformation of Islam contrary to his colleagues. He saw the social function of Islam useful for the unity of the Empire; however, he openly asserted that Islam could no longer be the guide to a civilization. Kemal, who was a totally different minded intellectual, gave Islam the role of legitimizing the political system. In Kemal's thought Şariat has the mission of founding the legitimate area of the politics.

Namık Kemal defined fatherland as a “geographical unit, but as an emotional bond in which the memories of ancestors, the recollections of one's own youth and earliest experiences all had a place.”²⁵⁵ Satı, on the other hand, took the idea of watan from Kemal and revised it. Not content with only attributing Islam the role as a unifier, he invented a new concept called *şarklı ruhu* (the spirit of the orient.) The novelty in the concept is, it seems was the word “spirit.” It should be underlined that in using this word he did not mean a lofty ideal that flies over the people. To the contrary, the concept was materially based. The customs of the people, their common experience of living constituted that spirit which would keep the Muslims and non-Muslims together. On his part Gökalp, recognized that only in a nation state where the harmony of people was realized could the true unifying elements be operative. As Heyd states, in Gökalp's definition, culture needs a homogenous national society that developing an Ottoman culture is by definition a failed attempt.²⁵⁶ Gökalp defined nation as such:

Nation is not a racial nor geographical, political, administrative community.
Nation is composed of individuals who have common language, religion, ethics

²⁵⁴ Ibid., p.102.

²⁵⁵ Mardin, *The Genesis...*, p. 87.

²⁵⁶ Heyd, p. 72.

and aesthetics. In other words, nation is composed of individuals who have had the same education.²⁵⁷

The striking difference between Gökalp and Ottomanists Namık Kemal and Satı is that for Gökalp only in a nation state where people who were similar in language and religion could constitute a culture. However, in Kemal and Satı the mechanism of mutual rights and duties and inculcation of the feeling of fatherland could be adequate to constitute a culture that kept the people together.

Satı was appointed Director of Darüşşafaka-i İslamiye on 5 November 1913. He did not remain in this office for a long time, resigning from the office in April.²⁵⁸ He went on a trip to Europe in July 1914 to look at nursery schools.²⁵⁹ In 1915, he established *Yeni Mektep* (New School) with Tevfik Fikret. Fikret explained the aim of the school: “to educate intelligent, honest, patriotic youth. Youths should be rescued from the harmful influences of the existing environment and be educated in the new environment of the school in such a way that personal and civic virtues might be nurtured in them”²⁶⁰ The main project of Satı Bey hidden between the words of Fikret was to educate a patriotic youth within whom personal and civic virtues are nurtured.

During his duty as a Director of the New School, he founded a kindergarten and appointed his sister, Neriman Hanım, as the director.²⁶¹ He also founded

²⁵⁷ Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları...*, p. 22. “Millet, ne ırki, ne kavmi, ne coğrafi, ne siyasi, ne de iradi bir zümre değildir. Millet dilce, dince, ahlakça ve güzellik duygusu bakımından müşterek olan yani aynı terbiyeyi almış fertlerden mürekkep bulunan bir topluluktur.”

²⁵⁸ Ergün, p. 5

²⁵⁹ Buzpınar, p. 176

²⁶⁰ Cited in, Berkes, *The Development...*, p. 246.

²⁶¹ Şehbal Derya Acar, *Eğitimde Bir Üstad Satı Bey'i Tanımak* (To Know Satı Bey a Master of Education) (İstanbul: Akademik Kitaplar, 2009), p. 29.

Darü'tterbiye (College for Tutores). In this school, Satı aimed to educate female instructors (*mürebbiye*) by new methods of instruction.²⁶²

During the years of World War I, Satı continued his duty as the Director of the New School. He gave lectures in various schools and institutions and engaged in discussions with the intellectuals Ziya Gökalp, Emrullah Efendi and Ismail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu.²⁶³ Especially his discussions with Ziya Gökalp were the most intense and exciting debates of Turkish social and political thought. The polemics of Satı will be examined in detail.

Satı Criticizes the Harsh Centralization Policies of CUP during the World War I

During World War I, Satı Bey moved away from his early centralist position and approached the decentralist views of Prince Sabahaddin. However, he never withdrew from advocating the Ottoman Empire as the embracing political entity of Muslims. After the harsh policies implemented by the CUP against the Arab people during World War I, Satı leaned on the Arab issue; however, it should be noted that he wrote only one article in which he mentioned the Arab problem, and in this article he did not explicitly propose autonomy for the Arabs. He only complained about the harsh centralist policies of the CUP

Satı argued that the CUP implemented harsh centralization policies which alienated the non-Turk elements in the Empire, however after the Balkan Wars the official of the CUP recognized the need to embrace the Arab lands. They signed a deal which promised Arabs new rights and concessions on the issues of “language,

²⁶² Ibid., p.31.

²⁶³ Ibid., p. 33.

services and special privileges.”²⁶⁴ However the CUP did not keep its promises first by delaying the implementation of the deal, and secondly by cancelling it.²⁶⁵

After World War I, and the separation of Arab lands from the Empire, Satı Bey decided to move to Syria because he was ethnically Arab. He wrote “moving to Arab land is a duty for me. Arabs should return to Arab lands.”²⁶⁶ After his move to Syria in 1919, Satı (al-Husri) was made Director General of Education in the provisional government, and then served as Minister of Education in the King Faysal government. In March 1920, Faysal was crowned King of Greater Syria. On July 21, French troops dispatched an ultimatum to the Syrian government for the recognition of the mandate. On July 21 al-Husri was sent as an envoy to negotiate with French officials. On July 24 French and Arab troops fought the Battle of Maysalun. The French won and moved to establish a French mandate in Syria. Al-Husri left Syria with King Faysal and spent one year with him in constant travel. After Faysal’s enthronement as King of Iraqi, Satı Bey was invited to Iraqi in July 1921. He served as Director General of Education (1923-1927). Because of a controversy with the Minister of Education on the limits of his authority, he resigned from the post.

The next four years he taught at Dar al-Mu’allimin in Baghdad. He became Dean of the Law College until 1935. He was soon appointed Director of Antiquities and served in this office from 1935 to 1941. After the invasion of Iraq by British troops in 1941, Satı al-Husri was ordered to leave the country because of his support for the nationalists. In 1941 he went to Aleppo and then moved to Beirut. He stayed in Beirut until 1944. He was invited by the Syrian government to serve on an

²⁶⁴ Satı, “Sabahaddin Bey, Fikirleri ve Muarızları I” (Sabahaddin Bey, His Ideas and Opponents I), *Vakit Gazetesi*, 27 Teşrinisani 1334 (27 November 1918).

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

²⁶⁶ Berkes, *Arap Dünyasında...*, p. 94.

advisory council to reorganize the educational system after the elimination of the French mandate. His vision of secularizing the education system met with the protests of the religious groups that soon he had to resign also from this post. He moved to Cairo in 1947 and served as advisor to the Cultural Committee of the Arab league, delivered lectures on nationalism and education at Cairo University and in 1953 was appointed director of the Institute of Higher Arab Studies. He retired from these offices in 1957 and died in 1968.²⁶⁷

Satı Bey participated in the Arab nationalist movement after his departure from Istanbul; however in a very short of time, he became the spokesman of secular pan-Arab nationalism.²⁶⁸ Thus, it is not easy to embrace two different intellectual careers, his liberal secular Ottomanism before 1919 and his nationalist ideology after 1919. As an Ottoman he had had to envision a broad-based system of loyalties to cope with the various languages, cultures and ethnicities.²⁶⁹ However, as an Arab nationalist he had to assimilate the diverse elements of the population into one single homogenous nation. Satı Bey who defended individualism in education, as an Arab nationalist began to argue for the indoctrination of a coherent, controlled nationalist ideology. Although the split between the two periods is striking, his commitment to secularism²⁷⁰ and his project of creating broad-base patriotism which transcended the local patriotisms²⁷¹ signify the continuity of his thought from Ottomanism to Arab nationalism.

²⁶⁷ For the biography of Satı Bey in Arab lands, look at Cleveland, pp. 47-80.

²⁶⁸ Cleveland, p. 51.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 63.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 90.

²⁷¹ Ibid., p. 95.

The question can be asked that whether Satı Bey was enrolled in proto-Arab nationalist thought. After my intensive examination I found no signs of his early commitment to the Arab nationalist movement. He did not participate in any Arab political movements nor write on particularly any issue that concerned Arab nationalism. Only in the article he wrote on Prince Sabahaddin did he criticize the Committee of Union and Progress's hypocritical attitudes concerning the Arab issue.²⁷²

Satı Bey, who should be evaluated as an Ottoman intellectual before 1919, dared to halt the disintegration of the Empire. In this chapter his political views, political side of his Ottomanism was discussed. In the following chapter, his views on the structure of the ideal society will be examined. By comparing his imagined society based on individual will with Gökalp's solidaristic conception of society, the differences between the Ottomanist and nationalist perceptions of society are shown.

²⁷²Satı, "Sabahaddin Bey, Fikirleri ve Muarızları I." ITC government was collapsed in 8 September 1918. This article was published after the fall of ITC government.

CHAPTER FOUR

OTTOMANISM AS A PROJECT OF SOCIALIZATION:

Satı Bey, like his colleagues, intended to transform the community-based structure of the Empire to an individual-based order. In other words, his project was to revolutionize the collective formation of Ottoman society by activating social change. The main question that occupied the intellectual's minds was how to free the individual from his communal and religious bonds which were the pillars of Ottoman society. He, similar to the famous liberal and decentralist Prince Sabahattin, who argued for the change of the structure of Ottoman society from collectivistic order to the individualist formation as the real remedy to solve the permanent problems of the Empire, regarded the social transformation of the Ottoman society as the main goal of his social and political thought. At that point, his distinction between the political and social revolution is important to understand this point.

Satı asserted that the revolutions of 10 July and 11 April had not been social but political revolutions. The constitutional monarchy was not an end in itself; however it was an instrument for the nations.²⁷³ The real goal should not only achieve constitutional monarchy as a political system, but by its means, realize the ends of “real liberty” (*hakiki hürriyet*) and “progress” (*terakki*).²⁷⁴ Satı argued that although the Young Turk revolution ended the absolutist rule of Abdülhamid II, it

²⁷³ Satı, *Fenn-i Terbiye* (The Science of Education) (İstanbul: Kader Matbaası, 1325), p.7

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

could not eliminate the ignorance (*cehalet*) which provided the conditions of absolutism.²⁷⁵

The only way to deepen the political revolution was to convey its principles to society by means of education.²⁷⁶ For Satı Bey, education was a vehicle for transforming and modernizing society. Although he was an educator, his efforts to modernize the Ottoman education system should not be seen as a mere professional desire. It should not be forgotten that he was graduated from the School of Civil Service (*Mülkiye*) and served as a teacher and governor in the Balkan region before 1908. Before any other role, Satı Bey should be evaluated as an Ottoman intellectual who strived to save “the Empire.” Thus, his role in the Ottoman education system could not be isolated from his political goals.

Politics of Education: Primary Schools and the Criticism of Elitist View

Satı regarded primary schools as a most convenient instrument for social change. He thought it could primary school could play more important role in contributing social change than the higher schools for two reasons: They were more diffused to affect the different regions of the Empire and the students in primary schools were more receptive to digest the new mentality because their minds had not been filled with false and unnecessary information.²⁷⁷

Satı Bey attributed primary schools the role of contributing to the construction of the Ottoman nation by giving examples from the Japanese and German

²⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 8.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p.7.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

experiences. Both nations owed their union and progress to primary education.²⁷⁸ However, unfortunately in Ottoman schools, he asserted, Ottomanness was not even mentioned. Especially in the minority schools' students were provoked to hate the other nations in the Empire.²⁷⁹ Satı thought education should inoculate the feeling of the fatherland above the personal benefits to the students.²⁸⁰

Elitism was an important part of Young Turk thought, as mentioned earlier. Derived from Le Bon's theories, the Young Turks attached primary importance to the creation of an elite class to shape the consciousness of the masses. Satı Bey was not an elitist. He said that "we need the army of teacher rather than the army of the soldiers" to educate the students for the union and progress of the Empire.²⁸¹ He did not mention educating an elite group which would be the carriers of social development. Although teachers were entrusted as the pioneers spreading the new mentality to the people of the Empire, their vanguard role only stemmed from their "sacred" duty.

The discussion of the Theory of the Tuğba Tree between Satı Bey and Emrullah Efendi stemmed from the disagreement over the agent of social change. As mentioned earlier, Emrullah Efendi, who served as the Minister of Education defended the argument that reform in the education should be started in Darülfünun because the resources of the state were too scarce to realize reform in primary schools. Emrullah Efendi argued that when the graduates of Darülfünun increased in

²⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 6.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 4.

²⁸⁰ Satı, "Terbiye-i Ahlakiye ve Vatanîye"[Education of Morality and Fatherland], *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 3, 15 Nisan 1326 (28 April 1910), p. 67.

²⁸¹ Satı, *Fenn-i Terbiye*, p. 8.

number, the new elite class could emerge,²⁸² and would be the pioneers of the social change. However, for Satı, the mentality of social change had to be disseminated to the people by the mediation of the teachers. Satı Bey argued that “no degree of education can rise without relying on a lower degree. The quality of education cannot be improved if it is founded on decayed primary school education.”²⁸³ Thus, the reform in education should start in primary schools because a real elite class could be developed only like real trees not like the Tuğba Tree.²⁸⁴

The Clashes of the Intellectuals: The Discussion from Education to Nation

Ziya Gökalp also defended the theory of the Tuğba Tree in the Congress of the CUP (1917).²⁸⁵ He distinguished value judgments (*kıymet hükümleri*) from reality judgments (*şeniyet hükümleri*) and argued that value judgments, which must be national (*milli*) should be the subject of education (*terbiye*) and reality judgments which were non-national (*la-milli*) should be the subject of instruction (*talim*).²⁸⁶ He declared that in the primary schools students should be instructed only by teachers; however, in the high schools they should be educated.²⁸⁷ Gökalp said that while in the primary schools children should be taught simple practical information, in the

²⁸² Necdet Sakaoğlu, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (The Encyclopedia of Turkey from Tanzimat to Republic), vol.2, edited by Murat Belge (İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 1985), p.482

²⁸³ Satı, “Tuğba Ağacı Hakkında Bir İzah”, [An Explanation on the Issue of Tuğba Tree], *Muallim*, no. 13 1 Ağustos 1333 (1 August 1917), p. 388.

²⁸⁴ Satı, “Tuğba Ağacı Nazariyesi” [The Theory of Tuğba Tree], *Muallim*, no. 12, 1 Temmuz 1333(1 July 1917), p. 360.

²⁸⁵ Ergin, pp. 1276-1280.

²⁸⁶ Ziya Gökalp, “Milli Terbiye I” [National Education I], *Muallim*, no.1, 15 Temmuz 1332 (28 July 1916), pp. 3-4.

²⁸⁷ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler IV* (Articles IV), prep. Ferit Ragıp Tuncor, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1977) , p. 45.

high schools which were responsible for raising an administrative class (*sınıf-i müdiri*) should provide qualified education”.²⁸⁸ He stressed that “those who are educated by the high schools are lawyers, doctors, authors, bureaucrats, teachers and eminent persons who are going to direct the Ottoman nation. Thus for him, if they were not educated, unselfish, altruistic and patriotic, the country would go into disaster.”²⁸⁹

Gökalp used education (*terbiye*) with its narrow meaning, as an exposition of social feelings (*içtimai his*) to the students. For him in the primary schools students should receive non-national instruction; however in the high schools they were exposed the values of the nation. Satı objected to the elitist view of Gökalp and emphasized the importance of the education of the children in primary schools. He argued that children were more receptive to inculcation (*telkin*)²⁹⁰ so that in primary schools, contrary to Gökalp’s suggestion, they should receive instruction, feelings and habits. In the high schools adolescents should be taught opinions (*fikirler*) and convictions (*kanaatler*).²⁹¹ After the reaction came from Satı, Gökalp withdrew from his early position that despised the primary schools and claimed that he had been misunderstood by Satı. He had argued that he did not principally opposed to the cultural education (*harsi*) of children in primary schools but that his concern was the partisan teachers who imposed on students ideas opposed to their social feelings (*içtimai his*).²⁹²

²⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 45.

²⁸⁹ Ibid.

²⁹⁰ Satı, “Telkin ve Terbiye I” [Inculcation and Education I], *Muallim*, no.3, 15 Eylül 1332 (28 September 1916), p. 72.

²⁹¹ Satı, “Terbiye ve Milliyet” [Education and Nationality], *Muallim*, no.4, 15 Teşrinievvel 1332 (28 October, 1916), p.106.

²⁹² Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler IV...*, p. 83.

Satı Bey like his companions engaged the question of what the end of the good education was. The response this question is critical to understanding the ultimate political desire of Satı Bey. He stressed that education had two ends: The first end was to develop the personal skills of the individual. Good education could not ignore the benefit of the individual. The second end was to develop the individual's capability of living with others. Thus, the benefit of society also should be noticed.²⁹³ Different from Satı Bey, the educationist and intellectual İsmail Hakkı took a utilitarian position and argued that the goal of education was to develop a class of producers.²⁹⁴ Satı Bey criticized this approach as a narrow one which restricted the goal of the education to the economic sphere. No modern nation, including America, determined the goal of their education with only economic goals. Economic development was only a means not an end for the modern nations. The real goal should be realizing progress.²⁹⁵

The discussion between Ziya Gökalp and Satı Bey on the question of the goal of the education reveals to understand the cleavage between the patriotism of Satı Bey and nationalism of Ziya Gökalp. Gökalp defined the goal of the education as "The sum of the values of judgments (*kıymet hükümleri*) living in the conscience of the nation is called as the nation's culture. The goal of the education (*terbiye*) is making the culture (*hars*) the property of the individual souls."²⁹⁶ It is important to

²⁹³ Satı, *Fenn-i Terbiye*, p. 14.

²⁹⁴ İsmail Hakkı, "İstihsal ve Terbiye" [Production and Education], *Muallim*, no.1, 10 Temmuz 1332 (23 July 1916), p. 15.

²⁹⁵ Satı, "Terbiye ve Milliyet"..., p.104

²⁹⁶ Ziya Gökalp, "Milli Terbiye I" [National Education I], *Muallim*, no.1, 15 Temmuz 1332 (28 July 1916), p. 3. "Bir kavmin vicdanında yaşayan kıymet hükümlerinin mecmuuna, o kavmin hars'ı denilir. Terbiye, bu harsı, o kavmin fertlerinde ruhi melekeler haline getirmektir."

note that Satı Bey's manifestation of the goals of the education stressed the priority of the "individual," contrary to Gökalp's emphasis on "culture" and "society."

Satı distinguished explicitly between national (*milli*) education and the patriotic (*vatanperver*) education. He argued that the quality of national education differed from nation to nation. It should be different in nations which were under the hegemony of other states and which had their own state that established hegemony over other nations.²⁹⁷ The Ottoman case conformed to the second group as different nations were living within its territory. Thus, national education should not assault other nations. Satı argued that "national education (*terbiye-i milliye*) should not assault patriotic education (*terbiye-i vataniye*) and should not take the shape of an obstacle preventing progress."²⁹⁸ If national education assaulted the citizen nations (*vatandaş milletler*) and opposed the requirements of the progress, it would be harmful for the Empire.²⁹⁹ He suggested that the feeling and inclination of nationality was part of the feeling and inclination of society. For this reason, national education was the phase of social education (*terbiye-i içtimaiye*).³⁰⁰ Satı defined social education by taking the individual as a reference point. For him, social education was meant to strengthen the individual's social feelings and inclinations.

Satı opposed Gökalp's definition of education (*terbiye*). For him education could not be reduced to national education: "Education is not absolutely national, if it

²⁹⁷ Satı, "Terbiye-i Milliye Hakkında Birkaç Mülâhaza" [A Few Considerations on National Education], *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 2, 12 Eylül 1334 (12 September 1918), p. 42.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁰ Satı, "Terbiye-i İçtimaiye Hakkında Mülâhazalar" [Considerations on Social Education], *Terbiye Mecmuası*, 26 Eylül 1334 (26 September 1918), p. 81.

has a national part, it also has a non-national part.”³⁰¹ Response to Satı’s criticisms, Gökalp claimed that he used education its limited meaning, which excluded instruction; however, this did not change the essence of his argument: “Then we can say that not education but acculturation is national. However changing the names do not change the meaning”³⁰²

The main tension between Gökalp and Satı stemmed from their view of society (nation) and individual. Satı did not regard society as an entity beyond individuals. Satı’s materialist ontology was centered on the needs and desires of the individual. However, for Gökalp, “individual” could not be isolated from national consciousness. He argued, that “the end of the education is making national individuals (*milli fert*). Bringing up national individuals means making a nation.”³⁰³ For Gökalp, only the individual who bore the culture of his nation in his consciousness could be a real individual with a distinct character. He stressed that non-national (*la-milli*) individuals could only be animals and un-national individuals (*gayr-i milli*) were called degenerates who did not have character.³⁰⁴

³⁰¹ “*Terbiye mutlak surette mill değildir; terbiyenin milli birkısım varsa la-milli bir kısmı da vardır.*” Satı, “Terbiye ve Milliyet,” p. 104.

³⁰² “*Bu surette ‘terbiye millidir’ diyeceğimize ‘tahris millidir’ deriz. Fakat isim değiştirmekle mahiyet değişmiş olmaz*” Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V* (Articles V), prep. Rıza Kardaş (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1981), p. 83.

³⁰³ “*... terbiyenin gayesi milli fertler yetiştirmektir. Milli fertler yetiştirmek ise, doğrudan doğruya millet yapmak demektir.*” Ibid., p. 51.

³⁰⁴ Ibid.

The Two Rival Methods: The Roots of the Controversy between Ziya Gökalp and
Sarı Bey

The political distinction between the nationalism of Ziya Gökalp and the Ottomanism of Sarı Bey can be traced their two different methodologies. In order to understand the cleavage between them I want to explore the different ontological and epistemological background that they nourished. I want to discuss the materialist-evolutionist ontology and positivist epistemology which grounded Sarı's individualist Ottomanist ideology by contrasting it to Gökalp's social idealist (*içtimai mefkurecilik*) position.

As argued before "science" was the basic criteria for the Young Turks for understanding social change. Sarı Bey, as a colleague of the Young Turks, embraced biological materialism as a reliable ontology. He aimed to prove that all metaphysical speculations could be reduced to some material facts. In a particular discussion, Sarı Bey defended psychology against sociology, arguing that the psyche did not have an existence isolated from the organism: For him, because, there is a close relation between the conditions of psyche (*ahval-i ruhiye*) and the conditions of organism (*ahval-i uzviye*), the conditions of psyche cannot be manifested independent from the acts of the organism.³⁰⁵ Similar to Abdullah Cevdet, who attributed the ability to think to the volume of the brain³⁰⁶ Sarı argued that "the ability to think is manifested

³⁰⁵ Sarı, "Mebahis-i Ruhiye I: Fiiliyat-ı Ruhiye ve Uzviye", [Subjects of the Spirit: Deeds of the Spirit and Body], *Ulum-u İktisadiyye ve İctimaiyye Mecmuası*, no. 9, 1 Eylül 1325 (14 September 1909), p. 72.

³⁰⁶ Cited in Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak*, p. 16.

according the deeds (*filiyat*) of the brain (*dimağ*), especially to the quantity of neurons the brain carries.”³⁰⁷

Satı Bey was a Darwinist who saw the mechanism of life similar to the struggle of the species. He saw life as a struggle in which the fittest survived: “Yes, life is a struggle. Because every living thing has enemies which can be other living things, forces and incidents that struggle to remove the lives of him.”³⁰⁸ The act of living obliged the constant struggle to which human beings were not immune: “Yes, for the human beings, life is a struggle; human beings have also incalculable, measureless enemies; human beings also have to win over the enemies to survive.”³⁰⁹

His evolutionist approach also shaped his pedagogy. He said that although evolution had its own character which was common for all living things, some factors generated the differences between individuals, such as life conditions and environment. Thus, the acts and deeds which managed the track of evolution by changing and moderating the conditions was “cultivation” (*ziraat*) for plants and education (*terbiye*) for human beings.³¹⁰ His analogy of plants and human beings is worth emphasis as it shows how he embraced all the living organisms in a single materialist framework.

Satı wrote that evolution was the process by which every living thing had to experience. By referring to human evolution he took a progressive position and argued that the importance of ethnography as a science which came from its

³⁰⁷ Satı, “Mebahis-i Ruhiye...,” p. 73.

³⁰⁸ Satı, “Ulum-u Tabiiyye” [The Natural Sciences], *Envar-ı Ulum*, no. 1, 1 Eylül 1324 (10 September 1908), p. 10. “*Evet hayat bir muharebedir. Çünkü her zilhayata düşman, her mahlukatın izale-i hayatına sayı birçok zilhayat, birçok kuvva ve hadisat mevcuddur.*”

³⁰⁹ Ibid. “*Evet insan içinde hayat bir muharebedir. İnsan içinde devam-ı hayat düşmanlara galebeye mütevaffıktır.*”

³¹⁰ Satı, *Fenn-i Terbiye...*, pp. 24-25.

capability to examine primitive societies.³¹¹ Ethnography and history both served a common end that was to exhibit the rules of society (*kavanin-i içtimai*). However, due to the limits of its research capacity, history could not examine the earlier periods of manhood. By examining the contemporary primitive countries ethnography complemented the knowledge provided by history.³¹² The examination of primitive societies, which lagged behind in evolution, enabled them to deduce the conditions of early manhood that history could not examine³¹³ thus, ethnography taught us the reason behind construction of the society (*hikmet-i içtimaiye*) by exhibiting the conditions of the state of nature that man experienced.³¹⁴

Satı Bey was epistemologically a positivist who suggested that scientific knowledge which rested on the method of induction could be the only reliable source of the knowledge. He argued that psychology, which was misunderstood as metaphysical knowledge that dealt with the soul of the individual should be evaluated as a positive science because it used induction (*usul-ü istikra*) as its method.³¹⁵ He said that the methodology of natural sciences should be used to examine societies. Like natural facts which had to conform to scientific laws, societies also had to be ordered and change according to specific laws:

All the situations of the society of people are determined and transformed by specific causes and conditions. The entire social phenomenon, like the natural phenomenon, occurs according to some fixed and exact laws. It is possible to reform (*islah*) and improve (*tadil*) the social conditions by only conforming to the requirements of these laws³¹⁶

³¹¹ Satı, “Etnografya” [Ethnography], *Mülkiye*, no. 2, 1 Mart 1324 (14 March 1908), p. 33.

³¹² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³¹³ *Ibid.*, p.33.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.35.

³¹⁵ Satı, “Mebahis-i Ruhiye...,” p. 71.

³¹⁶ Satı, “Etnografya,” p. 31. “*Cemiyet-i beşeriyenin- heyet-i içtimaiyenin her türlü ahvali bir takım esbab ve şerait neticesinde taayyün ve tahavvül eder; hadisat-ı içtimaiyenin hepsi- bütün hadisat-ı*

According to Satı, the laws of social change could be detected by importing the methodology of the natural sciences. Only after adopting the methods of the natural sciences would the social sciences emerge as a distinct scientific discipline. Satı stressed,

Natural sciences assist sociology (*ulum-u içtimaiyye*), philosophy and literature. All of these could only become real knowledge (*ilim*) and science (*fen*) after following the track of the natural sciences. The methodologies of research (*taharri*) and investigation (*tafahhus*) followed by the natural sciences diffused to the other sciences and caused great transformations (*inkilab*) in each of them.³¹⁷

Satı as an Evolutionist: His Views on the Origins of Society and Morality

Satı's sociology was biological and economic in character. Society had emerged as a utilitarian consequence of the biological needs and wants of individuals. Individuals in the state of nature only think of their own benefit. Satı wrote that, as the necessary consequence of the life, "like the animals, the basic nature of the human beings is selfishness: All the individuals before anything else is inclined towards satisfying his own needs and wants (*ezvak*)."³¹⁸ In the state of nature, men and women because of their biological needs had to establish sexual relationships. The relationships, which started as only the consequence of biological needs and wants, gradually transformed into love (*muhabbet*) between the sexes.

tabii gibi- sabit ve kati bir takım kavanine tab'an vukua gelir; ahval-i içtimaiyyeyi islah ve tadil etmek, en çok bu kavanininin mukteziyatına tevaffuk hareket eylemek ile kabil olabilir."

³¹⁷ Satı, "Ulum-u Tabiiyye," p. 11. "*Ulum-u tabiiyye ulum-u içtimaiye ve felsefeye ve edebiyeye pek çok muavenet etmektedir; bunların hepsi ancak ulum-u tabiinin izlerini takibe başladıktan sonra hakiki birer ilim birer fen halini alabilmişlerdir. Ulum-u tabiiyyede tatbik olunan usul-u taharri ve tafahhus, bütün şubat-ı uluma neşet etmiş, hepsinde büyük inkılaplara sebep olmuştur.*"

³¹⁸ Satı, "Mebahis-i Ruhiye: Hissiyat ve Sevaik-i Ahlakiye" [Subjects of the Spirit: Feelings and Moral Expeditions], *Envar-ı Ulum*, 15 Eylül 1324, (10 September 1908), pp. 18-19. "*Bütün hayvanat gibi insanın da taamak-ı fitratında merkez bir tabiat en basit ve umumi mukteziyat-ı hayatiye neticesinde olan- bir teamül vardır ki o da menfaatperestliktir.*"

Thus the basic character of human nature that is “one’s love of his own self” (*hubb-u nefis*) turned into a secondary character of “one’s love of other selves” (*hubb-u gayr*).³¹⁹ The family emerged as an institution based on emotional relationship between father, mother and the children. However Satı, did not explain how the materialistic relationship between the sexes necessarily had been transformed into a love relationship. His emphasis on the cooperation of men and women did not explicate such a deterministic foundation of a family.

The needs and wants of the individuals could not be completed only by the construction of family. For the intellectuals, families established relationships to other families to facilitate the harsh conditions of nature. Thus as a consequence of the mutual need of the families, clans and tribes emerged. In order to establish security, individuals became bound by a social contract that secured the inviolability of lives and properties of the residences of the tribe. The idea of social contract in already was seen above in the thought of Namık Kemal thought who had derived the concept from Rousseau. Kemal used the concept to advocate the view that people are the source of the sovereignty not a monarch. Satı’s idea of social contract was not connected such an idealization of people. The idea of social contract in Satı can only be regarded as a functional concept in his individualist ideology. He emphasized the theoretical priority of the individual before society by referring to a social contract. Kemal argued for the second contract, which delegated the will of the people to the executive class. However, interestingly, Satı did not dwell on the problem of government; he did not discuss the separation of powers or the status of the parliament. He was an intellectual of the period of Second Constitutional Period. The political problem of the restriction of the authority of the Sultan had been

³¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 19-20.

accomplished already by the July Revolution. For Satı, the problem was how to realize a social revolution.

After the construction of the tribe by social contract, the love of family began to extend to the love of the tribe. Thus the tribe also became a broad family consisting of small families.³²⁰ After a while, these tribes also had to establish relationships with each other. Thus government had to be constructed to regulate the relationship between the tribes.³²¹ However, after the creation of the government, with the advancement of interactions between the individuals, a new and abstract emotional bond emerged: The love of the fatherland (*vatan*) than binds the people together.³²² Fatherland as an idea emerged as a necessary consequence of the evolution of manhood. The individual's needs and wants culminated in the creation of family, tribe, government and fatherland. Fatherland should not be seen as a mere geographical place. It bore the memories of the past and many good and bad instances that the individuals had experienced.³²³ Satı Bey did not stop the evolution of the societies with the creation of the idea of a fatherland. He argued that with the interaction of the societies, the love of humanity could also emerge.³²⁴

Satı viewed society as an agglomeration of isolated individuals whose main motives were biologic and economic in character. Individuals had to cooperate for egoistical reasons. However, on the other hand, he put the idealistic concepts of love and brotherhood as a necessary consequence of this materialistic cooperation. However, as argued before, it is not easy to explicate the deterministic relationship

³²⁰ Ibid., p. 21.

³²¹ Ibid.

³²² Ibid.

³²³ Ibid.

³²⁴ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

between the materialist cooperation of the individuals and the feeling of (*muhabbet*) love emerged as a necessary consequence of the cooperation. It can be argued that Satı Bey intended to synthesize his individualistic ideology with his communitarian views. To put it differently, he accommodated his patriotism with his individualist-materialist by theorizing “love of fatherland” as a necessary consequence of the evolution of the human society. Thus, “love of fatherland” is a necessary stage of the evolution of society that was not founded on any ideological speculation. As a practical consequence for him, state or party need not impose any factitious national identity on the people because the very rules of evolution determined one’s natural love of fatherland. Thus, the mission of the teachers should be the unfolding of the natural inclination of the students, not preaching to them ideological constructions.

Satı used the analogy of organism and society to explicate the basic principles according to which societies were organized. Against the criticisms that such an analogy would serve the monarchy, because the brain takes the role of directing the body in the organisms, he insisted on the equality of the elements that composed the organism. Despite the common belief, the role of the brain in the body was not so significant.³²⁵ Every element that constituted the body had its own character and autonomy. Every element was born as a separate (*müstakilen*) entity, developed, lived and died. The activities of the body could not be isolated from the activities of the elements that constituted it. Thus, the organism should not be seen an entity above the elements. It did not have an independent character from the elements.³²⁶

An interdependence existed, however, between the elements which varied according to the scale of the division of labor. In the more developed societies, the

³²⁵ Satı, “Uzviyetler ve Cemiyetler” [Organisms and Societies] *Ulum-u İktisadiyye ve İçtimaiyye Mecmuası*, no.8, 1 Ağustos 1325 (14 August 1909), p. 434.

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 435.

degree of division of labor was high because of the need for specialization and differentiation; however in primitive societies the degree of division of labor was low.³²⁷ Satı said that one should not forget that “even in the most developed bodies, the elements have a private character”³²⁸ and there was no supreme organ which directed the body. The brain had the only role to preserve the harmony between the organs.³²⁹ The body was a gathering entity (*heyet-i mecmuu*) like a nation or society, although its character was shaped by the elements that constituted it. Different from its elements, which were living and dying in a small amount of time, the body persisted for rather a long time.³³⁰

It is not easy to explain the syncretism of Satı Bey’s social thought. On the one hand he is mentioned an idealistic concept of a social contract to bind the people together around the idea of reciprocal rights and duties of the individual. On the other hand, he used organist arguments to explain the structure of society. However, his organist views also supported his individualism. He put material needs and wants as the prime factor of cooperation. He did not say why the division of labor emerged as a consequence of the egoisms of the individuals. For Satı, the materialist cooperation of individuals spontaneously turned into a love relationship.

³²⁷ Ibid., p. 447.

³²⁸ Ibid., p. 440.

³²⁹ Ibid., p. 442.

³³⁰ Ibid., p. 440.

The Fathers and Sons: Spencer and Durkheim as the Forefathers of the Old

Discussion

The discrepancies in Satı Bey's social thought can be attributed to several reasons. One is the influence of Spencer on his social thought. Satı, like Spencer, took a synthetic approach and insisted on "the interaction between the individuals bio-psychological needs and motives and the social and psychological environment."³³¹ Nevertheless, it can be argued that Satı was a victim of the contradictions of Spencer's sociologies, which were difficult to reconcile. Satı might have been confused by Spencer who defined society both as "an organism" and society as "a network of contracts or quasi-contracts between the individuals."³³² However, while Gökalp's adoption of the sociological theory of Durkheim also cannot be regarded as a surprise, it should not be forgotten that Satı's adoption of Spencer's notions and ideas cannot be seen as accidental. Ottoman intellectuals of the period chose themselves Western intellectual figures according to their own intellectual needs and desires. Satı, who had inherited the materialist-positivist epistemology of the Young Turk thought, had to hold his Ottomanism with his materialism. Spencer's sociology provided Satı a shelter within which he could oppose the nationalism of Gökalp by leaning on the individualism of Spencer. However he also had to accommodate his Ottomanism by theorizing "the love of fatherland" as a necessary consequence of the evolution of the societies. This syncretism enabled him both to defend his individualist position against the

³³¹ Peter A. Corning, "Durkheim and Spencer", *The British Journal of Sociology*, v. 33, no: 3, (Sept,1982), p. 369.

³³² Werner Stark, "Spencer's Three Sociologies", *American Sociological Review*, v. 26, no: 4, (August 1961), pp. 515-521.

communitarian position of Gökalp and to appeal to an upper identity around which people could reunite. In this way, he could point out an alternative source of identity. “Love of fatherland” could be presented as an alternative to the “love of the nation.”

The difference between his nationalism and that of Gökalp can be traced to the methodologies of the two intellectuals. As asserted before, Satı was a committed materialist who reduced the foundation of society to the material needs and wants of the individual. Gökalp, contrary to Satı, was an idealist who argued that “values are not emerged from the material nature of the object however, there is a mysterious thing called ‘ideal’ (*mefkure*) which is the source of the values.”³³³ One could not argue that ideals started as mere opinion and turned into a reality after a while. However, ideals from the very beginning arose as a reality:

In the times of the crises, that only collective consciousness remains as a dominant consciousness. At these times individual consciousnesses disappear. Collective consciousness is a living reality that makes individuals serves it. The ideal (*mefkure*) is the living of the collective consciousness.³³⁴

Gökalp wrote that ideals were not lofty beings above the human condition. He opposed the idealism of Plato saying that “if the metaphysical world of ideas really existed, ideals could not be changed from society to society and time to time.”³³⁵ For him, the ideal only could be found in the life style of the people at special times. Gökalp attributed sociology a primary role to discover the ideal that existed in

³³³ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler VII* (Articles VII), prep. Abdulhaluk Çay, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1982) , p. 41.

³³⁴ Ibid., p. 48. “*Büyük bir buhran zamanında, cemiyette yalnız müşterek vicdan halim olur. Ferdi vicdanlar kaybolur. Bu müşterek vicdan ruhlara vecdler saçan, bütün fertleri kudsiyetine karşı hürmetkar ve fedakar kılan canlı bir şeniyettir. Mefkure dediğimiz şey bu ma’şeri vicdanın şedid ve mütekasif bir hayat yaşamasıdır.*”

³³⁵ Ibid., p. 42.

society. He asserted that, “sociology proved that the ideal is a real fact (*şerhiyet*) which belongs to the positive world.”³³⁶

The controversy between Gökarp and Satı could be seen as the reflection of the discussion between Durkheim and Spencer. In Gökarp and Durkheim, the primary problem was solidarity; however in Satı and Spencer, the problem of solidarity was secondary to the problem of meeting survival and reproductive needs.³³⁷ For Gökarp and Durkheim, the society had its own distinct entity before the individuals that composed it. For Spencer and Satı, society is the mere agglomeration of individuals.³³⁸

Nation or Individual: The Discussion between Gökarp and Satı

At this point of discussion between Gökarp and Satı will be followed step by step to unfold all the arguments and counter-arguments. The dialogue between them enables us to see where the secular Ottomanism of Satı and nationalism of Gökarp diverge and converged. It also will enable us to discover the theoretical underpinnings of the political and practical discussion of nationalism and Ottomanism.

The discussion started with a disagreement on the substance of education. Gökarp argued that education should be national, that for him good education should inculcate national culture in individuals.³³⁹ Satı opposed this argument saying that

³³⁶ Ibid., p.42.

³³⁷ Corning, “Durkheim and Spencer” ..., p. 369.

³³⁸ Ibid., p. 370.

³³⁹ Ziya Gökarp, *Makaleler V...*, p. 37.

education could not be necessarily perceived as national. It had national and non-national parts.³⁴⁰

Gökalp stated that “although Durkheim attaches great importance to the division of labor in his theory, he attributes all the social facts to the one unique origin that is collective comprehensions (*maşeri tere'iler*). Collective comprehensions consist of stories, legends, moral, legal, economic, scientific rules and philosophical ideas.”³⁴¹ According to him, in times of crises, collective comprehensions became strong and gain extreme power. At those times, “the ideal” (*Mefkure*) emerges as a distinct reality.³⁴²

Gökalp distinguished between organic-psychic (*uzviyen ruhi*) events the social-psychic (*içtimaiyen ruhi*) events. Psychology approached the two different kinds of events as one event.³⁴³ He asserted that although psychology assumed that social-psychic events emerged as the natural development of organic-psychic events, they should be distinguished.³⁴⁴ Sociology as a new discipline that distinguished between the two different kinds of events and proved the independence of social-psychic events from organic-psychic events:

Sociology as a social science discovered social-psychic events have a completely different essence from organic-psychic events if society did not emerge, there would be no religious, moral, esthetic values and no abstract administration that would be established contrary to the natural inclinations.³⁴⁵

³⁴⁰ Satı, “Terbiye ve Milliyet”..., p. 104.

³⁴¹ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler IX* (Articles IX), prep. Şevket Baysanoğlu, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1980) , pp. 28-29.

³⁴² Ibid., p. 30.

³⁴³ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V...*, p. 38.

³⁴⁴ Ibid.

³⁴⁵ Ibid.. p. 40. “İçtimaiyat ilmi içtimaiyen ruhi hadiselerin, uzviyen ruhi hadiselerden büsbütün başka bir mahiyette olduğunu isbat etti. İçtimai hayat olmasaydı, dini ahlaki, bedii duyguların mevcut olmayacağını, meşhumi br idrakin, sevk-I tabiiere muhalif bir iradenin teşekkül edemeyeceğini irae etti.”

Gökalp distinguished between the sentiments of matter (*keyfiyet ihtisasları*) from feelings of value (*kıymet duyguları*). Sentiments of matter were derived from qualities such as hearing, seeing and tasting and that these sentiments generally emanated from the material nature of the objects. However, he emphasized that feelings of value could not be derived from the nature of things.³⁴⁶ He gave the example of eating an apricot to clarify his point. When one ate an apricot and felt good, this feeling was not a one of value, but a feeling of a quality that emanated from the nature of the apricot. Feelings of values, such as religious, moral and esthetic sentiments did not emanate from the nature of the matters. He concluded that feelings of value were conditioned by the perceptions of society and comprehended by not the individual but the collective consciousness.³⁴⁷

Gökalp further stated that organic-psychic events should be the subject of biology and social-psychic events should be the subject of sociology. He did not acknowledge psychology as an abstract (*mücerret*) science because for him abstract sciences had a distinct object of study from other disciplines and sought general and abstract laws. Psychology was a concrete science because it did not have its own object of study.

Gökalp's arguments can be clustered around the idea of nation. He used "the social" and "the national" interchangeably. By employing the sociology of Durkheim he tried to theorize the Turkish nation as an entity which was above individuals. His adoption of Durkheim's notion of collective consciousness as an entity against the individual consciousnesses should be understood as an attempt to establish national culture (*hars*) as a source of authority above the deeds of individuals.

³⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 40.

³⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 40-41

Satı was aware of the implications of the sociology of Gökalp, that his theory saw a nation-state that excluded non-Turks. However, the Empire consisted of people from different ethnic origins, languages and religions. He had dedicated himself to the preservation of the Empire that accommodated people from different origins into a one political system. This system had to be individualistic to accommodate the differences of the people of the Empire. Thus he had to formulate an alternative sociology which prioritized the wills of the individuals so that individuals from different backgrounds would by their own wills subscribe to a common identity that was Ottomanness.

Satı challenged mainly two main points of Gökalp's the nationalist ideology of Gökalp: the existence of a distinct collective consciousness beyond the consciousnesses of the individuals, and the differentiation of organic-psychic events and social-psychic events.

Initially, Satı had to oppose the existence of the collective consciousness as a category beyond the wills of the individuals. In the article, "Individual Mind and Social Consciousness" (*Ferdi Şuur ve İçtimai Vicdan*) he harshly criticized Gökalp and declared that there was no spirit of society (*cemaat ruhu*) above the spirits of individuals:

In order to express organic-psychic events, it is said that "societies have also spirits" and the expression of "the spirit of society" (*cemaat ruhu*) is used. However, by looking at this expression, one should not think that societies have a distinct spirit outside the spirits of the individuals. Such a way of thinking surpasses the boundaries of the physical world (*müstebiyat*) that it should be evaluated as a metaphysical assumption.³⁴⁸

³⁴⁸ "Satı, "Ferdi Şuur ve İçtimai Vicdan" [Individual Consciousness and Social Conscience], *Muallim*, no. 5, 5 Teşrinisani 1332, (18 November 1916), p. 130. "Bu hadisat-ı ruhiyeyi ifade etmek için "cemaatlerin de ruhu var" denilir ve "cemaat ruhu" tabiri kullanılır, fakat bu tabirlere bakarak, cemaatlerde, ferdlerdekinden başka, ferdlerdekinden hariç ruh ve hadisat-ı ruhiye bulunduğu zannına düşmemek lüzum gelir. Böyle yapıldığı zaman müstebiyatın hududu geçilmiş hadisat ve müşahidatın müsadesi haricine çıkılarak –mabeadel tabiiyata müstenid- farziye yapılmış olur."

He acknowledged that at times of crises, some inspiration, inculcation and propagation may happen between the individuals so that in those times some psychic deeds (*ameliyat-ı ruhiye*) became strong and some lost its weight.³⁴⁹ The factor that was external to the spirits of the individuals was the interaction between the souls of the individuals. There was no determinant for the change in their souls other than the state of being social and interacting with one another.³⁵⁰

Satı clarified his criticisms of Gökalp saying that the existence of the collective consciousness beyond the consciousnesses of the individuals had no material bases. He emphasized the metaphysical character of the theoretical stance that entailed the recognition of a distinct collective consciousness. He argued that “our knowledge about our consciousness is intuitive. We comprehend it directly; however we cannot comprehend collective consciousness in such a way.”³⁵¹

As a second criticism, Satı opposed the differentiation between organic-psychic events and social-psychic events. Such a differentiation neglected the interdependence of the two types of events. He took the example of the feeling of taste upon which Gökalp dwelled. Satı intended to show the complexity of events which could not be divided into two categories. He aimed to deconstruct the category of organic psychic events by using the example that had been used by Gökalp that is the feeling of taste:

Are all the foods delicious in the same way for everybody and all the nations (*kavim*)? For instance, everybody likes okra; however I am disgusted by it. If the flavor emanates from the nature of the food, can the flavor of the same food be different for me and you? Especially how can the food that one nation finds delicious disgusting to another nation?³⁵²

³⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 129.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 130.

³⁵¹ Ibid., p. 131.

³⁵² Ibid., pp. 132-133. “*Her yemek, herkes ve her kavim için aynı derecede lezzetli veya lezzetsiz midir? Mesela bamyayı herkes lezzetli buluyor ve seviyor; fakat ben ondan iğreniyorum, onu hiç*

By analyzing the case of the feeling of taste Satı found that the so-called organic-psychic events were affected by many organic and psychic factors such as perceptions of the family and society, personal choices and habits. Nevertheless, the complexity of the causes of the events makes a clear-cut distinction between them impossible.³⁵³ He concluded that if it were possible to differentiate between social-psychic events and organic-psychic events, then it should be acknowledged that the former events were the evolutionary products of the latter's.³⁵⁴ Thus, for Satı, social-psychic events could not be evaluated as real independent events. They could be only defined as the consequences of organic-psychic events.

Satı criticized both Gökalp and Durkheim, who attributed sociology the primary role in explaining the social existence of individuals. For him, sociology could not be the sole way to understand and explain the character of individuals because there were many factors that determined the social existence of an individual that could not be reduced only to the role of a society.³⁵⁵ It is clear that Satı by opposing the hegemony of sociology over other the human sciences tried to prove the necessary role of psychology in understanding human behavior.

Gökalp insisted on his two main arguments, while responding the criticisms of Satı Bey, the existence of collective consciousness above individual consciousnesses, and the differentiation between social-psychic events and organic-psychic events. He argued that although Satı acknowledged that infection (*sirayet*) and inculcation

Yiyemiyorum, eğer lezzet eşyanın sırf maddi tabiatından sadır olsaydı aynı şeyin lezzeti bence başka sizce başka olabilir miydi? Bilhassa bir kavmin pek lezzet bulduğu yemeklerin başka kavimlerce hiç beğenilmediği, hatta bazen müstekre bile telakki edildiğini görmüyor muyuz."

³⁵³ Ibid., p. 133.

³⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 134.

³⁵⁵ Ibid.

(*telkin*) happened between the individuals in times of crises, he had not explained the mechanisms of interaction between individual souls³⁵⁶:

Satı accepts the physical (*hikemi*) intercourse of psychic events in the state of the social; however, he does not accept the chemical merge (*imtizac*). He does not explain according to which mechanisms in the state of physical intercourse some psychic deeds cease and, on the contrary some intensify, some inclinations assault themselves and disappear and some inclinations join and gain strength.³⁵⁷

Gökalp used the metaphor of water to explain existence and the distinction between the collective consciousness and the individual consciousnesses. For him, like water, which had different features from its elements oxygen and hydrogen, collective consciousness also had different features from the individual consciousnesses. He formulated the emergence of collective consciousness as a reality in the souls of individuals. The interaction between the souls of individuals resulted in a chemical merge in the every individual's soul so that new and totally different states of mind (*halet-i ruhiye*) came into existence.³⁵⁸ This state of mind transmitted among the individuals and created new merges. In the end, a new system of emotions (*duygular manzumesi*) came into being. Thus, collective consciousness consisted of this system of emotions that manifested in every individual soul not in a world of ideals.³⁵⁹

Gökalp also responded the Satı's denunciation of collective consciousness as a metaphysical concept. Satı had declared that different from individual

³⁵⁶ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V...*, p. 66.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 68. "*Satı Bey cumhur halinde, ruhi hadiselerin bir nevi hikemi ihtilatını kabul ediyor, kimyevi imtizacını kabul etmiyor. Fakat bu hikemi ihtilat halinde nasıl bir mekanizma ile bazı ameliyat-ı ruhiyenin durduğunu, bazı ameliyat-ı ruhiyenin de bilakis şiddetlendiğini, bazı temayüllerin birbirine te'aruz ederek kaybolduğunu, bazı temayüllerin birbirine inzıam ederek büyük bir şiddet kazandığını izah etmiyor.*"

³⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 71.

³⁵⁹ Ibid.

consciousnesses, collective consciousness could be comprehended intuitively. Gökalp argued that collective consciousness, like individual consciousness, consisted of systems of representations (*ter'iler manzumesi*) which were comprehended directly.³⁶⁰ He distinguished between social representations in two groups: conscious and unconscious. Unconscious representation was called public opinion (*hissiyat-ı amme*) consisted of animated, developed, moving events.³⁶¹ Unconscious representations took the form of conscious representations in two ways: Institutions in society and the sincere aspirations of individuals.³⁶²

Gökalp intended to prove that collective consciousness was not an abstract notion above the sphere of individuals, but it manifested itself in their soul. His main goal was to prove the concreteness of the national culture, which was living in the consciousnesses of every individual of the nation. Satı, on the other hand, opposing the differentiation of organic-psychic events and social-psychic events, sought to disprove the dualist epistemology of Gökalp. Satı as a monist only regarded individual consciousness as the real consciousness. Other consciousnesses, like national or social, could only be derivative of the original one.

Solidarist and Individualist Moralities: Gökalp and Satı Discuss the Problem of Morality

The split between the collective and individualist sociologies of Gökalp and Satı reflected itself also on the problem of morality. The different approaches of the

³⁶⁰Ibid., p. 76.

³⁶¹ Ibid., p. 79.

³⁶² Ibid., pp. 76-77.

two intellectuals to the issue of morality are important to pursue in delineating the continuity and coherence of the political stance of each intellectual. Gökalp, not surprisingly, argued for a morality which stemmed from the values of society. Moral sanctions had to guide individuals to conform to the customs of society. Satı's materialism and individualism shaped his approach to morality. He advocated a morality which made individuals to conform the necessities of nature.

Gökalp argued that the individual was born as asocial (*la-içtimai*) agents. However society, after the birth of the individual, tried to assimilate him by means of education. In order to socialize the individual, society had to implement two mechanisms, approval and disapproval. Thus, the instruments of awards and punishments arose from these two mechanisms.³⁶³ Awards and punishments appeared in the two distinct states pervasive (*münteşir*) or organized (*müteazzi*). The organized awards and punishments were written laws and regulations issued by the government. The pervasive form of morality was called moral custom (*ahlaki örf*), which emerged as the responses (*aksülamel*) of the public emotions (*hissiyat-ı-amme*).³⁶⁴

Gökalp regarded morality as a cement to bind the people together. Morality has the mission to establish solidarity between the individuals in a society.³⁶⁵ The pervasive morality was superior to the organized morality because the pervasive form had the real capacity to realize the socialization of the individual. The pervasive morality, which took its ground from the customs of society and reflected the desires

³⁶³ Ibid., p. 99.

³⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 105.

³⁶⁵ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler VII...*, p. 18.

of collective conscience, was the real type of morality. Thus, organized rewards and punishments should conform to the laws of pervasive morality.³⁶⁶

Satı objected to the reduction of morality to the socialization of the individual. Rewards and punishments are not the mere responses of social life. They could be the natural consequences of the activities of individuals.³⁶⁷ In Satı's ethics, the emphasis was on the agency of the individual. He found it a crucial mistake to disdain and underestimate the power and effect of the individual. The source of morality was not society, but the deeds of individuals.³⁶⁸ The end of moral education was not ensuring solidarity in society, but obtaining the happiness and excellence of individuals.³⁶⁹

The controversy between the two continued on the dichotomy of individual and society. Gökalp insisted on the existence of society as an independent agency before the individual. He criticizes Satı for not differentiating between social and natural responses. Social responses were the conscious responses of the individual; however natural responses did not consider consciousness or unconsciousness, they applied its laws equally to all people.³⁷⁰

Satı, on the other hand, acknowledged the social character of morality by arguing that the feeling of morality was the result of the conditions and relations of society.³⁷¹ However, he insisted that social responses could not be distinguished from

³⁶⁶ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V...*, p.105

³⁶⁷ Satı, "Mükâfat ve Mücazat Meselesi" [The Issue of Rewards and Punishments], *Yeni Mecmua*, no. 34, 7 Mart 1334, (7 March 1918), p. 42.

³⁶⁸ Ibid.

³⁶⁹ Satı, *Fenn-i Terbiye*, p. 243.

³⁷⁰ Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V...*, p.113

³⁷¹ Satı, "Mebahis-i Ruhiye: Hissiyat ve Sevaik-i Ahlakiye", p. 18

natural responses. He clarified his argument by putting emphasis on the word “natural” (*tabii*). He used it as equivalent to the words “artificial” (*sunî*) and arbitrary (*keyfî*). Because of this reason, he further argued that he regarded the consequences and responses of the one deed (*fiil*), whether they were mechanical, biological or social, as natural.³⁷² Thus, natural responses encompassed the social responses. Social responses did not have a distinct character before natural responses.

In his critique of Gökalp’s book *New Life* (Yeni Hayat), Satı criticized the solidaristic motto of Gökalp that is “there is no right but duty.” The consciousness of one’s right and duty could not be separable. The true perception of the one’s own rights also strengthens one’s feelings of duty.³⁷³ He argued that the mere feeling of duty isolated from the rights of individuals had only served the communal morality of earlier periods.³⁷⁴ However, Satı contrary to Gökalp, did not ground his ethics on the collective consciousness of the people. He argued that people could not convey true moral codes to individuals because their level of morality should also be raised:

Certainly, we should get to know and love the people. We should examine the morality of the people and try to improve it; however we should know that morality has so high peaks that it is even impossible for the people to raise.³⁷⁵

Satı defined the morality not on a social but on an individual basis. His evolutionary materialism also shaped his approach to the idea of “morality.” The individual who had to strive for a living had to establish relationships with other

³⁷² Satı, “Mükâfat ve Mücazat Hakkında” [Concerning the Rewards and Punishments], *Yeni Mecmua*, no. 36, 21 Mart 1334 (21 March 1918), p. 182. “Şüphesiz halkı tanımalı ve sevmeliyiz, halkın ahlakını tedkik etmeli ve yükseltmeye çalışmalıyız, fakat bilmeliyiz ki ahlakın öyle yüksek zirveleri vardır ki, onlara halkın yükselmesi mümkün bile değildir”

³⁷³ Satı, “Terbiye ve Ahlak Meseleleri, Kitaplar Arasında: Yeni Hayat” [The Issues of Education and Morality, Between the Books: New Life], *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 3, 26 Eylül 1334, (26 September 1918), p. 114.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

persons. The necessary intercourse with the other sex resulted in the beginning of society. With the evolution of society and man, the level of socialization and the capacity of the conceptualization of the people developed. Societies had to formulize a moral code that regulated their relationships to the natural and social environments.

Satı's idea of morality was detached from any idealist structure that included religion. He opposed any universal claim to morality isolated from the natural and social environment of the individual.³⁷⁶ Islam as a religion also could not be regarded as the legitimate source of moral codes. He distinguished between "believing in religion and "believing in morality." An atheist could also have moral principles that guided her behavior.³⁷⁷ In Satı's social and political thought, Islam was confined to the instrumental role of holding the Empire together by sustaining the allegiance of the Muslims to the state.

The agendas of the patriotism of Satı and the nationalism of Gökalp converged on some basic themes where both sought for the possibility of a "New Life" distinct from earlier periods. Satı, who regarded the July Revolution only as an initial step for a broad social revolution, imagined a new society grounded on a "new individual" who was well educated and knew his rights and responsibilities. This "new individual" should be the base of Ottoman society, which consisted of people from different religions, languages and ethnicities. Thus, Satı's sociology was individualistic because he recognized the risks of a collectivist ideology which would deform the pluralist structure of the Empire. However, he was unable to find the solution to the problem of solidarity. He avoided confronting the question of how this liberal individualistic sociology would enable to assure the unity of the Ottoman

³⁷⁶ Satı, "Mebahis-i Ruhiye: Hissiyat ve Sevaik-i Ahlakiye"... , p. 19.

³⁷⁷ Satı, "Terbiye ve Ahlak Meseleleri, Kitaplar Arasında: Din ve Hayat", [The Issues of Education and Morality: Between the Books: Religion and Life] *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 4, 24 Teşrinievvel 1334 (24 October 1918), p. 138.

society. To put differently, he failed to establish what motivated people from different ethnicities in leaving aside their communal and religious binds, to constitute an Ottoman society. For Satı, the creation of a new individual who knew his benefits could deliberately choose the Empire as the legitimate political entity. However, the problem of integration was an urgent one in the age of nationalism. Unfortunately Satı's project of Ottomanism as a socialization of the Ottoman subjects was doomed to fail before the project of Gökalp, which brought the problem of solidarity to its center.

Ironically, Gökalp's nationalist sociology although succeeded in formulating a practical political agenda to transform the Turkish people into a Turkish nation, by its very nature, could not protect the pluralistic environment of the age of Ottomanism which had begun with the proclamation of the Tanzimat Decree. The utopia of the political allegiance of the people from different religious and ethnic backgrounds to the superior political entity left its place to the homogenization of people around one language, nationality and religion.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This thesis scrutinized the political and social thoughts of an Ottoman intellectual, Satı Bey, who defended Ottomanism as a remedy to the problems of the collapsing Empire. The thesis was a short endeavor to fill two gaps in the existing literature. First, the thesis analyzed Satı Bey's thoughts with the framework of Ottomanism, which was one of the ideologies of the Second Constitutional Period. Although some valuable studies dwelling on the thoughts of Satı Bey exist, these studies examine Satı Bey as an educator not as a theoretician. Thus the thesis intended to locate Satı Bey's thought among the ideological movements of his period.

The second was to discuss the Second Constitutional Period Ottomanism which has been in the literature. Ottomanism was regarded as a failed attempt after the Balkan Wars and its ideological representation afterwards was ignored. However, to understand Satı's Ottomanism is important both to trace the intellectual development of Ottomanism just before the collapse of the Empire and to compare and contrast the project of nationalism and Ottoman patriotism especially by referencing the discussions between Satı Bey and the theoretician of Turkish nationalism Ziya Gökalp.

Satı Bey, besides being a successful bureaucrat was an influential thinker who revised the old ideology of Ottomanism by placing the "individual" at the center of his thought. He synthesized the Young Turk ideology, which prioritized a modernization program guided by the notions of "science" and "progress", with the

Young Ottoman theme of *vatan* as the basis of the allegiances of the citizens to the state. He attached great importance to primary education to nurture “a new individual” who as a loyal citizen of Ottoman Empire would be the bearer of modern thinking. All in all, the Ottomanism of the intellectual had three main characters: secular, centralist and individualist:

First of all, although he utilized Islam as the unifying factor of the Ottoman people, his social and political thought was founded on a secular basis. He was in the circle of the Westernists of his period. His sociology is individualistic and evolutionist and repudiates any religious references for the development of society and man. He shared the common ideal of “progress” of his period which for him meant a secular education to enhance the capacities of the individuals.

Second, although he criticized the Committee of Union and Progress for its rigid centralization policies which ignored the local needs of the people, contrary to the Arab intellectuals of the period, he never took a federalist position. The sources used here offer no evidence that he was drawn to the Arab cause until his departure from Turkey. His political thought was oriented towards unity not separation.

Third, he took the “individual” as the centre of his political thought and by the means of education he aimed to develop a new individual with a new perception of the world. He was not interested in developing different political agendas for different geographies of the Empire. His education policies targeted all of the population of the Empire, Arab or Turk. It is important to note that Satı’s Ottomanism did not offer a ready-made political or practical problem to ensure the unity of the Empire. His main desire was to transform the community-based structure of society to an individual-based one. Thus he opposed elitist views of the Young Turk intellectuals like Abdullah Cevdet, who argued for the creation of an elite class

isolated from the popular classes which bore the modern ideas. For Satı, modernization had to begin from the bottom of the society not from the top. For that reason, he as a pedagogue argued for the importance of primary schools in the modernization of the country. Good education should produce a capable, moral and patriotic individual who would be the agent of social change.

Satı lived in an age of social and political turmoil when different agendas were formulated by different ideological camps. As a committed Westernist and Ottomanist, he clashed with the leading intellectuals of his period, like the Turkish nationalist Ziya Gökalp; thinker and educationist İsmail Hakkı Baltacıođlu; and the Minister of Education of his period Emrullah Efendi. Especially his discussions with Ziya Gökalp reveal the similarities and differences, converging and diverging points of the Turkish nationalism and Ottoman patriotism of his period.

Satı's discussion with Ziya Gökalp on the objective of education was transformed into a broad-based discussion of the existence of national consciousness as an entity. Satı objected the existence of any transcendental entity above the realm of individual. His theory rested on the will of the individual independent from all external forces or ideological constructions. However, on the other hand, the agenda of patriotism of Satı and nationalism of Gökalp converged on some basic themes where both sought for the possibility a "New Life" distinct from the earlier periods. They both intended to change the community-based structure of Ottoman society, but only with different methodologies. Gökalp put society as a reality above the individual as the bearer of values which had the power to shape the character of individuals, Satı insisted on the will of the individual which deliberately constituted society.

Satı's Ottomanism was based on the autonomy of the individual who was aware of her benefits. However, Satı also recognized the shortcomings of such an individualistic formulation of Ottomanism while the Empire was in danger of dissolution along the ethnic lines. He was aware of the necessity to accommodate his individualist and materialist ideology an idealist construction which would serve as a source of loyalty to Ottoman state.

At this point, he broke with the leading Westernist Young Turk intellectuals like Prince Sabahaddin and Abdullah Cevdet, who regarded federalism a practical option for the state against dissolution. Although he criticized explicitly the Committee of Union and Progress after the departure of the leading cadre of the Committee for conducting harsh centralization policies, he never declared open support for federalism as a solution. To the contrary, Satı sought a new loyalty which would not instigate any ethnic or religious cleavages, but at the same time would provide the ground of legitimacy for the state. Thus he utilized and revised the Young Ottoman notion of *vatan* to offer an inclusive ground for all people of Ottomans as an alternative to the exclusionist project of nationalism.

Based on this analysis, one can say that the Ottomanism which has been perceived as a state policy after the Gülhane Receipt, was theorized by an Ottoman intellectual Satı Bey in the Second Constitutional period remained a vital political alternative at least intellectually just before the dissolution of the Empire. However, this could not efface the question of the why Ottomanism of Satı Bey failed before the nationalism of Gökalp.

It is not easy to determine why an ideology fails before another one. However, it should be clear that the failure does not indicate a total weakness of the failed ideology. It can be argued that the existing political conditions are highly influential

in determining which ideology would find the chance of implementation. In the case of Ottoman dissolution, when nationalism gained an upper-hand before the other political movements, Ottoman patriotism lost its power of transforming into an actual political agenda. However, this explanation is not adequate to explain the whole point. The intrinsic arguments of the both sides also have to be examined.

The main difference between Gökalp and Satı can be seen in the formulation of the immediate problem of the Empire. For Gökalp, the immediate problem was one of solidarity. He dealt with the question of “how keep people together”. Satı, on the other hand, worked for a total modernization project. His mind was involved with the nurture of a new modern individual. Although he also incorporated the theme of *vatan* by borrowing elements from Young Ottoman political thought and popular items of nationalism, he could not be persuasive. He could not find the exact solution to the problem of motivation. In another way, he failed to answer the persisting question of what motivates people from different ethnicities and religions, to constitute an Ottoman society. The only references to the binding role of “one fatherland” which contained the traditions of Oriental people could not be the effective answer to the immediate problems of the day. More exciting themes which would address the primordial bonds between people were needed to achieve the goal of integration. Gökalp’s project of constructing a nation as an entity above individuals filled this gap. Turkishness with its symbols could be the source of solidarity between the Turkish speaking people.

The study of Satı Bey’ thought may raise questions concerning the intellectuals of the Second Constitutional Period. Although many studies have been done on Ottoman intellectual history, the comparative analyses still are needed to understand the alternative intellectual trajectories of the period. The interaction

between the ideas, the controversies, converging and diverging points of the political thoughts of the period have to be worked over. Researchers should be aware that the political trends of the period were not born in a vacuum. Besides the political and social conditions, intellectual arguments also played a considerable role in shaping and developing new approaches. Thus new research concentrated on the interaction of Ottoman intellectuals could highlight the complex web of relations between their ideas.

Appendices: Selected Articles form Satı Bey:

Article I:

Terbiye ve Milliyet

“Muallim” in ilk nüshasında Ziya ve Hakkı Beyler’in makalelerini okuduğum zaman, ikisini de müfrit ve biraz inhisar ve kelimeci bulmuştum. Bununla beraber bu hususlardaki fikirlerimi yazmadan evvel, iki tarafın birbirine cevap vererek fikirlerini daha iyi izah etmelerine intizar eylemeği de zaruri görmüştüm.

Cevaplar intişar etti; ve – ilk makaledeki fikirleri izah ve hatta ta’dil bile ederken ortaya yeni bir takım meseleler daha çıkardı.

Ben, her şeyden evvel, bu meselelerin epeyce ta’yin ve tahdid edilerek birbirinden ayrılmasına lüzum görüyorum. Benim iştirak etmeyerek şaynı tedkik gördüğüm fikirler şunlardır: I) Terbiye harsı ferdlerde ruh melekeler haline getirmektir. II) Terbiye mutlak milli olmalıdır. III) Asri milletlerde terbiyenin parlak gıyesi çocukları müstahsil yetiştirmektir. IV) Ferdlerin hususiyeti hayatiyetli ilmiyenin, şahsın hususiyeti içtimiyat ilminin kanunlarıyla izah olunur. V) Lezzet yemişin maddi tabiatından sıdır, onu duyanda uzviyettir. Halbuki mukaddes, iyi ve güzel mahiyetlerini idrak eden uzvi bir şuur değil, içtimiyi vicdandır. VI) Uzviyen ruhi hadiselerle içtimaiyen ruhi hadiseler arasında kat’i bir infisal vardır. VII) Terbiye de yapılacak doğru bir inkilap harsı bırakıp medeniyete gitmek değil, medeniyeti bırakıp harsa doğru gitmektir. VIII) Avrupa medeniyeti fertlerin kabulü tarikiyle milli harsa geçmez, belki milli harsın kabulünden sonra hakiki surette fertlere geçebilir. IX) İbtidai mekteplerle meslek ve ihtisas mektepler ta’limi bir mahiyeti haizdir. Fakat sultaniyeler sırf terbiye bir mahiyeti haizdir. X) Sultanilerden funun şubesini ilga ederek mektebin heyet-i umumiyesini hars tedrise hasretmek iktiza eder. XI) Şahsiyet ibtida millette husule gelir ki buna hars

namını veriyoruz. Ferd bu harsdan alabildiği nisbette şahsiyete mülk olur. XII) Alman terbiyesi cemaatçi, Anglosakson terbiyesi ferdiyetçidir, demek doğru olamaz; her iki milletin terbiyesi de millidir ve harslıdır. XIII) Bir millet, ister temeddün etsin de çocuklarına asrî bir terbiye versin; ister çocuklarına asrî bir terbiye versin de temeddün etsin; gaye daima ikidir: Harslı medeniyet, medeniyetli hars.

Bu meselelerin bir kısmı birinci derece de terbiye meselesi ise de bir kısmı daha ziyade ruhiyat ve içtimaiyat meselesidir. Ben bugün, yalnız birinci kısım meseleleri tedkik edeceğim.

I) Terbiye-i milliye

Ziya Bey terbiyeye “millî” sıfatını tabî ve zarurî bir sıfat gibi rabt ediyor; ve terbiyenin mutlak surette millî olması lüzum geldiğini iddia ediyor.

Bu fikir ve iddia, terbiye hakkında ileriye sürülen ta’rifin tabî bir neticesidir: Ziya Bey’in fikrinde “Terbiye harsı- yani kavmin vicdanında yaşayan hükümlerinin mecmuunu- o kavmin fertlerinde ruhî melekeler haline getirmektedir.”

Terbiyeye bu kadar mahdud bir mana verince, onun tamamıyla millî olması lüzum geldiği iddia olunabilir. Fakat, terbiyenin manası bu tarifin medlundan çok daha şumüllüdür: Ziya Bey bile ikinci makalesinde “terbiye-i bedeniye” den bahs etmiş, ve “istikrâ melekесinin terbiyesi” – “istidlal melekесinin terbiyesi ta’birlerini kullanmıştır. Bu tabirlerdeki terbiye ile kıymet hükümleri arasında bir münasebet olmadığı meydandadır. Demek ki, bizzat Ziya Bey bu makalelerinde bile, terbiyeyi – yaptığı ta’rifinden - çok daha şîmil bir manada kullanmıştır.

Terbiye hep içtimaiyat nokta-i nazarından tedkik eden “Durkheim” bile “kahil batınlardan henüz hayât-ı içtimaiye için kemale ermemiş olan batınlardan üzerine yapılan tesirdir” diye ta’rif ediyor. Ve bunun gayesini de “çocukta mensup olduğu ve

olacağı cemaat-ı siyâsiye ile muhit-i hususiyenin istilzâm ettiği halet-i bedeniye, zihniye ve akliyeyi ikz ve tenmiye etmek” suretinde ta’yin ve izah ediyor.

Terbiyenin bedeni ve fikri de ihtiva eden hakiki ve şamil manası mülâhaza edilince teslim etmek zaruri olur ki: Terbiye, mutlak surette milli değildir; terbiyenin milli bir kısmı varsa lâmilli bir kısmı da vardır.

II- Terbiye-i İktisadiye

Hakkı Bey, asr milletlerinde terbiyenin gayesi çocukları müstahsil yetiştirmektedir diyor, ve bu gayeyi “parlak” vasfıyla tevsîf ediyor. Fikrini şu suretle izah ve tekküd dahi ediyor: “Kazanıcı ve çıkarıcı eller, kafalar yaratmak bu milletlerde terbiyenin ibtidâ ve ilmi, dünyevi ve uhrevi bütün müesseselerin ve mekteplerin büyük hedefidir... Artık bu cihanda mektepler, dersler, usuller hep şu iktisat terazisinin gözüne konularak tartılıyor: Kaç okka geliyor, kaç para kazanıyor...”.

İktisadiyatın hayat-ı milelde pek hakim bir mevki’ tuttuğu kimsenin inkar edemeyeceği hakikatlerdendir; terbiye de bu hakikatin nazar-ı dikkatten dâir tutulması lüzumu da her mürebbinin takdîr ve teslim edeceği zaruretlere dâir. Fakat bunlardan istihsal ve iktisadın terbiyede gaye ve mizan haline geldiği neticesini çıkarmak hiç de doğru değildir.

Ben “Asyalı, Avrupalı, Amerikalı asr milleti olan cemiyetler” den hiç birini “mekteplerini derslerini, usullerini hep iktisadiyat terazisinin gözüne koyarak” tartacak derecede nef’îleşmiş görmüyorum. Şüphe yok ki, hepsinin mürebbîleri iktisadiyata büyük ehemmiyet veriyor, fakat yine şüphe yok ki onlar bunu bir gaye değil, bir vasıta olarak telakki ediyor.

Bu asrın asrın şüphesiz en müstahsil millet olan Amerikalılar bile istihsali bir gaye-i terbiye gibi telakki etmiyor: “Bergson”, Amerikalılar hakkındaki tedkikatına-

ve Kolombiya Dar-ül Fünun’unda ders vermek için geçirdiği zaman zarfındaki müşahedetine istinaden idealizmin Amerikalı ruhunda da hakim olduğunu iddia ediyor. “Emil Butru” dahi, Amerikalıların serveti ma’nevi ve fikrîni büyüklükleri temin için sevdiklerini onun için kullandıklarını söylüyor; fazla olarak, Kolombiya Darülfünunu reisi ”Batler” n meşhur bir sözünü zikrediyor: Bu zat ta’limin, terbiyenin, fikrî-t-ı hristiyanın istilzam ettiği sarfiyattan bahsederken şu düstürü koyuyor: [Bu hususlarda “ne getirecek?” diye sormamalı, bu masrafların maddi maddi semerelerini düşünmemeli; bilmeli ki bu sarfiyatın husule getireceği semereler büsbütün başka bir cinstendir diyormuş].

Amerika cemahir-I müttfikesinin sabık reisi Roosevelt dahi eserlerinde ve nutuklarında iktisadi ve ticari gaye mefkurelerin şiddetle aleyhinde bulunuyor, ve hiç bir insanın ve hiçbir milletin yalnız ekmekle yaşayamayacağı bu gün her zamandakinden doğru bir hakikat” diyor.

İstihsal pedagojisi nazariyesinin mülhimi olan “Bunge” bile Almanların terbiye de terakkiyi hedef ittihaz ettiklerini ve istihsalı terakkiye vasıta addettiklerini söylüyor.

Hakkı Bey, fikrini şu muhakemeye bina ediyor: “İnsaniyat yaşamak hakkını çalışmak şartına ve çıkarmak kuvvetine bağlamıştır. Onun için asrımızın pedagojisi istihsal pedagojisidir”.

Bence, hayatın ancak yemek yemekle kabil olduğuna bakarak yemek yemeği bir “gaye-I hayat” addetmek ne kadar yanlışsa... Yaşamak hakkının çalışmak şartına, çalışmak şartının da çıkarmak kuvvetine bağlı olduğuna istinad ederek müstahsil yetiştirmeğe gaye-i terbiye gibi göstermek de o kadar yanlıştır.

III- İbtidailer ve Sultaniler

Ziya Bey “ibtidailer ta’limi bir mahiyeti haizdir; fakat sultaniler sırf terbiyevidir” diyor, bu sebeple sultanilerde f nun Őubesinin ilgasını tavsiye eyliyor.

Çocuklukta kazanılan his ve itiyadlar umumiyetle derin ve köklü olur. Bu sebeple çocukluk yaşının mektebi olan ibtidaileri ta’limi bir mahiyeti haiz telakki etmek kat’yen doğru olamaz. İbtidailerin de sultanilerin de hem ta’limi hem de terbiyevi vazifeleri vardır; ve birinci vazifenin ikinciye nisbeti- umumiyetle kabil edilmiş hakikatlerdendir ki- ibtidailerde sultanilerdekinden çok daha küçüktür.

Ziya Beyi buna ma’kus bir m lazaya sevk eden sebep, zan ediyorum ki, bir taraftan terbiyeye pek mahdud bir mana vermesi ve diđer taraftan sultani talebesinin gençlik buhranı geçireceğini m lahaza etmesidir.

Őüphesiz, gençlik bir buhran ruhu yaşıdır: His ile aklın tesad m ve m b rezesi zamanıdır, fakat bu m barezede hissiyatı b sb t n mađlup olmaktan kurtarmanın çarelerinden biri, onları daha evvelden – hen z m b reze başlamadan – kuvvetlendirmek deđil midir? O halde, bu vazifenin  f sına, tahs l-i ibtidai senninde başlamak l zum gelmeyecek midir?

Çocuklukta terbiye, en ziyade hisler telkin etmek ve itiyadlar vermek suretiyle, gençlikte terbiye ise daha ziyade fikirler vermek ve kanaatler tevl d etmek tarikiyle olur; çocukluk doğrudan doğruya terbiyenin, gençlik ise bilvasıta – bilhassa ta’lim vasıtasıyla- terbiyenin zamanıdır. Bu nokta-I nazardan da, ibtidaileri daha ziyade terbiyev , sultanileri ise daha ziyade ta’lim  telakki etmek zaruri deđil midir?

F nun Őubesi meslesine gelince, ben sultanilerimizin teŐkilat-I hazırasını tasv p ve m daafa edenlerden deđilim. Edebiyat Őubesinden hemen hemen yalnız riy ziyat derslerinin çocuklara ayrılan bir f nun Őubesi, bence pek az f ide temin eder bir Őubesidir. Fakat sultanilerde l zum gelen salah, fenniyatı azaltıp onların yerine felsefiy t ve içtim iyat ikame etmek suretiyle deđil, bilakis onlarda hakiki

fenniyat sokmak suretiyle temin olunabilir. Çünkü bu günkü tabiiyat derslerimiz henüz lisaniyat şeklinden tamamıyla çımış değildir: Ulum-u tabiiye derslerimiz henüz ekseriyetle “ulum-u tabiiye ıslahatı” dersleri mesabesinde... Bu böyle kaldıkça, sultanilere ulum-u felsefiye ve içtimaiye, zannediyorum ki, bizdeki kelimeciliği idame ve takviye etmekten başka bir şeye yaramayacaktır.

Article II:

Sabahaddin Bey, Fikirleri ve Muarızları I:

Meşrutiyeti istihsal için dâhilde çalışan “Osmanlı İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti” aynı maksat için hariçte faaliyet gösteren “Osmanlı Terakki ve İttihat Cemiyeti” ile teşrîk-i mesai etmişti; bu sebeple, onun bütün siyasi itikat ve ihtiraslarına – bir hamlede denilebilecek derecede büyük bir süratle – vâris olmuştu.

Bu itikad ve ihtirasların en kuvvetlilerinden biri “Prens Sabahattin” aleyhtarlığı ve merkeziyet taraftarlığı idi. Prens Sabahattin Bey “adem-i merkeziyet” i terevvüc ediyordu; halbuki adem-i merkeziyeti terevvüc etmek cemiyet nazarında vatanın parçalanmasına razı olmak demektir; çünkü bu tarz-ı idare memleketin birçok kısımlarına az çok muhtariyet verecekti, bu muhtariyette az çok bir zaman zarfında kati bir iftirak ile neticelenecekti.

Bu kanaat İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyetinin nüfuz ve teşkilatı sayesinde az bir zaman zarfında memleketin her tarafına intişar etti; ve gençliğin dimağında şüphe kabul etmez bir iman haline geldi. Sabahattin’in buna karşı yaptığı müdafaalar İttihat ve Terakki’nin bilhassa gizliden gizliye neşrettiği rivayetler sebebiyle tesirsiz kaldı: Rivayetlere göre Prens’in bu fikirleri samimi bir kanaat ve içtihat mahsulü zan olunmamalıydı. İyi bilinmeliydi ki bu fikirler iftirakçı unsurların ve bahusus Ermenilerin telkinatı eseri idi; Sabahattin onların elinde maksatlarına hadim bir aletten başka bir şey değildi, zevahire aldanmamalı, bu entrikaya karşı müteyakkız davranmalıydı.

Onun için “merkeziyet” düsturu hükümetin bütün icraatına gittikçe daha büyük bir kuvvetle hâkim oldu. İttihat ve Terakki siyaseti, bu hususta statükoya bile razı olmuyor, idarede zaten mevcut olan merkeziyetin bir kat daha şiddetlenmesini istiyordu: Bazı vilayetlerin muamelat-ı resmîyesinde Arapçaya gösterile gelen müsamahaya bile nihayet veriliyor. Arab mekteplerinde tedrisat yapılmasını isteyenlere “hain” nazarıyla bakan müdürleri bile görülüyordu...

İttihat ve Terakki en nüfuzlu reisi, Meclis-i Mebusan kürsüsüne dâhiliye nazırı sıfatıyla çıktığı vakit, her şeyden evvel imam Yahya ile yapılmış olan itilafnamenin iadesini talep ederek Yemen isyanının askerle teskinini taahhüt ediyordu. Cemiyetin en ateşli müdafaada, “muhâlif-i hükümet” in hazırladığı “Arnavutluk ıslahatı” programına şiddetle itiraz ederek bu programa karşı bir galeyana husule getiriyordu; bu Arnavutluğa “Arnavutçaya vakıf memurlar tayinini” esasını bile –kalemindeki hararet ve mantığındaki cesaret sayesinde- pek zararlı ve haksız bir tedbir suretinde gösteriyordu: Bu esas kabul edilince, Türkler Arnavutça bilmedikleri için Arnavutlukta memur olamayacaklar, fakat Arnavutlar Türkçe bildikleri için Anadolu’da da memuriyet alacaklardı; bu suretle Arnavutlar, memlekette unsur-u hakim olan Türklerden bile daha ziyade imtiyaz kazanmış olacaklardı!.

Filv□ki, bütün bunlara rağmen, şuradan buradan, arada sırada “merkeziyet imanı” ‘na muhalif bazı sesler çıkıyor, hatta pek merkeziyetçi olan (Tanin) de neşrolunan (Yeni Turan) bile adem-i merkeziyete taraftarlık ediyordu; bahusus şimdi büyük bir azim ve itimat ile takip olunan “silah ile te’dir” siyasetinin iflas etmesi, ve daha sonra Trablusgarp’da sevk-i vukuat ile teşkil olunan “kuvva-i mahalliye” nin harikalar göstermesi... zihinlerde merkeziyet ve adem-i merkeziyet hususunda yerleşmiş olan imanı epeyce sarsıyordu... Bununla beraber İttihat ve Terakki mahfilleriyle hükümetleri yine bütün manasıyla merkeziyetçi kalıyor, “adem-i merkeziyet “ fikir ve temayüllerine hasmane nazarlarla bakmağa devam ediyordu.

Bu hal, Balkan muharebesine kadar hep böyle devam etti. Fakat Balkan Muharebesinin elim neticeleri İttihat ve Terakki mahfilinin bu husustaki fikirlerinde büyük bir tahavvül hususa getirdi: Bazı kimseler merkeziyette ısrar edilmiş olmasına teessüf ediyor, bazı kimseler merkeziyetin mahza Rumeli için iltizam olduğunu söylüyor, fakat hemen herkes büyük hal ve vaziyet karşısında adem-i merkeziyete doğru gitmek lazım geldiğini teslim ediyordu. Vaktiyle Arnavutluk ıslahatına en ziyade şiddetle itiraz etmiş olanlar bile artık, Arabistan’a Macaristan’daki kadar vasi bir muhtariyet vermek lüzumundan bahsediyordu. Fikir ve kanaatlerden böyle bir tahavvül husule geldikten sonra, İttihat ve Terakki’nin Sabahattin’e karşı eski vaziyeti muhafaza etmesinde hiçbir mana kalmıyordu.

Zimamdarların hepsi bunu anlamış, Sabahaddin ile bir münasebet tesisi için çalışmaya başlamıştı. Bu münasebetler dürüst bir tarzda devam etseydi, belki bir mukarenet ve □tilaf ile neticelenirdi; fakat mateessüf, son derecede garip bir şekil alarak mukarenet imkanını büsbütün kaldırdı:

Bir gün Talat Bey, birkaç zatı tesvit ederek Prens Sabahaddin Bey’e, adliye nezaretini teklif etmiş idi; fakat yine o gün, Cemal Bey’de- küçük bir izzet-i nefis meselesinin sevkiyle-Prens’in evine taharri memurları göndermişti! Talat Bey tarafından memur olan zatlar gelerek Prens’e adliye nazırlığını teklif ettikleri zaman taharri ile muvazzaf ve meşgul olan zabıta memurları henüz konaktan çıkmamışlardı. Sabahaddin Bey bu gülünç ve muammalı hal karşısında “Bu teklifinize karşı lazım gelen cevabı, dışarıdaki polisler versin!” demekten başka bir çare bulamadı!. Ve İttihat ve Terakkinin Sabahaddin ile müzakere ve münasebetleri bu suretle inkıtaa uğradı. İttihat ve Terakki yine büsbütün eski zimamdarlarının elinde –ve onların inhisarı altında- kaldı. Ve belki bu sebeple çok geçmeden eski zihniyete döndü, herhalde ef’al ve icraatını o zihniyetin tesirlerinden bir türlü kurtaramadı. Bu tahavvül ve ricat kendisini, bilhassa “Arab Meselesi” ‘nde pek vazih bir surette gösterdi. İttihat ve Terakki, Balkan Muharebesinden sonra tekrar makam-ı iktidara geldiği zaman, Arab mat□lıbına ehemmiyet vermiş, Arap murahhasları ile müzakerelere girişerek bir itilafname akdetmişti, Arap vilayetlerine “İsan, memuriyet, mahsusat, hususlarında bazı haklar vermiş idi.

Bu itilaf, mutantan bir ziyafette, parlak nutuklarla ilan edilmiş idi; bu hakların Araplara verilmesi zaten öteden beri arzu edildiği halde Rumeli ahvalinin

fevkaladeliği sebebiyle verilemediği söylenmiş, Arap-Türk muhadenetinden pek hararetli lisanlarla bahis olunmuştu. Fakat, sonra hem de pek az bir zaman sonra zuhur eden ilk fırsattan istifade edilerek itilafname-i ahkamiyenin bir kısmının tatbikinden imtina olundu; itilafname Mısır'da bir gazete tarafından neşredilmişti; bunun üzerine “biz bu vaadi kendi kendimize düşünmüş gibi tatbik edecektik; bunların bir itilaf neticesinde kararlaştırılmış olmasının şüyu bizi müşkül mevkie getirecek. Binaenaleyh bizim için – o neşriyatı fiilen tekzip etmiş olmak üzere- tatbikatı tehir etmekten başka çare kalmıyor” denildi.

Daha sonra umumi seferberlikten ve harpten istifade olunarak itilafname büsbütün iptal edildi. Ve fazla olarak vaktiyle bu itilafı temin için çalışmış olan Araplardan bazıları da – mahzan o zamanki hareketlerinden dolayı- tevkif olunarak idam edildi.

İttihat ve Terakki ilanı hürriyetten sonra meşrutiyet-i idareyi, “keyfi muamele hakkının hükümdardan nazırlara nakli” suretinde telakki ve tatbik etmişti; Balkan muhaberesinden sonra “mahalli idare” meselesini de “keyfi muamele hakkının bazı vali ve kumandanlara da teşmili “ suretinde hallettikten başka bir şey yapamadı!..

Appendix III:

Satı Bey's Bibliography in Ottoman Turkish:

The Books of Satı Bey in Ottoman Turkish:

Satı, Fenni Terbiye, İstanbul, Kader Matbaası, 1325 (1909)

Satı, Layihalarım, İstanbul, Matbaa-ı Hayriyye, 1326 (1910)

Satı, Etnografya, İstanbul, Hilal Matbaası, 1327 (1911)

Satı, Dürus-u Eşya, İstanbul, Artin Asarduryan Matbaası, 1327 (1911)

Satı, Vatan İçin, İstanbul, Kader Matbaası, 1329 (1913)

Satı, Büyük Milletlerden Japonlar, İstanbul, Kader Matbaası, 1329, (1913)

Satı, Ümid ve Azim, İstanbul, Kader Matbaası, 1329 (1913)

Journal Articles:

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "İzah-ı Meslek," no.1, 15 Şubat 1325.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Şiir ve Musikinin Talim ve Terbiye'deki Ehemmiyeti," no.1, 15 Şubat 1325.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Elif Ba'yı Nasıl Öğretmeli," no. 1, 15 Şubat 1325.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Makale-i Ahlakiye: Annemizi Sevmeliyiz," Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısmı, no. 1, 15 Şubat 1325.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Resim Üzerine Ders: İtaatli Olmalı, Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısmı" no. 1, 15 Şubat 1325.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Hikaye Üzerine Ders: Adaletli bir Padişah", Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısmı, no. 1, 15 Şubat 1325.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Eşya Üzerine Ders: Ne İçin Yemek Yiyoruz", Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısmı," no. 1, 15 Şubat 1325.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Ne İçin Geri Kaldık", no.2, 15 Mart 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "El İşleri Nümuneleri." no.2, 15 Mart 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Terbiye-i Ahlakiye ve Vataniye", no.3, 15 Nisan 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, "Beliyye-i Küül," no. 3, 15 Nisan 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “İstanbul Nasıl Fethedildi,”Ders Nümuneleri, no. 3, 15 Nisan 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “İnsan Daima Başkalarının Yardımına Muhtaçtır,”Ders Nümuneleri, no. 3, 15 Nisan 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Ümid ve Azim,” no. 4, 15 Mayıs 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Beliyye-i Küül,” no. 4, 15 Mayıs 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Meslek Aşkı ve Fedakarlık,” no. 5, 15 Haziran 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Beliyye-i Küül,” no. 5, 15 Haziran 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Coğrafya Dersi: Sınıf Haritası,” Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısmı, no. 5, 15 Haziran 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Darülmualiminin Mesleği,” no.6, 15 Temmuz 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Usul-ü Tedrisin Kavaid-i Esasiyesi,” no. 6, 15 Temmuz 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Beliyye-i Küül: Tedabir-i Defiye,” no. 6, 15 Temmuz 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Mektepler ve Ahval-i İçtimaiye,” no.7, 15 Ağustos 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “İlmihal Nasıl Öğretilmelidir,” no.7, 15 Ağustos 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “İsviçre’de bir Ders,” no.7, 15 Ağustos 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “El İşleri Dersleri,” no.7, 15 Ağustos 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Eşya Üzerine Ders: Ekmek,” Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısmı, no.7, 15 Ağustos 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Hayat-ı Hususiye ve Hayat-ı Meslekiye,” no. 8, 15 Eylül 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Usul-ü Takrir ve Usul-ü Tekşif,” no. 8, 15 Eylül 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Tarih Dersinin Usul-ü Esasiyesi,” no. 8, 15 Eylül 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Mesaide İntizam ve Program,” no. 9, 15 Teşrinievvel 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Riyazat-ı Bedeniye,” no. 9, 15 Teşrinievvel 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Eşya Üzerine Ders: Çekiç ve Testere,” Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısım, no. 9, 15 Teşrinievvel 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Mekteplerde Teavün ve Tasarruf Sandıkları,” no. 10, 15 Kanunevvel 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Tedrisatta İsticvab,” no.10, 15 Kanunevvel 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Ders Nümuneleri: Tedrisat Levhaları Üzerine Notlar,” Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısım, no.10, 15 Kanunevvel 1326.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Medeniyet’i İslamiye,” no.11, 15 Mart 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Ders Nümuneleri: Muharebeden Sonra,” no. 11, 15 Mart 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Ezbercilik,” no.12, 15 Nisan 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Coğrafya Nasıl Tedris Olunmalıdır,” no. 12, 15 Nisan 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Bir Dervişin Payı,” no.12, 15 Nisan 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Haluk’un Defteri,” no.13, 15 Haziran 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Ders Nümuneleri: Devenin Başı,” Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısım, no. 13, 15 Haziran 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Sokakların Planı,” Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısım, no.13, 15 Haziran 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, “Ahlak Dersi: Hain Evlad,” Ameliyat ve Tatbikat Kısım, no. 13, 15 Haziran 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Nümune ve Tatbikat Mektebi İbtidaiyesi,” no. 14, 15 Temmuz 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Kutup Memleketleri”, no. 14, 15 Temmuz 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Darülmualimin’in Bir Senelik Hayatı,” no.15, 15 Ağustos 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Muallimlik ve Siyaset,” no. 16, 15 Teşrinievvel 1327

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “İrk ve Terbiye,” no. 17, 15 Kanunuevvel 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Mektebi İbtidaiye ve ve Terbiye-i Siyasiye,” no. 17, 15 Kanunuevvel 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Derslerde Tesirat-ı Ahlakiye”, no.18, 15 Kanunusani 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* “Malumat-ı Medeniye Dersleri: Hükümet Nasıl Anlaşılmalıdır,” no.18, 15 Kanunusani 1327.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası* “Faaliyet Zevki,” no.1, 15 Mart 1330.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası* “Aile Kucağında Vatan Terbiyesi,” no.1, 15 Mart 1330.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası* “Ressamın Tahassürü,” no. 2, 1 Nisan 1330.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası* Tedrisat-ı Talide Tekşif 1,” no. 2, 1 Nisan 1330.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası* “Yanya ve Yanyalılarımız,” no.3, 15 Nisan 1330.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası* “Tedrisat-ı Talide İstikra ve Tekşif 2,” no.3, 15 Nisan 1330.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası* “Kiraz Ağacı,” no. 4, 1 Mayıs 1330.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “Terbiye Hakkında Birkaç Mülahaza,” no.1, 19 Ağustos 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “Terbiye-i Milliye Hakkında Birkaç Mülahaza,” no.2, 12 Eylül 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “En ziyade Muhtaç Olduğumuz Zihniyet,” no.2, 12 Eylül 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, Terbiye-i İçtimaiye Hakkında Mülahazalar,” no.3, 26 Eylül 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “Kitaplar Arasında: Yeni Hayat,” no.3, 26 Eylül 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “Fikir İçin Yaşamak,” no. 4, 24 Teşrinievvel 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “Kitaplar Arasında: Terbiye ve Ahlak Meseleleri,” no. 4, 24 Teşrinievvel 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “Mektepler’de Cemiyet ve Cemaat Hayatı,” no. 4, 24 Teşrinievvel 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “Mekteplerde Cemiyet ve Cemaat Hayatı,” no. 5, 14 Teşrinievvel 1334.

Satı, *Terbiye Mecmuası*, “İçtimaiyat ve Ruhیات,” no. 5, 14 Teşrinievvel 1334.

Satı, *Muallim*, “Telkin ve Terbiye I,” no. 3, 15 Teşrinievvel 1332.

Satı, *Muallim*, “Terbiye ve Milliyet,” no. 4, 15 Ekim 1332.

Satı, *Muallim*, “Ferdî Şuur ve İçtimai Vicdan,” no. 5, 15 Teşrinisani 1332.

Satı, *Muallim*, “Telkin ve Terbiye II,” no. 6, 15 Kanunuevvel 1332.

Satı, *Muallim*, “Ma’şeri Vicdan Etrafında I,” no.8, 1 Mart 1333.

Satı, *Muallim*, “Ma’şeri Vicdan Etrafında II,” no.9, 1 Mayıs 1333.

Satı, *Muallim*, “Maşeri Vicdan Etrafında III,” no. 11 1 Haziran 1333.

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Ulum-u Tabiiye,” no. 1 28 Ağustos 1324.

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Gird-b□d Hayat,” no. 3, 11 Eylül 1324 .

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Talim ve Terbiye Mübahesesi,” no. 4, 18 Eylül 1324.

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Hoşlandırmak, Merak Ettirmek,” no. 4, 18 Eylül 1324.

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Fen ve Müdafa-i Vatan,” no. 5, 15 Teşrinisani 1324.

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Manazur-u Hadisat-ı Tabiiyat, Şebnem ve Yağmur,” 1 Teşrinisani 1324.

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Uçurtmalar,” no. 6, 1 Kanunuevvel 1324.

Satı, *Envar-ı Ulum*, “Hayat-u Adat-ı akvam,” no. 5, 15 Teşrinisani 1324.

Satı, *Ulum-u İktisadiye ve İçtimaiye Mecmuası*, “Uzviyetler ve Cemiyetler,” no. 8, 1 Ağustos 1325.

Satı, *Ulum-u İktisadiye ve İçtimaiye Mecmuası*, “Mebahis-i Ruhiye,” no. 9, 1 Eylül 1325.

Satı, *İctihad*, “Tanzimatçılık Meselesi I,” no. 64, 2 Mayıs 1329.

Satı, *İctihad*, “Tanzimatçılık Meselesi II,” no. 65, 9 Mayıs 1329.

Satı, *İctihad*, “Tahsil-i İbtidai Hakkında,” no. 67, 20 Mayıs 1329.

Satı, *Yeni Mecmua*, “Mükafat ve Mücazat Meselesi,” no. 34, 7 Mart 1334

- Satı, *Yeni Mecmua*, “Mükafat ve Mücazat Hakkında,” n. 36, 21 Mart 1334.
- Satı, *Mülkiye* “Etnografya.” n. 2, 1 Mart 1325.
- Satı, *Mülkiye* “Tecrübelilik Tecrübesizlik Meselesi.” n. 20, 1 Eylül 1326
- Satı, *Aşiyân*, “Ulumda Menfaatperestlik,” n. 4, 9 Teşrinievvel 1324
- Satı, *Düşünce*, “İlim Şimesi,” no.1 1334.
- Satı, *Düşünce*, “Durkheim Hakkında,” no.2, 1334.
- Satı, *Tanin Gazetesi*, “İstibdat İz ve Tohumları,” 17 Teşrinievvel 1324 .
- Satı, *Tanin Gazetesi*, “Darülmuallimin Programı Hakkında,” 21 Kanunuevvel 1324.
- Satı, *Vakit Gazetesi*, “Fırkacılık ve Ahlak,” 5 Teşrinisani 1334.
- Satı, *Vakit Gazetesi*, “Sabahaddin Bey (Fikirleri ve Muaruzları-I-),” 27 Teşrinisani 1334.
- Satı, *Vakit Gazetesi*, “Sabahaddin Bey (Fikirleri ve Muaruzları-II-),” 29 Teşrinisani 1334.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Journal and Newspaper Articles:

Satı. "Elif Ba Meselesi." *İçtihat*, no. 61, 11 Nisan 1329, (24 April 1913), p.1327-1339.

---. "Elif Ba Meselesi Hakkında Bir İzah." *İçtihat*, no. 64, 2 Mayıs 1329, (15 May 1913), p.1387-1388.

---. "Etnografya." *Mülkiye*, no. 2, 1 Mart 1324 (14 March 1908), pp.31-35.

---. "Ferdî Şuur ve İctimai Vicdan." *Muallim*, no. 5, 5 Teşrinisani 1332, (18 November 1916), pp. 129-135.

---. "Fırkacılık ve Ahlak." *Vakit Gazetesi*, no. 372, 5 Teşrinisani 1334 (5 November 1918).

---. "İrk ve Terbiye." *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 17, 15 Kânunuevvel 1327, (28 December 1911), pp. 161-167.

---. "İki Mektup." *İçtihat*, no. 129, 7 Teşrinievvel 1334 (7 October 1918), pp. 2785-2786.

---. "İlmihal Nasıl Öğretilmelidir." *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no.7, 15 Ağustos 1326, (28 August 1910), pp. 11-14.

---. "Mebahis-i Ruhiye I: Fiiliyat-ı Ruhiye ve Uzviye." *Ulum-u İktisadiyye ve İctimaiyye Mecmuası*, no. 9, 1 Eylül 1325 (14 September 1909), pp.71-87.

---. "Mebahis-i Ruhiye: Hissiyat ve Sevaik-i Ahlakiye." *Envar-ı Ulum*, 15 Eylül 1324, (10 September 1908), pp. 17-23.

---. "Medeniyet-i İslamiye." *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 11, 15 Mart 1327, (28 March 1911), pp. 181-189.

---. "Mekteplerde Cemiyet ve Cemaat Hayatı." *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no.4, 14 Teşrinievvel 1334, (14 October 1918), pp. 150-160.

---. "Mekteplerde Cemiyet ve Cemaat Hayatı." *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no.5, 14 Teşrinisani 1334 (14 November 1918), pp. 189-194.

---. "Mükâfat ve Mücazat Meselesi." *Yeni Mecmua*, no. 34, 7 Mart 1334, (7 March 1918), pp. 142-147.

---. "Niçin Geri Kaldık", *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no.2, 15 Mart 1326 (28 Mart 1910), pp. 37-46.

- . "Sabahaddin Bey Fikirleri ve Muarızları I." *Vakit Gazetesi*, no. 394 27 Teşrinisani 1334 (27 November 1918).
- . "Tecrübelilik Tecrübesizlik Meselesi." *Mülkiye*, no. 20, 1 Eylül 1326, (14 September 1910), pp. 50-55.
- . "Telkin ve Terbiye I", *Muallim*, no.3, 15 Eylül 1332 (28 September 1916), p.71-74
- . "Terbiye-i Ahlakiye ve Vataniye." *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 3, 15 Nisan 1326 (28 April 1910), pp. 67-78.
- . "Terbiye ve Ahlak Meseleleri, Kitaplar Arasında: Din ve Hayat." *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 4, 24 Teşrinievvel 1334 (24 October 1918), pp. 139-149.
- . "Terbiye ve Ahlak Meseleleri, Kitaplar Arasında: Yeni Hayat." *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 3, 26 Eylül 1334, (26 September 1918), pp. 111-116.
- . "Terbiye-i İçtimaiye Hakkında Mülâhazalar." *Terbiye Mecmuası*, (26 September 1918), pp. 81-82.
- . "Terbiye-i Milliyeye Hakkında Birkaç Mülâhaza." *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 2, 12 Eylül 1334 (12 September 1918), pp. 41-42.
- . "Terbiye ve Milliyet." *Muallim*, no.4, 15 Teşrinievvel 1332 (28 October, 1916), pp. 102-107.
- . "Tuğba Ağacı Hakkında." *Muallim*, no. 13, 1 Ağustos 1333, (1 August 1917), pp. 386-388.
- . "Tuğba Ağacı Hakkında Bir İzah." *Muallim*, no. 13, 1 Ağustos 1333 (1 August 1917), pp. 386-388.
- . "Tuğba Ağacı Nazariyesi." *Muallim*, no. 12, 1 Temmuz 1333 (1 July 1917) pp, 359-366.
- . "Ulum-u Tabiiyye." [The Natural Sciences], *Envar-ı Ulum*, no. 1, 1 Eylül 1324 (10 September 1908), pp. 9-13.
- . "Uzviyetler ve Cemiyetler." *Ulum-u İktisadiyye ve İçtimaiyye Mecmuası*, no.8, 1 Ağustos 1325 (14 August 1909), pp.433-454.
- . "Ümit ve Azim." *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, no. 4, 15 Mayıs 1326, (28 May 1910), pp. 101-107.
- . "Yanya ve Yanyalılarımız." *Terbiye Mecmuası*, no. 3, 15 Nisan 1330, (15 April 1914), pp. 97-98.

Satı Bey's Books:

- . *Fenn-i Terbiye*. İstanbul: Kader Matbaası, 1325.

---. *Vatan İin*. İstanbul: Kader Matbaası,1329.

Other Articles:

İsmail Hakkı, “İstihsal ve Terbiye”, *Muallim*, no.1, 10 Temmuz 1332 (23 July 1916).

M. Şinasi, “Elif Ba Meselesi”, *İçtihat*, no. 62, 18 Nisan 1329, (1 May 1913), pp. 1352-1356.

Ziya Gökalp, “Milli Terbiye I” *Muallim*, no.1, 15 Temmuz 1332 (28 July 1916), pp. 3-9.

Books and Articles

Abadan, Yavuz. "Tanzimat Fermanı'nın Tahlili." *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*. Edited by Halil İncik Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2006.

Acar, Şehbal Derya, *Eğitimde Bir Üstad Satı Bey'i Tanımak*, İstanbul: Akademik Kitaplar, 2009.

Baktıaya, Adil. *Osmanlı Suriye'sinde Arapçılığın Doğuşu*, İstanbul: Bengi Yayınları, 2009.

Başar, Hatice. "Satı Bey'in eğitim ile ilgili görüşleri." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Marmara University, 2001.

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

---. *Arap Dünyasında İslamiyet, Milliyetçilik, Sosyalizm*. İstanbul: Köprü Yayınları, 1969.

Buzpınar, Şit Tufan. *Satı' el-Husri, İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol.36, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988.

Caballero, Carlo. "Patriotism or Nationalism? Fauré and the Great War", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32, no.3, Autumn 1999.

Canovan, Margaret. "Patriotism is Not Enough", *British Journal of Political Science* 30, no.3, July 2000.

Cleveland, William. *The Making of an Arab Nationalist: Ottomanism and Arabism in the life and thought of Satı al-Husri*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Çankaya, Ali. *Son Asır Türk Târihinin Önemli Olayları İle Birlikde Yeni Mülkiye Târihi Ve Mülkiyeliler Mülkiye Şeref Kitabı*, vol.II, Ankara: Mars Matbaası, 1968.

Çil, Fatma. "Satı Bey'in hayatı, eserleri ve Türk eğitimine katkıları." Unpublished M. A. thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002.

Corning, Peter. "Durkheim and Spencer." *The British Journal of Sociology* 33, no. 3, (Sept, 1982).

Ergin, Osman Nuri. *İstanbul mektepleri ve ilim, Terbiye ve San'at müesseseleri dolayısıyla Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, İstanbul: Eser Neşriyat ve Dağıtım, 1977.

Ergün, Mustafa. "Satı Bey Hayatı ve Türk Eğitimine Hizmetleri." *İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no.1, 1987.

Erişirgil, Mehmet Emin. *Bir Fikir Adamının Romanı: Ziya Gökalp*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1984.

Gökalp, Ziya. *Makaleler IV* (Articles IV), prep. Ferit Ragıp Tuncor, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1977.

---. *Makaleler V*, prep. Rıza Kardaş, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1981.

---. *Makaleler VII*, prep. Abdulhaluk Çay, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1982.

---. *Makaleler IX*, prep. Şevket Baysanoğlu, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1980.

---. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. Prep. Mehmet Kaplan, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1970

Gündüz, Mustafa. *II. Meşrutiyet'in Klasik Paradigmaları: İçtihat, Sebilü'r-Reşad ve Türk Yurdu'nda Toplumsal Tezler*. Ankara: Lotus Yayınevi, 2007

Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1996

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *Doktor Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi*. İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1981

---. "Osmanlıcılık", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol.5, edited by Murat Belge, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 1985.

---, *The Young Turks in Opposition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Heyd, Uriel. *Foundation of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*. London: Luzac, 1950.

İnalcık, Halil. "Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkiler, Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu." Edited by Halil İnalcık, Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2006.

Kafadar, Osman. "Türk Aydınının Satı Bey Hakkında Kimi Yanılgıları Üzerine Düşünceler." *Türkiye Günlüğü*, no. 46, 1997.

Kallek, Cengiz. "Biat." *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol.6 İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988.

Kara, İsmail. *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2003.

Kayalı, Hasan. *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Kenanoğlu, M. Macit. *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek*. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2004.

Kuran, Ercüment. "Osmanlı Vatanseveri Satı Bey." *Türkiye Günlüğü*, no.34, Mayıs-Haziran 1995.

---. *Türkiye'nin Batılılaşması ve Milli Meseleler*. Comp. Mümtazer Türköne, Ankara: Türk Diyanet Vakfı, 1997.

Laborde, Cécile. "From Constitutional to Civic Patriotism." *British Journal of Political Science* 32, no.4, (October 2002).

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. London: Oxford U.P, 1961

---. "Watan." *Journal of Contemporary History* 26, no. ¾, Sep. 1991

Mardin, Şerif. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri, (1895-1908)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1983.

---. *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*, Syracuse NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

---. *Türk Modernleşmesi: Makaleler IV*. Compiled by Mümtaz'er Türköne, Tuncay Önder, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991.

---. *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset: Makaleler*. Compiled by Mümtaz'er Türköne, Tuncay Önder, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991.

---. *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset: Makaleler*. Compiled by Mümtaz'er Türköne, Tuncay Önder, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991.

Sakaoğlu, Necdet, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol.2, edited by Murat Belge, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985.

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. "Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol.1, edited by Murat Belge, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları: 2001.

Stark, Werner, "Spencer's Three Sociologies." *American Sociological Review* 26, no: 4, (August 1961).

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer. *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*. vol.3, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000.

---. "Türkiye'nin Siyasi Seyri İçinde İkinci 'Jön Türk' Hareketinin Fikri Esasları." *Tahir Taner'e Armağan*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1956.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. *Türk Tefekkür Tarihi*. İstanbul: Matbaai Ebüzziya, 1933

Viroli, Maurizio. *For Love of Country: An Essay on Nationalism and Patriotism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.