ANKARA'S PHANTOM BOURGEOISIE

IN THE LATE OTTOMAN AND EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIODS

ALPER KARA

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2024

,

ANKARA'S PHANTOM BOURGEOISIE

IN THE LATE OTTOMAN AND EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIODS

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Alper Kara

Boğaziçi University

2024

Ankara’s Phantom Bourgeoisie in the Late Ottoman and Early Republican Periods

The thesis of Alper Kara

Has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Yaşar Tolga Cora _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Assoc. Prof. Yücel Terzibaşoğlu _____

Assoc. Prof. Yusuf Doğan Çetinkaya _____
(External Member)

June 2024

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Alper Kara, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature…….....

Date …….....

ABSTRACT

Ankara's Phantom Bourgeoisie in the Late Ottoman and Early Republican Periods

This study focuses on the development and relationship with the state of the Muslim-Turkish commercial bourgeois class in Ankara from the Tanzimat era to the early years of the Republic. In Ottoman and Turkish historiography, it has generally been argued that the bourgeois class developed later than in Europe and that it was created by the state. This vested narrative, which operates on the assumption that capitalists were passive in relation to politics, has pushed class analysis in the formation of the nation-state to the background. Muslim - Turkish merchants were instrumentalized in the creation of a new bourgeois class and used to Turkify the economy during the nation-state phase. Contrary to the general belief, this thesis draws attention to the class dynamics of the Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie in Ankara, tracing its roots back to the Ottoman era. By examining the family origins, commercial ties, roles in local councils, and class characteristics of some prominent political and economic figures from Ankara, particularly during the first ten years of the Republic, demonstrates that the seeds of this class were sown well before the advent of national economic policies. This study argues that this class, which successfully adapted to each new era, including the Second Constitutional Period, the National Struggle, and the Republic, was not created from scratch but increased its commercial and political influence in conjunction with the implementation of the national economic programs. It is asserted that the commercial bourgeoisie tried to prioritize their class interests with their actions throughout all these periods.

ÖZET

Geç Osmanlı ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Ankara'nın Hayalet Burjuvazisi

Bu çalışma Tanzimat döneminden Cumhuriyet'in ilk yıllarına kadar Ankara'daki Müslüman-Türk ticari burjuva sınıfının gelişimine ve devletle olan ilişkisine odaklanmaktadır. Genellikle, Osmanlı ve Türkiye tarih yazımında Avrupa'dakine kıyasla burjuva sınıfının geç geliştiği ve bu sınıfın devlet tarafından yaratıldığı iddia edilmiştir. Sermayedarların siyaset karşısında edilgen bir halde bulunduğu ön kabulüyle hareket eden bu yerleşik anlatı, ulus devlet oluşumunda sınıfsal bir analiz yapma imkanını geri plana itmiştir. Müslüman tüccarlar yeni bir burjuva sınıfının yaratılmasında araçsallaştırılmış ve ulus-devlet aşamasında ekonominin Türkleştirilmesi için kullanılmıştır. Genel kanının aksine bu tez, Ankara özelinde Cumhuriyet'in Müslüman-Türk burjuvazisinin Osmanlı köklerine inerek sınıfsal dinamiklerine dikkat çekmektedir. Belli aileler üzerine odaklanan bu çalışma, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e bir devamlılığı işaret etmektedir. Özellikle Cumhuriyet'in ilk on yılında siyasi ve ekonomik olarak öne çıkan birçok Ankaralı figürün Tanzimat dönemindeki ailevi kökenleri, ticari ilişkileri, yerel meclislerdeki rolleri ve sınıfsal refleksleri incelenerek milli iktisat politikalarından çok daha önce bu sınıfın nüvelerinin oluştuğu ortaya koyulmaktadır. Bu çalışma, İkinci Meşrutiyet, Millî Mücadele ve Cumhuriyet dönemlerinde, her yeni döneme ve şarta uyum sağlamayı başaran bu sınıfın sıfırdan yaratılmadığını, aksine, uygulamaya koyulan milli iktisat programları ile birlikte ticari ve siyasi nüfuzunu yükselttiğini savunmaktadır. Tüm bu dönemlerde ticari burjuva sınıfının aldığı tavırlarıyla sınıfsal çıkarlarını ön planda tutmaya çalıştıkları iddia edilmektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the many supportive individuals who assisted me in the completion of this thesis. I would not have been able to complete this thesis without the invaluable support of my thesis advisor, Yaşar Tolga Cora. I am particularly grateful for his guidance in determining the thesis topic, his insights into the current literature, and his continuous encouragement. I am also thankful to Y. Doğan Çetinkaya and Yücel Terzibaşoğlu, who agreed to be on my defense committee and made significant contributions to my thesis, for their tolerant behavior and constructive criticism.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to İbrahim Akdağ and Mehmet Aydoğan, whose doors have always been open to me whenever I encountered difficulties in reading Ottoman documents. I am very grateful to Şakir Kınacı, Fatma Taşkın, and Ahmet Bulgurlu for their generosity in sharing information about their families' histories.

This thesis was made possible by the generous financial support of the TÜBİTAK - BİDEB 2210/A program. I am deeply grateful to TÜBİTAK for their funding, which enabled me to pursue my graduate studies and complete this thesis.

I am deeply grateful to my dear friend Oğuz Gürler, who has been a constant source of support in both my professional life in Ankara and my thesis writing. I also want to express my heartfelt thanks to my dear friends İbrahim Erkin Göçen, Kübra Yılmazer, Cahit Atıl Öder, Furkan Elmas, Deniz Yüce and Erhan Arca for their contributions to every aspect of my life. Throughout this journey, I have felt the

unwavering love and support of my dear mother Hüsniye Kara and my father İsmet Kara. I am truly grateful to them for their kindness.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my darling and companion, Dilara Uzunalioğlu. Feeling her love and support since the day we met has been the most incredible fortune of my life. Without her love, patience, encouragement, and stimulating intellectual companionship, I would not have been able to complete this thesis.

To my beloved Dilara, my partner in life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 What is bourgeoisie ? 1

1.2 Ankara: a city forged in turmoil 4

1.3 Historiography and the aims of the study 6

1.4 Chapter outline 15

1.5 Sources 17

CHAPTER 2: THE BOURGEONING CLASS, STATE AND TRADE IN THE 19TH CENTURY 20

2.1 An indigenous commodity: mohair 20

2.2 Railway construction and being part of new opportunities with prestige 24

2.3 Local councils and commercial sectors 29

2.4 Conclusion 38

CHAPTER 3: SECOND CONSTITUTIONAL PERIOD AND *MİLLİ İKTİSAT*. 40

3.1 The Young Turk Revolution and liberal economy 40

3.2 The Evolution of politics during the Second Constitutional Period 44

3.3 *Milli İktisat* and the flourishing Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie 51

3.4 Kinship relations 62

3.5 Rising from scratch 63

3.6 Conclusion 66

CHAPTER 4: THE BOURGEOISIE IN RESISTANCE 70

4.1 The class basis of the National Struggle 70
4.2 Trade in turbulent times 85
4.3 Conclusion 89
CHAPTER 5: THE REPUBLIC AND ITS PROTÉGÉS 92
5.1 Izmir Economic Congress 92
5.2 Politics and trade in Ankara 97
5.3 Exploring new opportunities with a new bank 102
5.4. Conclusion 109
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION 112
REFERENCES 119

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The existence and development of the Turkish-Muslim bourgeois class have remained controversial in Ottoman and Turkish historiography. There is a lack of studies that explicitly acknowledge this class as an agent and put it at the core of their analysis. Existing studies have tended to construct an image of a passive class dependent on the state. This has led to the dominance of a paradigm that regards the Turkish-Muslim bourgeoisie not as a natural class, as in the West, arising from historical political, sociological, and economic conditions, but as a class "created" by the state. Even when the bourgeoisie has been mentioned in literature, it often remains a phantom entity. This thesis analyses the commercial, political, and social relations of specific families and individuals in Ankara from the 19th century to the Early Republican Era. This study aims to present a concrete portrait of the development of a provincial bourgeoisie, make it visible, and comprehend its agency specifically in the context of Ankara.

1.1 What is bourgeoisie?

The terms "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie" are frequently employed throughout this thesis. However, defining or conceptually discussing these terms does not constitute the primary concern of this work. As Regine Pernoud aptly highlights, the question of "what is a bourgeois" has been extensively explored by scholars across various disciplines.[1] However, reaching a definitive conclusion remains a formidable challenge. Immanuel Wallerstein quotes Ernest Labrousse to make the same point:

[1] Pernoud, *Burjuvazi,* 7.

"Définir le bourgeois? Nous ne serions pas d'accord."[2] Joseph di Corcia summarizes this situation clearly: "While most historians would agree that the bourgeois were important and some would say they were critically so, few would agree on who the bourgeois were."[3] Consequently, discussing these terms requires time and effort far beyond the scope of this thesis.

However, from a fundamental perspective, the word "bourgeois" etymologically derives from the Latin form *burgensis*. While the earliest known record of the term is believed to date back to 1007, French records indicate that the word *burgeis* was first used in 1100. The term was initially used to refer to individuals who lived freely in a town, *bourg.* They benefited from the advantages of urban life and the legal rights that accompanied it.[4] However, as Paul E. Corcoran observed, the term has evolved throughout history to become a pejorative designation for entrepreneurs, property owners, the affluent, and the less wealthy, who often made their living without engaging in physical labor. By the seventeenth century, the term was predominantly used in a derogatory manner.[5]

For Friedrich Engels, the bourgeoisie is precisely the modern capitalist class, owners of the social means of production and employers of wage labor. Opposite to this is the class of the proletariat. This class does not own the means of production and sells their labor power to survive. [6] Wallerstein also argues that the bourgeoisie has been the driving force behind modern economic life. From his perspective, the three major ideological movements of the nineteenth century in particular – conservatism, liberalism, and Marxism – shared a significant degree of commonality

[2] Wallerstein, "The Bourgeois(ie) as Concept and Reality," 91.
[3] di Corcia, "Bourg, Bourgeois, Bourgeois de Paris from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century," 207.
[4] Wallerstein, "The Bourgeois(ie) as Concept and Reality," 91.
[5] Corcoran, "The Bourgeois and Other Villains,"477–480.
[6] Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, 219. Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.

in their characterizations of this class. All of those ideologies emphasize the occupational function of this concept, namely its involvement in commerce or the employment of wage labor and the ownership of means of production. On the other hand, it is the dynamic force of an economy and carries the desire for capital accumulation. Finally, there is a commonality in the definition of a cultural profile, which is the tendency to look after one's own interests.[7]

Pamela Pilbeam in the nineteenth century, this class includes professions, state servants, financiers, merchants, and industrialists.[8] If one approaches the bourgeoisie from a middle-class perspective, subcategories emerge, as Christof Dejung, David Motadel, and Jürgen Osterhammel do. For example, according to these scholars, the upper stratum includes old patricians, large landowners, and industrialists. The middle stratum is composed of merchants, business people, bankers, and professionals such as lawyers, teachers, and doctors. The lower stratum, on the other hand, is largely made up of small shopkeepers, white-collar workers, and craftsmen, often characterized as the "petite bourgeoisie."[9]

While refraining from engaging in a comprehensive discussion of the term "bourgeoisie," as mentioned earlier, this thesis functionalizes the term in a relatively narrow sense. The bourgeoisie presented in the thesis, specifically in the context of Ankara, represents an entrepreneurial economic class engaged in commerce or land ownership. Furthermore, one of the key arguments underpinning the thesis is that this class was conscious of its own existence and interests and acted upon this consciousness in the political, social, and economic spheres. Mainly from the nineteenth century to the early republican era, the existence of this class has been

[7] Wallerstein, “The Bourgeois(ie) as Concept and Reality,” 93.
[8] Pilbeam, “Bourgeois Society,” 86.
[9] Dejung, Motadel, and Osterhammel, “Worlds of the Bourgeoisie,”8-9.

debated in both Ottoman and Turkish studies. This thesis aims to introduce a new approach to this class.

1.2 Ankara: a city forged in turmoil

As outlined by İhsan Seddar Kaynar, Ankara stands as a city of remarkable historical prominence, having played a pivotal role in both the Roman and Ottoman Empires. Beyond its status as a crucial province within the Roman Empire, Ankara witnessed a remarkable trajectory of development following its incorporation into the Ottoman realm. Ankara's rich historical narrative encompasses notable events and cultural developments that have shaped its identity. For instance, it served as the stage for the pivotal Battle of Ankara in 1402, a clash between the armies of Timur, the ruler of the Timurid Empire, and Bayezid I, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire. The outcome of this battle had far-reaching consequences, altering the course of history in the region. It experienced a period of decline in the 16th century, primarily attributed to the disruptions caused by the Celali Rebellions. These uprisings, fueled by economic grievances and social unrest, posed a significant challenge to the Ottoman central authority. Despite these setbacks, Ankara's resilience and strategic importance ensured its continued significance. Ankara holds a special place in the history of Sufism as well, a mystical tradition within Islam. The city was home to Hacı Bayram Veli; according to historical narratives, he was one of the significant figures in the *Ahilik t*radition, an artisanal guild system that played a crucial role in regulating trade, promoting craftsmanship, and fostering social solidarity.[10]

Ankara, which was previously a sanjak in Anatolia, became the central sanjak of Ankara Province with the reforms made in 1836. Although there were periods of

[10] Kaynar, *Engürü'den Ankara'ya: Ankara'nın İktisadi Tarihi (1892-1962)*, 23-24.

population decline, Ankara, as the provincial center, did not experience significant fluctuations in its population from the 19th century onwards, despite the decline in industry and trade and the emigration from the province.[11] In 1522, Ankara had a population of approximately 15,000, including 200 Jews and 1,500 Christians. By the early 17th century, the population had increased to 25,000. Between 1785 and 1833, it is estimated that the population ranged between 15,000 and 20,000.[12] According to the 1881 census, the population of Ankara was 25,585, of which 17,218 were Muslims.[13]

Ankara is known for its production of mohair, which has become synonymous with the city. For centuries, mohair and the related textile industry have been the most important sources of income for the population. Throughout the two-century period spanning the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, Ankara had a vibrant commercial and social life.[14] As will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent sections, the production and trade of mohair, a highly unique product, became the most significant means of capital accumulation in Ankara. The Turkish-Muslim commercial bourgeoisie organized around this product and defended their class interests through it.

With all these characteristics and the processes, it underwent, which will be detailed in the subsequent sections of this thesis, Ankara became one of the most important cities both during the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and after the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. Despite having produced numerous figures who transitioned from entrepreneurs to politicians, particularly during the early years of the Republic, and despite still being home to families prominent in Turkey's

[11] Yavuz, "19. Yüzyıl Ankarasında Ekonomik Hayatın Örgütlenmesi ve Kent-İçi Sosyal Yapı," 195.
[12] Yıldırım, "Yeni Çağ'da Ankara," 70.
[13] Yavuz, "19. Yüzyıl Ankarasında Ekonomik Hayatın Örgütlenmesi ve Kent-İçi Sosyal Yapı," 195.
[14] Tamur, *Ankara Keçisi ve Ankara Tiftik Dokumacılığı*, 1-2.

capital world, the origins of the commercial bourgeoisie in this region have never been the subject of comprehensive academic research. For instance, the Kınacızade Mansion, one of the city's most significant structures, bears the name of the family that bestowed it, yet no in-depth research has been conducted on this family, which carries the suffix “-zade." In addition to the prevailing emphasis on bourgeois narratives centered on port cities, Ankara's unique economic, social, and political landscape, coupled with its historical development and significance, is anticipated to make a valuable contribution to the literature on the evolution of the provincial bourgeoisie in Turkey.

1.3 Historiography and the aims of the study

In the aftermath of the 1960s, the emergence of left-wing movements in Turkey spurred the development of class analysis studies within the field of historiography. This, in turn, led to the production of notable works that employed Marxist literature to examine the Ottoman Empire. Sencer Divitçioğlu's adaptation in his book, *Asya Üretim Tarzı ve Osmanlı Toplumu* (The Asiatic Mode of Production and Ottoman Society), which would go on to influence all subsequent literature, is of considerable importance. Within the framework of his analysis of Ottoman society as a class-based system, Divitçioğlu distinguishes it as a two-class formation, diverging from the historical trajectory of its Western counterparts. Within this analytical framework, the state emerges as the ruling class, holding ownership of the land, the primary means of production. However, the transformation of the abstract notion of the state into a concrete class requires its representation. Within the Classical Ottoman Era context, this representation was secured through the sultan, military, and ulema groups. The class was devoid of land ownership, but involved in the

production was the *reaya* (subjects). While exceptional deviations from the fundamental property relations, such as land grants and waqf, had occurred, these did not represent a fundamental change. According to this narrative, the produce invariably accrues to the state, embodying the ruling class and authority. Exploitation transpires not between individuals, but rather between the class that has embraced the function of the state and the reaya, the class tasked with executing production activities. In this context, trade operated as a means of securing a chain of necessities. In other words, the commercial activities that emerged were not the outcome of commodity production but rather the transformation of surplus produce by the ruling class, the constituent element of the state, into rare goods, luxury consumer items, and war materials.[15]

Constructing a relatively analogous narrative from a more political standpoint, İdris Küçükömer, however, challenges the notion of class formation. In his constructed narrative, Küçükömer posits that Western states exhibit a class-based structure. However, in the Ottoman Empire, which lacked a clear class structure throughout its historical trajectory, the bureaucracy eventually seized power. Yet, this group failed to transform into a class since it was unable to reinvest the surplus product into reproduction. Küçükömer acknowledges the existence of exceptions but emphasizes that this was the prevalent state of affairs. He also explores the political dimension within this framework, examining the Western-Eastern, secular-Islamist dichotomy. Due to the oppressive nature of the bureaucracy, the remaining segments of society failed to produce a class movement. Küçükömer's fundamental opposition to Divitçioğlu's analysis can be summarized as follows: The sultan could not constitute a class in itself, and neither can the subordinate groups to whom he granted

[15] Divitçioğlu, *Asya Üretim Tarzı ve Osmanlı Toplumu*, 75-106.

rank and rescinded at will be considered a class. These groups were not laborers, but they were also not owners of the means of production.[16]

Çağlar Keyder contends that a fundamental relationship existed between the bureaucratic class appropriating economic surplus and peasant producers. Similar to the perspectives of Divitçioğlu and Küçükömer, only a tiny portion of the appropriated surplus was reinvested in the conditions of reproduction. On the other hand, Keyder also argues that the Ottoman Empire framed the manufacturing industry within a division of labor that did not allow for free accumulation. The legal system and property order also never allowed accumulation independent of political authority. From his perspective, with the injection of capitalism into the Ottoman Empire, new social groups emerged. This also posed a systemic threat. Keyder identifies this newly emerged social group as a comprador trading group located in port cities such as Thessaloniki, Istanbul, and Izmir. They gained immunity due to their foreign passports and collaborations. Taking advantage of the opportunities presented by foreign trade, this new class gathered in the ports in accordance with market logic. The conflict brought about by this newly emerged class was determined by religious and ethnic differences in the context of Turkey, and the struggle was shifted to this area of conflict. As a result of the process following the Second Constitutional Period and the Early Republican Period, this class was eliminated, and the cultural gains they had created were erased. The Turkish-Muslim bourgeoisie, which arose from the policies and conditions of the First World War and replaced this class, chose not to clash with the state and refrained from forming civil society. They shaped themselves according to the political conditions that the state would allow.[17]

[16] Küçükömer, *Düzenin Yabacılaşması: Batılılaşma*, 11-37.
[17] Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, 37-107.

Şerif Mardin emphasizes that the social set as a category is quite suitable for examining the Turkish social structure. Unlike the social structure in Western Europe, which includes feudalism, the Ottoman Empire consisted of two social sets. As noted in other studies, there was a divide between rulers and the ruled. However, Mardin takes this as a legalized distinction and examines the stratification within these groups. Within each of these two social sets, there were further stratifications, and within these stratums, there were also oppositions and alliances.[18] He predominantly demonstrates these characteristics of the social sets within the center-periphery paradigm, which is a highly dominant approach in the literature.[19] He prioritizes a cultural rather than a class struggle, which has continued historically. For instance, the victory of the Young Turks did not alter this societal dichotomy within the empire. The former revolutionaries became the new rulers and distanced themselves from the ruled. In summary, Turkish society has been constituted upon the dichotomy between the rulers and the ruled, the dual rivalry among the state elite, and the distinction between those who aspired to entrepreneurship and those who resisted sharing power with them. The fundamental conflicts lie in this direction. While merchants and artisans also find their place in Mardin's narrative, he claims that Muslims and Turks had no economic initiatives until the beginning of the 20th century.[20]

Metin Heper also follows the narrative of the cultural or political dichotomy structure mentioned above. In particular, the local elite group that holds power has always acted from a regional perspective. They have not been able to convert their

[18] Mardin, "Tabakalaşmanın Tarihsel Belirleyicileri: Türkiye'de Toplumsal Sınıf ve Sınıf Bilinci, 69-95.
[19] Mardin, "Türk Siyasasını Açıklayabilecek Bir Anahtar: Merkez-Çevre İlişkileri", 30–66.
[20] Mardin, "Tabakalaşmanın Tarihsel Belirleyicileri: Türkiye'de Toplumsal Sınıf ve Sınıf Bilinci", 69-95.

local economic power into political power and have never been able to escape the control of the center. Heper evaluated the bourgeois group that emerged during the 19th century as more opportunistic than entrepreneurial and constructive.[21]

When considered cumulatively, all these narratives have broadly outlined the boundaries or existence of the Muslim-Turkish class in political, economic, and social terms. As Keyder emphasizes, the entry of capitalism into the Ottoman Empire, along with ethnic and religious-based division of labor, has become the main focus of historical writing. Y. Doğan Çetinkaya summarizes the main outlines of this dominant paradigm as follows: The state is the sole actor with authority. The Muslim-Turkish element remained uninterested in commercial and industrial activities for centuries. In general, this ethnic and religious group consisted of peasants and officials.[22] For instance, Şevket Pamuk defines the emergence of the Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie as the most significant social and economic development of the Republican era. According to Pamuk, it is impossible to speak of a Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie even in the 19th century. As Bernard Lewis also highlights, with the West's growing power over the Ottoman Empire, non-Muslim merchants emerged as a disloyal middle class, benefiting from capitulations and foreign passports. They profited immensely from the contact established with the Christian world and became the subject of numerous financial privileges. The attempts to create a Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie during the late Ottoman period were not entirely successful.[23] As Yahya Sezai Tezel also describes in his analysis of the division of labor within society, Greeks and Armenians were predominantly concentrated in urban areas and engaged in non-agricultural sectors. They held a

[21] Heper, *Türkiye'de Devlet Geleneği,* 37-83, 173.
[22] Çetinkaya, "İtibar-ı Milli Bankası ve İş Bankası Birleşmesi (1927): Bir Banka Birleşmesi Üzerinden Müslüman/Türk Burjuvazisi Üzerine Tarihyazımını Düşünmek," 158.
[23] Pamuk, *Türkiye'nin 200 Yıllık İktisadi Tarihi: Büyüme, Kurumlar ve Bölüşüm*, 309.

significantly more prominent position, particularly in the field of commerce, compared to Muslim Turks.[24] Korkut Boratav, while asserting the existence of an Ottoman bourgeoisie, provides a definition by outlining three characteristics. This bourgeoisie emerged not in industry but in commerce, particularly foreign trade. It exhibited comprador characteristics and is largely composed of non-Muslim elements. The Muslim-Turkish wing of the bourgeoisie, on the other hand, was weak, dispersed, and unorganized, operating on a small and medium-scale basis in domestic trade.[25]

In his book *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918* **(**National Economy in Turkey 1908-1918), which is considered one of the main works of the literature on the Second Constitutional and First World War periods, Zafer Toprak accentuates that the real bourgeoisie of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century were largely non-Muslims, foreigners, and Levantines. He asserts that traditional Muslim artisans, adhering to their customary methods, grew increasingly impoverished under the influence of capitalism and the Ottoman Empire's opening to the outside world. According to Toprak, the Second Constitutional Era was a period of crystallization of social strata. He put forward that, particularly with the policies implemented during World War I to create a national bourgeoisie, the Turkish-Muslim group, which for centuries had only strived for advancement within the bureaucracy or remained as peasants and artisans, sought to be imbued with an entrepreneurial spirit under state guidance. According to this narrative, crafts and trade were viewed as dishonorable professions among the Turkish population, while military service and public office were consistently revered. In conclusion, this class, which could not emerge on its

[24] Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi (1923-1950),* 88.
[25] Boratav, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985*, 15.

own, was to be created by the state, and this policy would continue throughout the republic.[26]

While these approaches to bourgeois development and classes maintain their prominence, on the other hand, there are also counter-arguments and studies present in Ottoman and Turkish historiography. For instance, Halil İnalcık argues that there existed a merchant class throughout the period known as the Classical Ottoman Era. When comparing artisans to merchants, İnalcık points out that artisans were much more autonomous and accumulated capital to the extent they were able while also actively seeking opportunities in order to raise their capital. İnalcık also emphasizes that legal regulations were quite favorable for merchants. He argues that they constantly interacted with the state thanks to the money they held and used this interaction to their advantage, earning even more money.[27]

Donald Quataert, on the other hand, divides the Ottoman trade system into two categories: internal and external. While he argues that the 1700-1922 period is more visible due to the availability of records in foreign state archives, he maintains that it was not as significant as internal trade. Quataert attributes the general perception that external trade was more dominant to the ease of access and readability of Western sources. He argues that while international trade increased globally throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, its reflection in Ottoman lands was rather limited. He particularly emphasizes that while the Ottoman Empire was an important market for the West in the 1600s, this was not the case in the 1900s. He acknowledges, as mentioned above, that with the development of capitalism, there were specific changes in the Ottoman merchant group. While he confirms that non-Muslim merchants were generally involved in external trade, he argues that Muslim

[26] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 9-69.
[27] İnalcık, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire," 98-103.

merchants held a dominant position in internal trade.[28] According to his analysis of agricultural products between 1800 and 1914, 25% of these products were exported. Emphasizing that the remaining 75% remained within the Ottoman Empire, Quataert states that these products were either consumed in the place of production or sold to other regions. He also points out that the urban population was an essential customer of the domestic market. He also provides the example of the 1908-1909 boycott of Austrian goods, emphasizing that this boycott was particularly successful in Anatolia. According to Quataert, this was because trade in Anatolia was mainly in the hands of Muslims during this period.[29]

In his significant work, *The Politicization of Islam,* Kemal Karpat highlights the commencement of the privatization of state lands in the Ottoman Empire concurrent with the advent of capitalism. With the transfer of *miri* (sultan's property) lands to private ownership, the economic influence of the palace at the local level diminished considerably, giving rise to new classes within society. Karpat does not analyze these classes from a Marxist perspective but instead defines them as economically-minded groups with religious consciousness and liberal economic tendencies. According to him, Muslim and Christian middle classes were predominantly located in agricultural and port cities, occupying positions of influence. Their intellectual and political development began during the reign of Abdulhamid II; as lands were rapidly privatized, agricultural production increased, and these classes became involved in the trade and manufacturing sectors. The number of people engaged in agriculture and the trade of agricultural goods

[28] Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, 126-130.
[29] Quataert, "19. Yüzyıla Genel Bakış: Islahatlar Devri 1812-1914", 943-958.

increased during the Abdulhamid II and Young Turk periods, leading to a rise in the population of this class.[30]

Recent studies have provided answers to the fundamental questions regarding the development of the national bourgeoisie, drawing upon historical sources and personal biographies. For instance, in his research examining the historical development, political connections, and the evolution of commercial relations of the Nemlizade family, Yaşar Tolga Cora highlights the underestimation of the activities of social or class actors, such as merchants while emphasizing the role of political actors in the literature. The narrative of a national bourgeoisie supposedly created during the Second Constitutional Period or the Republican Era has shifted the focus of class-based conflict to an ethnic and religious one, disregarding Muslim capital. Furthermore, it is argued that the dominant discourse of the examined period was accepted as reality, contributing to the distancing of the Republic's foundations from class conflict.[31] According to Çetinkaya, dominant narratives are reflections of the Cold War mentality's stance against class analysis. Class distinctions or conflicts have been considered antithetical to Muslim-Turkish society. However, there is no empirical evidence, source utilization, or research accumulation to substantiate this claim. It is argued that particularly A. J. Sussnitzki's "Ethnic Division" article, which was initially published in German during the First World War and then translated into English and published in 1966, had a significant influence on the present literature. According to this article, the labor division advocated above played a significant role in the narrative. Muslims were engaged in agriculture and state

[30] Karpat, *İslam'ın Siyasallaşması*, 161-172.
[31] Cora, "Nemlizadeler: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ekonomipolitiğinde Milli Tüccarı Aramak," 247-249.

affairs, while non-Muslims focused on trade and industry.[32] In her examination of Muslim-Turkish bourgeois families during the Early Republican Period, Neslişah Başaran L. Lotz argues that the national bourgeoisie was not created by the state but rather has a history that predates the Ottoman era. These families consolidated their power during the Early Republic. However, as is also mentioned in her work, some of the dominant paradigm claims that there was no bourgeois class during the Republican Period as well. This implies that this class either disappeared after World War I or never existed. In contrast, Lotz provides examples of some essential families and draws inferences about their backgrounds and development.[33]

1.4 Chapter outline

This thesis centers on the historical development of Ankara merchant families, focusing on their political and commercial activities between the Tanzimat Era and the first decade of the Republican Period. Structured chronologically, this study consists of six chapters, including the introduction and conclusion. The second chapter delves into how Ankara's merchants cultivated their spheres of influence and organizational structures during the 19th century, coinciding with the onset of the Tanzimat Era. With a particular focus on the mohair trade, which had traditionally emerged as a crucial commodity in Ankara, the chapter analyzes the petitions drafted to prevent the smuggling of mohair goats, the primary source of this trade, and to safeguard their market share. The chapter focuses on the emergence of local councils as a new practice during this era, examining how specific individuals and families leveraged their influence politically. Annuals documenting the period are scrutinized

[32] Çetinkaya, "İtibar-ı Milli Bankası ve İş Bankası Birleşmesi (1927): Bir Banka Birleşmesi Üzerinden Müslüman/Türk Burjuvazisi Üzerine Tarihyazımını Düşünmek," 158-162.
[33] Lotz, "Türkiye'de Burjuvazinin Gelişiminde Tüccarlar: Müslüman-Türk Aileler ve Ticaret Ağları," 205-206.

to analyze these prominent figures' commercial networks and sectoral distributions. Finally, the chapter explores the transformations in trade brought about by the arrival of the railway to Ankara and how merchant groups capitalized on these changes. It endeavors to substantiate the existence of a Muslim-Turkish bourgeois class during this period despite claims that it emerged in later eras.

The third chapter analyzes the Second Constitutional Period, with a particular focus on the narrative of the National Economy. It examines the rationale behind and the consequences of embracing a liberal economic approach in the aftermath of the Young Turk Revolution. The chapter concentrates on the network of connections and tensions between Çayırlızade Hilmi, a prominent landowner and merchant from Ankara who held a seat in parliament during the subsequent period, and the broader public. This analysis serves to illustrate how merchant groups, in general, adapted to the new circumstances and maintained their influence. In conclusion, the chapter challenges the notion that the Muslim-Turkish bourgeois class emerged solely during the National Economy period. Instead, it argues that this class already existed and capitalized on the policies implemented during this era to further consolidate its wealth and power.

The fourth chapter considers the class underpinnings of the resistance movement that emerged in Ankara following the First World War. This chapter explores the motivations behind the financial and societal support extended by the merchant class to the National Struggle during this period. In conclusion, the chapter examines the extent to which Ankara-based merchants were able to maintain their commercial activities during the period when military and political struggles raged across Anatolia and Istanbul, drawing upon insights from yearbooks and memoirs.

The fifth chapter focuses on the first decade of the Early Republican Period to analyze the evolution of Ankara-based merchants. It challenges the conventional categorization of the 1923-1929 period as a liberal era, bringing into question the decisions taken at the İzmir Congress and the subsequent developments. It scrutinizes the political connections and commercial continuities established by Ankara-based merchant families and individuals, spanning from the Tanzimat era to this period, particularly in the early years of the Republic. By examining the establishment and activities of *İş Bankası* (Business/Work Bank), the chapter sheds light on the involvement of Ankara-based merchant families in this process and how they became the focus of the "affairism" debates.

1.5 Sources

The primary challenge faced in studies on merchant families and their networks is the scarcity of adequate sources. State archives generally fall short of meeting this need. Nevertheless, this study strives to utilize Ottoman and Republic archive documents (Cumhurbaşkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi and Cumhurbaşkanlığı Cumhuriyet Arşivi) primarily. On the other hand, two types of annual publications have been utilized. The first is the official provincial *salnames* (yearbooks) specific to Ankara. These yearbooks provide information on a wide range of topics, including the province's geographical location, economic and demographic data, the status of service units, infrastructure, and the number of educational and religious institutions. Its particular significance for this thesis is the presentation of the province's administrative divisions in each yearbook, accompanied by a list of individuals involved. These yearbooks have been particularly useful in identifying individuals who served in local councils. The second type of annual publication is the *Annuaire*

Oriental series, printed at various times. It was prepared to introduce commercial centers within the Ottoman Empire and the economic activities taking place in these centers to entrepreneurs. The aim of its publication was to ensure that traders from the West could find the information they needed in these yearbooks. However, it also provided information to Ottoman and foreign merchants operating in centers such as Istanbul, Izmir, and Thessaloniki. It aimed to inform resident merchants who wanted to know which company sold a particular product or, if the product was of foreign origin, who its representative was. As Ayhan Aktar also points out, the professions listed here are defined using Western concepts and often do not have exact equivalents in the Ottoman commercial world.[34] Nevertheless, it remains the most important source for understanding in which sectors Ankara merchants were involved, how their sectoral distribution changed over time, and in which provinces they conducted their commercial activities. Since the thesis focuses on specific families and individuals, memoirs have been used to access information that could not be found in the archives. Therefore, memoirs of prominent Ankara families have been consulted. For instance, to examine the commercial and political relations of the Kınacızade family, Nebahat Taşkın's memoirs, titled *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara* (Our Family and Ankara with Memories), have been utilized. Furthermore, Can Dündar's study *Vehbi Koç: Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla* (Documents and Memoirs from the Vehbi Koç Special Archive), which compiles Vehbi Koç's memoirs along with documents, has been employed to analyze the activities and class positions of Ankara merchants during First World War, the National Struggle, and the Early Republic. Additionally, various anecdotes from Orhan Karaveli's book *Bir Ankara Ailesi'nin Öyküsü* (The Story of an Ankara Family), which sheds light on

[34] Aktar, "Şark Ticaret Yıllıkları'nda 'Sarı Sayfalar': İstanbul'da Meslekler ve Iktisadi Faaliyetler Hakkında Bazı Gözlemler, 1868-1938,", 119–123.

many families and political relations, have been evaluated. Lastly, Ali Fuat Cebesoy's memoirs, *Milli Mücadele Hatıralarım* (My Memoirs of the National Struggle), have been used to provide a detailed reflection of Ankara's unique situation during the National Struggle and to reveal the relationship established with Mustafa Kemal.

CHAPTER 2

THE BOURGEONING CLASS, STATE AND TRADE IN THE 19TH CENTURY

2.1 An indigenous commodity: mohair

The mercantile activities in Ankara potently have been hinged on one unique commercial good, mohair alias *sof,* in addition to ubiquitous productions in Anatolia, such as cereals and legumes before the 19th century. According to Evliya Çelebi, "It is white as milk, and there is no other white creature as it."[35] Free from doubt, that meta has been recognized as a divine gift by Ankara's people as well as all Ottomans. This specific commodity has been plucked from an indigenous goat's hair in Ankara and surrounding areas—the earliest records documenting industrial and commercial activities related to mohair trace back to the 16th century. Nevertheless, according to many Ottoman historians, considering the substantial magnitude of production and trade evident during this period, it implies that the origins likely predate this era.[36] Most of the bourgeois families in Ankara have had a relationship with the mohair trade in their origins.[37] Therefore, in order to comprehend the early bourgeoisie's deeds, organizations as well as their desideratum for their interest in Ankara from the Tanzimat period to the Early Republican era, it is essential to detect the commercial characteristics of the mohair and trace its history.

[35] Kaya, "Osmanlı Dönemi Ankara Sof Ticareti," 617.
[36] Tamur, "Ankara Keçisi Yetiştiriciliği ve Ankara Tiftik Sanayisi Tarihine Genel Bir Bakış," 73.
[37] For instance, the Kınacızade Family was one of the prominent merchant families; almost all family members were engaged in the mohair trade. For detailed information, the story of the family: Taşkın, N. (2011). *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*. Ankara: Yıldızlar Yayıncılık. Aydınyan family, as an Armenian example, was also quite influential in the mohair trade: Kelleci, A. (2019). "The Aydinians: A Catholic family between Ankara and Istanbul." *Journal of Ankara Studies,* 7(1), 225–253.

Mohair and the outputs that were based on it have been the hallmark of Ankara's commercial life during the Ottoman period. Moreover, it was the component that opened the door for merchants in Ankara to the external world. A well-developed network of commercial arteries within the Ottoman Empire facilitated the extensive dissemination of mohair across its internal and external territories. Strategically significant urban centers such as Istanbul, Aleppo, Bursa, and Damascus served as pivotal nodes within this network. Sofs delivered to these centers functioned as a central commodity pool that was readily available for further distribution. Established European markets in Venice and Poland constituted the primary destinations for these mohair consignments, channeled through these imperial hubs.[38]

In general, historians tend to make a comprehensive examination of the mohair trade's history by revealing a four-stage evolution. All steps in this evolution include more external influences and repercussions. The initial epoch witnessed the meticulous processing of raw mohair fibers into finished textiles before market distribution. It's noteworthy that the export of both unprocessed mohair and spun mohair yarn was strictly forbidden during this period in order to preserve the value of the meta. Spanning roughly the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century, this era can be definitively characterized as the pinnacle of mohair-based production and commerce within the Ottoman Empire.[39] Suraiya Faroqhi betokens that Angora was one of the leading commercial centers by virtue of sof trade at the end of the 16th century.[40] Together with Ankara, Istanbul came to the front as a commercial center

[38] Yücel, "Tarihi Dokumak: Bir Kentin Gizemi Sergisi Sof, Tiftik ve Ankara Keçisinin 600 Yıllık Serüveninin İzinde," 10.
[39] Tamur, "Ankara Keçisi Yetiştiriciliği ve Ankara Tiftik Sanayisi Tarihine Genel Bir Bakış," 74.
[40] Yücel, "Tarihi Dokumak: Bir Kentin Gizemi Sergisi Sof, Tiftik ve Ankara Keçisinin 600 Yıllık Serüveninin İzinde," 10.

with regards to the mohair trade; there were a lot of merchants from Ankara in Istanbul to merchandise.[41]

The second epoch would be regarded as a transitional period from finished fabric to semi-finished yarn since the British Empire advanced the mohair weaving looms; as a result, it begetted to increase the production and trade of yarn instead of fabric. This epoch lasted from the mid-17th century to the early 19th century. The third epoch, starting in the early 19th century, marked a significant turning point in Ankara mohair production and trade. This period witnessed a decline in fabric and yarn production, while raw mohair exports experienced a substantial increase. The primary factor driving this change was the British advancement of mohair spinning technology. The introduction of machine-based mohair spinning offered a significant increase in production capacity compared to the traditional methods employed in Anatolia. This development shifted the focus from mohair yarn to raw mohair.[42] "As far back as 1812, no less than 1,000 hand-looms furnished employment to 10,000 weavers … With the introduction of high-class machines … in the textile factories of Europe, the manufacturers of Angora at once gave way before this competition …".[43]

The fourth epoch contains the dispersing of indigenous Angora goats. The introduction of the Ankara goat beyond Turkish borders commenced in 1838, with a successful breeding program established by the British in South Africa. This pioneering effort was followed eleven years later by a pivotal contribution from the Ottoman Sultan Abdulmecid. In 1849, his gift of Ankara goats to the American agricultural expert Dr. Davis laid the groundwork for the development of Ankara goat breeding within the United States.[44] Merchants have always been reasonably

[41] Kaya, "Osmanlı Dönemi Ankara Sof Ticareti," 619.
[42] Tamur, "Ankara Keçisi Yetiştiriciliği ve Ankara Tiftik Sanayisi Tarihine Genel Bir Bakış," 74-76.
[43] "THE TURKISH MOHAIR INDUSTRY," 576.
[44] Tamur, "Ankara Keçisi Yetiştiriciliği ve Ankara Tiftik Sanayisi Tarihine Genel Bir Bakış," 76.

apprehended concerning the export of the mohair goat to the European countries or their colonies; furthermore, they did not abstain from writing petitions to the sultan and Sublime Porte for their interests. For instance, they submitted their concerns through a petition in 1889. Merchants accentuate that they had extraordinary wealth and prosperity when the price of each unit of mohair was sold for fifty guruş and that the leading trade depended on mohair in Ankara. However, the price has fallen to twelve guruş, and trade has been quashed due to the breeding goats being sent to the Cape of Good Hope. The merchants of Kastamonu are also involved in this matter; they have reportedly submitted a petition as well, and Ankara merchants approbate their proposed action.[45] It gives an indication of the organizational ability of the merchants in Ankara; further, they embrace petition writing so as to raise their voices as a coping skill against any possibility of incurring worsening commercial consequences. In another petition in 1895, they portended that if the goat exportation ban were lifted, stagnation in commercial life would be exacerbated. According to the petition, the mohair price is now increasing to twenty-eight thirty guruş due to the fact that the previously exported ones are about to be depleted in the Cape of Good Hope; yet it would be ephemeral. They highlighted that rumors regarding novel goat exports have spread throughout provinces, and they desire that it should be prohibited. They request the Sultan to send the necessary orders to the port areas to prevent the passage of mohair goats. The petition has eighty-eight signatures, although the names cannot be determined.[46]

The petitions serve as a lucid indication of the substantial number of merchants engaged in the mohair trade and their propensity to advocate their interests. It should be stated that the USA had 900.000 mohair goats in 1900, and the

[45] BOA, DH.MKT.1651/15, 23 Zilhicce 1306 (August 25, 1889).
[46] BOA, Y.MTV.126/74, 24 Safer 1313 (August 16, 1895)

export of the mohair goats to Southern Africa did not occasion big changes in the trade volume[47]; Ankara reserved its situation for the market. The story of mohair and its trade generates the story of the integration of Ankara's merchants with the global economy. Merchants sought to protect their exporter role by applying state intervention. Ultimately, mohair has always been a prominent medium for capitalist accumulation in Ankara.

2.2 Railway construction and being part of new opportunities with prestige

The burgeoning of the railway network in the Ottoman Empire entailed novel opportunities for the local merchants in Anotalia. The logic was simple and worked in some sense: "With a spreading railway network, transport costs were cut, agriculture was partly commercialized, and both internal and external commerce expanded."[48] The putative figures in Ankara desired to partake in the civilizational windfall and penned a petition to the Ministry of Interior and the sultan. They fervently belabored that railways would swiftly transform the Ankara's destiny and emphasized that trade and agriculture would stagnate without them. Notably, they pledged their support for compulsory labor if the state-initiated construction.[49] There were specific underlying fundamental reasons for the creation of such an eager as well as voluntary discourse; notably, the petitioners strategically employed contemporary vocabulary like "civilization" to bolster their claims. However, the main reason was associated with economic concerns; this primarily agricultural province suffered from a lack of modern transportation, so during good harvests,

[47] Çelik, "Koyunun Olmadığı Yerde Keçiye Abdurrahman Çelebi Derler: Ankara Eyaleti'nde Tiftik Keçisi Ekonomisinin Zaman-Uzamsal Analiz Denemesi (1889-1905)," 104.
[48] Coşar and Demirci, "Incorporation into the World Economy: From Railways to Highways (1850-1950)," 23.
[49] Ortaylı, "19. Yüzyıl Ankara'sına Demiryolunun Gelişi ve Bölgedeki Üretim Eylemlerinin Değişimi," 207.

crops were rotting in storage due to the poor quality of vehicles available to transport them or depressed prices. In other words, farmers aspire to deliver their harvest, and the merchants want to transfer it in time.[50] From the state perspective, "A railroad … would transform the plateau region into the new granary of the imperial seat and the residents of Istanbul …"[51]

While 1892 witnessed the railway's long-awaited arrival in Ankara via an extension of the Haydarpaşa-İzmit line, these tracks sadly marked the terminus. Aspirations for an extension towards Baghdad remained unfulfilled, with construction efforts diverted to a Baghdad route branching off the Konya line.[52] Nevertheless, the arrival of railways significantly reshaped the socio-economic life in Ankara. This advancement spawned new market opportunities, and grain export substantially escalated.[53] A British consular report from 1895 observed a significant rise in agricultural production, with a reported increase of around 50%. Prices of these products were also reported to have risen by 50 to 100 percent.[54] It is also possible to observe the development by considering the state's tithe revenues from the sanjak of Ankara. The tithe revenue for six years before the railway's concession was 7.875.879 piastre; on the other hand, after the concession and until the opening of the line for transportation in 1893, the revenue increased to 24.859.649 piastre for six years.[55] The extension of the railway prompted merchants as well as farmers to benefit from it, commencing production and trade for novel market opportunities.

[50] Aydın et al., *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, 230-231.
[51] Quataert, "Limited Revolution: The Impact of the Anatolian Railway on Turkish Transportation and the Provisioning of Istanbul, 1890–1908.," 141.
[52] Kaynar, "Cumhuriyet Öncesinde Ankara'nın İktisadi Gündemi," 4.
[53] Köksal and Polatel, "The Cihanbeyli and the Sheep Trade: From Provisionism and Semi-Nomadism to Liberal Economy and Sedentarisation," 171.
[54] *Diplomatic and Consular Reports on Trade and Finance. Turkey: Report on the Agricultural Condition of the Vilayet of Angora* (Foreign Office, Annual Series, no. 1624), 2.
[55] Kaynar, "Cumhuriyet Öncesinde Ankara'nın İktisadi Gündemi," 4.

The mohair was the key meta, as abovementioned, and it maintained its significance until the 1880s throughout all regions of Ankara. After the railway's construction, grain and sheep exportation was overhauled in some areas.[56] From 1893 to 1911, there was a big difference in agricultural products conveyed by railway. In 1893, 51.839 tons of grain was transferred, while in 1911, that surged to 262.145 tons. [57] Nevertheless, the railway extension to Ankara fell short of expectations; many merchants were still utilizing camel caravans to transport their commercial goods from Kayseri and Kırşehir. Ankara was the termination station, which increased only one type of raw material exportation, but what is more important is that it led to a differentiation in agriculture. Agricultural production has risen rapidly in the areas along the railway line. While railroad connectivity has facilitated this growth, mohair production maintains its prominent role in Ankara's eastern, southern, and northern regions.[58]

Furthermore, several merchants, whose familial ties and commercial dealings will be discussed in the following chapters in detail, obtained permits for the construction of grain warehouses subsequent to the railway's establishment. For instance, Haci Abdi Paşa, son of Seyyid Mehmed Efendi, a member of the notable family in Ankara and Serattarzade Ahmed and Mehmed Efendis, demanded permits to establish warehouses near the railway station in July 1893. It has been reported from the Ankara Vilayet that the construction of these warehouses does not impede, and the copies of the site plans and title deeds of the warehouses have been sent duly certified. After some bureaucratic correspondence, the sultan endorses the demands

[56] Aydın et al., *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, 235.
[57] Ortaylı, "19. Yüzyıl Ankara'sına Demiryolunun Gelişi ve Bölgedeki Üretim Eylemlerinin Değişimi," 211-213.
[58] Ortaylı, "19. Yüzyıl Ankara'sına Demiryolunun Gelişi ve Bölgedeki Üretim Eylemlerinin Değişimi," 208-214.

of those notable people. A tithe fee of 10 guruş is assessed for each of the two warehouse sites.[59] This indicates that these two families have decent economic and political power to establish grain warehouses. Although the sultan placed the final judgment, all the bureaucratic processes from vilayet to sadrazam were appropriately maintained, thanks to their prestige. According to Ayse Bugra, Turkish businessmen in the republican period always strived to justify their wealth by articulating its social value. They sublimated the moral aspect of having properties by displaying magnanimity[60]. This temperament might be evaluated as a collective memory of a class having roots in the late Ottoman period. Archival documents denote a dropline includes a request from the sadrazam in order to reward another member of the Serattarzade family, Ali Efendi, with the order of Medjidie of the fourth rank as a consequence of his charitable attempts so as to contribute to the interests of the sublime government and the development of the country in August 1893.[61] As an example of the families' charity works, there were two drinking fountains in Atpazarı, one of which was built by Serattarzade Ali, and the other one was by Serattarzade Emin. They were listed in the inventory of neighborhood fountains that received water from the Atpazarı *maksem* (divider) in 1890.[62]

Another example is Koçzade Mehmet Efendi's, grandfather of Vehbi Koç, a well-known entrepreneur in the Republican period, requisition for constructing a wooden warehouse near the railway station in April 1901. According to archival documents, the terrain on which Mehmet Efendi wanted to establish a warehouse belonged to the state, yet he had the right of disposition. It provoked a dispute among the multifarious departments in the state bureaucracy. Initially, it was stated that the

[59] BOA, DH.MKT.79/12, 20 Zilhicce 1310 (July 5, 1893)
[60]Buğra, *State and Business in Modern Turkey: A Comparative Study*, 4.
[61] BOA, DH.MKT.122/31, 12 Safer 1310 (August 26, 1893)
[62] Işık, "Ankara'nın Çeşmeleri/Su Yolları," 342-355.

construction of the mentioned warehouse did not require the Sultan's permission and that there were no obstacles to the construction per the relevant articles of the existing Land Law of 1858. Nevertheless, it was later indicated that the warehouse would be built as a four-room structure on a sixteen-arshine extended and ten-arshin wide area near the railway station; for this reason, it was argued again that the Sultan's permission was necessary.[63] After a discussion based on the present law, it was finally presented to the sultan for approval, and he endorsed the permit for Koçzade Mehmet Efendi.[64]

That example demonstrates that the Koçzade family was also one of the prominent families in Ankara, as in the previous instance, Serattarzades. According to the scrutiny of Ali Kılcı and Gökçe Günel on the Ibadullah Waqf, Koçzade's lineage may extend to a wealthy merchant, Hoca Mehmed, who was the founder of that pious foundation, which was founded probably between the end of the 15th century and early 16th centuries. The waqf was the wealthiest one in the Ottoman Empire in the 16th century; it generated a massive income of approximately 150.000 akçe from its immovable properties yearly. Hoca Mehmed set a condition in the charter that the successor trustee must be from his descendant. [65]

Towards the 18th century, the economic force of the waqf melted away; the trustee could not have the ability to have the waqf's mosque repaired. Hacı Yusuf Ağa, who was probably coming from a descendant of Hoca Mehmed, repaired the mosque using his own wealth and established a novel waqf in his own name by also constructing a madrasa on the land next to the mosque. Müderriszade Kadı Ahmed Efendi, who was one of the significant figures, he has gotten as an omnipotent *ayan*

[63] BOA, SD. 1351/12, 10 Muharrem 1319 (April 29, 1901)
[64] BOA, BEO. 1941/14556 20 Receb 1320 (October 23, 1902)
[65] Kılcı and Günel, *Bir Ankaralı Tüccarın Kentine Katkıları: İbadullah Vakfı*, 16-28.

for a long time, and Kocabeyzade Seyyid Abdulhadi Efendi was a descendant of Karaca Bey, became attesters in the foundation of the waqf. It seems that the trusteeship of the foundation continues from Hacı Yusuf Ağa's lineage, giving Koçzade Mehmet Efendi the right to be a trustee in 1889. In the waqf register, it is stated that the surplus income is to be shared among the administrator's children. In the document dated 14 August 1907, showing the accounting prepared by Koçzade Hacı Mustafa Efendi, the next trustee, son of Mehmet Efendi, the income of the 43 shops of the wakf was yielding 16,483 piastres. 15,013 piastres were spent on the expenses, and the remaining 1,475 piastres were distributed to 21 children of the trustee.[66] Establishing or being an administrator of a waqf has been a strategy to conserve and bequeath the private property in the previous centers; besides, it has been a way of becoming a protector in society.[67] Although the gradual centralization of the services that society needed during the nineteenth century, the waqf institution retained its importance in providing an image of a leading figure among elites.[68] While Koçzade Mehmet Efendi's lineage reaches out to a propertied merchant family, he, as well as previous examples, members of the Serattarzades family, possess the philanthropist's features.

2.3 Local councils and commercial sectors

The application of Tanzimat entailed the establishment of unprecedented local mechanisms in the periphery provinces. Before the Tanzimat, there had been some local city and *eyalet* administrations or indigenous systems, especially in the provinces with particularity and prerogatives, such as the Balkans, Lebanon, or some

[66] Kılcı and Günel, *Bir Ankaralı Tüccarın Kentine Katkıları: İbadullah Vakfı*, 16-28.
[67] Mestyan, "The Muslim Bourgeoisie and Philanthropy in the Late Ottoman Empire," 220.
[68] Singer, "Waqfs: Faith-Based Islamic Institutions before Modern NGOs,"19-20.

Mediterranean islands.[69] Additionally, during the 18th century, there were provincial councils in which governors or judges presided and involved local notables in disputing tax issues.[70] However, state officials and local representatives embarked upon being an official and essential part of the local councils as well as administration with the Tanzimat reforms.[71] One cannot define local councils during the Tanzimat period as democratic institutions in the modern sense; their complicated election arrangement and representation channels would not seem quite democratic. Yet, despite the deficiencies, the local councils underpinned the democratic environment and middle ground not for ordinary people but for two sides: the notables and early bourgeoisie included merchants, landowners, religious leaders, and state officials.

Tanzimat was a centralization project; the establishment of the local councils was the application of this mentality in the provinces. It commenced with the attempt to nullify the *iltizam* system by replacing it with *muhassıllık.* Tax collection will be wrenched from notables; the *muhassıl*s appointed from the center will be authorized. However, he was not solely; the plan was to establish councils in the provinces to determine and collect the taxation and submit it to the center after the costs were covered in the province. In addition to the state officials, there will be four representatives from the leading figures in the councils. According to Ortaylı, the notables and leading figures utilized those councils in order to strengthen their potency, and they turned into legal collocutors to designate local needs and

[69] Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880)*, 13.
[70] Akiba, "The Local Councils as the Origin of the Parliamentary System in the Ottoman Empire,"176–204, 179. Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880),* 17. Further reading for local council practices in the 18th century: Yaycıoğlu, A. (2016). *Partners of the Empire: The Crisis of the Ottoman Order in the Age of Revolutions.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
[71] Köksal, "Local Demands and State Policies: General Councils (Meclis-i Umumi) in the Edirne and Ankara Provinces (1867–1872)," 471.

decisions.[72] Akiba denotes that "… it was almost entirely in charge of local administration, including supervision of taxation, maintenance of public order, conscription, land survey, waqf administration, and public works.[73] The appointment of *muhassıl* was abrogated in 1842; however, the councils became permanent in the provinces.[74]

The establishment and evolution of these local councils were intertwined with various reform initiatives since 1864. Their influence fluctuated over time, experiencing periods of both ascendancy and decline. In a significant restructuring, the judicial functions of these councils were divested and transferred to the newly established Nizamiye courts. These courts, echoing the administrative councils from which they originated, incorporated local representation through appointed members. Furthermore, provincial-level governance saw the introduction of the *meclis-i umumi-i vilayet* (general council) in each provincial capital. This general assembly, comprised of representatives from the sanjaks, convened annually to deliberate on crucial matters such as taxation and public works. For instance, the general council in Ankara met on 13 February 1869 for the first time.[75] According to Yonca Köksal, the council was comprised of state officials in a heavy presence. The abovementioned demand for a railway construction project was voiced at that meeting first, although it was constructed in 1893.[76] Finally, major cities witnessed the formation of elected municipal councils tasked with urban administration. It is unknown when the

[72] Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880)*, 33-37.
[73] Akiba, "The Local Councils as the Origin of the Parliamentary System in the Ottoman Empire,"179.
[74] Akiba, "The Local Councils as the Origin of the Parliamentary System in the Ottoman Empire,"178-179.
[75] Akiba, "The Local Councils as the Origin of the Parliamentary System in the Ottoman Empire," 183.
[76] Köksal, "Local Demands and State Policies: General Councils (Meclis-i Umumi) in the Edirne and Ankara Provinces (1867–1872)," 474.

municipality was established in Ankara; however, one can detect the members of the municipal council in 1871.[77]

The state held a majority in many of these bodies, relegating local representatives to a purely consultative role. However, some essential bodies did include elected members. Examples of such bodies include the Education, Public Works, and Agriculture Commissions established in many provinces. In these bodies, the resolution of regional issues was entrusted mainly to local representatives. In general, the members of the Agriculture Commission were comprised of the wealthiest landowners. Elected members were also present in the judicial system, namely in the courts. On the other hand, Chambers of Commerce were not elected but rather selected from merchants and guild organizations deemed suitable for the position and then approved by the Ministry of Trade.[78] The right to stand for election to the provincial council indicates one privileged class. If one wanted to be elected as a member of the provincial council, one should be literate, a member of a respected family, and an Ottoman subject, over 30 years old, and, first and foremost, have been capable of paying at least 500 gurus tax in a year. [79]

On the other hand, one cannot assert that the elections were held in a way that was compatible with the official arrangements; in the periphery regions, men of weight sought to retain their presence in these councils.[80] For example, in August 1878, es-Seyyid Mehmed Said Efendi, the governor of Ankara, reported that the people were being subject to punitive actions intemperately, and open-and-shut cases were remaining unsolved. The situation is attributed to two main reasons: improper

[77] Dirihan, "Osmanlı Taşra Merkezlerinde Modern Belediyelerin Ortaya Çıkışı: 19. Yüzyıl Sonu ve 20. Yüzyıl Başlarında Ankara Örneği," 6.
[78] Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880)*, 71-88.
[79] Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880)*, 85.
[80] Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880)*, 85.

conduct of elections and the belief of present council members that they cannot be unseated. The governor desires to get novel legal arrangements if they are prepared; otherwise, warrant to make the new election in accordance with old instructions.[81] In another example, in 1889, it is stated that the imams and mukhtars of Ankara were complaining that the boards of commissions assigned to the town had not been fulfilling their duties properly, that the issue of holding elections every two years had not been sustaining, that the chairs had been transferred to each other within the elites, and that no one from outside had been allowed to enter this circle.[82] Ankara has been remaining on the agenda with regards to irregular election practice in the bureaucratic conversations incessantly. In 1894, the writing concerning the elected members indicates that in 1889/1890, all members of the council were elected; in 1890/1891, half were elected, and half kept their chairs; and in 1891/1892, the issue of the election was forgotten. It was decided that new members would be elected for 1892/1893 and that half of them would be changed by lot two years later. In accordance with this decision, it was stated that Toygarzade Huseyin and Karasol Panayot Efendis are keeping their positions, and Kütükçüzade Hacı Rıfat and Malkon Efendis were elected. They are waiting to be endorsed by the ministry.[83] It could be inferred that those notorious people somehow preserved their seats and sometimes ignored the elections. They also ameliorated their infiltration and extended their relations with the state officials. The state officials appealed to prosperous merchants and landowners in the local councils for investments and reparations; they used them to correlate with the inhabitants for works that required

[81] BOA, SD. 1335/11, 25 Şaban 1295 (August 24, 1878)
[82] BOA, DH.MKT. 1614/107, 9 Şaban 1306 (April 10, 1889)
[83] BOA, BEO_474/35546, 12 Rabiulevvel 1312 (September 13, 1894). The dates in the document are in the Hijri calendar form; for this reason, they are denominated with "/" in the form of the modern calendar.

manual labor. As a result, officials contacted the central government to reward these individuals for their services.[84] The request for Serattarzade Ali to give him the Order of Mejidie could be interpreted from this angle.

The membership of these assemblies, commissions, and municipal councils can be traced through *vilayet salnameleri* (provincial yearbooks). However, it is incredibly challenging within the scope of this thesis to ascertain the active participation of the merchant and landowner classes in these bodies. Many yearbook entries lack the identifying family nicknames that would facilitate such an investigation. Nevertheless, certain prominent names can be brought to the fore through assumptions. “Hace” or “hoca” were used as forenames to define the artisans, tradesmen, or those who had wealth and posts in the cities and villages.[85] One can also add " hacı “, the same meaning as the previous example, Koçzade Hacı Mehmed Efendi. According to Nebahat Taşkın, his grandfather’s name was Hacı Kerim Efendi, father of well-known merchant and politician Kınazıcade Şakir. Hacı Kerim Efendi was a merchant; he maintained the trade of henna, and for this reason, the family name Kınacızade, as well as sof. He was taking sof from the various towns in Ankara, sending them off to Arabia, and importing henna from there. He has a manufacturing store in Atpazarı as well.[86] One cannot ensure that the veracity of all aspects of the story is factual. However, Hacı Kerim Efendi was one of the prominent figures in the yearbooks.

As far as one can be ascertained, in 1874, Hacı Mehmed Ağa was a member of the *Emlak Dairesi* (Department of Property Affairs).[87] In 1883 he was a member

[84] Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880)*, 79.
[85] Kılcı and Günel, *Bir Ankaralı Tüccarın Kentine Katkıları: İbadullah Vakfı*, 24.
[86] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 23.
[87] *Salname-i Vilayet-i Ankara 1291*.

of the provincial administrative council.[88] In 1891[89], and 1893[90], he was a member of the municipal council. Additionally, he became chairman of the Ankara branch of Ziraat Bank council in 1900[91] and sustained this position in 1902[92]. In the same year, he was also a member of the *Muhacirin Komisyonu* (Immigrant Commission).[93] On the other hand, one can observe that Hacı Abdulkerim Efendi was a member of the *Ticaret Mahkemesi* (Commercial Court) in 1882[94] and 1883[95]. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Ankara Branch of Ziraat Bankası in 1891[96] and 1893[97]. Although they may not have been present in the narrow circle of the provincial administrative council, it can be inferred that they were local dignitaries, usually involved in trade-related matters.

Other families that will be subjects of the subsequent chapters could be traced in the yearbooks as well. For instance, Toygarzade Hüseyin Efendi was a member of the provincial administrative council in 1878.[98] He was a member of the board of directors of the Ankara branch of Ziraat Bankası in 1891 and *Emlak-ı Seniyye Komisyonu* (Commission for the Administration of the Imperial Estates).[99] He maintained this position and became chairman of the board of directors of the Ankara branch of Ziraat Bank in 1893.[100] On the other hand, Naşid Efendi was from the same family and became a member of the same council in 1900[101] and 1902.[102] One

[88] *1300 Sene-i Hicriyyesine Mahsus Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi*.
[89] *Üç Yüz Yedi Sene-i Maliyesine Mahsustur Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi*.
[90] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir (1311)*.
[91] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir 1318*.
[92] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir 1320.*
[93] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir 1320.*
[94] *Salname-i Vilayet-i Ankara 1299*.
[95] *1300 Sene-i Hicriyyesine Mahsus Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi.*
[96] *Üç Yüz Yedi Sene-i Maliyesine Mahsustur Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi*.
[97] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir (1311)*.
[98] *Salnâme-i Vilâyet-i Ankara 1295*.
[99] *Üç Yüz Yedi Sene-i Maliyesine Mahsustur Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi*.
[100] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir (1311)*.
[101] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir 1318*.
[102] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir 1320.*

can also see Attarzade Ali Efendi, the forename, was used variably with Serattar and Attarbaşı, was a member of the *Divan-ı Temyiz-i Vilayet* (Provincial Court of Cassation) in 1878.[103] Another member of the same family, Attarbaşızade Emin Efendi, was a member of the *Ticaret Mahkemesi* (Commercial Court) in 1893.[104] Lastly, Kütükçüzade's and Bulgurluzade's gain importance in the scope of our investigation. In 1907, Kütükçüzade Ali Bey was in the Immigrants Commission and Commercial Court, and Kütükçüzade Hacı Rıfat Efendi was in the *Ma'arif Meclisi* (Council of Education). In the same year, Bulgurluzade Tevfik Bey was a member of the Commercial Court as well.[105] It is possible to find the roots of the prominent families that would play a role in the Second Constitutional Period and the Early Republic in the local councils. The lack of family names for every individual hinders a more extensive analysis; however, the province yearbooks indicate the power of certain merchant families in both politics and trade, derived from their positions in the local councils.

Aydın, Türkoğlu, Emiroğlu, and Özsoy epitomize those *eşraf* members in Ankara by giving family names such as Koçs, Toygars, Kınacıs, Kütükçüs, Aktars, Hanifs.[106] One can also add Çubukçus, Çulhas, Bulgurlus, Yağcıs, and from the countryside, Beypazarı, Çayırlıs. Their origins were craft and trade; sometimes, they also became part of the ulema; they formed the city's governing[107] as well as the bourgeois class. At this point, the following questions became meaningful: what are the sources of those families' income that distinguish them? In which commercial sectors were those elites involved at the end of the 19th century? The primary

[103] *Salnâme-i Vilâyet-i Ankara 1295.*
[104] *Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir (1311).*
[105] *Ankara Vilayeti Salname-i Resmiyesi 1325 Sene-i Hicriyesine Mahsus.*
[106] Aydın et al., *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, 299.
[107] Aydın et al., *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, 299.

sources to trace their commercial activities are French annual commercial almanacs; however, these sources are not abundant, especially for the 19th century, contrary to the 20th-century almanacs.

In 1890, Attarzade Emin and Ali were registered as *négociants* (merchants); however, there is no further information concerning what they were merchandising. There is quite a small section devoted to Ankara's trade and professions.[108] That is the same for the 1894 almanac, and there are only Attarzade Emin and Ali as merchants from our scope.[109] The 1896 almanac differentiates from others and has more plentiful information concerning commerce and professions. Interestingly, Attarzade Emin, Ali, and Kütükçüoğlu were registered as *banquires.* They were probably engaging in loan distribution since there is no knowledge of whether they had relations with any banques. On the other hand, Emin and Ali Effendis emerge as people who were interested in the wool trade, and Bulgurluzade Tevfik was registered as a manufacturer.[110] The wool trade should have been associated with the mohair, and Bulgurzade Tevfik's manufacturing store might be based on fleece wool, mohair, and gum tragacanth. Further almanacs give that hint to us.

It should be noted that the almanacs in the late 19th century period concerning Ankara mainly delved into non-Muslim merchants. That could stem from their more intimate relationship with the Europeans regarding trade. Moreover, according to British observations in 1893, Muslims dominated the landownership and livestock farming industries, as well as horse and cattle trading. Additionally, they excel as grain and flour merchants, retail shopkeepers, bakers, butchers, grocers,

[108] *Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'Industrie, de l'Administration et de la Magistrature 9me Année 1889-1890*.
[109] *Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'industrie, de L'administration et de la Magistrature, 12ème année Russie, Grèce, Roumanie, Serbie, Bulgarie 1894*.
[110] *Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'Industrie, de l'Administration et de la Magistrature 14ème Année 1896*.

and sellers of fruit, vegetables, dairy produce, spices, cordage, and charcoal. The Armenian and Greek communities, along with the usual professional classes, boast a significant number of merchants actively engaged in purchasing, selling, and exporting the district's remarkable products. It is worth noting that the wholesale and retail import trade is predominantly controlled by Christians.[111] It is also worth acknowledging the gradual advancements made by Muslim eşrafs during this period, and all merchants signed the aforementioned petitions for their interest in the mohair trade; that is a sign of being an economic class regardless of ethnicity. Palpable segregation based on ethnicity or religion within the class was a phenomenon in the second constitutional period.

2.4 Conclusion

The developments in the political and economic life in Ankara during the 19th century give clues of the missing bourgeoisie in the Turkish historiography. The indigenous product, mohair, and novel competitive production centers shaped the merchants' reactions, and it impelled them to organize in order to obviate any potential attempt that would infest their unique position. Those petitions could be interpreted as beyond the simple aspirations. The merchants were aware of their position in the global economic market, and the uniqueness of the mohair was the only key they could keep. On the other hand, they desired to benefit from the products of civilization, the railways. From the 1860s onwards, they sought to keep this desideratum on the agenda through general councils, and in later years, they showed their determination in this request with a petition. As soon as they achieved their goal, the extension of the railways to Ankara, they asked the sultan for

[111] *Diplomatic and Consular Reports on Trade and Finance. Turkey: Report for the Year 1893 on the Trade and Agriculture of Angora*. Foreign Office, Annual Series, no. 1368, 8.

permission to make economic investments in the warehouses near the railway station. One can comprehend that both their material and spiritual prestige, stemming from their charity works, were influential in this issue.

The centralization mechanism of Tanzimat gave rise to eşraf gaining legal and executive positions in the local councils. Certain families came to the fore and occupied certain chairs. Rather than a public democracy, a class was officially addressed by the state; the electoral obligations also denote that situation. They utilized this opportunity to strengthen their own spheres of influence. The experience they gained in those local councils will contribute to them in the national assemblies of future periods[112]. This period can be considered the beginning of political representation for the newly bourgeoning class in Ankara. It is quite difficult to discover the exact sectors of their financial investments and earnings. There is only the possibility of reaching the records of a few families at most. However, their initiatives during the second constitutional period and the role they played in the republican economy will shed light on their origins once again. It should be stated explicitly that the development and organization stories here are specific to the provincial bourgeoisie and might be valid only for Ankara. They may not be compatible with the characteristics of the rising bourgeoisie in the port regions of the empire and may not have established intense international trade networks.[113] Nevertheless, limited information does not indicate that they did not exist and did not act as a class.

[112] Akiba, "The Local Councils as the Origin of the Parliamentary System in the Ottoman Empire," 176.
[113] Nemlizades in Trabzon can be presented as an example of the raising of the port city bourgeois class. *See* Cora, Yaşar Tolga. "A Muslim Great Merchant [Tüccar] Family in the Late Ottoman a Case Study of the Nemlizades, 1860-1930." *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 19, no. 1 & 2 (2013): 1–30.

CHAPTER 3

SECOND CONSTITUTIONAL PERIOD AND *MİLLİ İKTİSAT*

3.1 The Young Turk Revolution and liberal economy

The Young Turk Revolution entailed a new era in the Ottoman Empire, both politically and economically, in 1908. Despite the fact that this second constitutional period was remarked as the emergence of the national economy in Turkish historiography, that was not the aim at the early onset of the revolution. According to Zafer Toprak, prerevolutionary groups surfaced with the aspiration of liberalism, and their initial aim was not drawing forth interventionist policy on the state economy. Quite the reverse, the revolutionary step was not only against Abdulhamid II but also against the statecraft tradition of the Ottoman Empire; the obstacles that blighted the nation, such as interventionist policies, corruption, price fixing, and trade concessions, generated a liberal tendency within the intelligentsia. This traditional cycle and its implications had to be broken, and the dilemma between the state and the individual had to be resolved. The Ottoman nation hungered for policies that would spawn individuals who were able to accumulate wealth and prioritize their own personal gain rather than subjects under state intervention. Toprak underlines that from the angle of the unionists, there was a significant division. They specified in their minds the differences between the fiscal and economic states. Until the revolution, the primary goal had been to maximize the revenue of the state treasury, which was the fiscal state's requirement. Yet, it was necessary to embrace an economic state approach similar to that of other contemporary nation-states. The target was now to prepare ways for individuals to take the initiative, generate

entrepreneurs, and increase the people's taxpaying capacity; this was an attempt to create indirect revenue for the state.[114]

Korkut Boratav identifies bourgeois ideologies with two main branches in terms of their economic perspectives: while the first branch pursues a national capitalist policy, the other one drives forward free trade and integration into the world economy by embracing its own role. In other words, the latter refers to a model that includes an acknowledgment of raw material and an open market. According to Boratav, Mehmed Cavid Bey, together with Ohannes Pasha, was the typical representative of the second approach in the Ottoman Empire. Ohannes Pasha, with his book titled *Mebadi-i İlm-i Servet-i Milel,* published in 1881, and Cavit Bey, with his book titled *İlm-i İktisat* published in 1900, advocated a complete liberal economy both internally and externally. He was a proponent of specialization based on agricultural exports and an open-door policy towards foreign capital. In other words, it envisioned a trading bourgeoisie dependent on external factors instead of an industrial bourgeoisie that would emerge due to a national capitalism based on industry.[115]

The Committee of Union and Progress contained a significant figure who would shape and lead their own liberal policies: Mehmed Cavid Bey. He was a champion of typical 19th-century liberalism.[116] His liberal prospect was maintained until the Balkan Wars in 1912. Being an entrepreneur was regarded as numinous. There was a harmony between liberty and entrepreneurship in the political discourse. On the other hand, Toprak asserts that those liberal policies made non-Muslim subjects and foreigners, who had been developing in the field of commerce since the

[114] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 2-5.
[115] Boratav, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985*, 15-17.
[116] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918,* 58-59.

Tanzimat period, more powerful. Furthermore, Muslim Ottomans suffered from dispossession and impoverishment, especially artisans and craftsmen. In that type of categorization, the actual commercial bourgeoisie of the period definitely consisted of non-Muslims, Levantines, and foreigners in port cities. The consequences of free competition were adversely affecting Muslim artisans and craftsmen with each passing day.[117] In fact, that could be stated that Toprak historically adopted the contemporary Unionist intelligentsia's political and economic discourses of the day, which emerged with the *Milli İktisat*, which will be analyzed in detail in the next section. Free from doubt, the commercial connections of the aforementioned groups, the relations they established with foreigner councils and merchants, and the companies they founded were superior in number and influence. Yet, the argument involves the Muslim-Turkish group that has completely shrunken back, lost its crafts, and was not able to adapt to the conditions; thus, it did not have commercial bourgeois characteristics, which poses a vexing question. This implies that the class structure needed to be created.

On the contrary, Neslişah L. Başaran Lotz evaluates that the theory based on the need for bourgeoisification of Muslim-Turkish is incompatible with the reality of the 19th century and onwards; they achieved to become part of this process with their commercial origins.[118] In other words, from Cora's perspective, the Muslim-Turkish merchant class cannot be interpreted as those who "… had to wait for the process of nation-state formation to receive economic and social freedom in their 'own' state."[119] He gives an example of Nemlizades, who utilized their existing family

[117] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 9-55.
[118] Lotz, "Türkiye'de Burjuvazinin Gelişiminde Tüccarlar: Müslüman-Türk Aileler ve Ticaret Ağları," 208.
[119] Cora, "A Muslim Great Merchant [Tüccar] Family in the Late Ottoman a Case Study of the Nemlizades, 1860-1930," 6.

networks in various provinces of the empire, such as Samsun, Trabzon, Istanbul, Salonika, Erzurum, etc., from the mid-19th century and onwards. Nemlizades, whose point of origin was port cities in general, serves as a crucial case study in showcasing the Muslim-Turkish bourgeois figure who was integrated into well-established and connected commercial networks.[120] When considering Ankara, one can trace the story of a class that should be conceived as provincial bourgeoisie, as presented in the previous section, primarily focused on the mohair trade to defend its own material interests, develop its commercial networks, and strive to exist in different sectors.

The *Annuaire Orientals* are essential tools that provide the most detailed information on sectoral distribution. When one considers the year of the revolution, 1908, that can be deduced that Yağcızade Mesut Efendi was engaged in grain trading. Bulgurluzade Tevfik Efendi was in the textile sector, and he was also a manufacturer. Ettarzade Galip Bey, who may belong to the Attarzade or Serattar family, appears as a farmer. Serattarzade Sadullah Efendi was a merchant and manufacturer. Kınacızade Hacı Kerim, Çubukçupaşazade Ağa, and Çulhazade Osman also stand out as manufacturers. In Beypazarı, in the scope of this thesis as a countryside, Çayırlızade Hilmi Efendi appears as a leading figure in various sectors. He was a grain merchant, farmer, and rice trader and was also involved in sericulture.[121] In 1914, when the First World War broke out, which also coincided with the beginning of the national economic policies, the Bulgurluzade family emerged as one of the key figures in commercial life. The family continued their presence in the manufacturing and textile sector through Tevfik Efendi and expanded their commercial network to Istanbul,

[120] Cora, "A Muslim Great Merchant [Tüccar] Family in the Late Ottoman a Case Study of the Nemlizades, 1860-1930," 6.
[121] *Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'Industrie de l'Administration et de la Magistrature, 28me Année 1908*.

where they are registered as Bulgurluzade Brothers in the manufacturing sector of the annual. Kınacızade Hacı Kerim, Serattarzade Sadullah, Çubukçupaşazade Ağa, and Çulhazade Osman also maintained their presence in the manufacturing sector. Kınacızace Ahmed was involved in copper mining. The Yağcızade family entered the oil sector with İsmail Efendi, while Mesut Efendi continued with grain export. In Beypazarı, Çayırlızade Hilmi sustained his presence in the same sectors in 1908; additionally, another family member, Çayırlızade Hakkı, was also involved in grain, rice, and sericulture sectors.[122]

It can be assumed that the manufacturing sector was heavily reliant on the mohair trade since it was the main product in Ankara. Besides that, the annuals indicate that commercial figures increased significantly compared to the 1890s. The class that emerged during the late Tanzimat period expanded its network across various sectors. That Muslim-Turkish group was not entirely passive, although it could not be asserted that they held equal power with non-Muslim, Levantine, or foreign bourgeoisie presence in the port cities as well as maybe in provinces. During the following periods, when the liberal atmosphere dissipated, it is a matter of fact that they will not be a class generated by the state. Yet, they will utilize the ways created by the state and become part of the national economy.

3.2 The evolution of politics during the Second Constitutional Period

The re-inauguration of the parliament also ushered in a novel chapter in the realm of political engagement. In August 1908, the sultan endorsed the Election Act, and it inured. It should be taken into consideration that this parliament also had class

[122] *Annuaire Oriental, commerce, industrie, administration, magisture de l'Orient 1914.* There is no information in Nebahat Taşkın's memoir, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, or other available sources regarding Kınacızade Ahmed's place in the Kınacızade family.

dimensions as local councils. According to the act, the elections were planned to be conducted using a two-tiered system; there were conditions to be first-degree voters, such as re-establishing his reputation if he lost it due to bankruptcy and paying taxes more or less directly to the state.[123] The two-tiered system in the election gave rise to the consolidation of power of the local families and powerful landowners. The people in the villages were voting for the local elites with whom they were familiar.[124] The unionists did not advocate for the direct election mechanism in their political campaigns since, according to their mentality, in the direct election process, the local leading figures may influence the ordinaries in the provinces; they attributed this prediction to the nonproliferation of education. They did not trust the provincial elites; from their perspective, those who profited from the relationship they established between the state and the people could not have patriotic emotions. They firmly believed in educated and enlightened fellows of the organization for the elections; the seats in the parliament should be theirs. However, if they were unable to find a candidate with the desired characteristics, they turned to the ulama class for potential candidates for the chairs; for this reason, there were a lot of first-place ulama candidates in the districts. Yet, it does not imply that the eşraf could not be part of the new parliament. The unionists comprehended the reverse results of their desires in the elections due to the two-tiered election system and sought to put reform in that field into action; they could not succeed in the parliament in 1909.[125] In subsequent elections, issues arose due to the inability to control the countryside fully and the takeover of their own branches by influential individuals.[126] The competition in rural areas became increasingly important during this time as the emerging elite

[123] Demir, *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Meclis-i Mebusan Seçimleri*, 25-27.
[124] Ahmad and Rustow, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Meclisler: 1908-1918," 256.
[125] Demir, *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Meclis-i Mebusan Seçimleri*, 39-46.
[126] Demir, *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Meclis-i Mebusan Seçimleri*, 126.

sought to benefit from modernization while also being wary of new regulations. The Freedom and Accord Party (Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası) was formed by a section of the elite, along with distinct ethnic groups, with the aim of advocating for decentralization.[127]

According to a list of parliamentarians prepared by Feroz Ahmad and Dankwart A. Rustow, there are two names between 1908 and 1914 that fall within the scope of this study. The first one is Kınacızade Şakir Bey, who is marked as the Yozgat deputy for the second and third terms and listed as a Committee of Union and Progress member.[128] Yet, there seems to be a significant mistake, despite the fact that it is possible that Kınacızade Şakir Bey might be a deputy from Yozgat due to the provincial system or the widespread practice of being a deputy from other cities. Upon checking the certificate of election registers, it becomes clear that there is confusion between two individuals with the same name. The mistake stems from the confusion between Şakir Bey, who served as the police chief, and Kınacızade Şakir Bey.[129] On the other hand, another name that could be prominent for this study is Hilmi Efendi, who served as an independent deputy in the third term.[130] As presented above, Hilmi Efendi was a powerful landowner and merchant in Beypazarı and a quite controversial figure during this period.

Ahmed Şerif's journey to Anatolia after the re-promulgation of the constitution provides valuable hints concerning the relationship between the eşraf, especially Hilmi Efendi, and the state. Ahmed Şerif conducted this journey on behalf

[127] Aydın et al., *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, 328.
[128] Ahmad and Rustow, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Meclisler: 1908-1918,"274.
[129] *Mebusan Meclisi Üyeleri Mazbataları - Şakir Bey.* TBMM Library. The confusion between two individuals has been maintained in other studies, for instance: Öztürk, Gülin (2018). "Meclis-i Mebusan Yozgat Mebusu 'Kınacızade Şakir Bey'in 1912 Senesi Meclis Faaliyetleri", *Cappadocia Journal of History and Social Sciences, 10.*
[130] Ahmad and Rustow, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Meclisler: 1908-1918," 273. *Mebusan Meclisi Üyeleri Mazbataları - Hilmi Bey.* TBMM Library.

of *Tanin* Newspaper, which was the publication organ of the Committee of Union and Progress at that time. It can be argued that this journey was made for the unionists in order to comprehend the developments in the countryside, increase their political influence, and reinforce their organizational practices. Ahmed Şerif started publishing these journeys under the title "Tanin in Anatolia" in the form of letters.[131] The fact that the journey took place in 1909 when the revolution was still fresh is of great value in understanding the situation in the countryside. According to Şerif, laws did not govern and command the officials in Ankara. The *kaymakams* (district governors) and officials helped the eşrafs and influential people to secure their positions. The *naibs* (deputy judges), whose terms were limited to two years, were under the control of members elected without the knowledge of the wealthy and the general public. [132]

Şerif's journey to Beypazarı is also quite significant; according to his observation there, the most crucial source of trade was mohair. Peasants, merchants, and shopkeepers did business with each other with ultimate trust. More importantly, Şerif encountered an exciting event in the administrative council. The villagers of Çayırhan, who were affiliated with Nallıhan yet had commercial relations generally with Beypazarı, complained that Hilmi Bey, a leading figure from Beypazarı, had forcibly taken their pastures and fields. According to the villagers' narrative, Hilmi Bey was being protected in the same way he was protected during the autocracy of Abdulhamid II. It is seen that the villagers of Çayırhan also employed the discourse of the revolution to remark that something should have been changed. However, the situation has not changed as they expected.[133] The villagers argued that the trustee of

[131] Şerif, *Anadolu'da Tanin*, XVII.
[132] Şerif, *Anadolu'da Tanin,* 63.
[133] Şerif, *Anadolu'da Tanin,* 83-93.

the Sevdaviyye and Seyfiyye madrasah foundations had sold 140,000 acres of pasture that the villagers used for grazing to Hilmi Efendi for 500 liras despite not having the authority to sell it. Additionally, Hilmi Efendi had extraordinary powers in the old days, before the revolution. All the officials feared him, and the political leaders and figures in Istanbul respected him. He had even sent gifts to the sultan by wagons before the revolution; however, when the news of the proclamation of liberty was announced, he returned them from Haydarpaşa station.[134]

The villagers put forward that they pay taxes on their own fields every year; however, Hilmi Efendi cultivates and benefits from these fields. They emphasized that no matter where they applied or which court they went to before the revolution, Hilmi Efendi was always found right. He has extended his influence not only to themselves but also to seven villages and four farms. The villagers narrated to Ahmed Şerif that they thought everything would be arrived at a solution on their side when freedom came, that they would be rid of Hilmi Efendi's tyranny, and that they had forcibly removed the animals he had put on the pastures. However, in response to this action, Hilmi Efendi benefited from his influence in obtaining decisions from the province and Istanbul, and even well-known Unionist Talat Bey issued orders stating that the pasture should be handed over to Hilmi Efendi. As a result of Hilmi Efendi's actions, twenty-five villagers were thrown in prison.[135]

In addition to the aforementioned narrative from the villagers, it is also possible to trace complaints against Çayırlızade Hilmi Bey within archival records. For instance, considerably earlier, in 1901, Hilmi's deeds were the subject of many complaints from the local people and notable figures. According to allegations, he caused the detaining of thirty individuals arbitrarily because of a theft committed at

[134] Şerif, *Anadolu'da Tanin,* 93-94.
[135] Şerif, *Anadolu'da Tanin,* 94-96.

his house, and he subjected them to torture and compelled them to confess even though they did not commit the robbery. Additionally, in witness statements containing civil servants, he had close relations with the Minister of Interior and the governor of Ankara, dismissed the mayor arbitrarily, and was personally involved in appointing numerous bureaucrats. In light of the complaints and testimonies, it would be extractable that Hilmi Bey sought to advance his own interests by offering bribes to quite influential officials, intimidating his rivals by establishing agreements with bandit groups when necessary, seizing various pastures in different villages by force, and torturing innocent people.[136] In a telegram dated April 12, 1902, the notables, ulemas, imams, and mukhtars of Beypazarı lodged a complaint against his oppression of the local population, demanding that Hilmi Efendi should be summoned to the provincial center.[137] Furthermore, a document dated May 14, 1902, reveals a lawsuit filed by Hasan Sabri and Tevfik, teachers from Beypazarı, alongside merchants Galatalızade Hacı Hamdi, Seyyid Mustafa, Ali Rıza and Nuri Efendis, and *Çoban* (shepherd) Yusuf, pertaining to the aforementioned incident.[138] According to the research of Ercimet Sarıay, the issue of the pasture, as described by the villagers, was brought before the Ankara Provincial Administrative Council on June 14, 1904, where a decision was made to investigate the matter, and certain officials were appointed for this purpose. The investigation concluded that the villagers' claims were exaggerated. Additionally, a letter dated March 2, 1909, from the Minister of Land Registry and Cadastre to the Ankara Province stated that there was no document verifying the ownership of the pasture land by the villagers, but it was explicitly stated that a designated area for grazing animals could not be bought or

[136] BOA, Y.. PRK.AZJ._42/35, 1 Safer 1319 (May 20, 1901)
[137] BOA, BEO. 1828/137060, 3 Muharrem 1320 (April 12, 1902)
[138] BOA, BEO. 1847/138473, 5 Safer 1320 (May 14, 1902)

sold. Hilmi Bey, on the other hand, claimed that the land in Çayırhan was his registered property, that there was sufficient land in the village for grazing animals, and that the villagers were wrongfully interfering with his property. Although the incident had faded from the agenda by 1916 and Hilmi Bey had become a member of parliament in Ankara, the issue took on a different dimension in that year. Wheat seeds stored in the farm's warehouse, which was located on the land belonging to Hilmi Bey and his family, were seized by the district governor. Upon Hilmi Bey's complaint, the Minister of Interior Talat Bey sent a telegram to the Governor of Ankara, Reşit Bey, on December 9, 1916, demanding that the warehouse be opened immediately and the seeds be handed over to Hilmi Bey's family, and an investigation be conducted into the reason for the district governor's actions.[139]

The analysis of the villagers' statements reveals key details regarding the relationship between the provincial elite and the unionists. Çayırlızade Hilmi, who was already quite powerful before the second constitutional era, managed to maintain his power and even established a relationship with Talat Bey. As Ahmad and Rustow point out, he was an independent member of the parliament, yet he sustained these relations. He remained influential and prevented damage to his own property during famine years such as 1916. This indicates a relationship between the rural elite and the Unionists, at least in this case. However, it is essential to note that economic relations for the rest of the population cannot be assumed to have changed. They suffered from the same exploitation, and the decision-making remained in the hands of eşrafs thanks to their material and immaterial prestige and its effects on the political unions and linkages.

[139] Sarıay, "II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde Eşraf Ve Köylü İlişkisi Üzerine Örnek Bir Olay: Çayırhan Köylüleri İle Hilmi Bey Arasındaki Arazi Anlaşmazlığı," 605-608.

3.3 *Milli İktisat* and the flourishing Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie

The unionists' experiment with political and economic liberalism eventually came to an end. A chain of events, containing the annexation of Crete by Greece, the independence of Bulgaria, the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Tripolitania War, and the catastrophic defeat in the Balkan Wars engendered a subversive traumatic atmosphere. The comprehensive freedoms pledged at the beginning of the revolution were no longer suitable. From 1913 onwards, it was a period of arbitrary regime and authoritarianism marked by the Unionists.[140] Inclusivity was replaced by bestowing privileges on Muslim-Turkish elements, which manifested itself economically as a strict opposition to liberalism. The goal was to establish the Muslim-Turkish bourgeois class as the dominant force, even though this meant alienating non-Muslim citizens who had been promised equality.[141] The unionist intelligentsia began to verbalize and formulate explicitly this intention. According to Ziya Gökalp, the current division of labor in society was no longer functioning. The division of labor consisted of Muslim-Turkish soldiers, civil servants, and non-Muslim merchants; hence, from his perspective, there was no shared conscience, so society could not be transformed into a modern state. The intention of creating a bourgeois class did not echo in the language of the intelligentsia as "bourgeoisie"; rather, they utilized "*esnaf"* (artisan) and "middle-class" to identify their intention; ultimately, they were denoting a class that has urbanized and productive in the sense of commerce. Yusuf Akçura began to use the term "bourgeoisie" openly, probably because this type of class analysis stemmed from his education experience in Paris.[142]

---

[140] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 6-7.
[141] Varlı and Koraltürk, "II. Meşrutiyet'ten Erken Cumhuriyet'e Milli İktisadın Sürekliliği ve İzmir İktisat Kongresi," 129-130.
[142] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918,* 66-69.

It can be asserted that this period has marked the genesis of the approaches that resurfaced frequently in the Early Republican Period as well, becoming the dominant paradigm in Ottoman and Turkish historiography. The dominant narrative betokened that the Ottoman Turks disdained craft and trade, and the perception of soldiering and civil service as the ideal professions for Turks needed to change; additionally, Akçura went a step further and claimed that Ottoman Turks were only cavalrymen and civil servants, they were distant from the civilization. The bourgeois class should have generated the society needed by leading industrialists, merchants, and bankers.[143] Many prominent economic historians who worked on this national economy period, such as Zafer Toprak, also subscribed to the view put forward by the intelligentsia of the period. It should be taken into consideration that these classical and contemporary narratives of the national economy period may represent a mentality rather than bare facts. For instance, the developments of both the Ankara commercial bourgeoisie that forms the main line of this thesis and the aforementioned port city bourgeoisie from the Tanzimat period and perhaps even earlier make those arguments viable for further analysis. While there are differences between a class that has already had roots and a class that does not yet exist, it is significant to comprehend that the political mindset of the state or decision-makers and the historical atmosphere do not necessarily fully correspond with reality. Moreover, it is crucial to emphasize that the time period under study is one of great turmoil in Turkish history. For instance, the boycott movement from 1908 to 1914 might be beneficial in recognizing various axes and dimensions. Those movements varied depending on subperiods; the target was the economic awakening and

[143] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918,* 69.

ultimately represented a desire for economic prosperity.[144] According to Toprak, the Muslim Turks took Russia as an example, aspiring to engage in trade and craft and achieve rapid wealth; the boycott movements marked the beginning of implementing a national economy.[145] In his comprehensive studies of Ottoman-Turkish boycotts, Doğan Çetinkaya offers a significant caveat: "Therefore, the *Milli İktisat* (National Economy), which advocated the development of the Ottoman economy, was not only an invention of nationalist intellectuals or the policies of state elites but also social movement involving different social actors."[146] He focuses on the social actors and attitudes of various classes involving bourgeoisie that were presumed nonexistent.[147] National economic policy has created new economic figures, but building a class from scratch requires a different paradigm. It can also be interpreted from the perspective of established families expanding their sectoral range and becoming even wealthier by employing their adaptation mechanism and coming to the forefront as leading figures.

The outbreak of the First World War created an opportunity, perhaps even a necessity, for a complete transition to national economic policies. The time was ripe for the emergence of Muslim-Turkish businesspeople. The laissez-faire market mechanism began to be dysfunctional, and the economy was now under the control of the state. Muslim-Turkish entrepreneurs were favored under the banner of economic awakening, and capital accumulation accelerated via speculatively

[144] For the analysis of boycott movements in the Ottoman Empire: Çetinkaya, Y. D. (2004). *1908 Osmanlı Boykotu: Bir Toplumsal Hareketin Analizi.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları. and Çetinkaya, Y. D. (2014). *Young Turks and the boycott movement: Nationalism,protest and the working classes in the formation of modern Turkey.* New York: I.B Tauris.
[145] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 133.
[146] Çetinkaya, *Young Turks and the Boycott Movement: Nationalism, Protest and the Working Classes in the Formation of Modern Turkey*, 14.
[147] Çetinkaya, *Young Turks and the Boycott Movement: Nationalism, Protest and the Working Classes in the Formation of Modern Turkey*,, 12-35.

obtained profits.[148] The economic leaders followed during the war years were no longer Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Frederic Bastiat, and Paul Leroy-Beaulieu. Instead, proponents of national economics involving Friedrich List, Henry Charles Carey, John Rae, and Paul Cauwes became the new favorites.[149] It should be emphasized that the phenomenon of a war economy was not unique to the Ottoman Empire or the Unionist intellectuals. Eric Hobsbawm also highlights the effects of the war:

> By 1913, capitalist economies were already moving rapidly in the direction of large blocks of concentrated enterprise, supported, protected, and even, to some extent, guided by governments. The war itself had greatly accelerated this shift towards a state-managed, even a state-planned capitalism.[150]

According to Boratav, the economic effects of the war manifested themselves in two ways. Firstly, the Ottoman Empire, which he defines as a semi-colonial state, began transforming into a national economy under objective pressure. Secondly, profiteering and black marketeering under these extraordinary circumstances constituted the primary mechanism for the formation of primitive accumulation that would be utilized in the Early Republic,[151] although that could be observed that primitive accumulation had already begun much earlier and class consciousness had emerged as Ankara commercial bourgeoisie examples. Yet, the emphasis on the objective pressures is crucial; for instance, the Ottoman Empire had imported a total of 45 million liras worth of goods, 15 million liras of which were food products and 30 million liras of which were industrial goods before the war, could not even import %3 of this amount in 1915.[152] The war blocked trade routes, mainly between Istanbul and the West. The population of Istanbul was plunged into a severe famine; hence,

[148] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 135.
[149] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 14.
[150] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 132.
[151] Boratav, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985*, 18.
[152] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 64.

the Anatolian farmers and merchants were now the only source of supply for those in the metropolis. The national market was now in the hands of them.[153]

The Unionists had taken control of all economic strings since the First World War. Numerous arrangements implemented during this period were geared towards transitioning to a national economy. For instance, on October 1, 1914, capitulations were abolished unilaterally. Through a regulation enacted on October 15, 1914, all legislative provisions stemming from capitulations ceased to be valid. Subsequent enactments incorporated real and commercial entities within the legislative framework, eradicated the privileges enjoyed by foreign companies, and rendered foreigners subject to Ottoman legislation in commercial matters.[154] Concurrent with these developments, significant regulatory measures were enacted to the advantage of the Ottoman citizens. For instance, large landowners were granted an exemption from military service. Furthermore, they were permitted to exempt three farmers from military service for a fee for every 500 decares, allowing them to utilize these farmers on their lands. The authority and sphere of activity of Ziraat Bank was expanded, and it began to become a partner with agricultural companies and sell agrarian tools, ovaries, and domestic animals. Agricultural cooperatives were fostered and encouraged. With the aim of fostering national industry, the state introduced a plan to allocate 5,000 square meters of land at no cost to those who would establish factories. This initiative was accompanied by a range of new developments, encompassing the provision of free building permits, 15 years of tax-exempt operation, and exemption from customs and export duties.[155]

[153] Boratav, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985*, 19.
[154] Varlı and Koraltürk, "II. Meşrutiyet'ten Erken Cumhuriyet'e Milli İktisadın Sürekliliği ve İzmir İktisat Kongresi," 129-130.
[155] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın*, 265-266. A portion of these regulations were established through the enactment of the *Teşvik-i Sanayi Kanunu* (Law for the Encouragement of

A notable consequence of the national economy policies was the remarkable expansion of joint-stock companies. Notably, during the war years, the Ottoman Empire experienced an unparalleled upsurge in the creation of joint-stock companies. In 1908, the number of joint-stock companies operating on Ottoman soil stood at 86. Starting from 1849, an average of 14.5 new joint-stock companies were established annually. Within the 1908-1918 timeframe, a total of 236 companies were established. During the initial five-year liberal era after the revolution, 113 companies were established, translating to an average of 22.60 companies per annum. In the examination of the 1914-1918 period, comprising both the war years and the realization of national economic policies, 123 companies were established, with an average of 24.60 companies each year. Notably, when considering only 1916-1918, the annual average increases to 32.[156] These joint-stock companies unquestionably served a purpose. By pooling their financial resources, multiple entrepreneurs could undertake an economic investment of a scale far exceeding their individual means, and the legal personality of this investment could persist for a duration far surpassing a biological lifespan.[157]

Kemal Bey, known as Kara Kemal, a prominent figure within the Istanbul branch of the CUP, showed up as the mastermind behind the planning and execution of these national companies. The *Heyet-i Mahsusa-i Ticariyye* (Special Trade Committee), founded at his behest and tasked with ensuring Istanbul's food supply during the wartime shortages, amassed a remarkable profit of 273,374 liras. These generated profits were envisioned to serve as the capital for the national companies

Industry) in 1913, for further information concerning the articles of the enactment: Ökçün, A. G. (1975). Teşvik-i Sanayi Kanun-ı Muvakkatı, 1913. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi 3*, *30*(1), 25–45.
[156] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 136.
[157] Yılmaz, *Osmanlı Anonim Şirketleri: Ticaret ve Ziraat Nezareti Tarafından 1918 Yılında Yayınlanmış Olan "Memalik-i Osmaniye'de Osmanlı Anonim Şirketleri" Başlıklı Katalog*, 23.

the Unionists would establish.[158] The provisioning issue was one of the most pressing challenges throughout the war. The *Havayic-i Zaruriye Komisyonu* **(**Emergency Supplies Board), tasked with providing essential goods for the public and the military, met with failure. Hence, headed by Izzet Bey, secretary of the Bakers' Association, and under the management of Kemal Bey, the aforementioned Heyet-i Mahsusa-i Ticariyye was established. In October 1915, the *Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi* (Anatolian National Products Ottoman Joint Stock Company), which was partially funded by Heyet-i Mahsusa-i Ticariyye, took over the procurement and sale regarding provision. Established in Istanbul for a duration of 20 years, Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi, spearheaded by Kemal Bey, represented the first of the "national" companies.[159]

This company also held great significance for Ankara merchants. According to the articles of association, the company's objectives were to procure and sell domestic products such as grain, mohair, sheep wool, leather, and opium, which were transported and exported via the Konya, Ankara, and Baghdad lines, and to act as a commission agent for these products.[160] An examination of the company's founders reveals that individuals from diverse provinces and backgrounds established it. Notably, there were no non-Muslim or foreign founders among them.[161] Commercial bourgeois families from Ankara also supported this initiative and succeeded in becoming among the company’s founders. According to the articles of association, Serattarzade Sadullah, Hanifzade Mehmed, and Bulgurluzade Tevfik from Ankara were among the founders[162]. The company was established with 200,000 liras capital

[158] Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 137.
[159] Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*, 408-410.
[160] BOA, SD.1256/6, 10 Şaban 1338 (April 29, 1920)
[161] Saya and Alkış, “Milli İktisadın İlk Şirketi: Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi,” 28.
[162] BOA, SD.1256/6, 10 Şaban 1338 (April 29, 1920)

and increased its field of activity in subsequent years. On October 14, 1916, with the endorsement of Sultan Mehmed Reşad, it expanded its commercial privileges from Konya, Ankara, and Baghdad lines to all the Ottoman provinces. Based on the company's operations in 1916, the Istanbul-based enterprise expanded its reach by establishing new branches in Akşehir, Ankara, Afyonkarahisar, Ereğli, Eskişehir, and Konya. Mohair was identified as a strategic product against the British, and significant efforts were made in its production. It took over responsibility for the export of mohair, particularly that belonging to the Military Railway Administration, processing a substantial volume of 45,000-50,000 bales of mohair within the year. Cumulatively, the company handled 90,000 bales of mohair over the preceding two years. This resulted in a substantial revenue of 2,300,000 liras. The company's 1918 operations provided 2,000,000 kıyye (approximately 800 tons) of mohair to military railways and ports. However, due to unforeseen circumstances, the entirety of the mohair could not be delivered. In collaboration with the Ministry of Provisions, the company procured wheat and chickpeas as part of relief efforts.[163]

In the aftermath of the war and the dismantling of the CUP, the newly established government seized control of the company. Under the administration of Damat Ferit Pasha, national companies were widely regarded as havens for corrupt practices. Following the 1926 Izmir Assassination and the ensuing legal proceedings, the company, which Kara Kemal spearheaded, was discovered to have conducted activities in violation of contemporary commercial legislation. As a result, its operations were brought to an end.[164] The company's remarkable success during its initial years, with a 44% profit margin in its first year and a subsequent surge to

[163] Saya and Alkış, "Milli İktisadın İlk Şirketi: Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi," 29-31.
[164] Saya and Alkış, "Milli İktisadın İlk Şirketi: Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi," 31.

159% in its second year, underscores its significance as a groundbreaking venture of that era.[165] The participation of three prominent families with ingrained commercial networks in Ankara underscores their adeptness at exploiting the benefits of the new era and seamlessly integrating with the prevailing circumstances. It is plausible that they had cultivated vigorous ties with the CUP, especially with Kemal Bey. The exurgent of the national economy paved the way for them to accumulate substantial fortunes.

On the other hand, despite all the efforts, the provisioning problem persisted. After multiple attempts, a comparable organization was established, drawing inspiration from the German provisioning structure. As per the decision of July 23, 1916, Ottoman territories were delineated into provisioning zones. The first zone encompassed the provinces of Istanbul, Edirne, Hüdavendigar, Konya, Ankara, Aydın, and Kastamonu, together with the sanjaks of Bolu, Çatalca, Kale-i Sultaniyye, Karesi, Izmir, Eskişehir, Kütahya, Karahisar Sahib, Niğde, Menteşe, and Antalya. Kemal Bey was appointed to head this region. The *mübaaya vekilleri* (procurement agents) assigned to this area were responsible for purchasing wheat, flour, barley, corn, millet, oats, rye, chickpeas, and beans. The mübaaya vekilleri were authorized to requisition surplus produce from any producer in their assigned regions, and they also received a commission ranging from two to four percent. The three-zone provisioning system proved inadequate, and on April 12, 1917, these zones were reorganized and increased to five. In 1918, the Ministry of Provisions was established, and Kemal Bey was appointed as its head. This newfound authority granted Kemal Bey's ministry the power to oversee all procurement and sales transactions directly, utilize railway and road transport wagons for non-military

[165] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918,* 410.

purposes, and even requisition necessary sea vessels. These extensive powers effectively transformed Kemal Bey into a guardian of merchants, enabling him to steer the nation's entire economy through the provisioning sector. Speculative ventures flourished under his leadership. Attempts to curtail such activities, such as the establishment of the *Men-i İhtikar Heyeti* (Anti-Hoarding Commission), provided protection to the adherent merchants, mainly by eliminating non-Muslim elements from the market. This era witnessed the emergence of "war profiteers" – a term coined by the press to describe the newly wealthy individuals.[166]

The Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi was not the only joint-stock company in which Ankara residents were involved. Along with the spread of companies from the capital to Anatolia, the Ankara Milli Mensucat Anonim Şirketi (Ankara National Textile Joint-Stock Company) was also founded on November 25, 1916.[167] The company was established by Salihzâde Hakkı Efendi and his partners with a capital of 50,000 liras and a term of 25 years. According to its bylaw, the aim of the company was to weave various textile products from raw materials such as wool, mohair, cotton, and silk and plant fibers to be mixed with these raw materials, establish factories to prepare and produce silk, dye and other raw materials of textile, deal with the purchase and sale trade of raw materials specific to textile products and carry out other commercial transactions to be determined by the board of directors until the factory equipment and machinery are brought. Among the founders of the company were Çulhazade Rıfat Efendi, Serattarzade Rasim Efendi, Bulgurluzade Mehmed Efendi, Kınacızade Şakir Efendi, and Yağcızade İsmail Efendi.[168] To ensure the smooth operation of its activities, the company established branches in Istanbul,

[166] Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918,* 420-476.
[167] Varlık, "Ankara Millî Mensucat [Türk] Anonim Şirketi (1916-1930)," 75.
[168] BOA, SD.1256/29, 19 Muharrem 335 (December 15, 1916)

Eskişehir, Beypazarı, and Yozgat. While the exact extent of the company's size and scope of operations remains unclear during this period, its trajectory and impact will continue to be debated in the context of Turkey's National Struggle and the Republican Era.[169] It is noteworthy that with the spread of the joint-stock company system to Anatolia, prominent merchant families in Ankara promptly embraced this development, establishing companies related to mohair and wool, areas of expertise in which they were well-versed. It should be emphasized that this was not merely a starting point for these families; they adopted a national economic perspective and expanded their vested business scope further.

The extent to which the capital of these companies originated solely from the traders' own savings remains an open question. Notably, it can be observed that the dates of establishment and initial growth of the companies coincide with the dates of the Armenian deportations. To suggest that these two developments are coincidental would be beyond the realm of possibility. In his account of the confiscation of Armenian properties, Hilmar Kaiser asserts that the primary objective was to provide resources for Muslim companies. Armenian properties were sold at remarkably low prices. In particular, the allocation of mills and warehouses to Muslim companies at extremely affordable rates played a significant role in sustaining production. Furthermore, extra effort was made to prevent the sale of Armenian properties to foreigners, ensuring that all assets were transferred to Muslims.[170] Telegrams sent to the Liquidation Commissions in various provinces, including Ankara, during and after the deportation requested the transfer of movable and immovable properties to Muslim companies and traders.[171]

[169] Varlık, "Ankara Millî Mensucat [Türk] Anonim Şirketi (1916-1930)," 75.
[170] Kaiser, "Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies during the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1916," 62-64.
[171] Eroğlu, *Tehcirden Milli Mücadele'ye Ermeni Malları (1915-1923)*, 74.

Oya Gözel Durmaz provides the most concrete examples of the properties left behind by the Armenians after the deportation and the establishment of Muslim companies, drawing her evidence from the city of Kayseri. According to Durmaz, these abandoned properties were used to integrate Muslims into commercial life and to settle Muslim immigrants. Prior to the war, there were no joint-stock companies in Kayseri. However, during the war, two such companies were established in the city. Moreover, some companies dissolved themselves shortly after transferring the properties left behind by the deportees to their own names.[172] While the situation in Ankara does not reflect the former trend, the intersection of deportation with the establishment and development of companies leaves an open door for further investigation in this regard.

3.4 Kinship relations

In addition to commercial connections, these families were also meshed through kinship relations. It can be observed that marriage alliances held significant importance for this influential commercial bourgeoisie. Orhan Karaveli, in his book detailing his father and grandfather's lives, draws attention to this phenomenon, noting that in Ankara, with its population of twenty to thirty thousand at the time, such coincidences were entirely natural. Among the city's affluent families, close kinship marriages were prevalent at that time to prevent wealth from leaving the family, and these marriages sometimes resulted in children with disabilities.[173] One can epitomize these kinship marriages by utilizing memoirs. For instance, Vehbi Koç's father, Koçzade Hacı Mustafa, married the daughter of Kütükçüzade Hacı

[172] Durmaz, "The Distribution of the Armenian Abandoned Properties in an Ottoman Locality: Kayseri (1915–18)," 842-850.
[173] Karaveli, *Bir Ankara Ailesi'nin Öyküsü*, 29.

Rıfat Efendi. Vehbi's sister Zehra married Kütükçüzade Halim Bey, while his other sister Hüsniye married Emin Bey from the Aktarzade family. Vehbi Koç himself married Sadberk, the daughter of Aktarzade Sadullah Bey, in 1927.[174] Nebahat Taşkın's memoir also validates this phenomenon. For instance, Kınacızade Şakir's wife was Fatma from Kütükçüzade family. Şakir's sister Sıdıka married Çubukçuzade Mustafa Kazım. Arif Çubukçu, who was born from this marriage, will become a prominent businessman and later serve as a member of the parliament for the Republican People's Party. Kınacızade Şakir's daughter Nadiye married Arif Çubukçu as well. Osman Cevdet Çubukçu, born from the marriage of Sıdıka and Mustafa Kazım, who later became an important medical professional, married Melahat, the daughter of Aktarzade Sadullah. Sadberk, who married Vehbi Koç, was the daughter of Nadire Hanım, the cousin of Kınacıza Şakir Bey's wife, Fatma.[175] It is possible to multiply these examples and trace the family trees. It is clear that most of the children of these commercial bourgeois families were cousins to each other. In this way, commercial relations were combined and reinforced with kinship relations.

3.5 Rising from scratch

One of the significant memoirs concerning commercial relations and conditions of the 1910s belongs to a well-known entrepreneur, Vehbi Koç. The discourse employed by Vehbi Koç is compatible with the political atmosphere of the aforementioned period. Hence, instead of evaluating the narrative as genuine, it is necessary to take into consideration the dominant discourses of the national economy and its repercussions in the mind of Vehbi Koç. For instance, Vehbi Koç claims that Christians were extremely wealthy, so they traded, earned a lot, dressed well, and

[174] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç*, 13-14.
[175] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 28-53.

lived in nice houses; however, the Turks in Ankara were mostly predisposed to obtain professions such as being hodja, grocer, or warehouseman. From his perspective, Christians were much luckier than Muslim Turks since they had the advantage of being exempt from military service by paying a fee; on the other hand, that was not valid for Turks. Furthermore, according to him, all trade in Ankara was carried out by Armenians, Greeks, and Jews; the most exquisite buildings and shops belonged to them.[176] He asks his elders, considering this situation: "Who are the richest merchant families among Muslims, and how many liras do they have?"[177] The answer he received was that Bulgurluzades, Kınacızades, and Aktarzades were prominent, yet their wealth was considerably lower than that of the prosperous Christians of Ankara.[178] Vehbi Koç wrote his life story in the 1970s; therefore, one can presuppose that he embraced the narratives of both the Second Constitutional Era and the Early Republican period when he considered his past. This is not a unique characteristic of Vehbi Koç alone; as presented above, it has also been the dominant paradigm in Turkish historiography.

In general, businessmen biographies and autobiographies, as a genre, present a narrative with a story of starting from scratch in business.[179] Vehbi Koç implies, from time to time, the same structure; however, his fathers and his entourage confute the patterns in the narrative. For instance, during the war period, Vehbi's father, Koçzade Hacı Mustafa, and other members from prominent families, Kütükçüzade Fevzi Bey, İsmet Beyzade Nazif Bey, and Aktarbaşı Mehmet Efendi formed a partnership to trade wheat, this endeavor probably stems from the famine in İstanbul.

[176] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç*, 18-22.
[177] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç*, 22.
[178] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç*, 18-22.
[179] For instance, biographies of Nuri Demirağ: Şakir, Z. (1947). *Nuri Demirağ Kimdir?* Kenan Matbaası. Deliorman, M. N. (1957). *Nuri Demirağ'ın Hayatı ve Mücadeleleri*. Nu. D. Matbaası.

They bought wheat and barley from villagers and sold them to Christian merchants engaged in the wheat trade. He underlines that consignments were constantly made to Istanbul by wagons, and that was an easy trade from his perspective. The same partners also brought figs, grapes, and soap from Izmir and sold them. After assisting Vehbi in these various trade activities, he moved to the trading house of Aktarzade Sadullah Efendi, who would later become his father-in-law. While Sadullah Efendi lived in Istanbul and sent commercial goods from there, the other members of the family, Aktarzade Rasim and Hacı Kerim Beys, managed the dry goods store in Ankara. According to Vehbi Bey's narrative, he did not prefer participating in the same business since it was expensive. Instead, he opened a grocery store with his father by investing 120 liras as capital. He traveled to Istanbul many times during this period and met with a person called Paşazade Başağa from the Çubukcuzade family, who was a partner of Aktarzade Sadullah. On the other hand, he achieved business with a Swiss firm, Hochstrasser, through an Armenian merchant. He and his father received hazelnuts and tobacco from Samsun and Trabzon, found wagons in Ankara, and sent them to Istanbul. They also had many warehouses near the railway station. While his business in Ankara changed from time to time, such as transforming from hardware to leatherwork and from leatherwork to building materials, his commercial relations in Istanbul, especially in the Galata region, also developed.[180] Vehbi Koç's commercial success was enhanced by his ability to leverage both his commercial and kinship relations and the prevailing conditions of the period to his advantage. He was able to maintain these characteristics throughout the Republican period. However, it is challenging to identify a narrative of starting

[180] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç*, 25-39.

from scratch in this context. As previously discussed, the relationships that have been consolidated over time play a significant role in this rise.

3.6 Conclusion

Although the Second Constitutional Era in the Ottoman Empire is often remarked on as the advent of the national economy in historiography, this was not the initial motivation at the beginning of the revolution. The leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress, who sought to move away from the Ottoman statecraft tradition, identified economic and social freedoms as the new path for the nation. The way to integrate with the civilized world was through implementing liberal principles. Consequently, a financial program that envisioned the creation of entrepreneurial citizens was adopted rather than the vested interventionist and fiscal policies. The free market was regarded as the sacred principle. According to the dominant narrative, the free market prevented the development of the Muslim-Turkish population. It generated a societal and economic division that contained two groups: wealthy Non-Muslims who engaged in commercial occupations and Muslims who were striving to become only civil servants and soldiers. Furthermore, the narrative claims that the Muslim-Turkish bourgeois class did not exist at all before and from the very start of the revolution. However, despite the narrative that this period was one of prosperity for foreign and non-Muslim subjects, it can be demonstrated that the Muslim-Turkish bourgeois class of Ankara made significant commercial progress between 1908 and 1914. For instance, the Bulgurluzade Family emerged as an essential figure in commercial life when the transition to national economic policies was just being adopted. While the family sustained its presence in Ankara in the textile and manufacturing sectors, it also expanded its trade network to Istanbul. The

other commercial families in Ankara also maintained or enhanced their trade in different sectors. Hence, it is quite implausible to deny the existence of the commercial bourgeois class in various provinces of the empire.

With the re-establishment of the parliament and the beginning of the elections nationwide, the strategies of the political parties in the Ottoman Empire regarding their relations with provinces gained importance. Although the CUP had planned for an educated, intellectual, and enlightened list of deputies for the parliament, this intention was not compatible with reality. The influence of influential local figures could not be broken, and the CUP was forced to cooperate with them. Even Çayırlızade Hilmi Bey, a prominent figure from Beypazarı, who was elected as an independent member of the parliament, maximized his influence in the province. Hilmi Bey, who has been accused of numerous crimes ranging from bribing officials to grabbing villagers' pastures, was constantly supported by Talat Pasha, the most powerful member of the CUP. The mode of production and exploitation, as expressed by the peasants, and the position of the landowning and commercial class, which used all its influence for its own benefit, remained unchanged. They adapted to the new changes and continued to maintain their power.

The Balkan Wars and the chain of events that led to the empire's involvement in various disasters fostered the CUP to adopt a more protectionist economic policy and prioritize a single ethnicity and class in terms of economy and politics. The outbreak of the First World War created an opportunity, or even a necessity, for a complete transition to national economic policies. In the eyes of CUP-affiliated intelligentsia, the circumstances were conducive to the emergence of the Muslim-Turkish commercial class. The previously effective market mechanism began to malfunction, and the economy was now under the control of the state. The national

economic policies were prepared for implementation with all its theoretical debates. The historiography of this period also generally embraces the dominant political discourse of the period. It has become a recurring narrative that the Muslim-Turkish bourgeois class was not formed, and its first seeds were sown through state intervention. Yet, in many port cities and provinces, this class had been developing since the Tanzimat period, strengthening its own commercial networks and even kinship relations to reinforce these commercial ties. Rather than a class and commercial community created by the state and presented in a passive position, it would be more consistent to define a class that emerged as a social and economic actor in the policies carried out, utilized these policies for its own class interests and adapted to the contemporary discourses of the period. For instance, the join-stock company initiatives that emerged during the war period were met with a tremendously positive response by the merchants of Ankara, who contributed to the establishment of Kara Kemal's first initiative, the Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi, and united a partnership to establish a company, Ankara Milli Mensucat Anonim Şirketi. Furthermore, as evidenced by Vehbi Koç and those surrounding him, numerous commercial alliances were established.

In conclusion, it is challenging to assert that the commercial families of Ankara, as a provincial bourgeois class case, persisted throughout the liberal period and gained strength during the war years thanks to national economic policies. The families that sustained their vested networks and relations played a pivotal role, rapidly adopting the conditions of the period and increasing their wealth. The pervasive xenophobia, as well as the substantial foundation of ethnic discrimination within the empire, generated significant prospects for them.

These commercial families, which are also purported to have been created during the Early Republican Era just like the claims concerning the Second Constitutional Period, entered the new era, both politically and economically, in a well-positioned.

CHAPTER 4

THE BOURGEOISIE IN RESISTANCE

4.1 The class basis of the National Struggle

At the end of the First World War, the Ottoman Empire was among the defeated states. A resistance would subsequently emerge in Anatolia. In particular, Ankara turned into the epicenter of the resistance. The bourgeois class, which had been rooted from the Tanzimat period to this time and had obtained political power and economic accumulation, positioned itself in front of the new circumstances. By and large, mainly in Anatolia, members of this class sided with Mustafa Kemal and instigated the destiny of the National Struggle. Why this class contributed to the resistance would be significant in terms of comprehending its nature and deeds. Furthermore, an analysis of this class's attitudes– in general and in Ankara – at the beginning and the conclusion of the War of Independence would also be beneficial for the analysis of the Early Republican Period in terms of the continuity of their effects on state policies.

Historians have employed various frameworks so as to categorize the social and economic classes which are predominantly classified into three or four segments. For instance, Sabahattin Selek summarizes society into four classes: aghas and eşrafs, sheiks and clergy, intellectuals, and, lastly, the ordinaries during this period.[181] Additionally, Kamil Erdeha, taking inspiration from Mustafa Kemal, likens those classes to layers of a building. The roof of the building is formed by the top administrators, the walls by the eşrafs, and the foundation by the commoners. The intellectuals, administrators, or civil or military bureaucrats constituted a social class

[181] Selek , *Anadolu İhtilali,* 67-69.

educated in decent schools and served as guiding lights. They were generally considered to be enlightened people by the Unionists in the previous period. The law enforcement officers were under the command of this administrative class. Moreover, they had been almost everywhere throughout Ottoman territory due to the prevalence of the war. They were the representatives of the traditional authority of the state vis-a-vis other classes.[182] Yet, they lacked the capacity to fully comprehend the local nuances, even though they were the pioneers of the resistance. Hence, they had to collaborate with other groups. The only way to garner material and physical power would be to persuade the eşraf.[183] Şevket Süreyya Aydemir accentuates the characteristics of the relationship between classes:

> …In Ottoman Anatolia, the intellectuals were not yet strong enough to come to the forefront… they were forced to get along with the eşraf and the pious. After all, the intellectuals were, in the end, nothing more than the literate people of the cities and towns. Mustafa Kemal, both for the first time in Havza and Amasya, and later on and with the national movement in other cities and regions, encountered the ayans, eşrafs, ulema, and pious as the leader of the people. He reconciled with them.[184]

In the narratives of the National Struggle, the eşraf, as a social and economic class, are typically understood to represent a group that contains merchands, landowners, and clergy members.[185] It would not be possible to evaluate the class status of merchants and landowners independently from the impact of the previous national economic policies during the war years. The policies had a reinforcing influence on their class consciousness and position within the nation.[186] Their reaction to occupation and resistance movements also could not be indispensable to their class

[182] Erdeha, *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler,* 20-22.
[183] Selek, *Anadolu İhtilali,* 69.
[184] Aydemir, *Tek Adam: Mustafa Kemal 1919-1922*, 38-39.
[185] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın*, 286, Selek, *Anadolu İhtilali*, 68 1. Ergil, *Milli Mücadele'nin Sosyal Tarihi,* 48.
[186] Ergil, *Milli Mücadele'nin Sosyal Tarihi,* 48, Tanör, *Türkiye'de Kongre İktidarları (1918 - 1920)*, 116.

interests. It is crucial to note that the immediate aftermath of the war was characterized by a climate of chaos. For instance, Ali Fuat Cebesoy asserts that Anatolia was experiencing a period of profound anarchy. The connections between the peripheries and the center had been severed, and the pre-existing rivalries between the parties had intensified in the provinces following the war. According to Cebesoy, even in a small town, the Unionists and the Itilafists (the sympathizers of the Freedom and Accord Party) had come into direct confrontation. That tension ameliorated the occupation forces' position.[187] Bülent Tanör betokens that the center's influence was limited to from Pendik to Yeşilköy due to the de facto control of Unionist officials in the provinces.[188]

The decision of the eşraf regarding resistance or obedience was affected by regional circumstances and class dynamics. For instance, Celal Bayar posits that the primary concern for this class in Bursa was safeguarding their wealth and property. Their support for the resistance movement fluctuated mainly due to perceived threats and the depredation of their class interests. They supported or participated in resisters in regions where their commercial enterprises, trade connections, wealth, and properties were deemed vulnerable. On the contrary, they preferred to collaborate with occupying forces in areas perceived as less perilous or more conducive to maintaining their privileged status.[189] The fact that they did not show resistance against the occupation in various provinces, especially in the early stages, denotes that they were weighing up the potential results of their actions. A few arguments that they ruminated in their minds could be epitomized. For instance, as mentioned before, cooperation with the occupation forces may be beneficial in protecting their

[187] Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları*, 31.
[188] Tanör, *Türkiye'de Kongre İktidarları (1918 - 1920)*, 78.
[189] Erdeha, *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler,* 32.

wealth. In the context of the local competition, rival eşraf members could adopt different positions; in other words, while one side supported the resistance movement, the other could plump for the occupying forces. Furthermore, the occupying troops sought to attract the eşrafs to their side as a strategy to superintend the local population. In some provinces, the prominent figures acknowledged that if the insurgents prevailed, they would beget a greater risk of losing their zone of influence.[190] Ismail Cem also emphasizes the possibility that the immediate anarchy after the war would be terminated by the authority of the occupying forces. In some western regions that suffered from Greek occupation, the eşraf even had tailors sew Greek flags and prepare ceremonies for the occupying forces.[191] According to Bekir Sami Bey, on 24 May 1919, all the streets in Akhisar were ornamented with Greek flags; additionally, many local people who wished to ensure their property sought to enter into connection with the local Greek population. However, when the detrimental attitude and expansionist policy of the Greek occupation administration surfaced overtly, they shifted to the other side to abstain from any harm. In the regions occupied by the Italians, participation in the resistance movements was relatively low; even certain counter-revolts against the resistance broke out in subsequent years; in general, a hostile attitude was pursued against the War of Independence for a while. In Urfa, Antep, and Maraş, which were the symbol cities against the French occupation, there was no trace of the seeds of resistance at the onset of the occupation. In fact, Adana, Antep, Maraş, and Urfa were not even represented at the Sivas Congress. The Beyazıtzades, one of the leading affluent families of Maraş, even gave a great banquet to the French forces.[192]

[190] Sakallı, *Millî Mücadele'nin Sosyal Tarihi: Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyetleri,* 68.
[191] Cem, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*, 285.
[192] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın*, 286-290.

The local Greeks in the west and the Armenians who managed to survive and return from the deportation in 1915 were also factors that heightened the reaction of the eşraf and people. The eşraf, which had imbued with the mentality of the national economic policies during the war and turned it into an opportunity for capital accumulation, was now under significant threat because of the Greek occupation in the west as well as the returning Armenians potential demands for the property and assets they had left behind. The Armenians would undoubtedly feel a desire for an act of revenge. While one of the first *Müdafaa-i Hukuk* (Defense of National Rights) organizations in Erzurum gave concrete form to this confluence of concerns against the Armenians, the resistance against the French in the south began with the return of Armenians and their participation in the occupation forces.[193] The trials conducted by the Entente powers during this period also held the potential to fuel unrest and resentment in various provinces. For instance, two of the seven members of the first War Tribunal, established on December 16, 1918, were Armenians. The Entente powers got involved in the decision mechanism in those trials, while the Ottoman sultan remained entirely passive.[194] Considering that trials targeted Unionist cadres, it could be reasonable to expect that the local figures with Unionist tendencies harbored fears since the overwhelming majority of local resistance societies formed between November 1918 and March 1919 emerged under the influence of vested Unionists. According to one estimate, 164 out of the 197 branches of Müdafaa-i Hukuk organizations were Unionist-affiliated with their cadres. At this juncture, one should take into consideration that Unionists possessed a puissant organizational apparatus. They wielded significant influence over solidarity organizations such as the Red Crescent and the *Türk Ocağı* (Turkish Hearth) establishments while also

[193] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın*, 292-299.
[194] Tanör, *Türkiye'de Kongre İktidarları (1918 – 1920),* 79.

sustaining control over political and economic structures that constituted the initial resistance organizations such as the *Karakol Cemiyeti* (Guard Society), artisan and tradesman organizations, and the *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* (Special Organization).[195]

For a presented multitude of reasons, the eşraf who supported the National Struggle bore upon the resistance extensively. Their wealth, vested position in trade, and land ownership granted them substantial economic power. Moreover, they held a prominent position as societal leaders, wielding political, religious, and social influence. They had the ability to exert control over the masses and mobilize crowds in provinces. These factors made this class indispensable to the military and bureaucratic spheres of the resistance. The National Struggle's initial financing was almost entirely procured by the eşraf. Tax collection and army recruitment, which could be considered to be responsibilities falling under the purview of administrators, were facilitated by the eşraf's clout on the public.[196] Driven by both their inherent class dynamics and the prevailing post-war conditions outlined above, the eşraf of Ankara witnessed analogous occurrences. The city's emergence as the epicenter of the struggle would further propel them into different positions relatively.

The occupation of the Ottoman provinces by the Entente Powers extended to Ankara, which was a strategically significant province due to its railway connection. In December 1918, two British companies occupied the railway station, followed by French troops shortly thereafter.[197] Archival documents from the occupation period reveal that the British High Commission notified the Ottoman Ministry of Foreign Affairs. They demanded the Ottoman officers in the provinces facilitate the work of British officers who were to arrive in Ankara to supervise the implementation of

[195] Tanör, *Türkiye'de Kongre İktidarları (1918 – 1920),* 117.
[196] Erdeha, *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler,* 23.
[197] Güneş, "Azmi Milli Yurdu Nizamnamesi," 373–82, Şapolyo, *Kemal Atatürk ve Milli Mücadele Tarihi,* 246.

armistice provisions. In a letter dated January 4, 1919, it was requested that the assigned British officers be able to visit any desired institution, building, or person easily, receive the information they wanted, and use transportation vehicles as they wished. These requests from the British authorities were also transmitted to the Ankara Governorate. The names of two officers assigned to Ankara stand out in the documents: "N. Vitol" and "H.V.Vitol."[198] In a telegram dated February 1, 1919, the Ankara Governor informed the Ministry of Interior that the British officers were interfering in matters beyond their authority. He alleged they were trying to send supplies collected for army rations to Istanbul.[199]

The Whittall family, known as Vitol or Vitali in Ottoman Turkish as mentioned in the archival documents, was a prominent and wealthy family with a long history of commercial ties to the Ottoman Empire. Their roots can be traced back to the early 1800s. Charlton Whittall arrived in İzmir from Liverpool in 1808, and his brother James Whitall in 1812. Leveraging the privileges granted to foreign merchants, the Whittall family established a vast trading network and accumulated considerable wealth.[200] A family member, James William Whittall, came into sight as an eminent figure, spearheading the establishment of the British Chamber of Commerce in İstanbul in 1887 and serving as its founding chairman for 20 years. He was even awarded a certificate of appreciation for his contribution to the development of British industry and marketing efforts in the Ottoman Empire.[201] The family extended their influence beyond trade and acquired significant mining concessions, particularly in the Aegean region.[202] Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu notes

[198] BOA, DH.EUM.AYŞ, 65/38-7, 1 Rabiulahir 1337 (January 4, 1919)
[199] BOA, DH.ŞFR.613/2, 29 Rabiulahir, 1337 (February 1, 1919)
[200] Öndeş, *Modalı Vitol Ailesi*, 84.
[201] Öndeş, *Modalı Vitol Ailesi*, 162-164.
[202] For instance, a document dated December 23, 1896, indicates that the family held mining concessions for emery in Aydın: BOA, BEO.885.66316. Similarly, on June 5, 1920, they acquired

that the Whittalls dominated a substantial portion of export activities in İzmir, one of the largest export centers in the empire.[203]

Hugh Mckinley Whittall, as mentioned in the documents, was working in the accounting department of the J.W. Whitall and Co. shipping agency at the outbreak of the First World War. On March 12, 1915, he was summoned to the Reserve Officers Personnel Directorate to serve as an interpreter in the Mediterranean units due to his proficiency in Turkish and German. He, who served in various units, including Gallipoli, was eventually assigned to Ankara.[204] It is implausible that his family was not recognized by Ankara's commercial bourgeoisie due to its commercial relations in multiple regions of the empire. Moreover, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, in his memoirs, mentions that the officers serving in the British occupation forces in Ankara were involved in trade activities. He encountered his former comrade Ali *Çavuş* (sergeant) in Ankara and asked him what he was doing in the city. Ali had been wounded in the Balkan Wars and was left with a disabled leg. Therefore, he did not participate in the World War and preferred to go into business in Ankara. He complained to Ali Fuat regarding the British control officers, accusing them of using their administrative positions to buy goods cheaply. Ali Fuat emphasizes that he saw an opportunity to utilize this situation to his advantage, at least for a transition period in his mind; he did not object to the British trade and even stated that he would help them if possible. In doing so, he would be able to request certain services from them. He put his plan into action and did not interfere with their commercial activities. In return, he managed to have them write some reports in which he was interested.

---

mining concessions in Ereğli: BOA, ŞD.1268.24 Numerous other examples can be found in the archives. Even during the early Republican period, in1927, an antimony-arsenic mine in the village of Preme in Balıkesir was transferred to another family member: BCA.30.18.1.1/23.11.12

[203] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın*, 190-191.

[204] Öndeş, Modalı Vitol Ailesi, 181-202.

According to him, the British did not have the courage to constitute an impediment to his deeds and did not cause any trouble that jeopardized the outgrowth of the resistance movement.[205] Erdeha, on the other hand, argued that it was unthinkable that the British, who controlled the world textile industry, would not interfere in the wool trade in Ankara. Their intervention in this trade had put the eşraf of Ankara against them because of a conflict of interest.[206]

At the onset of the occupation period in Ankara, incidents of harassment of a Muslim woman in Samanpazarı sparked the events and led to the establishment of a secret organization against the occupation forces. With the unveiling of the organization, nearly ninety people, including the city's prominent figures, were arrested by Governor Muhittin Pasha.[207] According to the account of Hazım Kınacı, the son of Kınacızade Şakir, those prominent figures contained Kınacızade Şakir, Attarzade Sadullah, Bulgurluzade Mehmet, Sheikh of the Hacı Bayram Sufi Order Şemsettin, and Hanifzade Mehmet Bey were arrested due to the death of a British soldier during the events. They were also indicted to play a role in the Armenian deportations in 1915.[208] Accounts from this period mention that Kınacızade Şakir stated that the Gregorian Armenians were considered the perpetrators by them, and he requested his family not to cause any riot while he was being sent to Istanbul by train.[209] Eventually, they were sent to Istanbul for trial, but it is claimed that they escaped from prison and returned to Ankara after a while.[210] Ali Fuat's memoirs corroborate the incident. According to his narrative, Governor Muhittin Pasha

[205] Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları*, 51-69.
[206] Erdeha, *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler,* 233.
[207] Erdeha, *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler*, 233. According to Şapolyo, the number of those arrestes was 190, Şapolyo, *Kemal Atatürk ve Milli Mücadele Tarihi,* 247-248.
[208] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara*, 84.
[209] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara,* 189.
[210] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara,* 84.

supported the Istanbul government against the resistance movements. While he was still in Konya, several arrests were made. *İngiliz Muhipleri Cemiyeti* (Society of the Friends of England) assisted in these arrests, and a deportation court was established, which included some Christians who had returned.[211] According to Taşkın, a meeting held on June 8, 1919, with the participation of nearly five thousand people from Beypazarı, Kalecik, Kırşehir, Çubuk, and other regions, led by Mufti Rifat, altered the British and French administratives' decision. As a result, the Ankara prisoners in Istanbul were released.[212]

All these accounts and archival documents align with the general characteristics and class dynamics of Ankara's eşraf during the period. Ankara, holding a unique position in terms of trade and transportation, attracted the attention of the British and French, leading to its occupation. The British officers stationed there probably sought to engage in the mohair and wool trade, with which they were familiar. This attempt, in a sense, posed a threat to eşraf's primary source of income and undermined their class interests. Recognizing the increasingly detrimental nature of the prevailing circumstances, the eşraf deemed it expedient to contribute to the resistance. The prominence of certain individuals and the assumption of responsibilities by a specific group of people within the resistance organizations in Ankara, mirroring a pattern observed in other regions, invites a class-based analysis. On the other hand, Ankara was the city of merchants and tradesmen, and eşraf benefited from the Unionist policies that envisioned the creation of a national bourgeoisie and achieved significant economic accumulation during the war. Although the CUP officially dissolved on November 5, 1918, unofficial Unionist activity continued to operate in Ankara. Enver Behnan Şapolyo asserts that there was

[211] Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları*, 49.
[212] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 226-227.

a shop named *Tesanüt* (Solidarity) among the row of shops under the commercial complex called *Taşhan*, which was not open for business and served as a center for the resistance movement.[213]

Although the exact date of its establishment remains unknown, the first resistance organization in Ankara emerged in the subsequent days of the occupation of İzmir. This organization was named *Azmi Milli* (National Will). An examination of the founders of the organization reveals that they were predominantly drawn from the educated middle class of the city rather than commercial and landowner bourgeoisie. The founders included Lieutenant Colonel Mahmut, chemist Avni Refik Berkman, teacher Mahir İz, Ali Rıza from Ayaş, Teacher Yakup, Ekrem, and Fevzi. The primary intention was to foster national resistance by establishing scouting organizations, offering evening classes to the public, organizing various cultural activities to raise public awareness, and assisting in revitalizing the city's economy and trade. This organization generated the intellectual groundwork for the Müdafaa-i Hukuk organization, which would be established later.[214] The class, defined as "enlightened" in Kemalist literature and historiography, had fulfilled its duty as the first step in enlightening the public.

Ali Fuat's initial contact concerning the resistance movement in Ankara was with zade Rifat.[215] The participants of their first meeting consisted of Börekçizade

[213] Aydın et al., *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, 363.
[214] Güneş, "Azmi Milli Yurdu Nizamnamesi," 375-377.
[215] Mehmet Rifat's father was Ali Kazım from the Börekçizade family. He received his religious education in Istanbul and obtained an *icazet* (religious license). He became the mufti of Ankara in 1908 and served as the *kaymakam* (district governor) of Sivrihisar for a period in 1911 on an acting basis. In response to the fatwas issued by the Istanbul government that called the heretics the resisters, he became the leading figure in organizing the counter-fatwas. A group of prominent scholars drafted counter-fatwas containing statements concerning the religious legitimacy of the National Struggle and declared that the sultan was also a captive in Istanbul. There were signatures of 153 individuals, and those fatwas provided religious solid justification for the resistance movement: Sarıkoyuncu, *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları: Ahmet Hulusi, Mehmet Rifat Hacı Tevfik ve Abdurrahman Kâmil Efendiler*, 133-152.

Rifat, Kütükçüzade Ali, Ademzade Ahmet, Kınacızade Şakir, and Hanifzade Mehmet. Börekçizade Rifat took the lead in establisihing a Müdafaa-i Hukuk association in Ankara. The association's founders included Ömer Mümtaz, Hacı Atıf, Toygarzade Naşit, Ekrem (who later became the governor of Rize), Tolluzade Müderris Hacı Rıfat, Hatıpzade Hacı Mehmet, Çayırlızade Hilmi, Hanifzade Mehmet, Sheikh of the Hacı Bayram Sufi Order Şemsettin, Attarzade Rasim, and Kınacızade Şakir Bey.[216] On October 29, 1919, the Heyet-i Merkeziye (Central Committee) of the association was established with the election of its members. Börekçizade Rifat became president, and the other members were Major Fuat (representing the 20th Corps), Yahya Galip (treasurer), Hanifzade Mehmet, Bulgulurzade Mehmet, Serattarzade Rasim, Hacı Ahmed (Preacher of Arslanhane Mosque), Kınacızade Mehmet, Tolluzade Müderris Haci Rifat, and Ademzade Ahmet.[217] This newly formed Heyet-i Merkeziye began to manage all Ankara-related affairs independently. By April 23, 1920, they had made a total of 66 decisions, including organizing Ankara's crafts and artisans under the municipality. They were organized and enrolled as members of the association, enabling the collection of essential funds.[218]

Before Mustafa Kemal arrived in Ankara, the *Heyet-i Temsiliye* (Representative Assembly), the executive branch of the national struggle, received substantial financial aid from the Müdafaa-i Hukuk association in Ankara. The incomplete building for the new parliament in Ankara was also funded by this association. A total of 1,485,261 guruş was collected. 100,000 guruş of this amount was given to Mustafa Keaml for the expenses of the Heyet-i Temsiliye. Additionally,

[216] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara,* 81.
[217] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara*, 91-92, Uluğ, *Hemşehrimiz Atatürk*, 11.
[218] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara,* 91-92.

the hotel expenses of the deputies were covered using this money.[219] Börekçizade Rifat's son, former Ankara Mayor Fuat Börekçi, asserts that his father saved a substantial amount of money and gave it to Mustafa Kemal. Equivalently, Bahri Kınacı, the son of Kınacızade Şakir, mentiones that this amount was around 1000 liras, and Şakir Bey also donated around 5,000 liras.[220] It is also claimed that in the days following the Sivas Congress, the eşraf of Ankara collected 18,000 liras and delivered them to Mustafa Kemal.[221] Notably, the Çankaya Mansion, which later became the Presidential Palace, was also gifted to Mustafa Kemal by the eşraf of Ankara. According to Bahri Kınacı's narrative, the land was purchased 250 years ago by an English merchant named Edward, who had a mansion built on it. In 1914, an Armenian Kasapyan bought the land. With the arrival of the British, Kasapyand sided with them and assisted them. After Ankara turned into an epicenter of the national struggle, the municipality sized the mansion. Later, Bulgurluzade Mehmet Bey bought the land from the municipality for 9,000 liras. Mayor Kütükçüzade Ali, Kınacıza Şakir, and other friends gathered at a vineyard in Çankaya in one day. Mustafa Kemal later joined them. He expressed his admiration for the mansion's location; for this reason, Bulgurluzade transferred the land back to the municipality for the same amount, and the municipality, in turn, gifted the land to Mustafa Kemal.[222] Whether this account and narrative is entirely accurate remains a historical enigma. It is also possible that the land was confiscated during the Armenian Deportation in 1915. There are also varying accounts of how much it was sold to the

[219] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara,* 91-92.
[220] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara*, 106.
[221] Uluğ, *Hemşehrimiz Atatürk,* 258.
[222] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara,* 126.

municipality.[223] Nevertheless, the mansion and the land were undoubtedly gifted by the people of Ankara to Mustafa Kemal.

The political stance of the eşraf played a decisive role in Ankara. It was the period that witnessed the emergence of an outstanding breakage between the local political authority held by eşraf families since the Tanzimat period and the pro-Entente power central government in Istanbul. In the early stages, the people of Ankara sought to voice their grievances against Governor Muhittin Pasha's actions directly to the sultan. A group of prominent figures gathered at Yahya Galip's house; he was the treasurer in Ankara. They proceeded to the telegraph office and demanded the Sultan's immediate presence at the Palace Telegraph Office. However, the telegraph machine in Babıali was connected instead of the sultan, and the group that could not reach out to the sultan addressed Damat Ferit with the uncomplying statement: "We do not recognize you as Grand Vizier."[224] While the veracity of this incident remains in question, it was just one form of resistance indication against the Istanbul government. Eventually, as the resistance gained tremendous momentum, Governor Muhittin Pasha was arrested and sent to Sivas.[225] The Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet in Istanbul, which replaced the Damat Ferit's, sought to appoint Ziya Pasha, the former governor of Bitlis, to replace Muhittin Pasha. Yet, the public, organized and directed by Mufti Rifat, protested against this appointment. Mustafa Kemal and the Heyet-i Temsiliye were unfruitful despite their efforts to quell Ankara's eşraf due to political balances and relations inaugurated with the Ali Rıza Paşa cabinet. Ankara's eşraf and organized people desired Yahya Galip to be appointed as the

[223] Karaveli states that the mansion was sold to Bulgurluzade Tevfik Efendi for 4,500 liras: Karaveli, *Bir Ankara Ailesi'nin Öyküsü,* 54, and according to Taşkın, it was sold for 4,000 liras: Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 290.
[224] Uluğ, *Hemşehrimiz Atatür,* 37.
[225] Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları,* 93.

acting governor.[226] Müdafaa-i Hukuk associations in Beypazarı, Kalecik, and Nallıhan supported this decision with petitions.[227] The pressure proved effective, and the Istanbul government decided to abandon its new appointment of Ziya Pasha and allowed Yahya Galip to become the acting governor.[228] Sabahattin Tolluoğlu, grandson of Tolluzade Hacı Rifat, states that his grandfather also became the acting mayor. According to his statements, the municipal council consisted of Attarzade Sadullah, Kınacızade Şakir, Börekçizade Rifat, Ademzade Ahmet, and Kütükçüzade Ali Bey.[229]

The group that welcomed Mustafa Kemal at Dikmen upon his arrival in Ankara consisting of those eşraf members: Börekçizade Rifat, Kınacızade Şakir, Attarbaşızade Rasim, Toygarzade Naşit, Ademzade Ahmet, Hatıpzade Ahmet, Kütükçüzade Ali, Hacı Atıf, Hanifzade Mehmet ve Bulgurluzade Tevfik. [230] Some of those individuals would exert substantial influence on the newly established republic's political spheres. Börekçizade Rifat, who held the position of mufti of Ankara, was elected as the deputy of Menteşe in the first term of the Turkish Grand National Assembly. On 3 September 1920, with the enactment of Nisab-ı Müzakere Kanunu (Quorum Law), he preferred to serve as the mufti since the law necessitated a choice between being a civil officer or a member of parliament.[231] On April 1, 1924, he was appointed as the President of Religious Affairs and continued to serve in this position until he died in 1941.[232] Furthermore, Kınacızade Şakir became one of Mustafa Kemal's most prominent local figures, serving as the deputy for Ankara

[226] Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları*, 245-246.
[227] ATASE, AK. 14.0.106, 15 Kanunuevvel 1335, December 15, 1919.
[228] Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları,* 246.
[229] Bağlum, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara*, 90.
[230] Bağlım, *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara,* 97.
[231] Çolak, "I. TBMM'de Menteşe (Muğla) Mebusları ve Meclisteki Faaliyetleri (1920-1923)," 148-149.
[232] Gözaydın, *Diyanet: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Dinin Tanzimi*, 62.

for six terms from the opening of the Grand Nasional Assembly.[233] Aktarzade Rasim was elected as a deputy for Ankara in the 1934 by-election at the behest of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk.[234] He was re-elected for the subsequent term and continued to serve until his passing.[235] Although Çayırlızade Hilmi was not part of the welcoming committee according to the accounts, however, he was, as mentioned above, a member of the Müdafaa-i Hukuk organization and served as the deputy for Ankara in both the first and second terms.[236] Despite being the subject of numerous lawsuits during the reigns of Abdulhamid II. and the Second Constitutional Period, it seems that he maintained his ability to guarantee his political influence in the novel order.

4.2 Trade in turbulent times

Examining what extent the eşraf of Ankara, many of whom were in the commercial bourgeois class, were able to sustain their trade activities during the National Struggle and in which sectors they maintained their influence is substantial in order to understand the continuity and their capability in turbulent times. For instance, the Ankara Milli Mensucat Anonim Şirketi, established in the Second Constitutional Period, was unable to continue its operations in 1921-1922 sufficiently. The company's absence from the exhibition held during the İzmir Economic Congress, which convened immediately before the proclamation of the republic, could be seen as an indicator of this situation. The company's inadequacies during this period could also be observed in intra-parliamentary discussions. During a session in 1921, a bill of law was proposed to mandate that officers and civil servant uniforms be made from domestically produced fabric. Concerning the proposed bill of law, Hasan

[233] Demirel, *Birinci Meclis'te Muhalefet: İkinci Grup*, 585.
[234] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi*, 53.
[235] BCA, MGM. 30.10.0.0 / 75.496.5
[236] Demirel, *Birinci Meclis'te Muhalefet: İkinci Grup,* 585.

Basri, deputy of Karesi, cited the company and stated that it was unable to overcome its defects. During his visit to the company, he observed that Christians were operating all the looms; for this reason, he reprehended the present condition of the company. Ömer Lütfi, the Minister of Public Works, on the other hand, accentuated that the production of the company did not meet quality standards, yet the state continued to purchase fabric for soldiers.[237] While analogous criticisms were voiced in the parliament, they focused on the company's insufficient Turkish identity in the production process and its quality. Nevertheless, the company achieved to obtain support, which reflects the economic mindset of the previous period.

One of the most significant indicators of the commercial continuity during this period was the establishment of *Türkiye Milli İthalat ve İhracat Anonim Şirketi* (Turkish National Import and Export Joint Stock Company) with a capital of 100,000 liras.[238] The company was founded in Ankara on September 19, 1922, shortly after the Turkish army entered İzmir, and the withdrawal of occupation forces from Anatolia marked the end of the military phase of the National Struggle. According to Selim İlkin's ascertainment, it is possible to trace the company's establishment back to July, as reported in newspapers. This means the thought of establishing this company was conceived while the National Struggle was still ongoing. The company's general objectives can be outlined as follows: to procure goods and commercial items imported into Turkey directly from the regions where they are produced and sell them wholesale; to open retail stores; to export domestically produced goods through intermediation or directly on behalf of the company; and to request the monopoly of specified goods.[239] Within the first six months, the company

[237] Varlık, Ankara Millî Mensucat [Türk] Anonim Şirketi (1916-1930), 76-77.
[238] BCA, KDB. 30.18.1.1 / 5.29.3
[239] İlkin, "Türkiye Milli İthalat ve İhracat Anonim Şirketi," 201-203.

achieved a profit of 15,956 liras. It brought the flour and cotton mills in Adana and the mines in Zonguldak into full operation, played a role in the completion of the construction of the cannon and ammunition factories in Ankara, rectified and enlarged the routes of the Ankara-Sivas railway, and completed the construction of the cold storage chambers of the Istanbul Municipal Slaughterhouse.[240] The company's founders contained 54 deputies and 37 merchants. It is also known that most of them were former members of the CUP. Those merchants involved Hanifzade Mehmet, Attarzade Rasim, Mehmet Rıfat (a merchant from Ankara, family name unspecified), Kütükçüzade Fevzi, Çayırlızae Hilmi, Kınacızade Şakir, and Bulgurluzade Mehmet.[241] The commercial bourgeoisie in Ankara, which had been involved in the establishment of joint stock companies during the period of national economic policies, also considered this company to be an opportunity. In 1925, Çayırlızade Hilmi even succeeded in joining the company's board of directors.[242]

According to the Annuaire Oriental of 1921, Hanifzade Mehmed was listed as a money changer. Kınacızade Ahmed was involved in the copper sector, and Yağcızade İsmail was engaging in the oil sector. Another family member of the Yağcızades, Mesut, was listed in the section on grain trade. Bulgurluzade Tevfik was visible in the textile, and he was with Serattarzade Sadullah, Çubukçuğazade Ağa, and Çulhazade Osman were listed as manufacturers, and in Istanbul, Bulgurluzades, Tevfik and Mehmet, maintained their presence in the manufacturing business named Bulgurluzade Brothers. One can also observe a partnership between Hanifzade and Mermercizade in Istanbul, which was the same occupation. In Beypazarı, Çayırlızade

[240] İlkin, "Türkiye Milli İthalat ve İhracat Anonim Şirketi," 219-220.
[241] İlkin, "Türkiye Milli İthalat ve İhracat Anonim Şirketi," 229-230.
[242] İlkin, "Türkiye Milli İthalat ve İhracat Anonim Şirketi," 221.

family was involved in various sectors. Hilmi was listed as a farmer while also being involved in the grain trade and sericulture together with Hakkı.[243] In 1922, Çayırlızade Hilmi and Hakkı involved in the rice trade in Beypazarı as well. All other names subsisted in the same sectors as in the previous year. The almanacs compiled for 1921 and 1922 do not contain some names that were used in the previous ones. It is possible that some of them have actually left specific sectors; the war conditions may have also affected the preparation process of these lists.[244]

By examining Vehbi Koç's memoirs, it would be observed that he was able to travel for his business relations from Ankara to Istanbul with Çubukçuzade Arif during this turbulent period. He visited the store of *Milli Ticaret Şirketi* (National Trade Company), in which Aktarzade Sadullah Bey was a partner, and also met with Arif's uncle Paşa Efendi, who was also a partner in the company and whose name appeared in the almanacs as Çubukçupaşazade or Çubukçuağazade. Vehbi Koç states that he was not drafted into the army during the National Struggle since he did not have a high school degree when he reached military age. With the opening of the Grand National Assembly in 1920, he submitted a petition to Recep Peker and started working at the printing house. This would be considered to be a turning point or significant step for Koç in terms of the relationship that he established with the state officials in the following period and its advantages for his business life.[245]

In light of the presented information, while the chaotic environment and specific conditions caused by the National Struggle might have made commercial life more difficult, they did not disrupt it. Indeed, as a result of the maintenance of national economic policies that formed the backbone of this struggle, the commercial

[243] *Annuaire Oriental. Oriental Directory, commerce, industrie administration magistrature 1921*.
[244] *Annuaire Oriental. Oriental Directory, commerce, industrie administration magistrature 1922.*
[245] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç*, 48-54.

bourgeoisie in Ankara was able to become a partner in new companies and achieved significant profits in a certain period. While political relations were strengthening day by day, commercial relations sprouted in return. The stance taken by Ankara eşraf would ensure that they would sustain their influence both politically and economically during the Early Republican Era.

4.3 Conclusion

The Ottoman Empire's defeat in the First World War gave rise to the emergence of resistance movements in Anatolia. Although these movements were initially led by high-ranking military officers and bureaucrats, organizing the local populace and securing financial support required the involvement of the eşraf. The stance of this class towards the resistance movements was influenced by several factors. During the initial stages of the occupation, they did not support resistance movements as long as their commercial ties, wealth, and properties remained unharmed. In fact, at times, they allied with the occupation forces, which proved to be more profitable for safeguarding their own interests. Under local conditions, rival members of the class preferred different positions. While one faction supported the resistance, another collaborated with the occupation forces. Moreover, the occupation forces, akin to the strategy of Ottoman military officers and bureaucrats, also sought to influence the eşraf and collaborate with them to mobilize the local populace in their favor. Crucially, the fear that returning Armenian deportees would reclaim their properties or seek vengeance propelled the eşraf towards supporting the resistance movements.

Specific characteristics of the general class attitude during the occupation can also be observed in the specific context of Ankara. Notably, the appointment of members of the prominent Whittall family, who were involved in trade for many

years in the Ottoman Empire, as officers tasked with inspecting the armistice terms in Ankara triggered a backlash among the eşraf of Ankara. Under the policies implemented during the Second Constitutional Period and the war, the commercial bourgeoisie had significantly expanded their trade networks. However, fearing the potential disruption of this gain, they resorted to organizing against the occupation forces. Furthermore, the implications of being accused of complicity in the Armenian deportation and the fear of Armenian retribution pushed them towards supporting the resistance movements. In Ankara, the eşraf, under the leadership of Börekçizade Rifat, played a pivotal role in financing the National Struggle. They collected thousands of liras among themselves, providing crucial support to the resistance from establishing the new parliament to procuring Mustafa Kemal's residence. These contributions would pave the way for them to secure prominent political positions later.

Despite the prevailing chaos and anarchy of the era, the commercial bourgeoisie endeavored to maintain their business operations. Although Ankara Milli Mensucat Anonim Şirketi faced challenges and was even criticized by the newly established parliament, it managed to survive by securing political support. Even amidst the ongoing National Struggle, the commercial bourgeoisie, with political backing, managed to establish a new company. This company, named Türkiye Milli İthalat ve İhracat Anonim Şirketi, aimed to consolidate Turkey's import and export operations under its umbrella. Within its first six months, the company achieved significant profits. A substantial number of Ankaralı merchants joined the company as founding partners. While annual records from this period do not provide detailed information, it is evident that many merchants continued to operate in their pre-war fields. The most vivid memoirs from this era are those of Vehbi Koç, who, despite

the turmoil, managed to travel from Ankara to Istanbul and strengthen his commercial ties.

As a result, the merchants and landowners of Ankara, who supported the War of Independence by prioritizing their own class interests, gained critical political positions and economic interests. Some of them became parliament members, and some undertook responsibilities in prominent institutions and entered into company partnerships while the struggle was still ongoing. They would also open important areas for themselves in the organization of the new state.

CHAPTER 5

THE REPUBLIC AND ITS PROTÉGÉS

5.1 İzmir Economic Congress

While the period between 1923 and 1929 of the newly established republic is often characterized as a liberal era economically, Michael M. Finefrock argues that this illusion is based on the messages espoused at the Izmir Economic Congress held during the Lausanne Conferences.[246] Examining the characteristics of the congress at this juncture would allow one to draw conclusions concerning both general economic planning and the role of the commercial and landowning bourgeois class in the new order. Ankara has now become the political center. Anatolian merchants, who had become particularly powerful and profitable during the war, increased their influence and developed their relations as catalysts for the National Struggle. Additionally, Istanbul merchants, who remained relatively outside the resistance movements, did not want to lose their importance.[247] As soon as the War of Independence was won in the military field, Istanbul merchants embarked on the path of organization. They established the *Milli Türk Ticaret Birliği* (National Turkish Trade Union) on December 1, 1922. The aim of the union was to seize the commercial position held by Levantines, Greeks, and Armenians by utilizing the nationalist atmosphere. Ahmed Hamdi Başar, the mastermind of the union, advocated for the nationalization of trade via liberal views and free competition conditions, as well as for state intervention to achieve this aim fully.[248] In fact, this idea would lead to the convening of the İzmir Economic Congress in a sense.

---

[246] Finefrock, "Laissez-Faire, the 1923 Izmir Economic Congress and Early Turkish Developmental Policy in Political Perspective," 375–376.
[247] Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi,* 127.
[248] Başar and Koraltürk, *Ahmet Hamdi Başar'ın Hatıraları: "Gazi Bana Çok Kızmış ..."*, 132-137.

The MTTB aimed to organize a congress to explore ways for Muslim-Turkish merchants in order to establish commercial relations with Europe and America. They had invited a wide range of participants from various circles. However, the congress was postponed until January 15, 1923, due to incomplete preparations. The Ministry of Economy also requested the postponement of the congress for another three months, citing that the government will convene a congress in İzmir in February. While the postponed congress never convened, the MTTB had laid the groundwork for the congress in İzmir. With the inability to reach an agreement between concerned parties on various articles during the Lausanne negotiations, the congress convened in İzmir on February 17, 1923. There were 1135 people from multiple professional groups, including merchants, farmers, industrialists, and workers. The congress concluded on March 4, 1923.[249] Kazım Karabekir Pasha was elected as the president of the congress, and Ahmed Hamdi was elected as the secretary of the congress.[250] Prior to the Congress, Mustafa Kemal organized a tour to share his economic views with both the public and the press. For instance, on January 31, 1923, in İzmir, he delivered the following remarks:

> … In my opinion, our nation does not possess diverse classes pursuing vastly differing interests, thus engaging in constant conflict with one another. The existing classes are mutually interdependent. Consequently, the People's Party can dedicate itself to safeguarding the rights and ensuring the progress and prosperity of all classes.[251]

Likewise, in his conversation with the people of İzmir on February 3, 1923, he stated that:

> The consequences we have witnessed due to political parties that act as if there are distinct classes in our country are well-known. In reality, when we

[249] Koraltürk, *Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Ekonomin Türkleştirilmesi*, 97-99.
[250] Şahinkaya, *Cumhuriyet'ten Önceki Son Kurucu Kongre: Türkiye İktisat Kongresi (İzmir, 17 Şubat - 4 Mart 1923)*, 221.
[251] Şahinkaya, *Cumhuriyet'ten Önceki Son Kurucu Kongre: Türkiye İktisat Kongresi (İzmir, 17 Şubat - 4 Mart 1923)*, 94.

> speak of the People's Party, we are referring to the entire nation, not just a segment thereof ...[252]

This segment of his speech, which essentially served as a continuation of his discourse on national economics, provided significant clues regarding the Congress:

> As you know, our country is an agricultural nation. Therefore, the vast majority of our people are farmers and shepherds. This being the case, it comes to mind that there are large landowners and farmers. How many people in our country own large tracts of land? What is the extent of this land? If examined, it will be seen that no one owns large tracts of land in proportion to the size of our country. Therefore, these landowners are also people to be protected. Then come artisans and small traders who trade in towns. Of course, we are obliged to secure and protect their interests, conditions, and futures. Just like the large landowners, who we assume to be the opponents of farmers, there are no people with large capital opposite these traders. How many millionaires do we have? None. Therefore, we are not going to be enemies of those who have little money. On the contrary, we will strive to raise many millionaires, even billionaires.[253]

While the discourse was dominated by the idea of a classless society based on a cooperative approach, it was repeatedly emphasized that the bourgeois class would also be protected to foster the development of the country.

There was no outright opposition to foreign investment at the congress, and the importance of adherence to national laws and regulations was emphasized. Both the MTTB and the state concurred on the same stance. The MTTB proposed a set of restrictions on foreign investment, advocated the reservation of specific industries for domestic capital, denial of privileges and special permits to foreign companies, and exclusion from government contracts. In addition, the trade group specifically advocated for the Turkification of chambers of commerce and stock exchanges.[254] The core principles adopted by the participating delegations at the Congress comprise a total of 302 articles. Within these decisions, the number of proposals the

[252] Şahinkaya, *Cumhuriyet'ten Önceki Son Kurucu Kongre: Türkiye İktisat Kongresi (İzmir, 17 Şubat - 4 Mart 1923)*, 101.
[253] Şahinkaya, *Cumhuriyet'ten Önceki Son Kurucu Kongre: Türkiye İktisat Kongresi (İzmir, 17 Şubat - 4 Mart 1923)*, 102.
[254] Koraltürk, *Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Ekonomin Türkleştirilmesi*, 105-109.

merchant group recommended was 125. This corresponds to 41.39% of the total decisions. These decisions, which carry the core of a multinational economy instead of a liberal perspective, also foresee state intervention in certain areas.[255] Therefore, according to Boratav, there are striking similarities between the 1923-1929 period and the 1908-1922 period, together with the post-congress implementations.[256] According to Yahya Sezai Tezel, the Kemalist cadres pursued an interventionist economic program from the foundation of the republic in order to create a propitious environment. In his eyes, what distinguished the 1920s from the 1930s was not the absence or scarcity of this interventionist policy. It was the change in the weight given to private enterprise as the social element that would drive and enhance industrial development. In the 1920s, the state hoped to achieve rapid economic growth through the Turkish businessmen that it created or supported through its interventions in the economy.[257]

According to the instructions prepared for the congress, eight delegates were to be sent from each district. It was decided to have one representative each for merchants, artisans, laborers, companies, and banks, as well as three representatives for farmers.[258] Furthermore, while it was stated that numerous members of parliament and bureaucrats from Ankara would attend the Congress, they were unable to do so in order to secure a majority in the Assembly. In this regard, it can be assumed that Kınacızade Şakir was also not present at the meeting.[259] However, according to the Annuaire Oriental for the years 1924-1925, the Milli İthalat ve

[255] Şahinkaya, *Cumhuriyet'ten Önceki Son Kurucu Kongre: Türkiye İktisat Kongresi (İzmir, 17 Şubat - 4 Mart 1923)*, 276.
[256] Boratav, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985,* 28.
[257] Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi,* 206.
[258] Şahinkaya, *Cumhuriyet'ten Önceki Son Kurucu Kongre: Türkiye İktisat Kongresi (İzmir, 17 Şubat - 4 Mart 1923)* 156.
[259] Ökçün, *Türkiye İktisat Kongresi 1923 – İzmir: Haberler – Belgeler – Yorumlar*, 203.

İhracat Anonim Şirketi, who had partners from Ankara and Bulgurluzade Tevfik were members of the MTTB, suggesting that Ankara origin merchants were also among the attendees.[260] In this context, it is plausible to assume that Istanbul and Ankara merchants shared common ground on certain principles.

The MTTB's advocacy for the Turkification of chambers of commerce would be translated into practical action following this congress. The Istanbul Chamber of Commerce and Industry serves as a prime illustration of this initiative. It is worth noting that the chamber's activities were significantly hampered during the Armistice period. MTTB adopted a forceful approach toward the chamber. Its primary goal was to transform the chamber's governing body and establish a dominant presence for Muslim-Turkish elements. The chamber's governing council's term had expired on March 16, 1921. Yet, no renewal of the council had taken place due to the ongoing war and peace negotiations. MTTB demanded that elections be held to reconstitute the council by citing the regulations of 1910. As per the regulations, the council of the chamber in the capital city should have twenty-four members, and the other cities should have twelve members in their councils. With the relocation of the government's capital to Ankara, MTTB recognized the need for a corresponding adjustment in the composition of the Istanbul Chamber of Commerce's Governing Council. They were arguing that the number should be reduced to twelve. With the government's support, MTTB successfully pushed for the renewal of elections. The elections, held on August 1-2, 1923, resulted in the MTTB securing the seats, enabling it to place its own members on the council.[261] The chamber had become Turkified; names like İbrahim Paşazade, Hacızade, Yelkencizade, Kırzade, Velizade, Sofuzade, and Nemlizade managed to dethrone Manokyan, Dikran, Vitali, Kamhi

[260] *1924-1925 Annuaire Oriental.*
[261] Koraltürk, *Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Ekonomin Türkleştirilmesi*, 141-142.

and Zaven.[262] On the other hand, the extent to which this process applies to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Ankara remains unclear. It is believed that the chamber in Ankara was not sufficiently effective prior to 1926. The chamber, renewed or re-established in 1926, commenced its operations with a twelve-member board. As seen in the pre-Republican provincial yearbooks, non-Muslims also served on the chamber's governing board.[263] However, according to the Annuaire Oriental covering the years 1924-25, the governing board of the chamber consisted of twelve members, with Kınacızade Şakir Bey as the president. It can be observed that the remaining eleven members of this board were also Turkish. The influence of the prominent figures involved in the National Struggle would also be evident in the chamber. After Kınacızade Şakir Bey, Serattarzade Rasim would take over the presidency in the 1930s, and Emin Sazak and Vehbi Koç will follow as presidents.[264]

5.2 Politics and trade in Ankara

The class that shined during the National Struggle played a leading role in its success by mobilizing the masses and providing financial support; it was naturally destined to become the favorite of the newly established republic. Immediately after the completion of the military struggle, Mustafa Kemal would embark on the organization of a new political party. On January 15, 1923, he commenced an extensive nationwide tour that lasted until the end of March. That tour encompassed these cities: Eskişehir, İzmit, Bursa, İzmir, Balıkesir, Adana, Mersin, Tarsus, Konya, and Afyonkarahisar. The tour destinations provided clues regarding the class base upon which the party would rely for support and legitimacy. These were the regions

[262] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın*, 444.
[263] Kavak, *Ankara'nın İktisadi Tarihine Dair Bir Tetkik: Ankara Ticaret Odası Örneği 1938 – 1950*, 2.
[264] Kavak, *Ankara'nın İktisadi Tarihine Dair Bir Tetkik: Ankara Ticaret Odası Örneği 1938 – 1950*, 48.

where market relations were relatively more advanced and were most influenced by interactions with capitalist metropolises. Turkish merchants and large landowners in these regions wielded significant influence not only in economic matters but also in political and social spheres.[265] On the other hand, Ankara, which had become the center of the National Struggle, was now the center and capital of the newly founded republic. The eşraf, who had previously engaged in interactions under provincial conditions, now had direct contact with the central administration and cadre. As aforementioned, many leading figures maintained their influence for many years, either as members of parliament or in other civil positions in government. These individuals or their children also had an impact on the Republican People's Party's organization in Ankara. Şakir Kınacı, who was also the brother-in-law of mufti Rifat Börekçi, in particular, stood out prominently among Ankara's eşraf during the single-party era. He played a significant role in the establishment of the party's provincial organization. In fact, the organization was initially housed in the Kınacızade's home.[266] Another example is Vehbi Koç, who had joined the Müdafaa-i Hukuk association at the age of 19 with his father, who later became a member of the party. He would later serve as a party's provincial executive board member.[267]

In Ankara, the opportunities for trade and profit had multiplied. The city, which had a population of 25,000 during the National Struggle, was now the state's center and its needs were growing day by day. By the end of 1926, the population had reached 58,749; in the 1927 census, it had increased to 78,784.[268] Due to the ever-increasing needs, the vested commercial bourgeoisie in Ankara was also expanding their business areas. For instance, Vehbi Koç set aside his grocery, corner

[265] Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi*, 125-126.
[266] Aydın et al., *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, 522.
[267] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç,* 166.
[268] Çapa, "Devlet Merkezinin İnşa Sürecinde Ankara Şehreminliği ve Şehreminleri (1924-1930)," 77.

shop, and hardware businesses during this period and ventured into the construction materials industry. He had stocked his shop with Marseille-style tiles. After a severe storm, the roof of the new assembly hall was blown off, and the authorities came to his shop. Koç, who sold the tiles he had on hand, made a considerable profit. Koç also participated in a tender with Nafiz Kotan Bey, a prominent contractor of the time, for the construction of houses planned by the municipality in Yenişehir. He undertook significant projects and earned substantial profits. Later, in 1933, he completed the construction of the Ankara Numune Hospital. During this period, foreign companies also preferred establishing their own representations in Ankara by assigning them to influential local figures. For instance, Ford came to Ankara seeking an automobile dealership. In 1928, the first agreement was made with Koç. He opened the first Ford dealership store by making retired naval officer Rami Bey and his brother-in-law Kütükçüzade Halim Bey partners.[269]

On the other hand, the traditional mohair trade continued to operate, with Ankara and Istanbul being the main hubs. The three sons of Kınacızade Şakir Bey had significantly expanded the business. Hazim Kınacı procured wool, fleece, and mohair products from villages around Ankara. Bahri Kınacı and Ziya Kınacı, on the other hand, joined their uncle Mehmet Kınacı's company in Istanbul. The mohair prepared in Ankara was sent to Liman Han, a crucial commercial complex in Sirkeci, Istanbul. There, it was processed and exported to Britain and Russia.[270] Kınacızade Şakir's son's education was also aligned with their business connections. For instance, Ziya Kınacı was sent to Robert College in 1919 and graduated in 1926. Bahri Kınacı, on the other hand, received his education at Saint Joseph High School in Istanbul. Ziya was later sent to Britain so as to enhance commercial relations and

[269] Koç and Dündar, *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç,* 68-100.
[270] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 105-125.

obtain novel developments in mohair production. He spent many years in London, Manchester, and particularly in Bradford, working in factories and establishing close friendships with companies. He also stayed abroad for extended periods in France and Germany for business purposes and learned German in the process.[271] During this period, the Kınacı partners in Ankara and Istanbul made significant strides in foreign trade.[272]

The Ankara Milli Mensucat Türk Anonim Şirketi, which had lost its influence during the National Struggle, was also being revitalized through the efforts of politics and bureaucracy during this period. In accordance with a decision made in 1925, the company's capital was determined to be 150,000 TL, and a new administration was elected to serve for five years. The new chairman of the board was Çayırlızade Hilmi. A decree of 11 August 1926 stated that the company had been set up with the financial support of the state treasury and that it was the only facility available to the army in the country. Hence, it was authorized to obtain the desired quantity of fabric from the *Sanayi ve Maadin Bankası* (Turkish Industry and Mining Bank). In 1927, the company's capital was increased to 300,000 TL, but unable to sell its shares to private individuals, it fell into severe financial distress. During this period, the Sanayi ve Maadin Bankası, as a state bank, became a partner in the company by purchasing 23,000 TL worth of shares. Nevertheless, the company, which could not be revived, decided to dissolve in 1928. Unable to sell its facilities as well, the company was transferred to *Türkiye İş Bankası* (Business/Work Bank of Turkey) in 1930 and took on the form of *Yün-İş* (Wool Business).[273]

[271] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 197-225.
[272] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 313.
[273] Varlık, "Ankara Millî Mensucat [Türk] Anonim Şirketi (1916-1930)," 77-81.

The Annuaire Oriental, encompassing the years 1924-1925, provides a significant summary of the sectoral distribution of the examined commercial group during this period. For instance, Serattarzade Rasim and his brother, Kınacızade Şakir and his brother Mehmet Hacı Kerim, ventured into the opium trade. Yağcızade Mesut was involved in both flour and wheat trading. Serattarzade Halil was engaged in the haberdashery business. In the mohair trade, those involved were Hanifzade Ahmet, Yağcızade İsmail, Çayırlızade Hilmi, Serattarzade Rasim and his brother, Çulhazade Rıfat, Kınacızade Şakir ve and his brother Mehmet, Serattarzade Abdülkerim, Yağcızade Mesut, Bulgurluzade Mehmet, and the Milli Mahsulat Şirketi. Koçzade Hacı Mustafa was a hardware, stationery, and leather goods merchant. Yağcızade Halil was an apothecary. Moreover, almost all of these men, or at least several members of their families, were also textile merchants. In addition, Kınacızade Şakir and his brother Mehmet, Serattarzade Rasim and his brother, and Çayırlızade Hilmi were engaged in the fleece trade. In Beypazarı, the Çayırlızade family had many members involved in the leather, rice, mohair, grain, cocoon, and textile sectors. The Bulgurluzade brothers maintained their presence in Istanbul. Çubukçuzade Mehmet Arif, on the other hand, was engaged in the cigarette paper trade, also in Istanbul.[274] According to the Annuale Orientale for the year 1930, the Çulhazadeler were also present in Istanbul in the import and export section. The Kınacızade and Serattarzade brothers were also listed as merchants and commission agents. In Izmir, the Bulgurluzade Brothers appeared as manufacturers. Now, Ankara's long-established merchants were fully opening up to the outside world with the significant export cities.[275]

[274] *Annuaire Commercial Turc - Türk Ticaret Salnamesi. 1924-1925.*
[275] *Annuaire Oriental. Groupant, en un seul volume par ordre alphabétique les 10 pays suivants: 1930*

5.3 Exploring new opportunities with a new bank

The establishment of İş Bankası stands as one of the most significant developments during the first decade of the Turkish Republic. In line with national economic policies, the banking sector witnessed a period of expansion in the Second Constitutional Era, and the establishment of İş Bankası epitomized this trend during the Republican era. There was a pressing need to provide credit to Turkish-Muslim merchants. While merchants had established banks under the influence of the CUP, the foreign-capitalized Ottoman Bank continued to fulfill the role of a state bank. Notably, Turkey lacked a central bank during this period. The İş Bankası initiative emerged amidst this environment.

Various accounts and narratives exist regarding the bank's founding story, its capital, and who proposed its name. According to the prevailing belief, the unspent portion of the funds sent to Mustafa Kemal by Muslims from the Indian subcontinent during the War of Independence constituted the initial capital of İş Bankası. According to Hasan Rıza Soyak, Mustafa Kemal's Secretary General, approximately 500,000-600,000 liras were sent from India. Mustafa Kemal had forwarded this money to the treasury for the final military operation, the Grand Offensive. Approximately 380,000 liras were returned to him after the war. Of this amount, 250,000 liras were used as the bank's founding capital. His contributions to the bank, however, extended beyond this initial investment. He later deposited an additional 207,400 liras into his account at the bank. The issue of the bank's name has been the subject of differing accounts. Celal Bayar’s narrative indicates that the Minister of Commerce, Hasan Saka, proposed the name. Cemal Kutay, on the other hand, recounts Celal Bayar stating that the bank was established to conduct business

and that the name "Türkiye İş Bankası" should be given to this purely Turkish institution. Falih Rıfkı Atay, however, asserts that Mustafa Kemal himself chose the name. While often overlooked in narratives, another significant argument emerges during the bank's preparatory phase.[276] As preparations for the bank progressed, Mustafa Kemal also met with a delegation from Ankara, individuals he had known since the Müdafaa-i Hukuk organizations, to discuss the matter. The delegation contained Hanifzade Ahmed, Aktarzade Rasim, deputy of Ankara, and Chamber of Commerce President Kınacızade Şakir. They were asked for their opinions. They determined the establishment of such a bank as a definite necessity as well. They affirmed their intention to undertake their own duties and acquire shareholder status.[277] According to Nebahat Taşkın, as relayed by her brother Bahri Kınacı, the phrase attributed to Celal Bayar was actually uttered by Kınacızade Şakir. He proposed the name "İş," suggesting the bank's name should reflect its purpose.[278] While the exact origin of the name "İş" remains unclear, this anecdote also highlights the appropriation of the bank by the merchant group.

According to Celal Bayar's account, Mustafa Kemal requested a list of 15 individuals for the planning of the bank's board of directors. To avoid the impression of imposing a specific group, Bayar prepared a list of 30 candidates. The list primarily included individuals with experience in banking or those who had written about the economy in newspapers. Mustafa Kemal did not accept this proposal and considered including several individuals with whom he had personal ties on the board of directors. The bank was officially established as a joint-stock company on August 20, 1924. On June 14, Bayar signed a commitment letter with his six

[276] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi*, 4-13.
[277] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 396-397.
[278] Taşkın, *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*, 285.

townsmen from Bursa. However, upon examining the bank's first charter, it becomes evident that individuals known for their close ties with Mustafa Kemal were also added to the list. In particular, fifteen individuals from Ankara were added to this list, increasing the number of founders to forty-seven. Eleven founders, ten of whom were from Samsun, were removed due to their failure to pay the required quarter of their pledged capital. Reaching a final list of thirty-five founders, İş Bankası included several members of parliament from Ankara among its founders. Two prominent merchants from Ankara also became part of this list: Aktarzade Rasim and Kınacızade Şakir. Kıncacızade subsequently managed to become a member of the first administrative council. Only five members continued to serve uninterruptedly until the plenary committee following Atatürk's death on March 17, 1939, in this board. One of these was Şakir Kınacı. He served on the bank's administrative board for approximately 15 years.[279]

The bank was established with a capital of 1 million liras. While it was required that at least one-quarter of the pledged capital, 250,000 liras, be paid upon establishment, only 409,165 liras had been paid by the end of the first four months. Mustafa Kemal had already paid 250,000 liras of this amount. As a result, as mentioned above, the names of several individuals were removed from the charter. The total amount of the pledged capital was not paid until February 28, 1926. This clearly indicates that the promised funds were not deposited on time. [280]

The bank's primary purpose was outlined in Article 2 of its charter. Accordingly, in addition to carrying out all banking transactions, the bank would engage in activities in areas such as agriculture, industry, mining, and infrastructure. It would also be able to establish companies that produce and procure various tools

[279] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi*, 17-52.
[280] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi*, 55.

and equipment and participate in existing ones. Article 2 was later expanded to include the following sectors as areas of activity: insurance, transportation, export, tourism, and energy production and distribution.[281] Operating almost like a corporation, the bank became involved in nearly every sector. For instance, in 1925, the bank decided to participate in the *İstanbul ve Trakya Şeker Fabrikaları Türk Anonim Şirketi* (Istanbul and Thrace Sugar Factories Turkish Joint Stock Company) with an investment of 50,000 liras, and by 1926, its share in the company had reached 78%. In the mining sector, the bank was also interested in exploiting the rich coal deposits in the Ereğli-Zonguldak-Kozlu basin. In 1926, it established the *Maden Kömürü İşleri Türk Anonim Şirketi* (Turkish Coal Works Joint Stock Company), in which it held a 75% stake with a capital of one million liras, and the *Kozlu Kömür İşleri Türk Anonim Şirketi* (Kozlu Coal Works Turkish Joint Stock Company), in which it held a 51% stake with a capital of 500,000 liras.[282]

According to Yahya Tezel, the bank was the easiest way to enrich individuals. Large loans were distributed through acquaintances, and executives were involved in trade utilizing these relationships within the political cadre.[283] Considering the Republic's early years, İsmail Cem also identified a "happy minority." According to him, this privileged group consisted of Istanbul merchants, Anatolian eşraf, landowners, those who became interested in trade after participating in the national struggle, and high-level bureaucrats and deputies. These individuals, who became partners in the bank almost without paying any money, also increased their profits as the bank grew.[284] Falih Rıfkı also touched upon this issue, stating that everyone who wanted to make easy money tried to find influential merchants in

[281] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi*, 43.
[282] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi*, 295-296.
[283] Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi,* 213.
[284] Cem, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*, 299-300.

Ankara and obtain loans from the bank through them. The merchants did not pursue the dreams of development that were expected from them but rather prioritized profitable ventures that could be undertaken much more quickly with the credit they received. Most were engaged in import, commission, small-scale manufacturing, and trade.[285]

A new group, known as the İş Bankası group, was gradually emerging. Influential merchants and those who had recently entered the business world were beginning to expand their operations. This group included figures who had become synonymous with the War of Independence, such as Celal Bayar, Salih Bozok, Nuri Conker, and Ali Kılıç, and the group was often referred to by the name "affairism."[286] The term "affairism" was coined from the French word "affaire," which is "İş" in Turkish. İsmet İnönü was troubled by the privileges enjoyed by this group, and as a result, the biggest struggle in the future would be between this group and İnönü.[287] Orhan Karaveli's account exemplifies how merchants benefited from İş Bankası through the story of his father, Mahmut Karaveli. According to this narrative, Mahmut, who was expanding his commercial activities, was engaged in the wheat trade. He had become quite wealthy but needed capital to grow even further. Therefore, he decided to consult with Kınacızade Şakir, an Ankara deputy with whom he had good relations. Kınacızade acknowledged Mahmut's need for credit and advised him to visit İş Bankası and meet with Celal Bey. He informed Mahmut that he had spoken to Celal Bey and would serve as a reference. Celal Bey had expressed the bank's difficulty in extending loans during that period and requested Kınacızade to refer trustworthy tradesmen. Upon visiting the bank,

[285] Cem, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi,* 302-304.
[286] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın*, 374-375.
[287] Karaosmanoğlu, *Politikada 45 Yıl,* 102.

Mahmut was asked how much credit he needed. Although he had initially thought of 5,000 liras, he mustered his courage and requested 10,000 liras. Celal Bey, however, found this amount to be too small and extended a loan of up to 50,000 liras.[288] This example illustrates the extent to which merchants or bureaucrats could obtain substantial loans through recommendations within vested networks. In this way, merchants who already had economic power were further strengthened thanks to their connections with İş Bankası.

By 1927, a turning point was emerging for both *İtibar-ı Milli Bankası* (National Credit Bank), which had been founded earlier, and İş Bankası. The İtibar-i Milli was founded in 1917 within the context of a national economy. The need for a bank had been discussed in the press beforehand and brought to the public agenda. Amidst the war, there was a prevailing notion of developing an alternative to the foreign-capitalized Ottoman Bank, which was not meeting the government's demand for banknotes. In essence, the establishment of this bank was an integral part of the economic endeavor we discussed in the preceding chapters. On the other hand, in the eyes of the CUP, foreign-capitalized banks treated Turks as outsiders, both financially and in terms of their overall attitude. Propaganda campaigns conducted in both Istanbul and Anatolia generated significant interest in the bank's shares. For instance, Talat Pasha's visit to Ankara even before the bank's establishment served as a substantial motivator. The bank's founding petition was presented by Mehmet Cavit, Hüseyin Cahit, and Tevfik Bey, a merchant from Thessaloniki. After the establishment of the bank, Kara Kemal's companies' power was upsurged by financial integration.[289]

[288] Karaveli, *Bir Ankara Ailesi'nin Öyküsü*, 141-144.
[289] Esin, *Osmanlı Savaşı'nın İktisadi Aktörleri (1914-19),* 273-322.

In 1927, a decision was made to merge the two banks. Çetinkaya, focusing on various historical narratives surrounding this merger, highlights the tendency to view the event from a conspiratorial perspective. Remarkably, the alleged assassination attempt by the ex-Unionist cadre against Mustafa Kemal in 1926 and the subsequent lawsuits fueled the notion that this merger was politically motivated. Çetinkaya draws attention to the similarities in the banks' establishment and structures. While the İtibar-ı Milli also received significant state support during its foundation, İş Bankası was directly established with the personal financial backing of the Republic's founder. In his view, the merger of the banks was a manifestation of the single-party regime's policies and its conception of the nation-state. It was an outcome of a monolithic approach extending into the economic sphere. The objective was to prevent these banks from operating independently, with separate branches, and in an inefficient manner. It was desired to consolidate existing resources and expand the branch network. In this period, there was a significant demand, particularly from merchants, for the expansion of branch networks. This needed to be addressed. Moreover, by 1927, İş Bankası had already become the largest shareholder. The merger would be conducted entirely within the framework of legal regulations. As Çetinkaya highlighted, the contravening reaction to the merger came from İş Bank shareholders instead of the side of the İtibar-ı Milli since, according to İş Bank's charter, shareholders holding one hundred shares were entitled to a founder’s share. Those holding the founder’s shares received ten percent of the dividends. The proposal to extend this right to those coming from İtibar-ı Milli sparked heated debates. Nevertheless, shareholders were persuaded, and those from İtibar-ı Milli were granted this right. However, Article 63, which concerns the

founder's shares, was amended to prevent future acquisitions. Thus, the merger was achieved.[290]

Through this merger, İş Bankası gained significant strength. Major privileges were transferred to İş Bankası for a time, but these were later abolished and extended to all banks. The bank increased its capital to 4 million, gaining additional resources.[291] In the 1920s, it steadily reached new heights among national private (commercial) banks in terms of balance sheets, nominal and paid-up capital, commercial bills portfolio, total deposits, and profit distribution. It held 90.4% of total deposits in 1928 and 89% in 1929. Its share of total profits was 63% in 1928 and 62.7% in 1929. Between 1924 and 1928, İş Bankası had investments in 36 different ventures.[292]

5.4 Conclusion

With the establishment of the Republic, the Anatolian merchant was poised to reap the rewards of their support. On the other hand, in contrast to the more assertive involvement of their Anatolian counterparts in the National Struggle, Istanbul merchants, driven by a desire to preserve their established economic interests, pursued a strategy of accommodation with the Ankara government. The termination of military conflict was contemporaneous with the inception of the Milli Türk Ticaret Birliği, a new collective endeavor undertaken by Istanbul's bourgeoisie. By envisioning a congress of their own making, the association had found a means to influence the economic policies of the newly established state, especially with the participation of the government. The İzmir Economic Congress served as the forum

[290] Çetinkaya, "İtibar-ı Milli Bankası ve İş Bankası Birleşmesi (1927): Bir Banka Birleşmesi Üzerinden Müslüman/Türk Burjuvazisi Üzerine Düşünmek", 171-193.
[291] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi*, 112-117.
[292] Uygar Kocabaşoğlu et al., *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi,* 283-285.

through which they were able to introduce and advocate for their numerous ideas and proposals. Furthermore, by seizing the opportunity of postponed elections due to the war, the MTTB took control of the Istanbul Chamber of Commerce, thereby securing its own commercial interests. Ankara merchants, who had been expanding their commercial networks towards Istanbul, had already become part of these interests, and figures such as Bulgurluzade Tevfik had managed to secure positions within the MTTB.

Businesspeople based in Ankara, the new center of government, began to take more assertive steps in politics. As a reward for their contributions to the National Struggle, they were appointed to significant bureaucratic positions, elected as deputies of the newly founded Republican People's Party, and played active roles in its organization. In addition, figures, like Vehbi Koç, were able to substantially expand their business enterprises by leveraging the political networks they had cultivated. With the population of the new center experiencing rapid growth, accompanied by an expansion of business opportunities and state-provided incentives, families that had been consolidating their power since the Tanzimat Era began to diversify their economic activities and geographic reach, extending their operations to cities like Istanbul and Izmir.

One of the primary reasons for the significant strengthening of the Ankara-based commercial bourgeoisie at the outset of the Republic was the establishment of İş Bank. Leading Ankara merchants, who had stood by Mustafa Kemal since the National Struggle, were now pursuing a new venture under the leadership of Celal Bayar. A considerable number of them were able to become co-founders of the bank. Kınacızade Şakir, a member of parliament, had served on the board of directors for 15 years since the establishment of the bank. A banking-centered network of

bureaucrats and merchants responsible for introducing the concept of 'affairism' into Turkish enriched themselves through a system of preferential lending, providing substantial credit to their inner circle for various investment projects. Reflecting the era's centralized control, the İtibar-ı Milli Bank, a legacy of the Committee of Union and Progress, was consolidated with İş Bank in 1927, leading to a capital expansion to four million. By the end of the first decade of the Republic, Ankara's merchant families had reached the pinnacle of their political and economic influence through the relationships they had cultivated.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This thesis traces the evolution of the commercial bourgeoisie in Ankara from the Tanzimat Reform Era to the Early Republican Period by focusing on specific families and individuals. It delves into their class consciousness and their interactions with the state. This study counters the prevailing narrative of a Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie solely formed by state intervention. Instead, it posits a class with deeper historical roots and whose actions were driven by its particular class interests.

Theses and analyses on classes in Turkey gained prominence in academic writing, particularly with the rise of left-wing movements in the 1960s. Arguments, particularly those derived from Marxist literature, have been applied to the history of both the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey. Nevertheless, they were congruent with the rationalizations provided by the Committee of Union and Progress regime for pursuing a policy of economic nationalism. In the history of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey, it was generally accepted that there was an absence of a Turkish-Muslim bourgeoisie or that such a class was still in its infancy, lagging behind developments in the West. The historical context for this was often attributed to the bifurcated structure of Ottoman society before the nineteenth century, specifically the division between the ruling class and the ruled. It assessed a segment of the non-Muslim community, presumed to be more influenced by the innovations of the nineteenth century and mainly engaged in foreign trade, under the label of "comprador bourgeoisie."[293] As a result of all these factors, the state assumed

[293] For a detailed discussion on the term comprador bourgeoisie and its existence in the Ottoman Empire: Kasaba, R. (1988). Was There a Compradore Bourgeoisie in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Western Anatolia? *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 11(2), 215–228.

a class-creating role to sustain its existence, attempting to establish a Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie within the capitalist system. This narrative ultimately pointed to a passive Muslim-Turkish class. This class, waiting to be created, relied on state elites not only during the decline of the Ottoman Empire and the founding of the Republic of Turkey but even in later periods. In contrast to this argument, particularly in light of recent studies, this thesis advocates for the existence of a Muslim-Turkish bourgeoisie that evolved over time, adapted, and defended its class interests through political, economic, and social connections. The concepts of the bourgeoisie or bourgeois class in this study specifically focus on the narrow sense of the commercial bourgeoisie. The main reason for selecting the city of Ankara is its possession of a distinctive production and trade commodity, mohair, and its organization around this product, as well as its historical role in providing an opportunity to reveal the background of a class's preferences during pivotal moments, such as the National Struggle and the founding of the Republic of Turkey. Additionally, Ankara was not a port city but a significant provincial region in Anatolia during the Ottoman Empire. The arguments in this thesis may also be contributing to the fact that they facilitate future comparisons between the class-related reflexes of the bourgeoisie in port cities and those in provincial areas.

The second chapter examines the commercial relationships and local political roles of the leading merchants in Ankara during and after the Tanzimat period. This period provides significant insights into the presence of nascent bourgeois class elements and their class-related reactions. The trade of mohair produced from the Ankara goat, which was unique to Ankara, generally constituted the primary focus of this class. The export or smuggling of Ankara goats posed a significant risk of substantial losses in the global market, leading them to prefer organizing and making

demands from state mechanisms. Petitions written to the relevant state institutions and officials provide concrete examples of this issue. On the other hand, the demand for the expansion of the railway and related actions aimed at broadening their commercial opportunities using the prevailing discourse of “civilization” can also be interpreted from the same perspective. Even though their demands were met a little later than they initially requested, it still seems like they got results. Additionally, the archival documents indicate that they used the economic power and prestige gained through endowments or charity within society to obtain warehouse permits around the railway directly from the sultan himself. In the 1890s and early 1900s, families such as the Koçzade and Serattarzade, who were granted these permits, continued to exert influence in both trade and politics in subsequent years. This highlights significant aspects of the origins of the Ankara bourgeoisie.

Politically, during the same period, certain families began to wield significant influence. The centralization brought about by the Tanzimat reforms further enhanced the influence of specific families through the establishment of local councils in provincial towns. Although elections were held as a matter of legislation, it can be observed that certain individuals and families held specific chairs for extended periods and gradually increased their political representation. Their presence in these councils and assemblies indicates that rather than representing a democratic advancement, it provided an opportunity for a particular class to shape local policies in its favor.

The third chapter of the thesis challenges the "creation from scratch" argument; instead, it acknowledges the beginning of the Second Constitutional Period and *Milli İktisat* as a new turning point for the rise of the provincial bourgeoisie. Although the new era began with a narrative of a liberal economic order

for the entire society, internal and external factors, along with the ideology and approach of the new state elites, overshadowed this narrative. In the form presented by the prevailing historical paradigm, while the non-Muslim bourgeoisie enriched itself under the liberal economic understanding, the Muslim Turks, who did not possess a bourgeois class and did not view trade as a decent option, experienced a gradual loss of their wealth. However, as indicated by the commercial annuals used in the thesis, vested wealthy families in Ankara, such as the Bulgurluzade, had already increased their sectoral prominence before the national economic theories had fully developed. Additionally, the Ankara bourgeoisie, having internalized local experiences, began to step into national politics with the advent of the newly established council. Individuals such as Çayırlızade Hilmi, who were frequently the subject of public complaints through petitions, adapted to the new era, established areas where they could act autonomously, and even had the opportunity to become members of the parliament.

During this period, economic approaches that were most likely to serve the interests of the Turkish-Muslim bourgeoisie were also proposed by the state elites. Following the Balkan Wars and a series of adverse events, the state became increasingly protectionist. With the atmosphere created by the First World War, a range of new developments, from the army's provisions to meeting the state's and society's war-related needs, led to further enrichment of Anatolian merchants. The Ankara bourgeoisie, expanding their sectors and commercial relationships day by day, was establishing joint-stock companies for the first time. Although joint-stock companies were being established for the first time, family ties had already formed, and prominent figures had previously worked together. The thesis presents that while joint-stock companies represented a new initiative, many merchant families who

were already collaborating took the lead in these companies. Additionally, the transfer of property and money left behind as a result of the Armenian deportations to Muslim merchants was also a significant factor in the formation of the companies' capital. Ultimately, a new class was not being created from scratch. Instead, vested figures were adapting to new conditions, and the leading merchant families of Ankara were taking advantage of the opportunities presented to them.

The fourth chapter focuses on the bourgeoisie's reactions to national resistance and their ongoing commercial relations. In this thesis, their support for the resistance movement institutionalized under Mustafa Kemal is explained not merely through abstract concepts like patriotism but through their class-based reflexes. As presented in the thesis, the general stance of Anatolian merchants and landowners was to avoid conflicts with the occupiers as long as their commercial connections, wealth, or property were not threatened. At the time of the initial occupation, merchants in Ankara recognized a significant threat to their class interests. Remarkably, the fear of being held responsible for the Armenian deportations was an important source of anxiety. On the other hand, the presence of individuals from the Whittall family, known as a long-established trading family in the Ottoman Empire, at the head of the military unit sent to their regions caused commercial concern. In fact, British troops had even begun engaging in commercial activities using the railway. In such an environment, the provision of financial support to resistance movements and the organization of crowds by these vested families not only reflect the general reflexes of the bourgeoisie but also challenge abstract narratives.

The fifth chapter investigates the relationship between the commercial bourgeoisie in Ankara and the new ruling elite in the newly founded Republic, the new political and commercial opportunities, and their role in the establishment of *İş*

Bankası. In the Republican period, the conceptual beginning of economic thought was represented by the İzmir Economic Congress. It is significant that the Istanbul bourgeoisie, which had been more passive during the war, and the Anatolian bourgeoisie met at common points during this congress and made decisions regarding their interests. The fact that the pre-congress steps came from an organization such as the *Milli Türk Ticaret Birliği* rather than from the state begets discussions concerning the purpose of the congress. Both in alignment with Mustafa Kemal's views and those expressed by other speakers at the congress, it is evident that the newly established Republic sought to build the foundations of its economy through the same class.

Additionally, as a result of the support provided during the National Struggle period, many significant commercial figures in Ankara, such as Kınacızade Şakir, Serattarzade Rasim, and the relatively less influential Koçzade Vehbi, obtained important privileges both politically and commercially throughout the Early Republican Period. The bourgeoisie in Ankara, who also played roles in the organization of Mustafa Kemal's Republican People's Party, succeeded in leveraging these political relationships to their advantage. Notably, in the establishment of *İş Bankası*, which later merged with *İtibar-ı Milli Bankası*, it is evident that a class that had been increasingly strengthening since the Tanzimat period, seizing opportunities and being far more entrepreneurial and organized rather than merely waiting to be created, played a significant role. This class, which laid the foundations for the bank's establishment, managed to benefit from the bank’s offerings.

In conclusion, this thesis discusses the existence and rise of the commercial bourgeoisie in Ankara across four significant periods and turning points. Contrary to the dominant narrative, the analysis and sources presented in the study show that

neither the Committee of Union and Progress nor the Republican elites created this class through state mechanisms. The commercial bourgeoisie in Ankara, whose roots extend much earlier, is repositioned from a mere phantom to an agent in the thesis. Critical approaches to the existing paradigm are necessary to achieve broader generalizations, and further studies should explore more cities, bourgeoisie organizations, and families so as to generate a new narrative concerning the Anatolian bourgeoisie. Additionally, the relationship of this class with other classes and groups beyond the state, such as workers and peasants, which is not addressed in the thesis, remains a potential subject for further investigation.

REFERENCES

Archival sources

Archive of the Directorate of Military History and Strategic Studies of the Turkish General Staff (ATASE, Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Arşivi)

Presidency Ottoman Archives. (BOA. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi).

Presidency Republic Archives (BCA. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi).

ATASE, AK. 14.0.106,

BCA, KDB. 30.18.1.1 / 21.11.12

BCA, KDB. 30.18.1.1 / 5.29.3

BCA, MGM, 30.10.0.0 / 75.496.5

BOA, BEO. 1828/137060.

BOA, BEO. 1847/138473.

BOA, BEO. 1941/14556.

BOA, BEO. 474/35546.

BOA, BEO. 885/66316

BOA, DH. ŞFR.613/2.

BOA, DH.EUM.AYŞ, 65/38-7.

BOA, DH.MKT. 1614/107.

BOA, DH.MKT.122/31.

BOA, DH.MKT.1651/15

BOA, DH.MKT.79/12.

BOA, SD. 1335/11.

BOA, SD. 1351/12.

BOA, SD.1256/29.

BOA, SD.1256/6.

BOA, ŞD.1268.24

BOA, Y.. PRK.AZJ._42/35.

BOA, Y.MTV.126/74.

Mebusan Meclisi Üyeleri- Şakir Bey. Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi. https://cdn.tbmm.gov.tr/TbmmWeb/Mebusan_meclisi_ozluk_dosyalari/K014/D333/G001/SM_333_M_2.pdf

Mebusan Meclisi Üyeleri- Şakir Bey. Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi. https://cdn.tbmm.gov.tr/TbmmWeb/Mebusan_meclisi_ozluk_dosyalari/K020/D491/G001/SM_491_M_3.pdf

Yearbooks and diplomatic reports

1300 Sene-i Hicriyyesine Mahsus Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi, Milli Kütüphane 1960 SA 123 182

Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir (1311), Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı Library, No: 4689.

Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir 1318, Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı Library, No: 1243.

Ankara Vilayetine Mahsus Salnamedir 1320, National Library, No: 1960 SA 123,182.

Ankara Vilayeti Salname-i Resmiyesi 1325, Sene-i Hicriyesine Mahsus, National Library, No: 1960 SA 123,182

Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'Industrie de l'Administration et de la Magistrature, 28me Année 1908. Constantinople: R. César Cervati.

Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'Industrie, de l'Administration et de la Magistrature 9me Année 1889-1890. Constantinople: Cervati Freres & Cie.

Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'Industrie, de l'Administration et de la Magistrature 14ème Année 1896. Constantinople: Cervati Freres & Cie.

Annuaire Oriental du Commerce de l'industrie, de L'administration et de la Magistrature, 12ème année Russie, Grèce, Roumanie, Serbie, Bulgarie 1894. Constantinople: Cervati Freres & Cie.

Annuaire Oriental, commerce, industrie, administration, magisture de l'Orient 1914. Constantinople, The Annuaire Oriental.

Annuaire Oriental. Oriental Directory, commerce, industrie administration magistrature 1921. Istanbul: Alfred Rizzo.

Annuaire Oriental. Oriental Directory, commerce, industrie administration magistrature 1922. Istanbul: Alfred Rizzo.

Annuaire Commercial Turc - Türk Ticaret Salnamesi 1924-1925. İstanbul: İktisadi Tetkikat, Neşriyat ve Muamelat Türk Anonim Şirketi

Annuaire Oriental. Groupant, en un seul volume par ordre alphabétique les 10 pays suivants: 1930.

Diplomatic and Consular Reports on Trade and Finance. Turkey: Report for the Year 1893 on the Trade and Agriculture of Angora. (1894). Foreign Office, Annual Series (1368). London: Harrison and Sons

Diplomatic and Consular Reports on Trade and Finance. Turkey: Report on the Agricultural Condition of the Vilayet of Angora (1895). Foreign Office, Annual Series, (1624). London: Harrison and Sons.

Üç Yüz Yedi Sene-i Maliyesine Mahsustur Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi, Milli Kütüphane 1960 SA 123 182.

Salname-i Vilayet-i Ankara 1291, İBB Atatürk Library, Library No: 915,651105.

Salnâme-i Vilâyet-i Ankara 1295, Millet Genel Library, Section: A. E. Salnâme, Old Record No. 1, Classification no:CD 7137.

Salname-i Vilayet-i Ankara 1299, İBB Atatürk Library, No: 915,651105.

Books, articles and encyclopedia entries

Ahmad, F., & Rustow, D. A. (1976). İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Meclisler: 1908-1918. *Güneydoğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (4–5), 245–284.

Akiba, J. (2009). The Local Councils as the Origin of the Parliamentary System in the Ottoman Empire. In *Development of Parliamentarism in the Modern Islamic World* (pp. 176–204). Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.

Aktar, A. (1998) Şark Ticaret Yıllıkları'nda 'Sarı Sayfalar': İstanbul'da Meslekler ve Iktisadi Faaliyetler Hakkında Bazı Gözlemler, 1868-1938. *Toplum ve Bilim,* (76), 105–42.

Avcıoğlu, D. (1976). *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.

Aydemir, Ş. S. (1999). *Tek Adam: Mustafa Kemal 1919-1922* (Vol. 2). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Aydın, S., Türkoğlu, Ö., Emiroğlu, K., & Özsoy, E. D. (2005). *Küçük Asya'nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.

Bağlum, K. (1992). *Beşbin Yılda Nereden Nereye Ankara*. Ankara.

Başar, A. H., and Koraltürk, M. (2007) *Ahmet Hamdi Başar'ın Hatıraları: "Gazi Bana Çok kızmış ...".* İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Başaran Lotz, N. L. (2023). Türkiye'de burjuvazinin gelişiminde tüccarlar: Müslüman-Türk aileler ve ticaret ağları. *Tarih ve Toplum - Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, (21), 204–247.

Boratav, K. (1998). *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi.

Buğra, A. (1994). *State and Business in Modern Turkey: A Comparative Study*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Cebesoy, A. F. (1953). *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları*. İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyatı.

Cem, İ. (1974). *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

Cora, Y. T. (2013) A Muslim Great Merchant [Tüccar] Family in the Late Ottoman a Case Study of the Nemlizades, 1860-1930. *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, *19*(1&2), 1–29.

Cora, Y.T. (2023). Nemlizadeler: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ekonomipolitiğinde Milli Tüccarı Aramak. *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, (21), 247–70.

Corcia, J. (1978). Bourg, Bourgeois, Bourgeois de Paris from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century. *The Journal of Modern History*, *50*(2), 207–33.

Corcoran, P. E. (1977). The Bourgeois and Other Villains. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, *38*(3), 477–85.

Coşar, N., & Demirci, S. (2009). Incorporation into the World Economy: From Railways to Highways (1850-1950). *Middle Eastern Studies*, *45*(1), 19–31.

Çapa, M. (2020) Devlet Merkezinin İnşa Sürecinde Ankara Şehreminliği ve Şehreminleri (1924-1930). *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, (67), 75–115.

Çelik, S. (2018). Koyunun Olmadığı Yerde Keçiye Abdurrahman Çelebi Derler: Ankara Eyaleti'nde Tiftik Keçisi Ekonomisinin Zaman-Uzamsal Analiz Denemesi (1889-1905). In *Tarihi Dokumak: Bir Kentin Gizemi,* Sof (pp 95-106). Ankara: Koç Üniversitesi VEKAM.

Çetinkaya, Y. D. (2004). *1908 Osmanlı Boykotu: Bir Toplumsal Hareketin Analizi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Çetinkaya, Y. D. (2014). *Young Turks and the boycott movement: Nationalism, protest and the working classes in the formation of modern Turkey*. New York: I.B Tauris.

Çetinkaya, Y. D. (2023) İtibar-ı Milli Bankası ve İş Bankası Birleşmesi (1927): Bir Banka Birleşmesi Üzerinden Müslüman/Türk Burjuvazisi Üzerine Tarihyazımını Düşünmek. *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar,* (21), 153–203.

Çolak, F. (2018). I. TBMM'de Menteşe (Muğla) Mebusları ve Meclisteki Faaliyetleri (19200-1923). *Yeni Fikir, 9*(21), 133–156.

Dejung, C., Motadel, D., & Osterhammel, J. (2019) Worlds of the Bourgeoisie. In *The Global Bourgeoisie: The Rise of the Middle Classes in the Age of Empire* (pp 1-40.) Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Deliorman, M. N. (1957). *Nuri Demirağ'ın Hayatı ve Mücadeleleri*. Nu. D. Matbaası.

Demir, F. (1994). *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Meclis-i Mebusan Seçimleri (1908-1914)* (Unpublished MA Thesis). Dokuz Eylül University.

Demirel, A. (2003). *Birinci Meclis'te Muhalefet: İkinci Grup*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Dirihan, S. (2023). Osmanlı Taşra Merkezlerinde Modern Belediyelerin Ortaya Çıkışı: 19. Yüzyıl Sonu ve 20. Yüzyıl Başlarında Ankara Örneği. *Haliç Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, *5*(2), 1–15.

Divitçioğlu, S. (2015) *Asya Üretim Tarzı ve Osmanlı Toplumu*. İstanbul: Alfa.

Erdeha, K. (1975). *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Ergil, D. (1981). *Milli Mücadele'nin Sosyal Tarihi*. Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.

Eroğlu, T. (2008) Tehcirden Milli Mücadele'ye Ermeni Malları (1915-1923), (thesis).

Esin, T. (2020). *Osmanlı Savaşı'nın İktisadi Aktörleri (1914-1919)*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Finefrock, M. M. (1981) Laissez-Faire, the 1923 Izmir Economic Congress and Early Turkish Developmental Policy in Political Perspective. *Middle Eastern Studies*, *17*(3), 375–92.

Gözaydın, I. (2009). *Diyanet: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Dinin Tanzimi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Gözel Durmaz, O. (2015) The Distribution of the Armenian Abandoned Properties in an Ottoman Locality: Kayseri (1915–18). *Middle Eastern Studies, 51*(5), 838–53.

Güneş, İ. (1993). Azmi Milli Yurdu Nizamnamesi. *Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, *12*(3), 373–382.

Heper, M. (2023) *Türkiye'de Devlet Geleneği*. İstanbul: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Işık, Z. (2023). Ankara'nın Çeşmeleri/Su Yolları. In *Ankara Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 1, pp. 337–365). Ankara: Net Kitaplık.

İlkin, S. (1971). Türkiye Milli İthalat ve İhracat Anonim Şirketi. *ODTÜ Gelişme Dergisi*, *1*(2), 199–231.

İnalcık, H. (1969) Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire. *The Journal of Economic History* 29(1), 971–140.

Koraltürk, M. (2011) *Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Ekonomin Türkleştirilmesi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kaiser, H. (2006) Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies during the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1916. In O. Farschid., M. Kropp., & S. Dahne (Ed.), *The First World War as Remembered in the Countries of the Eastern Mediterranean* (pp 49–71). Beirut: Orient-Institut Beirut.

Karaosmanoğlu, Y. K. (1981) *Politikada 45 Yıl*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Karaveli, O. (2011). *Bir Ankara Ailesi'nin Öyküsü.* İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.

Karpat, K. H. (2010) *İslam'ın Siyasallaşması*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kasaba, R. (1988). Was There a Compradore Bourgeoisie in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Western Anatolia? *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, *11*(2), 215–228.

Kavak, E. (2015) *Ankara'nın İktisadi Tarihine Dair Bir Tetkik: Ankara Ticaret Odası Örneği 1938 – 1950*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Istanbul University.

Kaya, P. H. (2023). Osmanlı Dönemi Ankara Sof Ticareti. In *Ankara Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 2, pp. 617–618). Ankara: Net Yayıncılık.

Kaynar, İ. S. (2020) *Engürü'den Ankara'ya: Ankara'nın İktisadi Tarihi (1892-1962)*. Ankara: Efil Yayınevi.

Kaynar, İ. S. (2023). Cumhuriyet Öncesinde Ankara'nın İktisadi Gündemi. *Toplumsal Tarih*, (359), 2–9.

Kelleci, A. (2019). The Aydinians: A Catholic family between Ankara and Istanbul. *Journal of Ankara Studies*, *7*(1), 225–253.

Keyder, Ç. (2014) *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kılcı, A., & Günel, G. (2019). *Bir Ankaralı Tüccarın Kentine Katkıları: İbadullah Vakfı*. Ankara: Koç Üniversitesi VEKAM.

Kocabaşoğlu, U., Sak, G., Sönmez, S., Erkal, F., Gökmen, Ö., Şeker, N., & Uluğtekin, M. (2001). *Türkiye iş Bankası Tarihi*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Koç, V., & Dündar, C. (2007). *Özel Arşivinden Belgeler ve Anılarıyla Vehbi Koç*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.

Köksal, Y. (2017). Local demands and state policies: general councils (Meclis-i Umumi) in the Edirne and Ankara provinces (1867–1872). *Middle Eastern Studies*, *53*(3), 470–485.

Köksal, Y., & Polatel, M. (2021). The Cihanbeyli and the Sheep Trade: from Provisionism and Semi-Nomadism to Liberal Economy and Sedentarisation. In *Making a Living in Ottoman Anatolia* (pp. 157–174). Leiden: Brill.

Küçükömer, İ. (1969) *Düzenin Yabacılaşması: Batılılaşma*. İstanbul: Ant Yayınları.

Mardin, Ş. (1990a) Tabakalaşmanın Tarihsel Belirleyicileri: Türkiye'de Toplumsal Sınıf ve Sınıf Bilinci. In *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset: Makaleler I* (pp 67–94). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Mardin, Ş. (1990b) Türk Siyasasını Açıklayabilecek Bir Anahtar: Merkez-Çevre İlişkileri. In *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset: Makaleler I*, (pp 30–66). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Marx, K., & Friedrich, E. (2002) *The Communist Manifesto*. (Samuel Moore Trans.) London: Penguin Books.

Mestyan, A. (2019). The Muslim Bourgeoisie and Philanthropy in the Late Ottoman Empire. In *The Global Bourgeoisie: The Rise of the Middle Classes in the Age of Empire* (pp. 207–228). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ortaylı, İ. (2000). 19. Yüzyıl Ankara'sına Demiryolunun Gelişi ve Bölgedeki Üretim Eylemlerinin Değişimi. In *Tarih İçinde Ankara* (pp. 207–217). Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Ankaralılar Vakfı.

Ortaylı, İ. (2020). *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareler (1840-1880)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ökçün, A. G. (1968) *Türkiye İktisat Kongresi 1923 – İzmir: Haberler – Belgeler – Yorumlar*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1968.

Ökçün, A. G. (1975). Teşvik-i Sanayi Kanun-ı Muvakkatı, 1913. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi 3*, *30*(1), 25–45.

Öndeş, O. (2012). *Modalı Vitol Ailesi*. İstanbul: Tarihçi Kitabevi.

Öztürk, G. (2018). Meclis-i Mebusan Yozgat Mebusu 'Kınacızade Şakir Bey'in 1912 Senesi Meclis Faaliyetleri. *Cappadocia Journal of History and Social Sciences*, *10*, 103-10.

Pamuk, Ş. (2013) *Türkiye'nin 200 Yıllık İktisadi Tarihi: Büyüme, Kurumlar ve Bölüşüm*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası.

Pernoud, R. (1991) *Burjuvazi*, (Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Pilbeam, P. "Bourgeois Society." Essay. In S. Berger (Ed), *A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Europe* (pp 86-97). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Quataert, D. (1977). Limited Revolution: The Impact of the Anatolian Railway on Turkish Transportation and the Provisioning of Istanbul, 1890–1908. *Business History Review*, *51*(2), 139–160.

Quataert, D. (2004) "19. Yüzyıla Genel Bakış: Islahatlar Devri 1812-1914." In *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi* (Vol 2, pp 885–1052). İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık.

Quataert, D. (2005) *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sakallı, B. (1997). *Millî Mücadele'nin Sosyal Tarihi: Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyetleri*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.

Saray, E. (2019). II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde Eşraf ve Köylü İlişkisi Üzerine Örnek Bir Olay: Çayırhan Köylüleri İle Hilmi Bey Arasındaki Arazi Anlaşmazlığı. *Bilecik Şeyh Edebali Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *4*(2), 602–610.

Sarıkoyuncu, A. (1999). *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları: Ahmet Hulusi, Mehmet Rifat Hacı Tevfik ve Abdurrahman Kâmil Efendiler*. Ankara: Diyanet Isleri Baskanlıgı.

Saya, M., & Alkış, M. C. (2021). Milli İktisadın İlk Şirketi: Anadolu Milli Mahsulat Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi. *Journal of Applied and Theoretical Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 23–34.

Selek, S. (1987). *Anadolu İhtilali* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Kastas Yayınları.

Singer, A. (2016). Waqfs: Faith-based Islamic Institutions before modern NGOs. In *NGOs in the Muslim World* (pp. 17–28). New York: Routledge.

Şahinkaya, S. *Cumhuriyet'ten Önceki Son Kurucu Kongre: Türkiye İktisat Kongresi (İzmir, 17 Şubat - 4 Mart 1923)*. Ankara: Telgrafhane Yayınları, 2023.

Şakir, Z. (1947). *Nuri Demirağ Kimdir?* Kenan Matbaası.

Şapolyo, E. B. (1944). *Kemal Atatürk ve Milli Mücadele Tarihi*. Ankara: Berkalp Kitabevi.

Şerif, A., & Börekçi, M. Ç. (1999). *Anadolu'da Tanin*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Tamur, E. (2003) *Ankara Keçisi ve Ankara Tiftik Dokumacılığı*. Ankara: Ankara Ticaret Odası.

Tamur, E. (2018). Ankara Keçisi Yetiştiriciliği ve Ankara Tiftik Sanayisi Tarihine Genel Bir Bakış. In *Tarihi Dokumak: Bir Kentin Gizemi, Sof* (pp. 71–87). Koç Üniversitesi VEKAM.

Tanör, B. (2016). *Türkiye'de Kongre İktidarları (1918 - 1920)*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Taşkın, N. (2011). *Anılarla Ailemiz ve Ankara*. Ankara: Yıldızlar Yayıncılık.

Tezel, Y. S. (1982) *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi*. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları,

THE TURKISH MOHAIR INDUSTRY. (1909). *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, *57*(2949), 576.

Toprak, Z. (2023). *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Uluğ, N. H. (1973). *Hemşehrimiz Atatürk*. İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi .

Varlı, A., & Koraltürk , M. (2010). II. Meşrutiyet'ten Erken Cumhuriyet'e Milli İktisadın Sürekliliği ve İzmir İktisat Kongresi. *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *9*(20), 127–142.

Varlık, M. B. (2014). Ankara Millî Mensucat [Türk] Anonim Şirketi (1916-1930). *Ankara Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(1), 74–92.

Wallerstein, I. (1998) The Bourgeois(Ie) as Concept and Reality. *New Left Review*, (167), 91–106.

Yavuz, E. (2000) 19. Yüzyıl Ankarasında Ekonomik Hayatın Örgütlenmesi ve Kent-İçi Sosyal Yapı. In *Tarih İçinde Ankara* (pp 195–206). Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Ankaralılar Vakfı.

Yaycıoğlu, A. (2016). *Partners of the Empire: The Crisis of the Ottoman Order in the Age of Revolutions*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Yıldırım, Z. (2023) Yeni Çağ'da Ankara. In *Ankara Ansiklopedisi I* (pp 68–71). Ankara: Net Kitaplık Yayıncılık, 2023.

Yılmaz, C. (2011). *Osmanlı Anonim Şirketleri: Ticaret ve Ziraat Nezareti tarafından 1918 yılında yayınlanmış olan "Memalik-i Osmaniye'de Osmanlı Anonim Şirketleri" başlıklı katalog*. İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık.

Yücel, G. Ç. (2018). Tarihi Dokumak: Bir Kentin Gizemi Sergisi Sof, Tiftik ve Ankara Keçisinin 600 Yıllık Serüveninin İzinde. In *Tarihi Dokumak: Bir Kentin Gizemi, Sof* (pp. 9–42). Ankara: Koç Üniversitesi VEKAM.