



ITS IMPORTANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF TURKEY IN THE LATE 19TH - EARLY 20TH CENTURIES

Nabiyev Elyor Bakhtiyorovich

Tashkent State Pedagogical University named after Nizami

Head of the Department of Work with Youth, Spirituality and Enlightenment

Anotation

In this article, the peculiarities of the development of the Ottoman Empire in the late 19th and early 20th centuries led to the fact that the country integrated into capitalist relations very slowly and with difficulty due to the preservation of semi-feudal relations within the country and its economic and political dependence on Western countries, primarily Germany.

Keywords: Ottoman, Unity and progress, Young Turks, Ottoman Committee, Can verir, Germanization.

Introduction

The peculiarities of the development of the Ottoman Empire in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, which we are studying, led to the fact that due to the preservation of semi-feudal relations within the country and its economic and political dependence on Western countries, primarily Germany, the country integrated into capitalist relations very slowly and with difficulty. .

The emerging class of military and civil intellectuals in the country was in favor of changing the country's economic and political structure and feudal foundations in society and creating economic conditions for the development of the bourgeoisie.

In response to this political call, the foundations of a new reformist movement began to form, among which the establishment of the secret political society "Unity and Development" should be noted. It was founded by Ibrahim Temo, a student at a military medical school in Istanbul, and was the center of the immigrant opposition in Paris, led by Ahmed Reza Bey, the son of an influential Turkish official. Opposition movements criticizing the power of Abdul Hamid II gathered more and more supporters. In Europe, members of such opposition organizations began to be called "Young Turks".

In the context of the transformation of the Ottoman Empire into a peripheral element of world capitalism and the strengthening of the liberation movement among its non-Turkish citizens, the national issue, which was not unanimous among the leaders of the Young Turks, was of particular importance. Among them, based on the interests





of the emerging Turkish bourgeois society under the leadership of Ahmad Reza, they promoted the doctrine of "Ottomanism", because they saw in this doctrine a means of preventing the disintegration and division of the empire.

D. E. Eremeev describes Akhmed Reza and his supporters as a force that seeks to stop imperialist forces from interfering in the affairs of the empire. Declaring themselves supporters of the equal rights of all peoples in the Ottoman Empire, they did not accept the proposal to grant wide autonomy to national minorities¹.

A group of "Young Turks" led by Abdul Hamid's nephew Prince Mehmed Sabahiddin (1877-1948) took a different approach.

Sabahiddin called for an alliance with the foreign bourgeoisie and proposed to solve the national question by forming an Ottoman federation in which all the nationalities of the empire would enjoy autonomy. He also called for active cooperation with foreign countries to achieve capital flow and the development of private initiative, opposing the centralized state that binds initiative and entrepreneurship².

The first attempt to unite the efforts of all political societies, groups and circles that fought against the despotic regime led by Abdul Hamid was made in 1902 at the first congress of the "Young Turks" in Paris. However, the internal disagreement about the goal and method of the struggle led to the split of the "Young Turks" and the formation of two organizations: Ahmed Reza's "Committee of Ottomans "Union and Development") and Sabahiddin's "League of Private Initiative and Decentralization"³. The rivalry between the two "Young Turks" centers leads to a temporary decrease in their activity against the tyranny of Abdul Hamid. This is especially evident against the background of the growing movements of non-Turkic peoples. In the same years, the activity of Armenian nationalists increased, opposition Arab organizations were revived, anti-Turkish sentiment became widespread in Albania.

So at the beginning of the 20th century. Against the power of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, the "Young Turks" and the forces of the liberation movement of national minorities acted separately from each other.

The revolution in Russia, which began in 1905-1907, and then the revolution in Iran, which took place in 1905-1911, led to the strengthening of the "Young Turks" movement. At the end of 1905, in Anatolia, especially in its eastern regions, revolutionary uprisings began to gain a large scale.

¹ Еремеев, Д.Е. На стыке Азии и Европы (очерки о Турции и турках) [Текст]/ Д.Е. Еремеев. - М.: Главная редакция восточной литературы издательства «Наука», 1980, С.87.

² Иванов С.М. Османская империя в мировой экономической системе: вторая половина XIX- начало XX в.: дисс. доктора исторических наук, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2005, С.77.

³ Ўша жойда. С.99.





Erzurum became the center of these movements. At the beginning of 1906, the first bourgeois-revolutionary organization - "Can verir" ("Life gives") was formed there, which united representatives of various layers of society - merchants, artisans, religious figures, soldiers and officers. The support of the protesters was so strong that for about two years there was a virtual dual power in Eastern Anatolia as all attempts by the government against the community leaders failed⁴.

In 1906-1907, the growth of the revolutionary situation in the empire required the "Young Turks" movement to reconsider its strategy and tactics. They realized the need to unite their ranks and unite all the forces that fought against the sultan's absolute power. In September 1907, the leaders of the Paris Committee of Unity and Development, headed by Ahmad Reza, united with the illegal organizations close to them in the Ottoman society "Unity and Development".

In 1907, a congress of opposition forces gathered in Paris decided to overthrow Sultan Abdul Hamid II through an armed uprising and restore a constitutional government. Initially, the uprising was planned for the end of August 1909, the first anniversary of Abdul Hamid II's accession to the throne. However, the development of events forced "Young Turks" to start their performances early. The Sultan's government intensified the punishment measures against the national liberation movement and the repression against the members of the illegal "Young Turks" organizations.

Undoubtedly, under the influence of the revolution in Russia in 1906-1907, social unrest broke out in the Ottoman Empire. This led to demonstrations, occupations and rebellions, especially in the Eastern Anatolian provinces. This was caused by the government's attempts to introduce new taxes after this year's crop failure, high bread prices and arrears, especially among the military. The unrest that started in Kastamonu spread to Trabzon, Erzurum, Van and Diyarbakır. Especially the "Young Turks" who lived in exile in Kastamonu played a key role in promoting the uprising. Opposition spies sent to the east tried to politicize the protests, but the League of Private Initiative and the Armenian Revolutionary Federation were more influential than the Committee of Unity and Development⁵.

According to R.K.Kilasov, in February 1908, Austria's announcement about the construction of a railway connecting Bosnia and Saloniki lines through Novibazar, thus bringing the entire western part of the Balkan Peninsula under Austrian influence, accelerated the revolution⁶.

⁴ Киреев Н. Г. История Турции XX век. М.: Крафт + ИВ РАН. 2007, С.114.

⁵ Новичев, А. Д. Очерки экономики Турции до мировой войны [Текст] / А. Л. Новичев; Акад. наук СССР. Ин-т востоковедения. - Москва; Ленинград: Изд-во Акад. наук СССР, 1937, С.33.

⁶ Киласов, Р.К. Буржуазные революции в Турции в первой четверти XX века /Р.К. Киласов – Махачкала, 1990, С.95.





According to Yu.A.Petrosyan, England and Russia, who were in favor of saving Macedonia from the threat of "Germanization", put a number of demands on the Ottomans to implement reforms. In particular, 10,000-12,000 foreign corps have asked for permission to enter this area⁷. Such a decision on the fate of Macedonia meant its separation from the Ottoman Empire and, at the same time, the end of the main center of the revolutionary movement in the country. The threat of crushing the opposition forces and the Anglo-Russian ultimatum to the Ottomans prompted the "Young Turks" committee in Thessaloniki to decide to start the movement immediately.

The real impetus for the revolution came from factions within the empire, especially disgruntled members of the 3rd Army Corps in Macedonia. Many young corps officers stationed in Thessaloniki joined the Ottoman Liberation Society in 1906. This secret revolutionary group merged with the Committee of "Union and Progress" in Paris the following year, and as a result, young Turkish ideologues gained command of the 3rd Army Corps⁸.

The "Young Turks" revolution was carried out by the military forces. On July 3, 1908, Major Ahmed Niyazi from the 3rd Corps raised an uprising against the regional authorities in the city of Resna. Other conspirators soon follow suit, and the rebellion quickly spreads across the empire. Unable to rely on government troops, Abdul Hamid II proclaimed the restoration of the 1876 constitution on July 23 and dissolved parliament.

Soon, the military garrisons of Thessaloniki and other large cities of Macedonia will go over to the side of the rebels. The revolutionary movement was supported by partisan units operating here and in Albania, as well as by the local population. On July 23, 1908, the rebels entered Thessaloniki and other large cities of Macedonia.

According to A.S. Silin, Abdul Hamid II was forced to agree to the restoration of the 1876 constitution and the convening of the parliament. A wave of violent demonstrations that covered the largest cities of the empire forced the sultan to make new concessions⁹. An amnesty was declared for the participants of the revolutionary movement, censorship was abolished, the secret police of the sultan was abolished, and an army of 30,000 provocateurs was disbanded.

The "Young Turks", who achieved a quick and bloodless victory, believed that the revolution had won. However, their actions during the short-term "constitutional

⁷ Петросян Ю.А. Младотурецкое движение (вторая половина XIX. -начало XX в.). М., 1971, С.93.

⁸ Пиотровский, С. Свет и тени Турции [Текст]/ С. Пиотровский. - М.: Главная редакция восточной литературы издательства «Наука», 1981, С.107,

⁹ Силин А.С. Экспансия германского империализма на Ближнем Востоке накануне первой мировой войны (1906-1914 гг.). М., 1976, С.97.





spring" practically did not affect the foundations of the old regime. This allowed the feudal-clerical reaction to quickly recover from the blow. The position of the Young Turks will soon weaken as the supporters of Sabahiddin do not accept the new program of the Union and Development Committee¹⁰.

Sabahiddin's supporters form their own liberal party (Hizb al-Ahrar) and ally with the conservative Ottoman bureaucracy to oust those associated with the Committee of Union and Development. Bourgeois-revolutionary organizations that fought for the national liberation of the Macedonian and Albanian population also left the alliance with the Young Turks. M. S. Meyer notes that the work of the Chamber of Deputies (the lower house of the Ottoman Parliament) elected in the fall of 1908 under the leadership of Ahmad Riz was not very effective. During his five-month tenure, he did not make any important decisions. This led to a decrease in the reputation of the leaders of the "Union and Development" Committee among the population¹¹.

As it is known, the restriction of the power of Abdul Hamid II and attempts to carry out reforms in various fields did not please the Sultan, and he tried to take revenge. On April 13, 1909, the reactionaries agreed with Abdul Hamid II and with the support of the clergy and part of the leadership of the Hizb al-Ahrar party managed to organize a demonstration of a part of the Istanbul garrison, who demanded the dissolution of the Chamber of Deputies, the role of religious law (Sharia) and the restoration of the authority of the Sultan¹². In a short time, Abdul-Hamid managed to restore the autocratic regime. However, the Young Turks, whose leaders managed to escape to Thessaloniki, managed to quickly suppress the uprising in the capital.

Most of the active participants of the uprising were arrested, some, including Prince Sabahiddin, managed to escape and then went to Europe. The next day, the parliament decides to remove Sultan Abdul Hamid II from the throne and deprive him of the caliphate. Aged and weak-willed, Mahmud V Rashid (1909-1918) ascends the throne. A number of figures from the Union and Development Committee will join the new government. Their supporters were appointed governors, ambassadors, and held the highest positions in the army and court¹³. The events of April 1909 marked the end of the "Young Turks" revolution.

In conclusion, after analyzing the historical foundations of the modernization of Turkey's development in the late 19th - early 20th centuries, we can draw the following conclusions.

¹⁰ Еремеев, Д.Е. На стыке Азии и Европы (очерки о Турции и турках) [Текст]/ Д.Е. Еремеев. - М.: Главная редакция восточной литературы издательства «Наука», 1980.

¹¹ Мейер, М.С. Историческая динамика исламской цивилизации [Текст]/ М.С. Мейер// Исламская цивилизация в глобализирующемся мире. По материалам конференции/ Отв. ред. В.Г. Хорос. – М.: ИМЭМО РАН, 2011. – С. 51.

¹² Киреев Н. Г. История Турции XX век. М.: Крафт + ИВ РАН. 2007, С.116.

¹³ Широкоград А. Взлет и падение Османской империи М., Мысль, 2012, С.45.





During the study of the concept of modernization and the features of its implementation, it can be noted that the theory of modernization tried to explain the process of social evolution. Modernization has been seen by scholars as the expansion of "modern" social elements into "traditional societies" through education, consumption patterns, ways of thinking, and economic life typical of capitalism. At the same time, development has been interpreted as an internal process that takes place within national boundaries but is open to the impulses of the modern world.

References

1. Абдрахманова, Г. Турция / Г. Абдрахманова. - М.: Директ-Медиа, Комсомольская правда, 2014. - 747 с.
2. Аватков В.А. Внешнеполитическая идеология Турецкой Республики при правлении Партии справедливости и развития: дисс. на соискание ученой степени канд. политич. наук. М., МИД, 2013. – 139 с.
3. Аватков В.А. Внешнеполитический курс Турецкой Республики в рамках современной системы международных отношений: автореф. дисс. на соискание уч. степени доктора политич. наук. М., МИД, 2020. – 49 с.
4. Акопян В. Турция использует американскую стратегию «контролируемого хаоса» [Электронный ресурс] // ИА Регнум. - 01.06.2010. - Режим доступа: <http://www.regnum.ru/news/1289484.html>
5. Александер Дж. После неофункционализма: деятельность, культура и гражданское общество / пер. с англ. Т.В. Дорофеевой // Социология на пороге XXI века. М.: Интеллект, 1998. С. 238.
6. Алибеков, И.В. Государственный капитализм в Турции / И.В. Алибеков. – М.: Наука, 1962. – 243с.
7. Алиев, Г.З. Турция в период правления младотурок (1908-1918 гг.) /Г.З. Алиев. – М.: Наука, 1972. – 360с.
8. Алексеев, В.М. Внешняя политика Турции / В.М. Алексеев, М.А. Каримов. – М.: Изд-во ИМО, 1961. – 96с.
9. Аралов, С.В. Турция Ататюрка. Воспоминания Полпреда / С. Аралов // Международная Жизнь. – 1960. – № 8. – С. 113 – 119.
10. Арешев А. Непризнанные государства: в поисках стратегии мирного урегулирования конфликтов//21-й век. 2007. №2(6) с.123-139
11. Астахов, Г. От султаната к демократической Турции / Г. Астахов. – М. – Л.: Государственное издательство, 1926. –52с.
12. Астафьев Н. И. Русско-германские отношения 1905-1911 гг. - М.: Изд-во Московского Университета, 1972.





13. Ататюрк Кемаль. Избранные речи и выступления / Ататюрк Кемаль. – М.: Политиздат, 1966.
14. Багиров, Ю.А. Турция на Лозаннской конференции: Автореф. канд. истор. наук / Ю.А. Багиров; Академия Наук СССР. Институт Востоковедения. – М., 1955. – 16с.
15. Багиров, Ю.А. Из истории советско-турецких отношений в 1920-1922 гг. (по материалам Азербайджанской ССР) / Ю.А. Багиров. – Баку: Издательство академии наук Азербайджанской ССР, 1965. – 144с.
16. Бакустин А.В. Турция, Россия и государства Центральной Азии в XXI веке//Россия и современный мир. 2009. №2 (63) С.175-186
17. Барг М.А. Эпохи и идеи. Становление историзма. М.: Мысль, 1987. – 259 с.
18. Баталов Э.Я. Мировое развитие и мировой порядок. М., РОССПЭН, 2005. – 169 с.
19. Бжезинский З. Великая шахматная доска: Господство Америки и его геостратег, императивы. М.: Международные отношения, 1998. 704 с.
20. Богатуров А.Д., Косолапов Н.А., Хрусталева М.А. Очерки теории и политического анализа международных отношений. М.: НОФМО, 2002. – 285 с.
21. Болдырев А. В. Конвенция Монтрё в прошлом и настоящем российско-турецких отношений. – Мусульманское пространство по периметру границ Кавказа и Центральной Азии. М., 2012, с. 434-458.
22. Болдырев А. В. Конвенция Монтрё и политика балансирования Турецкой Республики между Востоком и Западом в XX-XXI вв. – Внешнеполитические интересы России: история и современность. Самара, 2016, с. 29–42.

