

A CITY TRANSFORMED: WAR, DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE
AND PROFITEERING IN KAYSERI (1915-1920)

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

BY

OYA GÖZEL DURMAZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

JUNE 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Ömer Turan
Head of Department

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

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur	(METU, HIST)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut	(METU, HIST)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Oktay Özel	(Bilkent, HIST)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. E. Attila Aytekin	(METU, Pol. Scie.)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Selçuk Dursun	(METU, HIST)	_____

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

Name, Last name : Oya Gözel Durmaz

Signature :

ABSTRACT

A CITY TRANSFORMED: WAR, DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE AND PROFITEERING IN KAYSERI (1915-1920)

Gözel Durmaz, Oya

Ph.D., Department of History

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut

June 2014, 294 pages

One of the foundational origins of the Turkish Republic was the drastic change in the demographic composition of Anatolia following the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 and World War I. This change was a result of factors such as the deportation of Armenians, the exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece and the high number of deaths in successive wars. All of them greatly altered the composition of the population. The change in the demographic composition of Turkey corresponded to a significant era in Turkish history: the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Turkish Republic as a nation state. Thus, this process of demographic transformation became significant in the socio-economic foundation of the new Republic.

The present study aims to analyze the socio-economic impacts of this demographic change, especially Armenian deportation, on the sanjak of Kayseri. In this respect, it starts with an assumption that the characteristics of the local forces had a decisive role in the development of the process in the localities. The basic questions that this dissertation addresses are: How were the population policies of the Ottoman government, especially Armenian deportation, implemented in Kayseri? To what extent the local dynamics and factors, like the social and economic features of the city, and the character of the governors, shaped the execution of these policies? Finally what were the

implications of this demographic transformation on the social and economic life of the inhabitants of Kayseri?

Keywords: The Armenian Deportation, Abandoned Properties, Kayseri, Conversion to Islam

ÖZ

BİR KENTİN DÖNÜŞÜMÜ: KAYSERİ’DE SAVAŞ, DEMOGRAFİK DEĞİŞİM VE VURGUNCULUK (1915-1920)

Gözel Durmaz, Oya

Doktora, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç Dr. Ferdan Ergut

Haziran 2014, 294 sayfa

Balkan Savaşları ve Birinci Dünya Savaşı süresince yaşanan demografik dönüşüm Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin kurucu temellerinden biri olmuştur. Söz konusu dönüşüm Ermeni tehciri, Türkiye ve Yunanistan arasında gerçekleştirilen nüfus mübadelesi ve birbirini izleyen savaşlar dizisi boyunca yaşanan ölümler gibi nedenlerden kaynaklanmıştır. Bu süreçte bugünkü Türkiye topraklarında yaşayan nüfusun yapısında çok ciddi değişimler meydana gelmiştir. Nüfus kompozisyonunda yaşanan bu köklü dönüşüm siyasi açıdan Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun yıkıldığı ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin kurulduğu çok önemli bir döneme denk gelmiştir. Dolayısıyla yaşanan demografik dönüşüm süreci, yeni kurulan Cumhuriyetin sosyo-ekonomik temelleri üzerinde de çok önemli etkilerde bulunmuştur.

Bu çalışma yaşanan demografik değişimin, özellikle de Ermeni tehcirinin, Kayseri sancağı üzerindeki sosyo-ekonomik etkilerini analiz etmeyi hedeflemektedir. Bu bağlamda da, sürecin yerelliklerde şekillenmesinde yerel güçlerin özelliklerinin belirleyici bir role sahip olduğu varsayımı üzerinden hareket edilmiştir. Bu tez şu soruları cevaplaya çalışmıştır: Osmanlı hükümetinin nüfus politikaları, özellikle de Ermeni tehciri, Kayseri’de nasıl uygulandı? Şehrin toplumsal ve iktisadi özellikleri ile yerel yöneticilerin karakteri gibi yerel dinamikler ve faktörler bu politikaların uygulanmasını ne

dereceye kadar şekillendirdi? Son olarak da, bu demografik deęişimin Kayseri sancaęında yaşıyan insanların toplumsal ve iktisadi hayatları üzerinde ne gibi etkileri oldu?

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ermeni Tehciri, Emval-i Metruke, Kayseri, İhtida

To the beautiful children of June,
Ethem, Mehmet, Abdocan, Medeni, Ali İsmail, Hasan Ferit, Ahmet
and Berkin

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Ferdan Ergut who accepted to become my supervisor and encouraged me to begin this dissertation. I would also want to thank Oktay Özel, E. Attila Aytekin, Recep Boztemur and Selçuk Dursun who kindly accepted to be members of the dissertation committee, and read the draft and made valuable comments, criticisms and suggestions which had vastly improved the work.

The contributions of Oktay Özel and E. Attila Aytekin were particularly crucial in the development of this study. They were always ready to read the drafts and made constructive criticisms during the dissertation writing process. I am especially grateful to Oktay Özel for his encouragement and guidance throughout my research. Without his support and trust to me, this work would not come to an end.

I would also want to thank Hilmar Kaiser who was very kindly directed me to research in the Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives. Without his encouragement, I could not begin a thesis based on archival research. He spent much time to improve my knowledge regarding the literature and never hesitated to answer my questions. He read the draft and made constructive criticisms to my study.

I am also grateful to Kaan Durukan who read the draft and contributed greatly to the improvement of this dissertation with his comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Bedross der Matossian, Talha Çiçek and Simon Payasliyan who have generously sent a copy of their studies to me.

I wish to express my gratitude to The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) for supporting me with scholarship for five years. The Middle East Technical University also funded my research projects and thus I could conduct research in the American and British Archives.

I also wish to thank my friends Özden Erdoğan, Deniz Dölek Sever, Erinç Erdal, Gözde Somel, Çağdaş Sümer and Sibel İmren for their solidarity, encouragement and motivation during this process. Finally, I would like to thank to my family for their deep and infinite love. They have always supported me both emotionally and financially in every field of my life. I have to express my deepest thanks especially to my beloved, Orkun Saip Durmaz, for his belief in me. He has always motivated me with his love, patience and positive energy. His existence enriched me and increased my belief for the coming beautiful days.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xvi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE ECONOMY OF KAYSERI UNTIL 1915.....	20
2.1 Kayseri as a Commercial Center.....	20
2.2 Armenians in the Economy of Kayseri	34
2.2.1 Economic Life of the Armenian Villages	34
2.2.2 The Armenian Merchants.....	37
3. THE ROAD TO THE ARMENIAN DEPORTATIONS.....	43
3.1 The Armenian Constitution of 1860.....	44
3.2 The Internationalization of the Armenian Question.....	46
3.2.1 The Settlement of the <i>Muhacirs</i>	47
3.3 The Armenian Political Organizations	51
3.4 The <i>Hamidiye</i> Cavalry Regiments	54
3.4.1 The Land Issue	57
3.4.2 The 1894-1896 Armenian Massacres	59
3.4.3 The Second Constitutional Regime and the Land Issue	62

3.5	The Balkan Wars (1912-1913)	65
3.6	The Deportation Decision of the Ottoman Government	68
4.	THE DEPORTATION OF THE KAYSERI ARMENIANS	76
4.1	The Implementation of the Deportation Order in Kayseri	76
4.2	The Conversion to Islam: An Area of Struggle among Different Actors	91
4.3	The Demography of the Armenians at the End of the Deportations	98
4.3.1	The Number of the Kayseri Armenians after the Deportations	102
4.3.1.1	The Memoirs of a Convert.....	105
4.3.1.2	The Armenian Girls and Children at the American Mission	107
4.3.1.3	A Comparison of the Numbers	111
4.4	Conclusion	116
5.	THE ISSUE OF ABANDONED PROPERTIES IN KAYSERI (1915- 1918)	121
5.1	The Legal Arrangements	121
5.2	The Implementation.....	128
5.3	The Distribution of the Abandoned Properties.....	131
5.3.1	The Military	132
5.3.2	The State Institutions	133
5.3.3	The Settlement of the Immigrants, Refugees and Prisoners of War (<i>Üsera-yi İslamiye</i>).....	135
5.4	The Properties of the Remaining Armenians	144
5.5	The Abandoned Properties as a Diplomatic Issue	145
5.6	The Procedural Disputes over the <i>Emval-i Metruke</i>	148

5.7 The Claims of the Malpractices and “Corruption”	153
5.8 Conclusion.....	160
6. THE ECONOMY AS A CONTESTED TERRITORY: THE TRANSFORMATION OF KAYSERI’S ECONOMIC LIFE AFTER THE DEPORTATIONS (1915-1920).....	163
6.1 The “National Economy” Policy.....	163
6.1.1 First Attempts to Nationalize/Turkify the Economy	165
6.2 Post-Deportation Transformation of the Economy	166
6.2.1 Abandoned Properties in the Service of the “National Bourgeoisie”	166
6.2.2 The Establishment of the Joint Stock Companies	169
6.2.2.1 The Establishment of the Joint Stock Companies in Kayseri.....	171
6.2.2.1.1 The <i>Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi</i>	173
6.2.2.2 The Establishment of the Joint Stock Companies in Other Districts	175
6.2.3 The Implications of the National Economy Policy.....	177
6.2.4 The Collapse of the Artisanal Production and the Shortage of Labor.....	179
6.3 Conclusion.....	183
7. THE RETURN OF THE ARMENIANS (1918-1920).....	186
7.1 The Delivery of the Armenian Women and Children	190
7.2 The Flight of the Armenian Population.....	197
7.3 The Restitution of the Abandoned Properties	203
7.3.1 The Abandoned Properties of the Deceased Deportees	207
7.3.2 The Problems in the Restitution of the Properties	210
7.3.3 The Muslim Refugees and Immigrants	217
7.3.4 The Impact of Insecurity	220

7.4 The Decree of 8 January 1920.....	225
7.5 The Demography of Kayseri in the 1920s.....	228
8. CONCLUSION	232
REFERENCES	240
APPENDICES	256
APPENDIX 1	256
APPENDIX 2	262
APPENDIX 3	266
APPENDIX 4	268
APPENDIX 5	273
APPENDIX 6	274
APPENDIX 7	275
APPENDIX 8	294

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 1	An average from the last five years of the imports and exports of Kaisarieh furnished by one of the leading merchants.....	23
Table 2	The Carpet and Rug Manufacturing in Kayseri sanjak.....	27
Table 3	The Oriental Carpet Manufacturers Ltd., Report of the Board of Directors on Carpet Making (1910-1914).....	30
Table 4	The Population of Kayseri Sanjak According to the Census of 1914.....	76
Table 5	The Population of Kayseri Sanjak by 22 September 1915.....	90
Table 6	The Number of Armenian Deportees.....	98
Table 7	The Number of Armenians at the End of the Deportations.....	100
Table 8	The Distribution of the Kayseri Armenians.....	102
Table 9	The Number of Armenians in the Sanjak of Kayseri by 22 October 1916.....	104
Table 10	The Number of Armenians in Kayseri Sanjak by February 1917.....	118
Table 11	The Distribution of the Refugees in the Ottoman Lands in the Spring of 1916.....	141
Table 12	The Alleged Crimes Related with the Deportation and Investigation Results.....	158
Table 13	The Distribution of the Orphans in Turkey by June 1922.....	197
Table 14	The Population of Kayseri Sanjak in 1922.....	229
Table 15	The Population of Kayseri According to the Census of 1927.....	230

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.MKT.MHM	: Sadaret Mektubi Mühimme Kalemî Evrakı
A.MKT.UM	: Sadaret Mektubi Kalemî Umum Vilayat Evrakı
ARF	: The Armenian Revolutionary Federation
BEO	: Bab-1 Ali Evrak Odası
BOA	: Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi
CUP	: The Committee of Union and Progress
DH.EUM	: Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti
DH.EUM.2.Şb	: Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti İkinci Şube
DH.EUM.6.Şb	: Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Altıncı Şube
DH.EUM.MEM	: Dahiliye Emniyet-i Umumiye Memurin Kalemî
DH.EUM.VRK	: Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Evrak Odası
DH.HMŞ	: Dahiliye Nezareti Hukuk Müşavirliği
DH.İ.UM	: Dahiliye Nezareti İdare-i Umumiye
DH.İ.UM.EK	: Dahiliye Nezareti İdare-i Umumiye Ekleri
DH.MB.HPS	: Dahiliye Nezareti Mebani-i Emiriye ve Hapishaneler Müdüriyeti
DH.SYS	: Dahiliye Nezareti Siyasi Kısım
DH.ŞFR	: Dahiliye Nezareti Şifre Kalemî
DH.UMVM	: Dahiliye Nezareti Umur-ı Mahalliye-i Vilayat Müdüriyeti
HR.SYS	: Hariciye Nezareti Siyasi Kısım
MF.MKT	: Maarif Nezareti Mektubi Kalemî
MV	: Meclis-i Vükelâ Mazbataları
NARA	: The US National Archives and Records Administration
ŞD	: Şura-yı Devlet

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the foundational origins of the Turkish Republic was the drastic change in the demographic composition of Anatolia following the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 and World War I. According to the population census of 1906, the Ottoman population in Turkey's current boundaries was about 15 million: 80% Muslims, 10% Greeks, 7% Armenians, approximately 1% Bulgarians and 1% Jews and other religious groups in small numbers such as Protestants, Armenian Catholics, Syriacs, Roman Catholics (Latins). In 1927 the population of Turkey decreased to 13.6 million despite high level of the Muslim immigration from the Ottoman territories that had been lost. This change was a result of factors such as the deportation of Armenians, the exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece and the high number of deaths in successive wars. This process greatly altered the composition of the population and the non-Muslim population decreased to 2.6% of the total population by 1927.¹ This change in the demographic composition of Turkey corresponded to a significant era in Turkish history: the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Turkish Republic as a nation state. Thus, this process of demographic transformation became significant in the socio-economic foundation of the new Republic.

These population movements mentioned above and the policies of the Committee of Union and Progress (hereafter CUP) which changed the demographic composition of Anatolia attracted the attention of the scholars especially in the last decade. The literature focused on central state policies, with the demographic policies of the CUP being generally evaluated in the

¹ 28 *Teşrinievvel 1927, Umumi Nüfus Tahriri, Usuller Kanun ve Talimatnameler, Neticelerin Tahlili, Fasikül III*, Ankara, Başvekalet Müdevvenat Matbaası, 1929, pp. 8, 30; Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914, Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985, pp. 168-169; Çağlar Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey*, London, Verso, 1987, pp. 67-69, and 79-81; Erik Jan Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, Istanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2007, pp. 239-241.

context of “demographic engineering”, and the homogenization/Turkification/Islamization of the population:

Demographic engineering is a novel concept employed to explain the forced migrations and ethnic cleansing of recent decades in several regions of the world... it defines state intervention regarding population level, composition, distribution and increase/decrease. In other words, any deliberate state programme or policy originating from religious/ethnic discrimination or initiated for political, strategic or ideological reasons which aim to increase the political and economic power of one ethnic group over others by manipulating population through various methods can be defined as demographic engineering.²

From the perspective of the demographic engineering concept, the forced migration of the non-Muslim communities was a part of the attempts by the state to change the demographic composition of the country. The expulsion of the Greek population from Western Anatolia before the outbreak of World War I and the Armenian deportations were implemented in this context. The settlement of the Muslim refugees and immigrants in place of the non-Muslims accompanied the deportations. The ruling elite implemented such policies to create the majority of Turkish/Muslim element in the “homeland”. However, this process had another important component, consisting of the “national economy” policy. The strengthening of the “national”, namely Turkish and Muslim, element economically was a part of the demographic engineering. Within this framework, the economic power of the non-Muslim entrepreneurs had been targeted by boycotts or confiscation of their properties.³

These demographic policies also targeted the Muslim communities which were distributed within the Ottoman lands in order to prevent them being a

² Nesim Şeker, “Demographic Engineering in the late Ottoman Empire and the Armenians”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 43, No. 3 (May 2007), p. 461.

³ Şeker, “Demographic Engineering in the late Ottoman Empire”, pp. 461-474; Fikret Adanır and Hilmar Kaiser, “Göç, Sürgün ve Ulusun İnşası: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Örneği”, *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 186 (June 2009), pp. 18-27; Erik Jan Zürcher, “The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of Demographic Engineering”, paper presented at the conference “Le Regioni Multilingui Come Faglia e Motore Della Storia Europe Nel XIX-XX Secolo”, Napoli, 2008, p. 6 (Retrieved January 29, 2013 from, http://www.sissco.it/fileadmin/user_upload/Attivita/Convegna/regioni_multilingue/zurcher.pdf)

compact group in a district. The Ottoman governors considered this distribution to be important to prevent the future nationalist demands and organized the transfer and settlement of the populations with a high level of statistical concern in mind.⁴

Ülker points out that the Turkification policies were not implemented in all territories of the empire. It was only Anatolia that became the target of such policies as the “core of the nation-building project”:

...[i]t [Turkification] has to be categorized as a specific policy pattern that aimed to construct a national core in the empire. This has two dimensions. The first is the geographical nationalization of specific areas in order to turn them into a basis wherein the nation-building project would be implemented... The second dimension concerns the question of which peoples and communities of the empire are to be included in the empire’s core nation. This results in the *assimilation* of some communities and the *dissimilation* of others on the basis of inclusion into or exclusion from the core nation.⁵

In this respect, Ülker rejects the generalizing arguments regarding the Turkification policies. He proposes that instead of such arguments, the geographical variations in the implementation of these policies are to be taken into account. For instance, while Turkification policies were applied in Anatolia, “relative administrative authority and language rights” were given in the Arab provinces. The economic nationalization was a part of the Turkification policies, but Ülker asserts that demographic policies of settlement and forced migrations were the main devices of the government within this framework. Another important point was that while the non-Muslim groups were excluded from the “core of the nation”, the non-Turkish Muslim groups were incorporated.⁶

⁴ Fuat Dündar, *İttihat ve Terakki’nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası (1913-1918)*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2001; Fuat Dündar, *Modern Türkiye’nin Şifresi, İttihat ve Terakki’nin Etnisite Mühendisliği*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2008.

⁵ Erol Ülker, “Contextualising ‘Turkification’: Nation-Building in the late Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918”, *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 11, no. 4 (2005), p. 615.

⁶ Ülker, “Contextualising ‘Turkification’”, pp. 614-625.

The studies focused on the central government policies are important in the evaluation of the demographic policies of the Ottoman government; however, the socio-economic impacts of the demographic change in the localities still stand as a neglected dimension of the process. Most of the existing studies are constructed from the telegrams sent from the Ministry of Interior (*Dahiliye Nezareti*) to the localities. This kind of research contributes to our understanding of the central government policies at a macro level, but a gap exists regarding the development of the process in the localities. Our knowledge regarding the implementation of the policies in the localities and their impacts remains limited compared to the more general studies. The deficiency in the local histories mainly stemmed from the absence of archival documents sent from the localities to the center. However, the new documents made public in the Ottoman Archives, especially the received coded telegrams, provide the opportunity to evaluate the developments in the localities. Thus, the analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the population movements emerged as a new area of study in recent years.

Based on these new documents, the present study aims to analyze the socio-economic impacts of the central government policies during World War I on the district of Kayseri which was an independent sanjak (*mutasarrıflık*) of the Ottoman Empire by the beginning of the war.⁷ The basic questions that this dissertation addresses are: How were the population policies of the CUP, especially Armenian deportation, implemented in Kayseri? To what extent the local dynamics and factors, like the social and economic features of the city, and the character of the governors, shaped the execution of these policies? Finally what were the implications of this demographic transformation on the social and economic life of the inhabitants of Kayseri?

A significant number of Armenians lived in the sanjak and comprised twenty percent of its total population (about 52,000) before 1915, and this

⁷ Kayseri was a sanjak of Ankara province until 1914, but it became an independent sanjak on 20 April 1914. It had four counties (*kazas*): Kayseri, Bünyan, Develi and İncesu. The independent sanjaks were directly bound to the Ministry of Interior in the Ottoman provincial administration system. Zübeyir Kars, *Milli Mücadelede Kayseri*, Ankara, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1993, p. 75.

Armenian community included important merchants with considerable commercial assets. Since Kayseri did not become a battle zone during the war, the most transformative factor in the transition of the sanjak from the Ottoman to Republican period was the Armenian deportation. Therefore, the role of the deportation in the social and economic transformation of a district would be more easily evaluated in the case of Kayseri for the sanjak was relatively free of other transformative factors; such as being a battlefield or invaded. In addition, even though the deportation was implemented in the sanjak, a significant number of Armenians were not deported and allowed to remain through conversion to Islam. Thus, it is thought that some local dynamics had an important role in the implementation process. The fact that Kayseri was a *mutasarrıflık* also affected the selection of this area as the focus of the current study. A detailed analysis of the process in a province, composed of many sanjaks with different local governors and local features, would be problematic since such a study could fail to take into account the peculiarities and variations among different sanjaks of the province.

This dissertation will examine the developments between 1915 and 1920; 1915 marked the beginning of the Armenian deportations and, in 1920, the Ottoman government ceased to be the sole authority in Anatolia. After this period, two centers of authority competed with each other for control of Anatolia as the nationalist movement aroused and a national government was founded in Ankara. The specialties of that transition period deserve a separate study. Thus, this dissertation does not extend beyond 1920.

This work will focus on the issue of “abandoned properties” (*emval-i metruke*) in order to understand the implications of the Armenian deportations on the social and economic life of Kayseri. This issue emerged as one of the significant by-products of the deportation process. The deported Armenians left behind wealth in the form of movable and immovable property. These abandoned properties thus became the subject of redistribution by the authorities. Allocating such properties was of great importance since it deeply altered the socio-economic structure of Turkey.

In the last years, abandoned properties of the deported Armenians began to attract the interest of the scholars as a new topic. The pioneering studies focused on the central government orders and the legal status of the abandoned properties. These studies contributed greatly to our understanding and increased our knowledge concerning the development of the legislation and other aspects.⁸

This study, on the other hand, does not aim to analyze the legal framework or try to reflect on the mentality of the Unionists by evaluating the content of the rules and regulations. Instead, it examines the subject by focusing on the implementation process and tries to cover topics such as the relations among social actors, conflicts and arguments, or collaborations over the distribution of the abandoned properties in the sanjak of Kayseri. This study argues that even though the content of the rules and regulations are important, the analysis of the implementation process in the localities is

⁸ For the different aspects and discussions regarding the Armenian abandoned properties see: Hilmar Kaiser, "Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies during the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1916", in Olaf Farschid, Manfred Kropp & Stephan Dähne (eds.), *The First World War as Remembered in the Countries of the Eastern Mediterranean*, Beirut, Orient-Institut, 2006, pp. 49-71 (In Turkish, Hilmar Kaiser, "1915-1916 Ermeni Soykırımı Sırasında Ermeni Mülkleri, Osmanlı Hukuku ve Milliyet Politikaları", in *İmparatorluktan Cumhuriyete Türkiye'de Etnik Çatışma*, ed. by Erik Jan Zürcher, Istanbul, İletişim, 2005, pp. 123-157); Salahaddin Kardeş, "*Tehcir*" ve *Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara, Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, 2008; Nevzat Onaran, *Emval-i Metruke Olayı, Osmanlı'da ve Cumhuriyette Ermeni ve Rum Mallarının Türkleştirilmesi*, Istanbul, Belge Yayınları, 2010; Uğur Ümit Üngör and Mehmet Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction, The Young Turk Seizure of Armenian Property*, London, Continuum, 2011; Taner Akçam and Ümit Kurt, *Kanunların Ruhü, Emval-i Metruke Kanunlarında Soykırımın İzini Sürmek*, Istanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2012; Sait Çetinoğlu, "Diyarbakır'da Ermeni Mallarını Kim Aldı?", in *Diyarbakır Tebliğleri, Diyarbakır ve Çevresi Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Konferansı*, Istanbul, Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları, 2013, pp. 368-406; Mehmet Polatel, "Diyarbakır'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Dönüşümünde Ermeni Mallarının Rolü", in *Diyarbakır Tebliğleri, Diyarbakır ve Çevresi Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Konferansı*, Istanbul, Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları, 2013, pp. 407-420. In addition to these studies, there is also a critical review of Taner Akçam regarding Üngör and Polatel's *Confiscation and Destruction* and the reply of authors to this critical review: Taner Akçam, "Uğur Ümit Üngör ve Mehmet Polatel: El Koyma ve Yıkım, Genç Türklerin Ermeni Mallarını Gasp Etmesi Kitabı Üzerine", *Tarih ve Toplum, Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no: 14 (Summer 2012), pp. 95-119; Uğur Ümit Üngör and Mehmet Polatel, "Taner Akçam'ın Eleştirilerine Dair", *Tarih ve Toplum, Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no: 14 (Summer 2012), pp. 121-136. In October 2013, Onaran published a revised and enlarged version of his book (*Emval-i Metruke Olayı*) in two volumes: Nevzat Onaran, *Osmanlı'da Ermeni ve Rum Mallarının Türkleştirilmesi (1914-1919), Emval-i Metrukenin Tasfiyesi-I*, Istanbul, Evrensel, 2013; Nevzat Onaran, *Cumhuriyet'te Ermeni ve Rum Mallarının Türkleştirilmesi (1920-1930), Emval-i Metrukenin Tasfiyesi-II*, Istanbul, Evrensel, 2013.

fundamental to understand the fate of the Armenian abandoned properties. In other words, passing from legal status (*de jure*) to actual process (*de facto*) is the focus.

The pioneering study regarding the Armenian abandoned properties was that of Hilmar Kaiser's "Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies during the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1916". His article analyzes the legal status of the abandoned properties, and then illustrates the implementation process. Kaiser evaluates the issue of abandoned properties as a part of the government policy to change the ethnic map of the Ottoman Empire. According to him, the Ottoman government aimed to change the ethnic composition of the country and the dispossession of the Armenian community accompanied this process. The Armenian abandoned properties were used for creating Muslim companies and settling Muslim immigrants. Kaiser evaluates the laws on abandoned properties as "fictitious legality". This means that the laws were just fictions which were codified to secure a legal basis to the implementation. He states that the protests of the foreign countries and their demands had a significant impact in the codification attempts of the government. Besides, Kaiser tries to show that the orders of the Ministry of Interior had more weight in the implementation process than the rules and regulations.⁹ He states that:

The Ottoman deportation law and the law on abandoned properties were both enacted retroactively. There were intended to provide excuses for the illegal action taken by Ottoman authorities. Such excuse-making was deemed necessary in view of future demands by the Ottoman's German ally and the Entente powers' threats of retribution. While Entente and German protests had an impact on Ottoman policies, they did not stop the Ottoman extermination and confiscation campaign. Instead these protests lead to the creation of a *fictitious legality*.¹⁰

Salahaddin Kardeş's book, which quoted a significant part of the legal framework concerning the abandoned properties, followed Kaiser's article.

⁹ Kaiser, "Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies", pp. 49-71.

¹⁰ Italics are mine. Kaiser, "Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies", p. 70.

Instead of making an analysis, Kardeş transcribed the original laws and regulations.¹¹ The book written by Nevzat Onaran starts from the same point, the evaluation of the legal status. Besides, as an important contribution, Onaran analyzes the debates in the Ottoman and Turkish parliaments in order to present the approaches of the ruling elites regarding the abandoned properties and the deportation of Armenians. He evaluates the issue of abandoned properties as a stage in the Turkification of economy. According to Onaran, the laws on the abandoned properties prepared a legal guise for the property transfer from the Armenians to Muslims.¹² Onaran's study can be considered as an effort to understand the “intentions” of the CUP cadres and also the Republican elite, who were regarded as the successors to the Unionists. In this respect, his book highlights the continuity of the mentality concerning the policies against the Armenians which aimed the Turkification of the economy.

Another study, which directly focuses on the abandoned properties, is the master thesis by Mehmet Polatel, “Turkish State Formation and the Distribution of the Armenian Abandoned Properties from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey (1915-1930)”. Like Onaran, Polatel underlines the continuity between the Unionists and the Kemalists. He finds important the alliance between the CUP and the “newly emerging commercial Muslim bourgeoisie” for the creation of a “national economy”, and evaluates the distribution and liquidation of the Armenian abandoned properties as a part of the national economy policy. Polatel highlights that the distribution process which began in the CUP period continued in the Kemalist era. According to him, the Unionists benefited from the war circumstances to execute their policies. He defines the homogenization of Anatolia and the creation of a national economy as the main components of these policies, and analyzes the distribution of the abandoned properties both in the Ottoman and early Republican periods within the framework of the formation of the Turkish

¹¹ Kardeş, “*Tehcir*” ve *Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*.

¹² Onaran, *Emval-i Metruke Olayı*.

state.¹³ Polatel considered that; “[i]n the case of Turkish state formation, the Armenian abandoned properties were used by the ruling elites to take consent from the society in order to apply their policies.”¹⁴ In this respect, he highlights the impact of both local and state elites in the formation of government policies.

After evaluating the legal framework of the abandoned properties and their distribution, Polatel focuses on two localities (Adana and Mamuretülaziz) in order to determine the actual implementation of the government policies. In that section, he tries to explain how Armenian deportation changed the social and economic life of these districts. He concludes that:

Indeed, the state used these properties to change the socio-economic and demographic structure of these regions. In the short run, the elimination of Armenians in these two regions led to the destruction of economy, but in the long run it resulted in the appearance of new social classes within Muslim Turkish population. This was also parallel to the policy of the creation of national bourgeoisie and promoting Muslim crafts and traders in terms of national economic policy. The distribution of the Armenian abandoned properties contributed to the achievement of these aims in these two cases.¹⁵

Even though the master thesis of Uğur Ü. Üngör is not directly focused on the issues concerning the abandoned properties, his work is also important for my dissertation since it analyzes the implementation of CUP policies in the province of Diyarbakır during World War I. He focuses on the center-periphery relations and tries to show that various alliance and resistance examples can develop in center-periphery relations. In this respect, Üngör evaluates the relations between the CUP and the local notables in Diyarbakır and the alliance of tribes, elites and officers. It is important as a case study since it shows the impact of local factors such as the local governors on the development of

¹³ Mehmet Polatel, “Turkish State Formation and the Distribution of the Armenian Abandoned Properties from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey (1915-1930)”, unpublished MA Thesis, Koç University, 2009.

¹⁴ Polatel, “Turkish State Formation”, p. 183.

¹⁵ Polatel, “Turkish State Formation”, p. 182.

different implementation processes. Üngör claims that the fanaticism of the governor Reşid Bey increased the scope of the massacres in Diyarbakır province compared to other Ottoman provinces.¹⁶

Üngör analyzes the deportation of the Armenians in the part titled “Persecution of Christian Communities, 1915”, and gives examples regarding the utilization of their abandoned properties within Diyarbakır in the context of settlement of the immigrants and national economy. Since the main trend had been to analyze the legal framework and not to focus on a particular locality, this study provided a new insight into what actually happened during the Armenian deportations by evaluating Diyarbakır case.

In the framework of this dissertation, the book written by Üngör and Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction, The Young Turk Seizure of Armenian Property*, is also noteworthy. In fact, it is a revised and enlarged version of their master theses. They argue that:

...[t]he Young Turk political elite launched a process of societal and economic transformation in order to establish a Turkish nation state with a robust economy consisting of ethnic Turks. In this process of persecution, the ethnically heterogeneous Ottoman economic universe was subjected to comprehensive and violent forms of ethnic homogenization. The distribution of Armenian wealth was a central part of this process.¹⁷

They try to analyze this process both by evaluating the legal framework and the actual implementations in the localities. Like other studies on the Armenian abandoned properties, Üngör and Polatel begin with the evaluation of the “national economy” policy and the legal status of the abandoned properties.¹⁸ For them, the Unionists used abandoned properties to change the

¹⁶ Uğur Ü. Üngör, “‘A Reign of Terror’, CUP Rule in Diyarbekir Province, 1913-1923”, unpublished Master thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2005.

¹⁷ Üngör-Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction*, p. x.

¹⁸ Taner Akçam prepared a critical review of Üngör and Polatel’s study in which he criticized the third chapter (Legal Foundations: Using the Justice System for Injustice) of the book. He commented that the authors made mistakes in the evaluation of the laws and regulations and that there was some misinformation. Üngör and Polatel also replied Akçam with an article. Since the current study does not focus on legal framework as its base or make claims that the

socio-economic structure of the country and these properties became a significant link between the state and local elites. While state elites had their own program to nationalize the economy and homogenize the population, the local elites supported the deportations to maximize their interests. Those who had connection with the local CUP cadres benefited from the liquidation process and acquired the abandoned properties. In this respect, Üngör and Polatel focus on the local elites and their collaboration with the state. According to them, this collaboration and the policies to liquidate Armenian abandoned properties continued in the Republican era.¹⁹

They try to prove the validity of their arguments by analyzing the actual process in two localities, Diyarbakır and Adana. They analyze those districts as sample of their claims rather than directly evaluating the deportation process in the localities. In this respect, they based their analysis on the Ottoman archival documents, sent from center to these areas, and the documents from the Prime Ministry Republican Archives. Üngör and Polatel conclude that:

The cases studied in this book suggest that after 1915 the process of state formation in Turkey was partly secured through the government's policy of property transfer. The expropriation process generated a nationwide network of notables loyal to the CUP in the coming decades, long enough to durably consolidate the party's grip on the state. The distribution of Armenian property was organized in such a way that it satisfied these influential families in the Ottoman Empire, but the relationship between the expropriations and the genocide was a two-way process: the Young Turk regime distributed Armenian property to local elites in exchange for support for the genocide. In other words, it was a win-win situation. The regime bought the loyalty of the old urban aristocracy by appealing to their sense of economic self-interest and thereby created a new bourgeoisie.²⁰

Following these studies described above, Taner Akçam and Ümit Kurt's joint study "*Kanunların Ruhu, Emval-i Metruke Kanunlarında Soykırımın İzini*

legal framework had the definitive impact on the implementation process neither the criticism of Akçam nor the response from Üngör-Polatel will be evaluated. For more information see Akçam, "Uğur Ümit Üngör ve Mehmet Polatel: El Koyma ve Yıkım", pp. 95-119; Üngör-Polatel, "Taner Akçam'ın Eleştirilerine Dair", pp. 121-136.

¹⁹ Üngör-Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction*.

²⁰ Üngör-Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction*, p. 167.

Sürmek” was published in November 2012. This book directly focuses on the legal framework of the abandoned properties, and in particular, provides valuable information on the Lausanne and post-Lausanne periods. Akçam and Kurt claim that the laws and regulations codified both in the Ottoman and Republican periods had a common aim of not restituting the Armenian properties.²¹

Finally, works of Sait Çetinoğlu should be mentioned. His article, “Diyarbakır’da Ermeni Mallarını Kim Aldı?”, accepts the arguments of Kaiser regarding Armenian abandoned properties and states that the laws and regulations were codified retroactively to legitimize the seizure of Armenian property. He points out that the distribution of abandoned properties continued in the Kemalist regime. The main significant feature of this article is the utilization of new sources to illustrate distribution of the abandoned properties in the Republican period. He evaluates newspaper advertisements from *Diyarbakır Gazetesi* concerning the abandoned properties put up for sale in the district between 1926 and 1931.²² Çetinoğlu also wrote the introduction of *Mardin 1915* in which he claims that the leading people in the Armenian massacres were also the ones who most benefited from this process and became rich. He claims that they coincided with the local CUP cadres and also became the leading people of the Republican period. In his study, he again used newspaper advertisements this time from *Ulus Sesi* regarding the sale of churches' and non-Muslims' abandoned properties in the Republican period.²³

As this brief analysis of the literature illustrates, the main tendency has been the evaluation of the rules and regulations in the analysis of the issue of abandoned properties. Even though it is important to take legal framework into consideration, I would rather focus on analysis of the actual process in a

²¹ Akçam-Kurt, *Kanunların Ruhu*.

²² Çetinoğlu, “Diyarbakır’da Ermeni Mallarını Kim Aldı?”, pp. 376-384.

²³ Sait Çetinoğlu, “Soykırımı Laboratuvarında İncelemek: Mardin 1915”, in Yves Ternon, *Mardin 1915 Bir Yıkımın Patolojik Anatomisi*, Istanbul, Belge, 2013, pp. 9-75. *Mardin 1915* narrates the deportation process in Mardin on the basis of testimonies.

locality. By doing this, one can go beyond presenting the “mentality” of the ruling elite, and construct the actual histories of the process. In this respect, the present study starts with an assumption that the characteristics of the local forces had a decisive role in the development of different stories in the localities.

The studies which focused on the localities such as Üngör’s master thesis and the article by Kaiser on the Aleppo province²⁴ also exemplified the impact of local factors. While Üngör analyzed the role of Reşid, the governor of Diyarbakır, in the radical implementation of the government policies in the province,²⁵ Kaiser underlined the adverse role of military and civil governors in the province of Aleppo in alleviating the execution of the policies, such as the Fourth Army Commander Cemal Paşa and the governor Celal Bey.²⁶ The article by Ayhan Aktar and Abdülhamid Kırmızı also focus on the province of Diyarbakır and evaluate the deportation process in this area. They provide an account on the role of both the governor of the province, Reşid, and also local notables and the CUP cadres in the extermination of the Armenian population within the province.²⁷

The variations in the implementation of the central government policies in the localities of Aleppo and Diyarbakır are significant since they illustrate the limits of the generalized accounts which ignore the potential autonomy of

²⁴ Hilmar Kaiser, “Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies: Ahmed Djemal Pasha, the Governors of Aleppo, and Armenian deportees in the Spring and Summer 1915”, *Journal of Genocide Research*, vol. 12, nos. 3-4 (September-December 2010), pp. 173-218.

²⁵ Kaiser’s new book published in April 2014 also analyzes deportation of Diyarbakır Armenians. Kaiser describes Diyarbakır as a region of “large scale massacres”. He focused on the role of local social actors, such as the governor of the province and local notables, and local affairs in the extermination of Diyarbakır Armenians. Hilmar Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians in the Diyarbekir Region*, Istanbul, Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2014.

²⁶ Kaiser, “Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies”, pp. 173-218. Talha Çiçek also evaluates Cemal Paşa’s Syria governorate and reaches a similar conclusion with Kaiser regarding the treatment of the Armenians in Syria. M. Talha Çiçek, *War and State Formation in Syria, Cemal Pasha’s Governorate During World War I, 1914-17*, London, Routledge, 2014, pp. 106-141.

²⁷ Ayhan Aktar and Abdülhamit Kırmızı, “Diyarbakır, 1915”, in *Diyarbakır Tebliğleri, Diyarbakır ve Çevresi Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Konferansı*, İstanbul, Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları, 2013, pp. 289-323.

the local actors. This dissertation tries to analyze that potential autonomy and to what extent it was applied in the sanjak of Kayseri. The study, therefore, directly targets the analysis of the deportation process and its impact on a locality, instead of using the local as a sample of a generalized account.

Such a detailed analysis requires the evaluation of not only the central government orders but also the telegrams sent from the localities to the center.²⁸ Nevertheless, most of the existing studies on the Armenian deportation used the telegrams sent from the Ministry of Interior to the provinces and *livas* as their basic sources. However, it has to be underlined that the Ministry of Interior wrote most of them in reply to the telegrams that had been received from the localities. If the received telegrams are ignored, then there is always the possibility of misunderstandings and misconclusions in the evaluation of central government orders sent to the localities. This dissertation tries to overcome this deficiency, which affected many of the previous studies, by using the received telegrams as its main sources.²⁹

Another significant source for our study is the record books of the abandoned properties (*Emval-i Metruke Defterleri*) and the records of the Liquidation Commissions. However, those books and records are not open to the scholars. It has to be stated that without analyzing these documents the scholars cannot fully understand the liquidation process of the abandoned properties. I have tried to analyze the practice by evaluating the coded telegrams, and such an analysis enabled me to grasp a part of the story; but it is not the complete story. The coded telegrams generally contain information regarding the immovable properties which were used by the government

²⁸ DH.ŞFR (The Ministry of Interior, Coded Telegrams) classification in the Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives (*Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi/* hereafter BOA) include both the documents sent from the Ministry of Interior to the provinces and sanjaks (which can be differentiated as DH.ŞFR *Giden*), and also documents sent from the provinces and sanjaks to the Ministry of Interior (which can be differentiated as DH.ŞFR *Gelen*). The documents which was catalogued with the numbers 400 and above (such as DH.ŞFR, 464/21) contain the telegrams received by the Ministry.

²⁹ There are a few studies which utilized the received coded telegrams to analyze the Armenian deportations: Kaiser, "Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies"; Aktar- Kırmızı, "Diyarbakir, 1915"; Çiçek, *War and State Formation in Syria*; Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians*; Akçam also used a few documents in *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*.

institutions such as schools and prisons, and also the movable commercial goods which were auctioned or expropriated by the military. Besides, these telegrams generally focus on the problems and complaints in the transfer of the abandoned properties. However, we do not know what happened to the Armenian properties which did not become subject to the telegrams. For example, there is not detailed information in the documents regarding the settlement of the immigrants and refugees in the abandoned houses. The documents state the number of them, and their settlement in some evacuated villages, but there is no data on their settlement process village by village. Another example is the workshops of the deported artisans. There is also no detailed information concerning the fate of these workshops, either they were given to the immigrants and refugees or they remained vacant? Only the *Emval-i Metruke Defterleri* and records of the Liquidation Commissions can provide such detailed accounts regarding the distribution of the abandoned houses, workshops, movable properties and auctions. Therefore, my concluding remarks are open to change if these sources made public for the research of the scholars.

As another important source, I want to mention *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*. This document gives significant data regarding the population movements during the Young Turk era. The correlation of these data with the Ottoman archival documents shows that the same numbers were also recorded in the archival documents. It is understood that these data was prepared for Talat Paşa by the officials of the Ministry of Interior. The tables in this document not only provide the number of the deportees on the basis of provinces and *livas* but also give data regarding the abandoned properties. Besides, there is information on other population movements such as the Balkan war immigrants, eastern refugees, and Greek deportees.³⁰

³⁰ This document was found at the private archives of Talat Paşa and given to Murat Bardakçı by Talat Paşa's wife in 1982. Bardakçı transcribed and published it by attaching the original document to the book. It has to be stated that it was not written by Talat Paşa but prepared for the Paşa (probably) by the Directorate for the Settlement of Tribes and Immigrants (*İskan-ı Aşair ve Muhacirin Müdüriyeti*). Murat Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi, Sadrazam Talat Paşa'nın Özel Arşivinde Bulunan Ermeni Tehciri Konusundaki Belgeler ve Hususi Yazışmalar*, İstanbul, Everest, 2008.

This study utilizes not only the Ottoman archival documents but also analyzes a couple of documents from the Prime Ministry Republican Archives (BCA). However, BCA documents are not widely used since the study does not focus on the post-1920 period. Foreign consular and missionary reports are important as well. Especially, the reports of the American missionaries in Kayseri who stayed until the first months of 1917 in the sanjak provide scholars with significant information regarding the deportation process. The British consular reports are generally utilized for the 19th century and the return period of the deportees. Besides, I use the memoirs of both Kayseri Armenians such as Aris Kalfaian's *Chomaklou*, Svajian's *A Trip through Historic Armenia* and Alboyacıyan's *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria*, and the leading Muslims such as the mayor Ahmet Rıfat Çalika and Ahmet Hilmi Kalaç.³¹ However, because of the linguistic difficulties, I am not able to analyze more Armenian language sources regarding the issue. I hope that future studies analyzing Armenian memoirs and other Armenian sources will fill this gap.

Following this introduction, in order to analyze the transformation of Kayseri during the war years, the second chapter covers the economic structure of Kayseri until 1915. This chapter focuses on the commercial situation of the sanjak, and then evaluates the economic position of the Armenian community both in the villages and in the trades.

The third chapter addresses the turning points on the way to the Armenian deportations. The 19th century was an era that witnessed the internationalization of the Armenian question. In the rising inter-communal conflicts, the Armenians suffered attacks from the Kurds and Circassians. In this respect, Abdülhamit's policy of using Hamidian tribes added a new layer to the rise of the Armenian question. The establishment of the *Hamidiye* Cavalry Regiments in eastern Anatolia and their attacks on the local Armenian population became a significant element in the deterioration of the inter-communal relations. In the attacks and massacres carried out by the Hamidian

³¹ Arşak Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria, Vol. II*, (in Armenian), Cairo, 1937. (The related parts of this book were translated by Can Erzurumluoğlu from Armenian language to Turkish.)

tribes, which were protected by the Ottoman center, the Armenians were not only targets to be murdered but also had their land usurped by the Hamidian chiefs. Hence, the land issue emerged as a significant problem. Furthermore, this period marked the rise of Armenian political organizations. Therefore, I evaluate the demands and activities of those organizations. The forthcoming part of the chapter includes the impact of Balkan Wars in the demographic transformation of the empire and in the rise of Turkish nationalism. This process of the CUP's move towards nationalistic policies especially in economic and demographic context had a negative influence on the relations between the Armenian political organizations and the CUP. The chapter concludes with an evaluation of the escalation of the CUP policies during the war which culminated in the Armenian deportations.

The fourth chapter of the dissertation focuses on the implementation of the deportation order in Kayseri which had been the main factor in the socio-economic transformation of the sanjak. In this framework, the first part evaluates the demography of the sanjak before 1915, and then details the deportation of the Kayseri Armenians. The population composition of the sanjak after the application of the order is also provided. The conversion of the Armenians is a significant subtitle of this chapter. In this sense, the chapter examines both the conversion process and the peculiarities of the sanjak with a brief comparison of the situation in other provinces.

Chapter five addresses the issue of abandoned properties in Kayseri, and analyzes first the legal framework and then the appropriation of the Armenian abandoned properties in the sanjak. A significant aspect of this issue was the distribution of the properties. They were utilized for many purposes such as strengthening the Muslim bourgeoisie, the needs of the military and state institutions and the settlement of the immigrants and refugees. In this process, the properties of the deportees were confiscated and liquidated by the local authorities. However, an important number of Armenians remained in Kayseri. This chapter also evaluates the fate of their properties. The confiscation and liquidation process was not free of problems since it gave rise to both international and local conflict. In the international arena, countries such as

Germany and the United States protested to the Ottoman Empire over the issue of the appropriation of the Armenian properties. This stemmed from the fact that many of the companies in those countries had commercial relations with the Armenians and their deportation made it impossible to reimburse the credits, given by these companies to the deportees. On the other hand, the liquidation of the abandoned properties triggered a power struggle among the leading local actors on the basis of who would control the liquidation process and who would benefit from it. The malpractices and corruption concerning the Armenian abandoned properties is also evaluated within this framework.

The sixth chapter focuses on the socio-economic implications of the liquidation of the abandoned properties in Kayseri sanjak. The policies aiming to strengthen the Turkish/Muslim elements and break the power of the non-Muslims over the Ottoman economy began to be favored before the outbreak of World War I. However, the war presented the Ottoman government with many “opportunities” to execute these policies, known as “National Economy”. The emergence of abandoned properties with the deportation of the Armenians had the definitive impact in the rise of these “opportunities”. This chapter first gives the framework of the national economy policy, and tries to analyze to what degree the experience in Kayseri fits this framework. As stated above, the strengthening of the Muslim bourgeoisie was one of the targets in the liquidation of the abandoned properties. Thus, abandoned properties were channeled into the service of the Muslim entrepreneurs. An important component of the government policy was the establishment of joint stock companies. In this process, two joint stock companies were founded in Kayseri under the direct initiative of the local authorities and the CUP cadres. The *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi* was one of those companies that greatly utilized abandoned properties and this chapter also evaluates its formation. However, the transformative impacts of the deportation were not only confined with the spectacular “opportunities” for Muslim entrepreneurs but it also brought about the collapse of artisanal production and created a shortage of labor in artisans and agriculture. This chapter also analyzes this subject.

The seventh chapter focuses on the period between 1918 and 1920. By 1918, the official policy regarding the Armenians was changed in the face of the Ottoman defeat in the war, and the Ottoman government gave permission for deportees to return in October 1918. Nevertheless, this return gave rise to controversial issues such as the situation in which Armenian women married to Muslims, and the Armenian children, who had been living with the Muslim families for years, would be returned to the Armenian community. This topic is analyzed in this chapter. A second important topic is the rise of insecurity in the localities which increased the fear of future Armenian massacres and thus led to the flight of Armenian people from inland areas to coastal cities. However, the most complicated topic of the process was the restitution of the Armenian abandoned properties to the returnees since the properties of them had already been liquidated. Therefore, this chapter includes a detailed analysis of that process. The dissertation ends with the conclusion chapter which sums up the results of the study.

CHAPTER 2

THE ECONOMY OF KAYSERI UNTIL 1915

2.1 Kayseri as a Commercial Center

More than any other town, Kaisariye breathes of an olden distinction as a trade center and the seat of kings... Situated on a low spur of Mt. Argeus, the modern town of Kaisariye is the most important trade center of eastern Asia Minor. Kaisariye lies on the ancient trade route, from Sinope to the Euphrates, on the Persian "Royal Road" from Sardis to Susa, and on the Roman highway from Ephesus to the east.³²

This position of Kayseri as a traditional trade center of Asia Minor was affected by the change of trade routes and with the introduction of steam navigation. The new trade routes brought about a decline in the overall volume of international trade in Kayseri sanjak but it still held a considerable share of the regional trade. The merchants of the sanjak had an extensive commercial network with important centers both in Asia Minor and in Europe.³³

The infertility of the soil was an important factor in the rise of Kayseri as a trade center and many observers at the time remarked that the district did not

³² Melville Chater, "East of Constantinople, Glimpses of Village Life in Anatolia, the Battleground of East and West, Where the Turks Reorganized Their Forces After the World War", *The National Geographic Magazine*, vol. 43, no. 5 (May 1923), pp. 527, 532.

³³ "Report on the Trade of Kaissariah for 1848, and General Remarks on the state of the District by Henry Suter, 26 February 1842, FO 78/492", quoted by Charles Issawi, *The Economic History of Turkey, 1800-1914*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1980, p. 128. The Ottoman yearbooks mentioned the transportation as the most important factor preventing the development of trade in the sanjak. Since Kayseri was not a port city or on the way of the rail lines, the development of roads was necessary for the rise of trade. With the construction of highroads (*şose*) after 1878, trade, export and transportation found another chance of development. Construction of railroads in Konya affected the trade of Kayseri only indirectly. Before its construction, the manufactured goods were exported through Mersin port; however, after the opening of Konya railroad, the route of exportation changed. In particular, trade with Sivas, Adana and with some foreign countries was developed. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu and Murat Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası Yayınları, 1998, pp. 138, 197.

have sufficient arable land to sustain the population of the city.³⁴ British sources also confirmed that the soil was poor in and around Kayseri and the harvest sufficed for not “more than three months consumption of the population”. Thus, the deficit had to be met by deliveries of grain from Yozgat and Sivas.³⁵

Likewise, the yearbooks (*salnames*) of Ankara province³⁶ highlighted the development of commerce and the inefficiency of farming in Kayseri sanjak because of its hilly ground and the low level of agricultural production compared with the number of people.³⁷ In addition, agriculture in Kayseri was undertaken using old fashioned inefficient farming methods. Even though there was not a high level of agricultural production, the arrival of fertilization and irrigation together with weeding techniques had brought about the development of horticulture around the city.³⁸ Both yearbooks and travel accounts emphasized that fruit and vegetable growing were developed farming activities in Kayseri.³⁹ In addition to these farming activities, there was the production of

³⁴ Ahmet Hilmi Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, Yeni Matbaa, 1960, p. 57; Ahmet Nazif Efendi, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, Kayseri, Kayseri İl Özel İdare Müdürlüğü ve Kayseri Belediyesi Birliği Yayınları, 1987, p. 13; Hıfzı Nuri, *Kayseri Sancağı*, 1922, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası, 1995, p. 7; Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, p. 138; “Report on the Trade of Kaissariah for 1848”, p. 129; “General Report by Lieutenant Bennet on the Sandjak of Kaisarieh”, *Turkey, No.6 (1881), Further Correspondence Respecting the Condition of the Populations in Asia Minor and Syria*, London, Harrison and Sons, 1881, p. 271.

³⁵ “Report on the Trade of Kaissariah for 1848”, p. 129; “1318 (1900) Ankara Vilayet Salnamesi”, Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, p. 138; Ahmet Nazif, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, p. 13.

³⁶ Since Kayseri was one of the sanjaks of Ankara province until 1914, the yearbooks of Ankara province will be used for information regarding the pre-1914 Kayseri.

³⁷ “1325 (1907) Ankara Vilayet Salnamesi”, “1320 (1902) Ankara Vilayet Salnamesi”, “1318 (1900) Ankara Vilayet Salnamesi” in Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 138, 166, 197.

³⁸ Nuri, *Kayseri Sancağı*, p. 7.

³⁹ John Macdonald Kinneir, *Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia, and Koordistan, in the Years 1813 and 1814, with Remarks on the Marches of Alexander, and Retreat of the Ten Thousand*, London, John Murray, 1818, p. 103; William Francis Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Armenia, Vol. II*, London, John W. Parker, 1842, pp. 267-268, 272; Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 96, 119, 147, 172, 235-236; “General Report by Lieutenant Bennet”, p. 271.

traditional agricultural goods such as; barley, wheat, rye, pea, tare, lentil, gum tragacanth (*kitre*)⁴⁰, yellow berry (*cehri*)⁴¹, grape, apple, pear, walnut, apricot and plum.⁴²

Yearbooks and travel accounts also provide data on the manufacturing industry of the sanjak. The main products that were recorded were; carpets, rugs, light rugs (*cicim*), Morocco leather (*sahtiyani*), headscarves (*yemeni*), pastrami, furniture, towels, linen, gum tragacanth, yellow berry, madder root, seeds (*acı çekirdek*), leather from goats, sheep, and kid, cowhide, wool, grape and some grains. Of these, gum tragacanth, yellow berry, wool, carpets, rugs, leather and skins were the principal exports and the chief sources of income for Kayseri sanjak. In this context, especially the manufacture of gum tragacanth and yellow berry came to the fore.⁴³

⁴⁰ *Kitre* is the sap of a wild plant used in textiles dyeing.

⁴¹ *Cehri* is the fruit of a plant used as natural dye stuff.

⁴² The 1891 yearbook of Ankara province gave a detailed list of the agricultural goods farmed in Kayseri city and its *kazas* (counties), Develi and İncesu. Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 94-96.

⁴³ Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 138-139, 165-166; Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, pp. 267-268, 272; “General Report by Lieutenant Bennet”, p. 282.

TABLE 1: Five-years average of the imports and exports of Kayseri provided
by one of the leading merchants of the city

Imports, 1875-1880

Description of Goods	Quantity	Value on Receipt £ T.	Observations
Cloth, woolens, &c.	40,000 meters	16,000	Chiefly from Germany
Long cloths, &c.	30,000 pieces	10,000	Chiefly from Manchester
Prints	20,000 pieces	10,000	Chiefly from Manchester
Velveteens, silks, and woollens	...	15,000	Chiefly from France
Cotton, thread, &c.	10,000 rolls	5,000	Chiefly from Manchester
Woolens, Berlin wool, &c.	1,000 rolls	2,000	Chiefly from Manchester
Glass	500 cases	750	Chiefly from France
Porcelain and glass wares	...	2,000	Chiefly from France and Austria
Coffee	1,000 bags	6,000	Rio de Janeiro Coffee from Marseilles
Sugar	40,000 okes	2,500	Dutch, from Marseilles
Iron	200,000 okes	5,000	England
Copper	25,000 okes	4,000	England
Petroleum	2,000 cases	1,200	France and England
Steel	200 cases	500	England
Pepper, black	200 bags	500	Marseilles and England
Tin, for tinning vessels, &c.	6,000 okes	1,000	England
Tin tacks	500 barrels	500	England
Candles	1,000 cases	600	England
Cochineal	3,000 okes	1,500	England
Dyes and paints	5,000 okes	3,000	England
Goats' hair	40,000 okes	1,200	Marseilles
Sundries, fancy goods, &c.	...	15,000	France and Germany
Tobacco, unmanufactured	111,295 okes	12,242	
Salt	292,632 okes	3,414	
Soap	50,000 okes	2,500	From Mersin and Samsun
Cotton	100,000 okes	9,000	From Adana and Samsun
Total		130,406	

Exports, 1875-1880

Description of Goods	Quantity	Value on Spot £ T.	Observations
Yellow berries	250,000 okes	15,000	
“Kitre” (gum tragacanth)	70,000 okes	16,800	
Wool	30,000 okes	1,800	
Goat skins	20,000 skins	2,400	
Sheep skins	20,000 skins	1,300	
Hare skins	60,000 skins	1,500	Chiefly exported to Marseilles
Fox skins	8,000 skins	800	Chiefly exported to Russia
Polecat or weasel skins	1,200 skins	800	Chiefly exported to Russia
Beaver skins	200 skins	100	Chiefly exported to Russia
Lynx skins	25	50	
Mohair	5,000 okes	1,000	
Goats’ hair	6,000 okes	1,000	
Beeswax	3,000 okes	500	
Apricot stones	30,000 okes	1,200	
Salep	3,000 okes	400	
Cat-gut	50,000 pieces	400	
Opium	200 okes	400	
Narcotic of hemp or bang	200 okes	400	To Egypt
Drugget	1,500 pieces	3,000	To Europe and Egypt
Tobacco, manufactured	27,306 okes	8,192	
Salt	61,824 okes	772	
Cow hides	90,000 okes	9,000	To Constantinople
Pasterma (jerked meat)	360,000 okes	21,600	To Constantinople
Morocco leather	10,000 okes	5,000	To Smyrna and Constantinople
Wheat and barley	1,000,000 okes	10,000	To Mersin and Samsun for export
Total		103,414	

Source: “General Report by Lieutenant Bennet”, p. 282.

Yellow berry was a significant source of income for the population. William Ainsworth who visited the sanjak in the 1840s wrote that the soil of Kayseri was appropriate for the cultivation of yellow berry and its cultivation was implemented around the city. British consular sources state that two-thirds of the annual yellow berry production in the empire was undertaken in this

region and the quality of the produce was superior to those grown elsewhere.⁴⁴ The production of yellow berry brought a relative prosperity to the sanjak, and because of this income, many tradesmen and artisans turned to the production of and trade in yellow berry. According to Tuzcu, this gave rise to the decline in agricultural production and in some types of artisanship.⁴⁵

In addition to the yellow berry and gum tragacanth, carpet making had emerged as an important area of production at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries.⁴⁶ Earl Percy, who visited Kayseri in 1900, mentioned carpet making as a prominent area of occupation. According to him, the industry had been introduced in Kayseri after the Armenian massacres of 1895-1896⁴⁷ to help the people, and very high quality carpets made of wool or silk were manufactured in many houses.⁴⁸ Kalaç states that the carpet making business was initiated in the sanjak in 1893 by two entrepreneurs who had twenty five handlooms.⁴⁹

By 1898, the important Armenian carpet manufacturers were; Harutyun Gürünlüyan (50 looms), the company of Kızılyan and Kılıcıyan (60 looms), the company of Dikran Çakmaklıyan and Harutyun Kalpakyan (50 looms), Mıgırđıç Dökmeciyan (40 looms), Community of Teachers Savings (*Varjabedats Khınayoğagan Miutyun*) (30 looms), Hagop Balyan (40 looms), Daniel Sarrafyan (20 looms), Garabet Martayan (20 looms), Hovhannes

⁴⁴ Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, p. 263. “Report on the Trade of Kaissariah for 1848”, p. 129: “The principal production of the country is the yellow berry, to which the climate and soil of Kaissariah are peculiarly favorable, the quality here being acknowledged far superior to that grown elsewhere....of the total quantity of this article annually produced, it is reckoned, that two-thirds are grown in this district.”

⁴⁵ Ali Tuzcu, “19. Yüzyılın Başlarından 20. Yüzyılın İlk Çeyreğine Seyyahların Gözüyle ve Konsolosluk Raporlarında Kayseri'nin İktisadi Yapısı”, *III. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri (06-07 Nisan 2000)*, Kayseri, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2000, pp. 536-539.

⁴⁶ Kocabaşođlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 138-139.

⁴⁷ The 1894-1896 Armenian massacres will be evaluated in Chapter 3, between pages 59-62.

⁴⁸ Henry Algernon George Percy, *Highlands of Asiatic Turkey*, London, E. Arnold, 1901, pp. 60-61, 75.

⁴⁹ Ahmet Hilmi Kalaç, *Kayseri'yi Bilmek İster misiniz? Yahut Kayseri'nin Ekonomik Durumu 1911*, Kayseri, Mazaka Yayıncılık, 2007, p. 26.

Kınacıyan (20 looms), Rupen Yakupyan (20 looms), Nazar Hacıkızyan (20 looms), Bedros İspeçeryan (20 looms), Penyamin Hamalyan (20 looms), Dikran Kalpakyan (20 looms), and Mihran Yepremyan (20 looms). There were also many people who owned less than 20 looms. Since carpet manufacturing had emerged as a significant sector within the sanjak, the district governor established a Carpet Commission in 1898, consisting of a chairman; İmamzade Ömer, who had 50 looms, and the manufacturers; Hagop Morukyan, Hovhannes Avakyan, Haygazun Yahupyan and Harutyun Sariyan, who were the members of the commission.⁵⁰

Ahmet Nazif described carpet making as a rising sector of the economy with more than ten thousand carpets and prayer rugs (*seccade*) being produced annually by the beginning of 1900s. These products were exported and contributed around 50,000-60,000 liras to the economy of the sanjak. Many families earned their livelihood from carpet and rug making.⁵¹ Ahmet Nazif gave a breakdown of the carpet and rug production in Kayseri sanjak and detailed the number of workers in the Muslim and non-Muslim households:

⁵⁰ *XV. Yüzyıldan 1915'e Günümüz Türkiye'sinde Ermenilerin Ticari-Ekonomik Faaliyeti Toplu Belgeler*, ed. by Kahaçadur Dadayan, translated by Mariam Arpi and Nairi Arek, Yerevan, Gasprint, 2012, p. 47.

⁵¹ Ahmet Nazif, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, p. 12. In the British consular reports for 1880, it was stated that a limited amount of carpet was produced in Kayseri for local demand. It is understood from the comparison of this report and Ahmet Nazif's table which gave information about the first decade of 1900s that the carpet making became a rising sector of the economy in the coming twenty years. "General Report by Lieutenant Bennet", p. 269.

TABLE 2: The Carpet and Rug Manufacturing in Kayseri Sanjak

		Muslims		Non-Muslims		Total
		Kayseri city	Other counties	Kayseri city	Other counties	
Carpets	Workers	number	1,100	500	1,300	3,800
	Looms	number	10	-	100	110
	Annual manufacturing	number	10	-	100	110
	Looms	number	5	-	10	15
Rugs	Annual manufacturing	number	5	-	10	15
	Looms	number	300	200	100	800
	Annual manufacturing	number	1,210	800	300	3,100
	Looms	number	600	200	1,000	2,400
Total manufactures	Annual manufacturing	number	1,800*	800	3,000	7,400
	Total carpet looms	number	915	400	1210**	3,325
	Annual manufacturing	number	3,015***	1,600	3,410	10,625

Source: After Ahmet Nazif, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, p. 198.

* Even though this number was transcribed as “180” at the book, it can be deduced from the number of annual manufactured goods that there were 1800 rugs. Therefore, I have used “1800” instead of “180”.

** Even though this number was transcribed as “120” at the book, it can be deduced that there were 1210 looms. Therefore, I have used “1210”.

*** Even though this number was transcribed as “3,015” at the book, I calculated that annual manufacturing was 3,025.

It is understood from this table there were total 3,800 workers in the carpet and rug manufacturing. The number of non-Muslim workers exceeded that of the Muslims with 2,200 non-Muslim and 1,600 Muslim workers. Besides, the production of non-Muslim workers also exceeded that of the Muslims. This table shows that carpets both made of wool and silk were manufactured only in the Kayseri city. There was no manufacture in the townships. The carpet manufacture of non-Muslims far more than the Muslims. While the non-Muslims manufactured 110 carpets (100 made of wool and 10 made of silk), the Muslims only manufactured 15 carpets (10 made of wool and 5 made of silk). The non-Muslims also manufactured more silk rugs. The Muslims exceeded the non-Muslims only in the manufacture of wool rugs. It can be thought that the income of the carpets and rugs, especially those made of silk, was more than the rugs made of wool. Therefore, it seems that the non-Muslims gained more from the carpet and rug manufacturing compared to the Muslim workers.⁵²

The manufacture of a kind of local carpet (*kilim*) was also important in the sanjak. There were 140 looms which wove *kilim* and the total number of produced reached 19,600 of which 15,600 were exported by 1907. Approximately 150 looms produced 25,000 light rugs (*cicim*) annually and Ahmet Nazif stated that 60,000 light rugs had been exported to the United States before it levied custom duty on this type of light rug.⁵³

Women were employed to work on the carpet looms. This was related with the lower daily wage of the women. Thus, the production cost of the

⁵² Ahmet Nazif, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, p. 198. A similar table was given in the *1325 (1907) Ankara Vilayet Salnamesi*. Therefore, it can be thought that this data is from 1907. *Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi 1325 (1907)*, ed. by Kudret Emiroğlu et al., Ankara, Ankara Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1995, p. 177.

⁵³ *Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi 1325 (1907)*, ed. by Emiroğlu, et al., p. 171; Ahmet Nazif, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, p. 201.

women-made carpets was lower than that of the men-made. Arşak Alboyacıyan confirmed that women were involved in the carpet making in the Armenian villages.⁵⁴ Even though the exact information on the production process of these carpets is not available, Kalaç states that there was no particular factory in which carpets were made. Instead work was farmed out to women who used hand looms in their houses.⁵⁵

There was demand for the Kayseri carpets in the European and American markets, and carpets were manufactured for export. In particular the Armenians had actively participated in the making of carpets and the trade in these products. Big carpet making houses, where workers received training, were opened in the sanjak. The Aliotti carpet and carpet yarn factory in Sivas, which were opened in the 1900s, hired most of their craftsmen from Kayseri because of their qualifications.⁵⁶ In 1915, there were 23 companies within the sanjak who operated in the carpet trade which were owned by Armenians.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Nuri, *Kayseri Sancağı*, p. 18; Alboyacıyan, *Badmootium Hye Gesaria, Vol. II*, pp. 1588-1593.

⁵⁵ Kalaç, *Kayseri'yi Bilmek İster misiniz?*, p. 28.

⁵⁶ Tuzcu, "Seyyahların Gözüyle ve Konsolosluk Raporlarında", pp. 547-548. Aliotti was one of the founders of the Oriental Carpet Company, based in Izmir. For information about the Aliotti family see "A potted history of the Aliotti family in the Levant" (Retrieved 20 April 2013, from, <http://www.levantineheritage.com/testi77.htm>)

⁵⁷ Dadayan (ed.), *Günümüz Türkiye'sinde Ermenilerin Ticari-Ekonomik Faaliyeti*, p. 48.

TABLE 3: The Oriental Carpet Manufacturers Ltd., Report of the Board of Directors on Carpet Making (1910-1914)

	Number of looms	Number of workers	Quantity (1000 m ²)	Worth (million guruh)	Price of carpet per square meter (guruh)
Istanbul region	380	775	17	5.3	311
Uşak	1,175	5,500	150	16.9	112
Simav	380	1,120	23	1.8	78
Gördes	800	2,700	60	6.8	113
Demirci	600	1,356	31	3.8	122
Kula	1,500	3,800	35	4.7	134
Isparta	2,160	6,481	117	11	94
Eğridir	500	1,500	15	1.3	86
Burdur	800	2,400	22	2.2	100
Buldan	250	400	3	1.5	500
Kırşehir region	1,720	5,500	110	7.3	66
Kayseri, Bünyan	3,300	8,500	160	16.8	105
Sivas	550	1,800	35	6.6	188
Niğde	900	3,000	70	4.9	70
Konya, Karaman	330	900	25	2.4	96
Antep	300	850	20	2.2	110
Other regions	3,500	13,500	190	13	68
Total	19,445	60,082	1,087	108.5	99

Source: Vedat Eldem, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun İktisadi Şartları Hakkında Bir Tetkik*, Ankara, TTK, 1994, p. 86 (Source: The Oriental Carpet Manufacturers Ltd., Reports of the Board of Directors, 1910-1914, in Faik Courdoglou, *La Turquie Economique*, Librairie de l'Institut, Anvers, 1928)

According to this report of the Oriental Carpet Manufacturers Company, Kayseri was a major center of carpet making. From 1910 to 1914 there were 3,300 looms and 8,500 workers, and these were the highest numbers at the table compared to other districts. The table shows that the carpets of Buldan were the most precious with 500 guruh price per square meter. The price of Kayseri carpets per square meter was about 105 guruh. Even though the carpets of the sanjak were not among the most valuable, their price exceeded the average of 99 guruh.

Fabric weaving was another significant economic activity in the sanjak.⁵⁸ According to the 1907 yearbook, there were fifteen head scarf factories

⁵⁸ Nuri, *Kayseri Sancağı*, p. 18; Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, p. 199.

(*yazma-yemeni fabrikası*) in Kayseri.⁵⁹ Moreover, weaving of gingham (*alaca*) was prominent in the sanjak with 220 looms being used for this work. Another 250 looms produced native linens (*yerli bezi*) in the center of the city and there were 200 looms in the villages.⁶⁰ Since weaving was a leading industry, dye houses were established in the sanjak. According to Quataert there were fifteen dye houses by the beginning of the 20th century and “each employed an average of 20 workers.”⁶¹ In addition to the dye houses, the women of Kayseri were acquainted with dyeing since most of them were involved in weaving.⁶²

Weavers in the Kayseri district at this time worked on 1,500 looms, mainly producing a coarse natural-colored cotton cloth, using Adana-made yarn for the woof. To a lesser extent, they produced colorful *alaca* cloth, with imported European yarn. In the prospering conditions at the turn of the century, the city of Kayseri contained a growing muslin printing industry of some importance, employing 500 workers and using 2.7 million piastres worth of English cloth.⁶³

Intensive trade with Adana province, a center of cotton cultivation, was a factor in the development of weaving industry in Kayseri. Kinneir, who visited the sanjak in the 1810s, emphasized this commercial link and commented that Kayseri was the center of cotton trade and both Anatolian and Syrian merchants visited the city to buy cotton.⁶⁴

Free labor spun the yarn in thousands of village homes, often for family use or casual sale in nearby markets. But merchants also organized substantial putting-out systems, involving large numbers of village and town spinners. The Kayseri merchants operated a very widespread network, buying cotton from Adana (some 70 percent of its total output)

⁵⁹ *Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi 1325 (1907)*, ed. by Emiroğlu, et al., p. 171.

⁶⁰ Ahmet Nazif, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, pp. 200, 202.

⁶¹ Donald Quataert, *Ottoman Manufacturing in the Age of the Industrial Revolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 87.

⁶² Nuri, *Kayseri Sancağı*, p. 20.

⁶³ Quataert, *Ottoman Manufacturing*, p. 61.

⁶⁴ Kinneir, *Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia, and Koordistan*, p. 100.

and distributing it to the spinners throughout central and northern Anatolia.⁶⁵

Kayseri maintained an important commercial relationship with Adana and Tarsus since cotton of these areas was distributed to the hinterland through Kayseri. The merchants from Kayseri visited Adana 30-40 times a year to purchase cotton and distribute it to the Anatolian cities. However, the use of steam ships between Istanbul and the port cities reduced Kayseri's commercial activities.⁶⁶ In addition to the new trade routes, the putting-out system of the Kayseri merchants collapsed with the penetration of the European yarn imports into the market. Nevertheless, spinning yarn continued to be a part of women's occupation around Kayseri until World War I.⁶⁷

Leather tanning was another prominent sector of the Kayseri economy. Although tanneries employed old-fashioned methods and their output was not of high quality, tanned leather was one of the significant exports.⁶⁸ In addition, a saltpeter factory was opened in Kayseri in the 1840s and operated by the government.⁶⁹ The inhabitants of the city extracted saltpeter from the outskirts

⁶⁵ Quataert, *Ottoman Manufacturing*, p. 33.

⁶⁶ William Burkhardt Barker, *Lares and Penates; or, Cilicia and its Governors*, London, Ingram, Cooke and Co., 1853, pp. 372-377. Barker mentioned the involvement of Kayseri merchants in the trade of Adana: "the merchants of Tarsus and Adana are chiefly strangers, and during the hot season they visit their families in Kaisariyah, and in the other towns of Asia Minor, whence they return in the months of September and October." p. 115.

⁶⁷ Donald Quataert, *Manufacturing and Technology Transfer in the Ottoman Empire 1800-1914*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, 1992, p. 16; Quataert, *Ottoman Manufacturing*, pp. 37-38. "...yarn imports obliterated the once-prosperous putting-out system centered in Kayseri and extending into west and west-central Anatolia. The massive influx of British yarn imports began in the 1790s, was interrupted by the Napoleonic wars, and then rose very dramatically in the 1830s. During that decade, Kayseri merchants were very much on the defensive. But, they still managed to supply raw cotton from Adana to spinners in North Anatolian towns such as Zile, Merzifon and Vezir Köprü as well as Bor in the southeast. The merchants then had these town workers weave cloth for local use or for export to the Crimea. Or, they sold the yarn to large manufacturing centers such as Bursa. By the 1860s, however, the Kayseri putting-out empire had collapsed under the pressure of continuously-declining prices for British goods." p. 37.

⁶⁸ Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 139, 200; Nuri, *Kayseri Sancağı*, p. 19; *Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi 1325 (1907)*, ed. by Emiroğlu, et al., pp. 200-201.

⁶⁹ Tuzcu, "Seyyahların Gözüyle ve Konsolosluk Raporlarında", p. 549; Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, p.137.

of the city and sold it to the government. This rough saltpeter was refined at the factory and sent to Istanbul for the manufacture of gunpowder.⁷⁰ The 1882-1883 yearbook of Ankara province mentioned the existence of not only the saltpeter factory but also other factories such as; *Gözübüyükzade Fabrikası*, *Kalpakçıyan Fabrikası*, *Kundakçıyan Fabrikası*, *Karakaşyan Fabrikası*, *Tabanyan Avadis Fabrikası*, *Tabanyan Ohannes Fabrikası*, *Ağabaşyan Fabrikası*, *Kökliyan Saragan Ağa Fabrikası*.⁷¹ Even though the yearbook did not provide information about their area of production, as carpet making and weaving were the most significant manufacturing areas within the sanjak by the beginning of the 20th century, it appears that most of these factories dealt with carpet making or weaving.⁷² Alboyacıyan refers to the Kalpakyan family who had operating carpet looms in Everek. The *Kalpakçıyan Fabrikası* could be this factory. Dadayan also mentions Dikran Kalpakyan and Harutyun Kalpakyan who were involved in carpet manufacturing. Besides, we know that Krikor Kundakçıyan was a carpet manufacturer. In addition to the carpet making, Alboyacıyan cites the factory of Çakmakçıyan Hagop and Yusufyan Hacı Nişan in Everek which manufactured socks.⁷³

In 1911, the main export goods and their income were as follows: pastrami (525.000 liras), wool (37,440 liras), carpet (250.000 liras), leather (24.000 liras), *kitre* (34.000 liras), *cehri* (6.900 liras), wheat (30.000 liras), barley and rye (11.000 liras).⁷⁴

⁷⁰ “General Report by Lieutenant Bennet”, p. 269. For detailed information on the saltpeter factory see M. Metin Hülügü, “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Güherçile Üretimi ve Kayseri Güherçile Fabrikası”, *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 11 (2001), pp. 73-93.

⁷¹ Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 71-73.

⁷² The Turkish Trade Yearbook of 1924-1925 gave information about the factories in Kayseri that except flour and pharmaceutical plants, all the other factories dealt with carpet making and weaving. This production structure could be similar to the earlier period. Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 231-232.

⁷³ Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria*, Vol. II, pp. 1588-1593; Dadayan (ed.), *Günümüz Türkiye’sinde Ermenilerin Ticari-Ekonomik Faaliyeti*, pp. 47-48. Factory of Çakmakçıyan was appropriated by the government in 1915, and the machines were sent to Sivas. However, these machines could not be installed there.

⁷⁴ Kalaç, *Kayseri’yi Bilmek İster misiniz?*, pp. 21, 28-29, 33, 39.

2.2 Armenians in the Economy of Kayseri

In order to understand the impact of Armenian deportations on the economic life of Kayseri sanjak, the economic activities of the Armenians both in the villages and in the city need to be analyzed. First, the economic life in the Armenian villages will be discussed mainly by using Arşak Alboyacıyan's *Hye Gesaria* which narrated, in great detail, the history of Kayseri Armenians.

2.2.1 Economic Life of the Armenian Villages

According to Alboyacıyan, agriculture was not the main economic activity for the Armenian villagers due to the barrenness of the land. Thus, the farmers also worked as artisans. Until the 1890s, the yellow berry (*cehri*), a natural dye, had been the main source of income for poor villagers, but after this time synthetic dyes replaced natural ones. Thus, following the example of Everek Armenians the Armenian villagers turned to sericulture (*ipekböcekçiliği*). Another area of employment was gum tragacanth (*kitre*). Even though Çomaklı and Tomarza were important agricultural areas, as the efficiency of the land decreased over time, the income from farming could not support the people and allow them to pay taxes. This directed farmers to cease their involvement in agriculture and to engage in the production of gum tragacanth and other occupations that were not depended on the land.⁷⁵ For example, Kalfaian wrote:

The soil that was once virgin and fertile yielded less and less. In consequence the laboring masses weakened....The majority of the farmers soon abandoned farming and sought a livelihood from another occupation: bush cropping, gazakordzoutuin. The soil had lost its fascination. To turn things around the farmers began in engaging in the production of gum, more specifically gum-ragacent.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria*, Vol. II, pp. 1588-1593.

⁷⁶ Aris Kalfaian, *Chomaklou, The History of an Armenian Village*, New York, Chomaklou Compatriotic Society, 1982, p. 32.

Alboyacıyan specified the livelihood of the villagers village by village. It is understood that some kinds of artisanship such as plastering (*sıvacılık*), stone cutting (*taşçılık*), carpentry (*marangozluk*), pottery (*çömlekçilik*), cutlery (*bıçakçılık*), carpet making, ironsmith, silkworm breeding and shoe making were the main businesses in the Armenian villages. In Tavlusun most of the Armenians were involved in plastering; in Belegesı while the women weaved carpet, the men were known as potters and cutlers; in Derevenk and Mancusun cutting and carpentry were popular occupations among the artisans; and in Muncusun silkworm breeding was prevalent.⁷⁷ Further instances include the involvement of Armenians in iron making (*demircilik*) in Efkere, and others were involved in trade and agriculture. Most of the women wove carpets. In Fenese, the Armenian villagers engaged with fruit growing, wine making, silk weaving, carpet making, pottery, jewelry and leather tanning.⁷⁸

This diversification was however, often still insufficient. Therefore, Kayseri Armenians sought work abroad starting a trend of emigration.⁷⁹ A visiting traveler, Edmund Naumann, refers to the emigration of the villagers from the sanjak in the 1890s. According to him, there were 450 Greek, 220 Armenian and 110 Turkish households in the village of Germir with 400 families having already emigrated from the village within the past thirty years.⁸⁰ The hard rural life in the villages led many young Armenian men to become seasonal workers in Istanbul and then focus of emigration turned to the United States.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria*, Vol. II, pp. 1588-1593.

⁷⁸ Mary Kilbourne Matossian, Susie Hoogasian Villa, *Anlatular ve Fotoğraflarla 1914 Öncesi Ermeni Köy Hayatı*, trans. by Altuğ Yılmaz, Istanbul, Aras Yayıncılık, 2006, pp. 299, 301.

⁷⁹ Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria*, Vol. II, pp. 1588-1593.

⁸⁰ Edmund Naumann, “*Von Goldenen Horn zu den Quellen des Euphrat*”, quoted in *Seyahatnamelerde Kayseri*, ed. by Osman Eravşar, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası Yayınları, 2000, p. 191.

⁸¹ http://www.oia.net/news/articles/2003_06_21_News_13_31_29.html (accessed November 17, 2011); Hervé Georgelin, “Armenians in Late Ottoman Rural Kesaria/Kayseri”, in *Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri and Cappadocia*, ed. by Richard G. Hovannisian, California, Mazda Publishers, 2013, pp. 235-238. The emigration of Armenian men to America was also recorded in the memoirs

The emigration of Armenian men was also triggered by the Armenian massacres of 1895 and 1909. This population movement contributed to the prosperity of the Armenian villages as the migrants sent large sums back to their families who remained in the villages of Kayseri.⁸² According to the 1911-1912 report of the Kayseri Mission Station, a school had been opened in Tomarza, a prosperous township densely populated by Armenians, and this school was “supported by a Society formed of men from this village who have gone to America but who take an interest in their native place and have seen the value of education”.⁸³ In their 1913-1914 annual report, the missionaries described the impact of the migrants on the economic development of the villages:

The large sums sent back by the pilgrims to America very materially affect the prosperity of the villages. It is reported on good authority that about 1000 liras in one month were sent back to Tomarza, some 500 of whose men have migrated. Three or four thousand liras per year would probably not be an extravagant estimate for this village. The village of Chomaklu probably receives 1000 liras per year, while the Boys’ and Girls’ schools are entirely supported by villagers now in the United States. Our treasurer alone transmits some 400 liras per year to Chakmak, while quite large sums come for other villages. The consequence of all this is unprecedented village prosperity.⁸⁴

of Kayseri Armenians such as Stephen G. Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, New York, Green Hill Publishing Ltd., 1983, and Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*.

⁸² The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), Harvard University, Houghton Library, reel. 628; Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 62.

⁸³ “Cesarea Station, 1911-1912, General Work”, ABCFM, reel. 628. According to a report of the US Department of Labor, 65,756 Armenians emigrated to the United States from 1901 to 1924: 1,855 Armenians in 1901, 1,151 Armenians in 1902, 1,759 Armenians in 1903, 1,745 Armenians in 1904, 1,878 Armenians in 1905, 1,895 Armenians in 1906, 2,644 Armenians in 1907, 3,299 Armenians in 1908, 3,108 Armenians in 1909, 5,508 Armenians in 1910, 3,092 Armenians in 1911, 5,222 Armenians in 1912, 9,353 Armenians in 1913, none in 1914 and 1915, 964 Armenians in 1916, 1,221 Armenians in 1917, 221 Armenians in 1918, 282 Armenians in 1919, 2,762 Armenians in 1920, 10,212 Armenians in 1921, 2,249 Armenians in 1922, 2,396 Armenians in 1923, and 2,940 Armenians in 1924. Quoted from Kemal H. Karpat, “The Ottoman Emigration to America, 1860-1914”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol.17, no.2 (May, 1985), p. 196.

⁸⁴ “July 27, 1914, Annual Report of Cesarea Station, June 1913-June 1914”, ABCFM, reel. 628.

Villages such as Talas, Tavlusun, Germir, Zincidere, Endürlük, Efkere, Gesi, Nirze, Darsiyak, Mancusun and Muncusun resembled towns more than villages, and there were very attractive summerhouses and vineyards.⁸⁵ These villages had significant non-Muslim population.⁸⁶ The contradiction between the barrenness of the land and the level of development in the villages in Kayseri would, much later in 1924, become a problem in the settlement of the exchanged Muslims (*mübadils*) in the district. The Minister of Exchange, Reconstruction and Settlement, Refet Canitez, explained the reason for this problem in the session of 27 October 1924 at the National Assembly:

Then, there is the zone which includes Kayseri and Niğde. There were quite a lot of Greek villages. These were appropriated wholly in a prosperous situation. However, there is no possibility of settlement in these villages because of the absence of land. You know that the people of these villages engage in commerce with the big cities especially with Istanbul, leave their families and build mansions and houses to settle when they turn to their homeland. In other words, there are houses, but land is scarce, therefore the capability of settlement is weak.⁸⁷

2.2.2 The Armenian Merchants

As early as the 13th century, there had been Armenian merchants whose activities extended from Europe to China. The Armenian merchants of Kayseri also acquired a leading position in the trade of the sanjak and from the 16th to 18th centuries they also extended their business to cities such as Venice and

⁸⁵ Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 134, 188. The travel books also mentioned the developed situation of the non-Muslim villages in Kayseri sanjak. For instances see Hasan Özbay's quotation from Oberhummer and Zimmerer, Hasan Özbay, "XIX. Yüzyılda Talas ve Talas'ın Amerikalılar Tarafından Misyon Merkezi Olarak Seçilmesinin Sebepleri", *I. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri (11-12 April 1996)*, Kayseri, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 1997, p. 257; Henry C. Barkley, *A Ride Through Asia Minor and Armenia, Giving a Sketch of the Characters, Manners, and Customs of Both the Mussulman and Christian Inhabitants*, London, John Murray, 1891, pp. 148-149.

⁸⁶ "General Report by Lieutenant Bennet", pp. 278-281. In this report, Bennet attached tables which indicated male population and land under cultivation in Kayseri village by village. For detailed information see these tables.

⁸⁷ *TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.2, Cilt.9, İçtima Senesi.2, 48. İçtima (27 October 1924), p. 59.

Amsterdam in the west and to India in the east. They involved in the trade of “Asiatic brocades, mohair shawls and precious gems.”⁸⁸

The network of Armenian merchants was not confined only to the Ottoman Empire, especially as prominent Christians were able to gain extraterritorial rights such as obtaining foreign passports and receiving protection of European states. Eventually, they began to open commercial firms in Constantinople as well as in Manchester and other European cities and to take a leading position in import-export businesses.⁸⁹

By the 19th century, the Armenian merchants of the sanjak expanded their commercial activities and established branches both in other cities of the Ottoman Empire and in commercial hubs abroad. Istanbul and Manchester were the two main centers for their commercial activities. It seems that the Crimean War had been important event in the rise of commercial relations with Europe as many important Armenian merchants of Kayseri opened branches in Manchester after this war.⁹⁰ Famous commercial houses were established by these merchants including the Gulbenkians,⁹¹ Selians, Frengians, Manukians, Gumushians and Bashbazirgans. They involved in the trade of “woolens, silks

⁸⁸ K. S. Papazian, *Merchants from Ararat, a Brief Survey of Trade through the Ages*, ed. and revised by P. M. Manuelian, New York, Ararat Press, 1979, pp. 29, 47.

⁸⁹ Bedross Der Matossian, “Ottoman Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri in the Nineteenth Century”, in *Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri and Cappadocia*, p. 198.

⁹⁰ Alboyciyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria, Vol. II*, pp. 1478-1480; Papazian, *Merchants from Ararat*, pp. 46-48.

⁹¹ “The Gulbenkian family is a typical example: from Caesarea they had extended their relations to Constantinople, with representatives in Isfahan, Erzerum, Izmir, Adana, Aleppo, Basra, Baghdad, Mosul and Tiflis. After these they created new representatives in Marseille, Lyon, Paris, London and Manchester, spreading later as far as New York. The Gulbenkians were also responsible for introducing the latest technological developments to the Empire, particularly in the fields of medicine and agriculture. They owned one of the largest export companies in the Empire... In 1880, Sarkis Gulbenkian... was the owner of large oil fields in Transcaucasia. He was the representative of the international company of Alexander Mantacheff in the Ottoman Empire, dealing in oil for lighting and heating.” *Calouste Sarkis Gulbenkian, The Man and His Work*, Lisbon, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2010, pp. 15, 18. The son of Sarkis Gulbenkian, Calouste, born in 1869, became the most famous member of his family. Known as “Mr. Five Percent”, he became a key figure in the petroleum business of the Middle East. *Calouste Sarkis Gulbenkian, The Man and His Work*, pp. 29-32.

and other textiles, ready-made clothes, weapons, iron and capper, furs, cutlery, rugs, leather and shoes.” Some of these merchants also owned textile mills.⁹²

The Manoukians opened a branch of their firm in Constantinople in 1840 and soon became the largest wholesalers of varied merchandise in that city. The founder of the Constantinople branch was Senekerim Manoukian who also founded the chamber of commerce there. After 1854 the family opened a branch in Manchester, England, from where they forwarded English woolens and other textile goods to Constantinople, Caesarea and other cities in Turkey. They were followed by the Funduklian and Gulbenkian families who in turn, opened branches in Constantinople and Manchester after the Crimean war. Another prominent merchant from Caesarea with various business enterprises both in Europe and Asia in the 1860s was Garabed Selian who had a branch office in Tiflis solely devoted to the cotton trade.⁹³

Visiting travelers and British consular representatives confirmed the leading role of the non-Muslim merchants in the foreign trade of Kayseri. They stated that while foreign trade was in the hands of Christian merchants, the Muslim merchants generally dealt with the supply of local demand. The merchants of Kayseri were identified as “middle men engaged in the distributing trade”. They used to store the manufactured produce in their depots at Kayseri, and send them to international trade centers such as Istanbul or Izmir.⁹⁴ In addition to the export of local produces, the Armenian merchants of Kayseri mostly dealt with the trade of dry goods (*manifatura*) and became the pre-eminent importers of the dry goods in the Ottoman market. These merchants became the distributors of European industrial products in

⁹² Papazian, *Merchants from Ararat*, p. 47; Bedross Der Matossian, “The Armenian Commercial Houses and Merchant Networks in the 19th Century Ottoman Empire”, *TURCICA*, no. 39 (Fall 2007), p. 157.

⁹³ Papazian, *Merchants from Ararat*, pp. 47-8.

⁹⁴ Percy, *Highlands of Asiatic Turkey*, p. 75; Tuzcu, “Seyyahların Gözüyle ve Konsolosluk Raporlarında”, p. 542; Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, pp. 263, 267; William John Hamilton, “*Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus and Armenia*”, quoted in *Seyahatnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 112-113; “General Report by Lieutenant Bennet”, p. 268; H. Barth, “*Reise von Trapezunt durch die nördliche Hälfte Klein-Asiens nach Scutari im Herbst*”, quoted in *Seyahatnamelerde Kayseri*, p. 143; Henry F. Tozer, “*Turkish Armenia and Eastern Asia Minor*”, quoted in *Seyahatnamelerde Kayseri*, p. 161.

Anatolia.⁹⁵ Süme explains that the Armenian merchants had been active in the commercial life of the city and were described as “merchants, shoe traders and jewelers” in the Ottoman religious court records.⁹⁶ In 1880, Bennet stated that:

The Christians in Kaisarieh are drapers, chiefly tailors, silversmiths, artisans, or merchants. Many have their families in the villages round Kaisarieh and pursue their several occupations as shopkeepers in Constantinople, Smyrna, or elsewhere, returning for a year or two at long intervals, and eventually settling down at their native place.⁹⁷

These accounts illustrate that many Kayseri merchants settled in trading centers such as Mersin, Adana⁹⁸, Izmir, and Istanbul. They continued their commercial activities in these port cities by leaving their business to trusted personnel in Kayseri. An important example of such merchants was Kosma Simyonoğlu, a Greek from Kayseri who dealt with yarn weaving. Simyonoğlu opened a cotton yarn mill in Adana in 1906⁹⁹ which, by 1914, employed 222 workers.¹⁰⁰

By 1915, there were many Armenian merchants in the sanjak who were involved in many sectors of the economy such as the trade of dry goods, carpet manufacturing and trading, ready-made clothing, rope trade (*urgancı*), trade of silk (*kazaz*), ironmonger, arms dealer, trade of hardware, copper trading,

⁹⁵ Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria, Vol. II*, pp. 1478-1480. Ahmet Hilmi Kalaç also mentioned the superior position of the Armenians and Greeks in the trade of dry goods. According to him, a Muslim company had been formed to engage in the *manifatura* trade against their superior position. Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, pp. 62-63.

⁹⁶ Mehmet Süme, “Turkish-Armenian Relations in Develi According to the Sharia Court Records”, *Armenians in the Ottoman Society, Vol. II*, ed. by Metin Hülagü et al., Erciyes University Press, p. 56.

⁹⁷ “General Report by Lieutenant Bennet”, pp. 268-269.

⁹⁸ For information on the merchants of Kayseri who settled in Adana see Aslı Emine Çomu, “The Impact of the Exchange of Populations on the Economic and Social Life of the City of Adana (1875-1927)”, MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2005.

⁹⁹ Tuzcu, “Seyyahların Gözüyle ve Konsolosluk Raporlarında”, p. 543. Simyonoğlu had already established a flour mill in Adana. He had to leave Turkey in 1923 Greek exodus. Edward Clark, “The Emergence of Textile Manufacturing Entrepreneurs in Turkey, 1804-1968”, Diss., Princeton University, 1969, p. 99.

¹⁰⁰ Eldem, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun İktisadi Şartları Hakkında Bir Tetkik*, p. 75.

broker, bookselling, exporting, fur trading, money lending, head scarf manufacturing, light rug (*cicim*) weaving, and pastrami manufacturing. The Armenian merchants were especially pre-eminent in the trade of dry goods, and in the manufacture and trade of head scarves and carpets.¹⁰¹

Stating that there were many important merchants among the Armenians of Kayseri does not mean that there was an ethnic division of labor in Kayseri such as equating Armenians with merchandise and Turks with agriculture. Hilmar Kaiser showed that the prevalent idea of existence of a division of labor on the basis of nationality in the Ottoman Empire stemmed from an article by the German writer; Alphons Sussnitzki. His article, dated 1917, can be considered as war-time propaganda, but it became influential on the later Ottoman history scholars even though it was proven by later studies that there was no such ethnic division of labor in the Empire. Kaiser stated that according to Sussnitzki's article, all the professions were dominated by an ethnic group in the Ottoman Empire. Nearly all Ottoman trade was controlled by Greeks and Armenians who had prevented the development of other nationalities. The elimination of Greeks and Armenians was considered necessary by Sussnitzki for they were under the influence of the British and French and worked on behalf of these countries' interests. Kaiser claimed that Sussnitzki's thesis has been revived in modern scholarship and so racist perceptions about Armenians could be used to justify massacres against the Armenians.¹⁰²

As described above there was also an important Armenian village community in the district of Kayseri. However, because of the poor soil, in addition to tilling the land, Armenian villagers tended to engage in artisan trades and also many villagers used to take up seasonal work. There were also many Muslim merchants in the sanjak, and the Muslim villagers were also

¹⁰¹ For the list of these Armenian merchants and information concerning them see Dadayan (ed.), *Günümüz Türkiye'sinde Ermenilerin Ticari-Ekonomik Faaliyeti*, pp. 45-48.

¹⁰² Hilmar Kaiser, *Imperialism, Racism, and Development Theories, The Construction of a Dominant Paradigm on Ottoman Armenians*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Gomidas Institute, 1998, pp. 1-2, 29-32, 34-35; Alphons J. Sussnitzki, "Zur Gliederung wirtschaftlicher Arbeit nach Nationalitäten in der Türkei", *Archiv für Wirtschaftsforschung im Orient*, 2 (1917), pp. 382-407.

involved in activities apart from agriculture such as carpet making. As shown in Table 2 above, there were not only non-Muslims but also a considerable number of Muslims in the carpet-making. Therefore, stating that the Armenian community of Kayseri was a significant part of the sanjak's economy does not mean ignoring the Muslim merchants or artisans. However, these groups are beyond the scope of this study.

CHAPTER 3

THE ROAD TO THE ARMENIAN DEPORTATIONS

For the Ottoman Empire, among other things the nineteenth century was shaped by the rise of nationalisms and the failure of the Empire to cope with them.¹⁰³ As Roderic Davison stated “the empire was torn apart by nationalism’s explosiveness.” First Greeks and then other communities experienced a “national awakening” and struggled for autonomy and independence.¹⁰⁴ The nationalist movements of non-Muslim communities were supported by the Western Christian powers and as a general pattern they acquired autonomy or independence with the support of the Great Powers of the period. This is how the “Armenian Question” primarily emerged as a significant diplomatic issue.

The acute problems in military and administrative structure of the empire led some Sultans to take radical action in the form of reforms that began at the end of the 18th century. The result was *Nizam-ı Cedid* which refers to the quest for a “new order”. The reform movement in the Ottoman Empire aimed to strengthen the central power and centralist policies that moved towards a modern bureaucracy were implemented in this respect.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Economic problems had also significantly affected the history of the 19th century Ottoman Empire. There was a close relationship with the decline of the empire and the crisis in the Ottoman economy. For more information on these issues see Şevket Pamuk, *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme 1820-1913*, Istanbul, Tarih Vakfı, 2005; Tevfik Güran, *19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Tarımı Üzerine Araştırmalar*, Istanbul, Eren, 1998; *The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy*, ed. by Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

¹⁰⁴ Roderic H. Davison, “Nationalism as an Ottoman Problem and the Ottoman Response”, in *Nationalism in a non-National State*, William W. Haddad and William Ochsenwald (eds.), Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1977, pp. 25-27.

¹⁰⁵ In order to prevent defeats at wars and loss of lands, the first reforms were implemented in the military. Education, public administration, judicial system and laws were also reformed in this process. For detailed information on the Ottoman reforms see Roderic H. Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform, 1856-1876*, Istanbul, Agora, 2005.

Moreover, the Tanzimat reforms which began in the 1840s included the development of the idea of “equality” between the Muslim and non-Muslim subjects of the empire. This was achieved by legal arrangements, in particular, the Reform Edict of 1856. An attempt was made to institutionalize the system of representation with the country-wide and provincial assemblies in which both non-Muslims and Muslims took part. The Ottoman Constitution of 1876 and the opening of the Ottoman Parliament were the final stages in this scheme.¹⁰⁶ However, as the later developments would show, the problems relating to the status and positions of the non-Muslims continued, creating new kinds of tensions towards the end of the 19th century.

In this “great transformation” process, the Ottoman peoples also experienced profound changes within their religious communities. As Davison commented:

...[t]he nineteenth century seems to have been a period of more rapid social and political flux than were the preceding centuries. Political, economic, and intellectual pressures were eroding the stratifications of society. In this process, the status of *millet*s and of their members was altered and their internal structures were changed...In each of the three *millet*s there was a social upheaval and a cultural renaissance in the nineteenth century.”¹⁰⁷

3.1 The Armenian Constitution of 1860

One of the results of the social change within the Armenian *millet*¹⁰⁸ and effects of the Armenian “national awakening” was the “struggle for democratic representation” from which the Armenian Constitution of 1860 emerged.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform*, pp. 2-7, 38-43, 49-51.

¹⁰⁷ Roderic Davison, “The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire, Vol. I*, eds. by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, New York, Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982, pp. 319, 329.

¹⁰⁸ In this part, the role of *amiras* and Armenian bourgeoisie in the social change within the Armenian *millet* is evaluated. However, it has to be underlined that the villagers were also a significant part of the Armenian community.

¹⁰⁹ Louise Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement, The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1963, p. 42.

There was a privileged class within the Armenian *millet*, known as the *amiras*. These were the wealthy community leaders who had functioned “as intermediaries between the Ottoman government and the Armenian population of the empire.” Most of the *amiras* were moneylenders (*sarrafs*) who had a critical role in the tax-farming system (*iltizam*) of the Ottoman Empire.¹¹⁰ However, the economic power of the *amiras* declined with the abolition of the tax-farming system in 1840 since these moneylenders used to lend money to the tax-farmers and some of the *amiras* went bankrupt in this process. This led to a decrease in their impact and authority over the Armenian society and the Patriarch, who controlled all civic and spiritual matters of the Armenian community. Thus, the Patriarch turned to the Armenian artisans for financial assistance. This process strengthened the role of artisans in the administration of the Armenian *millet*.¹¹¹ The Crimean War was also a blow to the *amiras* as the European capitalists and banks entered the Ottoman financial system.¹¹²

The Armenian Patriarch was controlled by the *amiras* who selected patriarchs until 1846. This system, based on the domination of the *amiras*, led to the opposition of the new young and educated Armenian generation.¹¹³ The Armenian students, who had studied abroad, had been influenced by the ideas of the French Revolution and some had even seen the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848 in Europe. This young Armenian intelligentsia challenged the existing system of representation and rule within the Armenian community. Those who were known as the enlightened (*lusavoreal*) wanted to end the power of the

¹¹⁰ Hagop Barsoumian, “The Dual Role of the Armenian *Amira* Class within the Ottoman Government and the Armenian *Millet* (1750-1850)”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire, Vol. I*, eds. by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, New York, Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982, pp. 171-172.

¹¹¹ Vartan Artinian, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Ermeni Anayasası'nın Doğuşu (1839-1863)*, Istanbul, Aras, 2004, pp. 65-71.

¹¹² Barsoumian, “The Dual Role of the Armenian *Amira* Class”, p. 174.

¹¹³ Barsoumian, “The Dual Role of the Armenian *Amira* Class”, pp. 177-180.

amiras and Patriarch over the Armenian *millet*. On the other side, the supporters of the old system were called obscurantist (*xavareal*).¹¹⁴

The struggle between the conservatives and the reformists in the Armenian *millet* would result in the formation of two assemblies in 1847. The conduct of religious affairs and civic affairs was divided between two independent assemblies. Their establishment limited the authority of the Patriarch and the *amiras*, however, there was no written rule about the authorities of these assemblies. The need for written rules led to the preparation of the Armenian National Constitution of 1860 which was approved by the Sultan on 17 March 1863.¹¹⁵ The constitution accepted the elected assembly as the basis of its *millet* government by giving it the right of legislature. The Turkish reformers were also influenced by this development in that the Armenian Constitution inspired the Ottoman Constitution of 1876.¹¹⁶ The Greek and Jewish *millets* also prepared their own Constitutions following that of the Armenians.¹¹⁷

3.2 The Internationalization of the Armenian Question

The 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian War not only meant a disastrous defeat for the Ottoman Empire but also brought the internationalization of the Armenian Question. The Treaty of Berlin (1878) contained article 61 on this subject, as follows:

The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out, without further delay, the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the

¹¹⁴ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp. 46-47; Barsoumian, “The Dual Role of the Armenian *Amira* Class”, p. 180. For the Armenian churches in Kayseri and the impact of the Armenian Constitution within the Armenian community of the city see Der Matossian, “Ottoman Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri in the Nineteenth Century”, pp. 195-197.

¹¹⁵ Artinian, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Ermeni Anayasası'nın Doğuşu*, pp. 86-93. For the text of the Armenian Constitution see pp. 208-263.

¹¹⁶ Davison, “The *Millets* as Agents of Change”, pp. 329-330; Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, p. 48; Artinian, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Ermeni Anayasası'nın Doğuşu*, pp. 117, 123.

¹¹⁷ Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform*, pp. 132-137.

provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds. It will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the Powers who will superintend their application.¹¹⁸

Thus, for the Ottoman governors, this war not only meant shocking land losses, it also gave rise to the fear of the establishment of an Armenian state in the eastern lands of the empire. They evaluated the reform promise of the Berlin Treaty on behalf of the Armenians as a preliminary step for the secession of eastern lands from the empire.

In addition to the reforms, security against the Circassians and Kurds was demanded in the article 61 of the treaty. The settlement of the Muslim immigrants (*muhacirs*) in predominantly Armenian populated areas was a part of this process since it brought about tension between the Muslim and non-Muslim peoples of the empire.

3.2.1 The Settlement of the *Muhacirs*

The 19th century witnessed an influx of immigrants from the lost territories of the empire and from the Caucasus. However, settlement of these immigrants¹¹⁹ caused significant difficulties. The traditional feudal structure of the Caucasian peoples, the incapacity and inefficiency of the Ottoman bureaucratic organization, the financial and psychological breakdown of the immigrants because of the war in the Caucasus and their forced migration led

¹¹⁸ Fuat Dündar, *Crime of Numbers, The Role of Statistics in the Armenian Question (1878-1918)*, New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers, 2010, p. 12.

¹¹⁹ There is no exact data on the number of immigrants. Nedim İpek states that 311,333 immigrants reached the Ottoman Empire from 1854 to 1864. While 283,000 immigrants arrived in 1864, 87,000 immigrants came in 1865. After the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877-1878, the wave of immigration accelerated again. Even though there is no accurate data, the related Ottoman statistics show that more than one million immigrants were recorded and sent to the Ottoman provinces and sanjaks to be settled in between the years of 1876 and 1894. Nedim İpek, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*, Trabzon, Serander, 2006, pp. 40, 331.

to the emergence of problems in their settlement and adaptation to their new life.¹²⁰

Eastern Anatolia was one of the settlement areas of the Caucasian immigrants.¹²¹ These immigrants had resentment toward Caucasian Christians. They came to the Ottoman territories with bitter feelings and directed this resentment to the Ottoman Christians.¹²² In this context, the attacks by the Circassians on the local Christian population became a source of disturbance. The complaints that were sent to the Ottoman center illustrated that the attitude of the Circassians towards the Christian population of the Empire was unfavorable. The Ottoman center sent orders to the local authorities for the prevention of ill-treatment of its Christian subjects.¹²³ However, it has to be stated that not only the Christians of the region but also Muslim population had problems with the Caucasian immigrants.

The continuation of the complaints shows that the immigrants continued harassing the indigenous population (*ahali-i kadime*). The Ottoman government tried to prevent excesses to the *ahali-i kadime* and attempted to resolve problems related to the settlement of immigrants. Since the majority of the Circassians were settled within the authority area of the Fourth Army, the government gave authorization to its commander for the trial and punishment of the immigrants who had committed crimes. The main complaints were the usurpation of people's properties and the murders committed by immigrants.

¹²⁰ Georgi Chochiev, "XIX. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kuzey Kafkas Göçmenlerinin Toplumsal Uyarlanmasına Dair Bazı Görüşler", *Kebikeç*, 23 (2007), p. 407.

¹²¹ BOA, A.MKT.UM, 527/99 (26 November 1861); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 532/87 (15 January 1862); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 540/6 (11 February 1862); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 540/63 (13 February 1862); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 542/32 (20 February 1862); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 542/66 (21 February 1862); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 552/57 (8 April 1862); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 562/66 (6 June 1862).

¹²² Justin McCarthy, *Ölüm ve Sürgün*, trans. by Bilge Umar, İstanbul, İnkılap, 1998, p. 122; Stanford J. Shaw, Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Volume II: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 117-118.

¹²³ BOA, A.MKT.UM, 528/75, (1 December 1861); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 529/33, (2 December 1861); BOA, A.MKT.UM, 535/39 (24 January 1862).

One of the archival documents, which will be analyzed below to present the content of the problems, started with the recognition of the fact that the Circassians had been subject to many oppressive measures and cruelties in their mother country and had taken refuge in the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman government and even the Ottoman population worked to provide accommodation and a livelihood for these unlucky people. In exchange for this good treatment, it was expected that the immigrants would live in a well behaved way in their settled areas and adopt a neighborly attitude towards the Ottoman population. However, these expectations did not materialize and the Ottoman government felt forced to take some measures against the inappropriate and excessive behavior of the Circassians. Indeed, this document admitted the responsibility of the Ottoman government regarding this situation. Even if the government wanted to prevent such actions, it did not severely punish the immigrants who committed such crimes. Therefore, in order to prevent these crimes the government wanted the proper and full punishment of the criminals from the Fourth Army Commander and provinces in which the immigrants were settled.¹²⁴

It was also pointed out that the Circassians found the courage to carry out such outrages because they bore arms. Therefore, carrying weapons was prohibited. Their weapons would be collected and confiscated if they resisted this order. Some of the tribal leaders of the Circassians were also found guilty of the continuing crimes because they did not hesitate to direct their tribesmen to plunder the settled people and commit theft and murder. These leaders also resisted the settlement process by not approving any place for the settlement. The government ordered the separation of these leaders from their people and sent them to live in remote places. Distribution of the communities which committed the crimes was also suggested as a measure for the prevention of such crimes. The inefficiency of the settlement process was also an issue in that the required land and materials were not supplied to some of the immigrants. This inefficiency impeded the productivity of the immigrants and damaged the

¹²⁴ BOA, A.MKT.MHM, 421/34, (25 August 1868)

treasury since a daily fee/remuneration (*yevmiye*) continued to be paid to the unsettled immigrants.¹²⁵

In the face of these events, in order to prevent the settlement of new immigrants in eastern Anatolia after the *93 Harbi*, the people of the region, especially Armenians, complained to the British consuls.¹²⁶

It has been arranged to locate 4,000 Circassian families in this province: most of the heads of the Christian communities have requested my assistance to prevent this arrangement, which is most undesirable in the existing unsettled state of the country.... A few days since it became known here that the Government contemplated settling in the Vilayet of Diarbekir 4,000 or 5,000 families of Circassian emigrants. The news created great excitement, as the memories of the former Circassian immigration came to mind, when 40,000 people passed through Diarbekir from the north on their way to the settlement of Ras-el-Ain, causing great suffering to the population of the country passed through, who had first to support them, and then to suffer from their robberies and other depredations.¹²⁷

Indeed, such problems were not peculiar to eastern Anatolia, trouble between the immigrants and the indigenous population also emerged in other settlement areas.¹²⁸ However, the settlement of Caucasian immigrants in eastern Anatolia gave rise to more complicated problems as it increased the already existing disorder within the region.

¹²⁵ BOA, A.MKT.MHM, 421/34, (25 August 1868)

¹²⁶ These complaints were delivered to the Sublime Porte through the British Vice Consuls in the region. For example, Armenians of Agenli (Eğin ?- today Kemaliye) complained of the settlement of Circassian refugees in their lands and wanted revision of this situation by settling them in another place and also demanded restitution of their lands, HR. SYS, 78/5 (Document 27, 28 and 29), 25.09.1882.

¹²⁷ “No. 144, Major Trotter, R. E., to the Marquis of Salisbury, Diarbekir, January 17, 1879, F.O. 424/80”, *British Documents on Ottoman Armenians, Vol. I*, ed. by Bilal N. Şimşir, Ankara, TTK, 1982, p. 304.

¹²⁸ For the problems about the settlement process of immigrants and the policies of the Ottoman government regarding this issue see Georgi Chochiev, “Kuzey Kafkas Göçmenlerinin Toplumsal Uyarlanmasına Dair Bazı Görüşler”, pp. 407-456; also see Oktay Özel, “Muhacirler, Yerliler ve Gayrimüslimler: Osmanlı'nın Son Devrinde Orta Karadeniz'de Toplumsal Uyumun Sınırları Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler”, in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri Bilimsel Sorumluluk ve Demokrasi Sorunları*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011, pp. 107-123.

The disorder and insecurity prevailing in eastern Anatolia played a pivotal role in the rise of Armenian question. The attempt to centralize was an important part of the Ottoman modernization and eastern Anatolia was within the scope of these policies. The implementation of the *Tanzimat* reforms in the region led to the destruction of the existing administrative system based on the Kurdish emirates. As the Kurdish emirates were dissolved, centrally appointed government officials replaced the Kurdish *mirs*. Nevertheless, these officials could not fill the position of their predecessors who had provided security in their districts before the implementation of these centralization policies. Thus, the destruction of emirates created insecurity and disorder within the region. Hence, the exploitation of the peasants by the Kurdish tribes increased. Under the impact of these factors, many Armenian peasants fled to Russia¹²⁹ and it was in this context that the settlement of Muslim immigrants in eastern Anatolia occurred. About 40,000 to 45,000 immigrants from the North Caucasus were settled in the region beginning from the middle of the 19th to the 20th century.¹³⁰

3.3 The Armenian Political Organizations

¹²⁹ Martin van Bruinessen, *Ağa, Şeyh, Devlet*, Istanbul, İletişim, 2004, pp. 239-245, 268-271, 347; Hakan Özoğlu, *Osmanlı Devleti ve Kürt Milliyetçiliği*, Istanbul, Kitap Yayınevi, 2005, pp. 79-85; David McDowall, *A Modern History of the Kurds*, London, I. B. Tauris, 1996, p. 49.

¹³⁰ Georgi Chochiev and Bekir Koç, “Migrants from the North Caucasus in Eastern Anatolia: Some Notes on Their Settlement and Adaptation (Second Half of the 19th Century-Beginning of the 20th century)”, *Journal of Asian History*, ed. by Denis Sinor, 40 (2006), pp. 80-103. The authors evaluated the problems between the indigenous Armenian population and Caucasian immigrants on the basis of rising Armenian question. They claimed that the complaints of the Armenians regarding the immigrants’ outrages “formed a deliberate attempt to draw the attention of the European states to the treatment of Christian subjects in the Ottoman Empire during and following the period of the ‘Eastern Crisis’ from 1875-1878.”, pp. 98-99. Such an approach, which equates all kinds of complaints as a deliberate attempt to internationalize Armenian question not as realities, led the authors not to analyze the real nature of the problems between the Armenians and immigrants. For example while the article devotes five pages to the part titled “Relations between Circassians and local Muslim groups”, only two pages are dedicated to the “Relations between Circassians and the non-Muslim population”. This shows the tendency of the authors to ignore the reality of the problems between the Armenians and Caucasian immigrants, and to present the issue as a diplomatic discourse of the Armenians.

Beginning with the 1880s, secret political organizations were formed. The Armenian national awakening became influential in their formation.¹³¹ The first Armenian political party, Armenakan, was established in Van in 1885 with the aim “to win for the Armenian the right to rule over themselves through revolution”. Although the party center was in Van, branches were also opened in Muş, Bitlis, Trabzon, and Istanbul. The party adopted self-defense as its method so the party would train the Armenians in the use of arms and organize guerrilla forces, however, it would avoid demonstrations and use of terror. An important concern of the party was to protect the Armenians from the raids of Kurdish tribesmen. It asserted that the Armenian people would be prepared for a general movement and favorable external circumstances would be sought for the rise of this movement.¹³²

Hinchakian Revolutionary Party (Hinchak) and the Armenian Revolutionary Federation-Dashnaksutian (ARF) were the other and more influential Armenian political parties. Hinchak, the first socialist political party in the Ottoman Empire and Persia, was established in Geneva in August 1887. The party targeted the formation of an independent and socialist Armenia through revolution. The Hinchaks adopted the use of violence against the Ottoman government as a method to achieve their goals, and terror could also be used.¹³³ Istanbul became the center of their activities. The Kumkapı demonstration on 15 July 1890 became the first important action of the Hinchaks. Armenian reform demands were the main theme of the demonstration. However, this demonstration became unsuccessful and the reform demands were also not taken into account by the Porte. During the

¹³¹ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, p. 29.

¹³² Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp. 90, 97-99.

¹³³ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp. 104, 108-110. For an analysis of the relationship between the Armenian revolutionary organizations and development of socialist movement in the Ottoman Empire see, Anahide Ter Minassian, “The Role of the Armenian Community in the Foundation and Development of the Socialist Movement in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1876-1923”, in *Socialism and Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1923*, eds. by Mete Tunçay and Erik Jan Zürcher, New York, British Academic Press, 1994, pp. 109-156.

demonstration some Hinchak leaders and demonstrators were killed and arrested. However, the party still “continued to organize demonstrations and insurrections in towns and villages inhabited by Armenians.”¹³⁴

The Hinchaks had actively participated in the Sasun Rebellion in 1894¹³⁵, organized the demonstration of Bab-ı Ali on 30 September 1895 and guided the Zeytun Rebellion¹³⁶ of 12 October 1895. These rebellions and demonstrations aimed to draw the attention of the European governments. Under pressure of the European governments, the Ottoman government signed the Armenian Reform Program on 17 October 1895. However, the reform program was never to be implemented and just “became a dead letter.” This active and influential period of the Hinchaks ended in 1896 and the party split: “The primary purpose of the party’s activities since 1887 had been to bring about European intervention with the Porte in favor of freeing Turkish Armenia. But it turned out, the Hinchaks had little success in securing European support.”¹³⁷

As the Hinchak party weakened, the ARF became the most influential Armenian organization. The Dashnaksutiun was established in 1890 in Tbilisi, Russia. Even though the formation of an independent state, composed of Turkish, Russian and Persian Armenians, was the central goal of the Hinchaks, this was not the aim of ARF. Instead, it advocated reforms in the Ottoman Armenian provinces. The Dashnaks was also a socialist organization and

¹³⁴ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp. 117-119.

¹³⁵ See pages 59-60 for a brief information on the Sasun Rebellion.

¹³⁶ On the reasons of Zeytun Rebellion, Dadrian stated that: “Like the highlanders of Sassoun, those from Zeitoun were bent on ending the abuses of a regime which, coincidental with the empire-wide massacres of that period, was using every available method to provoke the mountaineers.... Finally, the military units began to deploy nightly and proceeded to burn down selected Armenian villages in the area. The Zeitounlis promptly retaliated, and this is what the authorities were waiting for. The military commander informed the Sultan by wire that the Zeitounlis were in rebellion and were mercilessly massacring the Muslims.” Vahakn N. Dadrian, *The History of the Armenian Genocide Ethnic Conflict from the Balkans to Anatolia to the Caucasus*, New York, Berghahn Books, 2003, pp. 127-128. On the other hand, Kamuran Gürün evaluated the Rebellion as a planned uprising of the Hinchaks to evoke European intervention on behalf of the Armenians. Kamuran Gürün, *Ermeni Dosyası*, Ankara, 1985, pp. 157-161.

¹³⁷ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp. 120-128.

adopted terrorism as a tactic.¹³⁸ Like the Hinchaks, ARF believed that European intervention was essential to free the Armenians. The Ottoman Bank Demonstration of 24 August 1896 was organized by the ARF to secure this European intervention in the Armenian question. The Ottoman Bank was seized by the Dashnak revolutionaries who demanded that the Ottoman Empire implemented reforms. To end the seizure of the Bank, the European governments intervened and provided a safe passage to the revolutionaries from Istanbul to Marseille. The demanded reforms were not implemented by the Ottoman government, and the Ottoman Bank demonstration triggered attacks against the Armenian population in the capital in which hundreds of Armenians were killed.¹³⁹

Since the Dashnaks called for reform in the Ottoman Empire, the party collaborated with the other political organizations advocating reform. In this context, the Dashnaks signed an agreement with the Committee of Union and Progress (*İttihad ve Terakki*) in 1907 and with the Freedom and Unity party (*Hürriyet ve İtilaf*) in 1912.¹⁴⁰

3.4 The Hamidiye Cavalry Regiments

Ottoman policy towards eastern Anatolia after the Berlin Treaty of 1878 was shaped by the Armenian reform demands. The Ottoman government at the time in imperial administration perceived these reform demands and Great Powers' pressure for them to protect the rights of non-Muslims as a threat towards the social unity and territorial integrity of the empire. Within this framework, the Ottoman government embraced a policy of using the Kurdish

¹³⁸ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp. 151, 169-171. For more information about the ARF see Dikran M. Kaligian, *Armenian Organization and Ideology under Ottoman Rule: 1908-1914*, New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers, 2009.

¹³⁹ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp. 175-178. For a re-evaluation of the Ottoman Bank Demonstration see Edhem Eldem, "26 Ağustos 1896 "Banka Vakası" ve 1896 "Ermeni Olayları"", in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri*, pp. 125-152.

¹⁴⁰ Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, p. 172. For the development of Armenian political organizations in Kayseri see Der Matossian, "Ottoman Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri in the Nineteenth Century", pp. 202-207.

tribes as a political and military means against the rising Armenian reform demands. Abdülhamit tried to gain the loyalty of the Kurdish tribal leaders and to achieve this aim he adopted conciliatory policies towards the Kurdish notables.¹⁴¹ In the deteriorating Kurdish-Armenian relations, the excesses of the Kurdish *aghas* over the villagers were generally overlooked since the tribes were regarded a crucial military asset of the state in eastern Anatolia.¹⁴² The establishment of the *Hamidiye* Cavalry Regiments in 1891 can be evaluated as an extension of this approach, but it was not the sole reason for their formation:

There were many compelling reasons to raise the tribes in this irregular military formation. First, it would bring elements that were outside the reach of central authority into the fold. Access meant control-the opportunity to learn about and thus regulate the movements and activities of a largely mobile people, the ability to collect taxes and recruits for the regular army from a people who scarcely contributed either, and the hopefully permanent introduction of the acceptance the sultan as a higher authority than their local chiefs. It would balance existing powers, each a certain threat to central rule, playing one against the other and backing some over others, but ensuring that such support was clearly a gift from the sultan and could be withdrawn at any time. It could help “civilize” and assimilate the people who lived there. It would help to bolster military forces against a future Russian invasion. And lastly, it would act as a counter to the newest, and seemingly most potent, of threats-the perceived Armenian “conspiracy” and the budding Armenian revolutionary movement.¹⁴³

Abdülhamit II’s pan-Islamic policy which aimed to unite the Muslims was also influential in the formation of these regiments on the basis of

¹⁴¹ For detailed analysis of the government policy toward eastern Anatolia between 1878 and 1890 see S. Aslıhan Gürbüz, “Hamidian Policy in Eastern Anatolia (1878-1890)”, MA thesis, Bilkent University, 2008.

¹⁴² “Inclosure 3 in No.66, Memorandum”, *Turkey, No.10 (1879), Correspondence Respecting the Condition of the Population in Asia Minor and Syria*, London, Harrison and Sons, 1879, p. 111: “The Imperial Government still labours under the fatal mistake that these wild hordes of Kurds form an indispensable military element of the State, and, therefore, the Beys, who are in league with the hordes, and by whom it is thought they were manageable, are allowed to have their own way, even though it is known they are sorely oppressing and ruining loyal subjects of the Sultan, thus perpetuating a state of things detrimental to the best interests of the Empire.”

¹⁴³ Janet Klein, “Power in the Periphery: The Hamidiye Light Cavalry and the Struggle over Ottoman Kurdistan, 1890-1914”, Dissertation, Princeton University, 2002, pp. 32-33.

integrating the Muslim Kurds to the Ottoman system.¹⁴⁴ Besides, the Ottoman government aimed to use the *Hamidiye* regiments as a balancing power against the urban notables who were regarded as the main opponents of the centralization policies of the Ottoman center. With the rise of *Hamidiye* regiments as the agents of the central government in the region, the power of the urban notables could be weakened or at least balanced.¹⁴⁵

Under this framework, 64-65 cavalry regiments were formed in the region. Even though the regulation for the establishment of regiments stated that the regiments would be composed of Arab, Turcoman, Kurdish and Karakalpak tribes, only few of the regiments consisted of Arabs and Karakalpaks and there were no Turkomans. Thus, almost all the regiments comprised men from the Sunni Kurdish tribes. Janet Klein asserts that while there had been plans to integrate Alevi tribes and Yezidis into the regiments, these were never implemented.¹⁴⁶

The formation of the *Hamidiye* regiments was not only important for the state but it was also profitable for the tribes to take part in them since the members of the regiments benefited from many privileges such as exemptions from certain taxes (such as sheep tax) and conscription. The tribal chiefs also benefited from the formation of regiments for they became the commanding officers of the regiments and thus strengthened their position. Since the regiments offered a privileged position, the Kurdish tribes were willing to join the *Hamidiye*. The Alevi tribes of Dersim and Yezidi tribes wanted to join the regiments, but they were rejected by the Ottoman administration. As their participation in the regiments was not adopted, they were put in a

¹⁴⁴ For an evaluation of the implementation of Abdülhamit's pan-Islamic policy in eastern Anatolia see Stephen Duguid, "The Politics of Unity: Hamidian Policy in Eastern Anatolia", *Middle Eastern Studies*, 9 (1973), pp. 139-155. Also see Kemal H. Karpat, "Pan-İslamizm ve İkinci Abdülhamid: Yanlış Bir Görüşün Düzeltilmesi", *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no: 48 (1987), pp. 13-37.

¹⁴⁵ Duguid, "The Politics of Unity", p. 151, Bayram Kodaman, "Hamidiye Hafif Süvari Alayları, II. Abdülhamit ve Doğu-Anadolu Aşiretleri", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 32 (1979), pp. 439-440.

¹⁴⁶ Klein, "Power in the Periphery", pp. 34, 85-94.

disadvantaged position in relation to the Hamidian tribes.¹⁴⁷ The Caucasian immigrants, settled in eastern Anatolia, were also aware of the fact that they would be at a disadvantage in relation to the Kurds and Bedouins. Therefore, the immigrants were also willing to join the regiments.¹⁴⁸

The privileges of the *Hamidiye* regiments were especially large in the juridical area. These forces were not in the scope of ordinary law, and therefore, could not be tried at the provincial tribunals. Instead they could only be court-martialed. The regiments were placed under the control of Zeki Paşa, the commander of the Fourth Army, which meant that the provincial administrations had no authority or control over the *Hamidiye* regiments. For Zeki Paşa always protected the regiments against the provincial administration, this attitude encouraged the lawlessness of the tribes. It has to be emphasized that Zeki Paşa's protection was extended with the consent of the Sultan. Moreover, the *Hamidiye* regiments were used in the region as the police force in addition to their military duties. Policing of the region consolidated the power of the regiments.¹⁴⁹ This wide power of the regiments caused many problems because of corruption and that the Hamidian tribes oppressed the other tribes and the populations that were not part of the regiments.¹⁵⁰

3.4.1 The Land Issue

The establishment and extensive powers of the *Hamidiye* regiments were one of the factors in the emergence of land issues, which were called the “agrarian question”.

¹⁴⁷ Mehmet M. Sunar, “Tribes and State: Ottoman Centralization in Eastern Anatolia, 1876-1914”, Master thesis, Bilkent University, 1999, pp. 48-50; Kodaman, “Hamidiye Hafif Süvari Alayları”, pp. 447-448.

¹⁴⁸ Georgi Chochiev, “Kuzey Kafkas Göçmenlerinin Toplumsal Uyarlanmasına Dair”, pp. 425-426, 447-449.

¹⁴⁹ Duguid, “The Politics of Unity”, p. 152; Sunar, “Tribes and State: Ottoman Centralization in Eastern Anatolia”, pp. 50-52; Kodaman, “Hamidiye Hafif Süvari Alayları”, p. 451.

¹⁵⁰ Fırat wrote about the assaults and damages of the *Hamidiye* regiments, free of being subject to law, particularly to the Alevi tribes of Varto. M. Şerif Fırat, *Doğu İlleri ve Varto Tarihi*, Ankara, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1983, pp. 67-81, 125, 127.

The “Agrarian Question”, as it came to be known by Armenian leaders and European diplomats who took a keen interest in the matter, was actually, however, not truly an agrarian question. It was not about land reform in the usual sense, nor was it about how to promote agricultural productivity or good land-use practices. Rather, it was a euphemism for the matter of the Armenian lands usurped during the previous decades mostly by Kurdish tribal chiefs.¹⁵¹

The struggle over land was not a new issue in eastern Anatolia. There had been many problems before the establishment of the regiments but the *Hamidiye* had a deep impact on the evolution of the land problems. The decisive factor was the privileged status of the regiments and that the Ottoman center supported the regiment. With the advantage of their privileged and overprotected position, the Hamidian chiefs felt free to act at the expense of peasants and tribes which were not the members of the *Hamidiye*. The Hamidian chiefs appropriated large tracts of land belonging to unprotected peasants and weak tribes in this period. The government tolerated these arbitrary actions since it aimed to secure the support of the Kurdish tribes even if it meant the devastation of the settled people. Many Armenians fled from the region because of the massacres and attacks by the Hamidian tribes. Their evacuated lands were then occupied by the Kurdish tribes.¹⁵² It has to be stressed that the rise of the land values also intensified struggle over land ownership. One of the significant results of the Ottoman economy’s incorporation into world capitalist system was the rise of land values at the end of the 19th century. As the demand for agricultural products increased, this stimulated the rise of land prices and struggles over land ownership.¹⁵³

The peoples of eastern Anatolia had become used to the migration to large cities such as Istanbul and Izmir to find employment, and this migration

¹⁵¹ Klein, “Power in the Periphery”, p. 261.

¹⁵² Klein, “Power in the Periphery”, pp. 258-259, 272-275, 287-288.

¹⁵³ Çağlar Keyder, “Nüfus Mübadelesinin Türkiye Açısından Sonuçları”, *Memalik-i Osmaniye’den Avrupa Birliği’ne*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2003, pp. 106-108; Klein, “Power in the Periphery”, pp. 266-270.

movement was not particular to the Armenians. During the 19th century both the Kurds and Armenians used to travel to the big city centers to work.¹⁵⁴ However, the migration of the Armenians gained momentum during the reign of Abdülhamit II and reached its climax with the massacres of 1894-1896. The uprooting of the Armenian peasantry was a vehicle to reduce the density of the Armenian population in the eastern provinces. With the decrease in the Armenian population, there would be no area where the Armenian population was demographically concentrated. Thus, the basis of the demands for autonomy from the Armenians and even the demands for the improvement of conditions would be eliminated. In other words, the uprooting of the Armenian peasantry was seen as an end to the Armenian nationalism and to the Armenian question. Therefore, the expropriation of the Armenian peasants' land by the Kurdish chiefs was not prevented; on the contrary the chiefs were taken under the umbrella of state protection with the *Hamidiye* regiments.¹⁵⁵

3.4.2 The 1894-1896 Armenian Massacres

The deteriorating relations between the Armenians and Kurds entered a new stage with the 1894-1896 Armenian massacres. The first event occurred in 1894 in Sasun, a predominantly Armenian populated area. As a result of the centralization attempts of the Ottoman state during the 19th century, the peasants of eastern Anatolia faced the problem of double taxation. In addition to paying traditional taxes to the Kurdish aghas, the Ottoman authorities also began to demand central taxes from the peasants. The Sasun event of 1894 emerged from the resistance against the burden of double taxation of the

¹⁵⁴ Reşad Kasaba, "A Time and a Place for the Nonstate: Social Change in the Ottoman Empire during the 'Long Nineteenth Century'", in *State Power and Social Forces, Domination and Transformation in the Third World*, ed. by Joel S. Migdal-A. Kohli-V. Shue, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 221.

¹⁵⁵ Dikran M. Kaligian, "Agrarian Land Reform and the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire", *Armenian Review*, vol. 48, nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 2003), pp. 25-26; Stephan Astourian, "Testing World-System Theory, Cilicia (1830s-1890s): Armenian-Turkish Polarization and the Ideology of Modern Ottoman Historiography", Dissertation, Los Angeles, University of California, 1996, pp. 599-600, 611-613. For an evaluation of the relation between the population statistics and Armenian question see Fuat DüNDAR, *Kahir Ekseriyet Ermeni Nüfus Meselesi (1878-1923)*, Istanbul, Tarih Vakfı, 2013.

Armenian peasants who were supported by Armenian revolutionaries.¹⁵⁶ The *Hamidiye* regiments and regular troops took part in the clashes between the Kurdish tribes and the Sasun Armenians, and thousands of Armenians were massacred in the joint operation. This massacre led to the European powers' intervention on behalf of Armenians as they increased pressure on the Ottoman government to implement reforms, which had been on the agenda since 1878, in the Armenian populated provinces. In the meantime, after the Hınchak demonstration in Istanbul on 30 September 1895, the massacres spread to other Ottoman provinces including the six provinces (Sivas, Van, Erzurum, Bitlis, Diyarbakır, and Harput) which were within the scope of reform demands.¹⁵⁷ However, the attacks on Armenians did not remain limited to these provinces:

With only five exceptions of consequence, the massacres were confined to the territory of the six provinces in eastern Turkey where reforms were to be instituted. These places were Trebizond, Marash, Aintab, Urfa and Caesarea... In those four places the Moslems were excited by the nearness of the scenes of massacre and by the reports of the plunder which the other Moslems were securing.... The victims were almost exclusively Armenians. The large Greek population in Trebizond and also in the vicinity of Caesarea, suffered scarcely at all...¹⁵⁸

The Kayseri Armenians were also targeted on 30 November 1895, and several hundred Armenians were killed in the sanjak. The memoirs and consular reports indicate that the soldiers did not stop the massacres until the order came from Istanbul. According to these sources, the attacks resembled a plunder campaign to which even neighboring Turkish villagers attended to take

¹⁵⁶ Donald Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide, Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 51.

¹⁵⁷ Robert Melson, "A Theoretical Inquiry into the Armenian Massacres of 1894-1896", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 24, No. 3 (Jul. 1982), pp. 487-488, Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide*, pp. 51-52. For the number of lost lives as a result of these massacres see Dündar, *Kahir Ekseriyet*, pp. 157-160, 284.

¹⁵⁸ Rev. Edwin M. Bliss, *Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities*, London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1896, pp. 476-477.

their share.¹⁵⁹ The British acting consul, Raphael A. Fontana, gave information about this massacre-plunder nexus in Kayseri:

On Saturday, the 30th ultimo, at about 8 o'clock Turkish, a mob of Turks suddenly poured from the different Mussulman quarters into the Sewahi Bazaar and the Ouzoun Charshi (market), armed with long knives, and shouting "Kill, kill the Giaours". Armenian shops and houses were broken into, the inmates slaughtered, and everything of value plundered. A part of the crowd rushed into the public baths, dragged out Christian women into the street, tore the earrings from their ears and the rings from their fingers, and then killed them. At the Casma Hane factory the proprietor and twenty-one workmen were butchered. In Pambouk Han, the shoemakers' centre, fifty-three men were killed. Houses and shops belonging to Armenians were fired, and most of the timber-built houses were burnt down. Numbers of young women and girls were carried off by the pillagers.¹⁶⁰

The consular reports pointed out that 518 Armenian houses were destroyed during these attacks in Kayseri. Even though the government tried to restore the stolen property, only a small portion was returned.¹⁶¹ This plunder and massacre affected the commercial life of the city with the Armenian shopkeepers keeping their shops closed for weeks fearing a new attack. According to British reports, out of the 1,800 Christian shopkeepers, only seventy shops were open by the beginning of March 1896. Therefore, trade came almost to a standstill. These events also prompted a migration from the city. The well-to-do Armenians, in particular, who managed to obtain a travel permission (*tezkere*) from the police by paying a high bribe, left the sanjak for other areas, generally for Istanbul.¹⁶² Alboyacıyan underlines the role of economic competition between the Muslims and Armenians in this event. The

¹⁵⁹ Bliss, *Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities*, pp. 469-470, 490; Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, pp. 346-352; *Turkey, No.2 (1896), Correspondence Relative to the Armenian Question and Reports from Her Majesty's Consular Officers in Asiatic Turkey*, London, Harrison and Sons, 1896, pp. 260-261.

¹⁶⁰ *Turkey, No.2 (1896)*, p. 247.

¹⁶¹ *Turkey, No.2 (1896)*, pp. 260-261; *Turkey, No.8 (1896), Further Correspondence Relating to the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey, [In Continuation of "Turkey No.2 (1896)"]*, London, Harrison and Sons, 1896, p. 18.

¹⁶² *Turkey, No.8 (1896)*, pp. 67, 88, 278-79.

1895 massacre was a serious blow to the Kayseri Armenians, but as Alboyacıyan explained, they achieved recovery.¹⁶³ Svajian also confirms the recovery of Armenians after the plunder:

...they (Turks) were more interested in looting than in killing. For this reason the number killed was less than expected. How many Armenians were killed? I do not know. Some said five hundred, others said much less... the Armenians gradually opened their stores and began where they had left off. The Turks began to bring the goods that they had plundered from the Armenian stores and houses and sold them to the Armenians. Thus many Armenians got rich from these purchases because the Turks did not know the real value of the goods they had plundered.¹⁶⁴

3.4.3 The Second Constitutional Regime and the Land Issue

The establishment of the Second Constitutional Regime in 1908 raised the expectations of the Armenians that there would be an end to the activities of the *Hamidiye* regiments, which was favored by Abdülhamit II, and the appropriated lands would be restituted to their real owners. In addition to the Armenians, many Kurdish peasants whose lands had also been appropriated by Kurdish *aghas*, also wanted the restoration of their lands. Indeed, the intention of the new regime had been towards this direction at the beginning. However, the opposition of the Kurdish elites (especially the Kurdish deputies from the eastern provinces, Kurdish *aghas* and large landowners) to the planned land reform prevented the materialization of such a project.¹⁶⁵ Klein stated that:

It seemed less of a risk to alienate a population that consisted of poor peasants with few alternatives (or so they believed) than to estrange a population that was the ‘protector of the frontier’ and the ‘native’ police force of the border regions, and whose loyalty was of great value as the country faced so many internal and external threats.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria*, vol II, pp. 1478-1480.

¹⁶⁴ Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, pp. 351-352.

¹⁶⁵ Kaligian, “Agrarian Land Reform”, pp. 32-33, 38-39; Klein, “Power in the Periphery”, pp. 262-263.

¹⁶⁶ Klein, “Power in the Periphery”, p. 260.

The Unionists needed the support of the large landholders at the local level; therefore, they could not dare to change the existing relations in the rural areas. Land reform was on the agenda of the Unionists before they came to power, but the external and internal problems of the country (the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary, independence of Bulgaria, the Crete problem and the rising opposition to the Unionists which exploded in the counter-revolution of 1909) forced them to retreat from their initial project. The support of the large landholders gained importance in such a complicated atmosphere. The cost of securing their support was the enforcement of their control over the land. The reopening of the parliament also gave the landholders the chance of acting as a group to protect their interests. Since they formed majority within Parliament, they could prevent the implementation of any measures or policies which would be against their interests.¹⁶⁷

The ARF waited for a government administrative action to put an end to the land disputes by acting on behalf of the dispossessed peasants. However, the inability of the government in this respect, only directing the land issues to be solved in the courts showed the Armenians there would not be a solution to this problem in the near future. The ineffectiveness of the judicial system also further complicated the issue. The ARF Western Bureau Turkish Section determined the problem as:

The Armenians were told to go to court. They had no money, no way of earning any. How could they go to court knowing the inefficiency of the courts that could take years to resolve a dispute. Most court employees were bribed, court employees were related to people in power, etc. It was like saying to the Kurd that the Armenian was powerless.¹⁶⁸

In addition, the settlement of the Balkan immigrants in eastern Anatolia before solving the already acute land disputes was evaluated as the continuity of the Hamidian policies in the region. This policy disappointed the

¹⁶⁷ Feroz Ahmad, "Genç Türkler'in Tarım Politikası, 1908-1918", *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, İstanbul, Kaynak Yayınları, 1999, pp. 66-69, 72-75.

¹⁶⁸ Quoted from Kaligian, "Agrarian Land Reform", pp. 35-36.

Armenians. In spite of solving the land problems, the CUP added another layer to the already accumulated ones. The disappointment of the ARF regarding the restitution of appropriated lands became an important reason for the break off the relations between the CUP and the ARF.¹⁶⁹

Furthermore, the Adana massacres were influential in the rise of disappointment toward the Unionists. In the spring of 1909, there were clashes between the Christians and Muslims which resulted in the death of thousands of Armenians. Stemming from factors such as the resentment of the Muslims against the constitutional regime and constitutional freedoms of the Christians, the economic competition between these communities in the region, the fear of the establishment of an Armenian state in Cilicia, the attacks on the Armenians of Cilicia began on 14 April 1909 just one day after the start of counter-revolution in Istanbul (*31 Mart Vakası*). Even though the CUP was not regarded as the organizer of the massacres, it is asserted that many local CUP leaders took part.¹⁷⁰ Court Martials were established for the Adana massacres and 349 people (25 Armenians and 324 Muslims) were put on trial.¹⁷¹ Cemal Paşa gave the number of dead for the Adana events as: 17,000 Armenians and 1,850 Muslims. The Armenian Patriarch claimed that the number of dead was 21,300.¹⁷²

Even though the activities of *Hamidiye* regiments and the land appropriation of the Kurdish *aghas* were not direct problems for Kayseri which was a central Anatolian sanjak, the escalation of these problems and the

¹⁶⁹ Kaligian, “Agrarian Land Reform”, pp. 39-42.

¹⁷⁰ Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide*, pp. 60-61. For recent re-evaluations of the Adana massacres see Meltem Toksöz, “Adana Ermenileri ve 1909 “İğtişaşı””, in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri*, pp. 153-162; *1909 Adana Olayları Makaleler, The Adana Incidents of 1909 Revisited*, edited by Kemal Çiçek, Ankara, TTK, 2011; and Tetsuya Sahara, *What Happened in Adana in April 1909? Conflicting Armenian and Turkish Views*, Istanbul, ISIS, 2014.

¹⁷¹ For the list of the trialed persons and their sentences see DH.SYS, 54-1/2-1, in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde 1909 Adana Olayları, Vol. II*, Ankara, Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2010, pp. 299-237.

¹⁷² Cemal Paşa, *Hatıralar, İttihat ve Terakki, I. Dünya Savaşı Anıları*, ed. by Alpay Kabacalı, Istanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, p. 386; Gürün, *Ermeni Dosyası*, p. 176.

deterioration of relations between the Armenian political organizations and the CUP influenced the inter-communal affairs in many districts. The attacks on the Armenian population of the city in 1894-1896 exemplify that the developments in other localities had a deep impact on the sanjak. The Adana events of 1909 was another shock since Kayseri had strong commercial bonds with the Adana/Çukurova region, and the deterioration of inter-communal relations in such a neighboring area directly affected the sanjak.

3.5 The Balkan Wars (1912-1913)

The Balkan Wars had an important role in the demographic transformation of Anatolia. These wars not only signaled the loss of the Balkan lands, but also brought about a significant change in the demographic composition of the empire. The number of non-Muslims decreased remarkably within the total Ottoman population and the influx of Muslim refugees from the lost Ottoman territories became a great problem.¹⁷³ The Balkan Wars had a considerable influence on the CUP, most of whose main leaders originated from the Balkan lands.¹⁷⁴ In the eyes of the CUP elite, the core of the empire was lost, and from then on a new core had to be created. Thus, the loss of Balkan lands directed the CUP to focus on Anatolia as the motherland.¹⁷⁵

Hence, the Balkan Wars not only changed the boundaries and demography of the empire, but also gave an impetus to Turkish nationalism among the ruling elite. Even though Turkish nationalism had gradually

¹⁷³ “In the peace settlement of 1913 eighty percent of the European territory of the Empire was lost, with 4.2 million inhabitants (about 16 percent of the total population of the Empire).” Zürcher, “The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of”, p. 6.

¹⁷⁴ Erik Jan Zürcher, “The Young Turks-Children of the Borderlands?”, *Turkology Update Leiden Working Papers Archive* (Retrieved January 29, 2013 from, http://edoc.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/HALCoRe_derivate_00003227/youngturks_borderlands.pdf)

¹⁷⁵ Ülker, “Contextualising ‘Turkification’”, pp. 615-626; Zürcher, “The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of”, pp. 6-7; David Kushner evaluates the rise of Turkish nationalism during Abdülhamit’s reign and Anatolia’s matching with the Turkish homeland in this period. Therefore, it can be said that the pioneering ideas in this respect have their roots before the Balkan Wars. David Kushner, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu*, Istanbul, Ay Köprüsü Yayınları, 2004, pp. 95-99.

influenced the Young Turks long before the Balkan Wars, Hanioglu claims that the wars “proved the CUP’s long-standing assertion that, with few exceptions, the non-Turkish communities of the empire inclined toward separatism.”¹⁷⁶ Equating the non-Muslim communities as secessionist groups, they began to be regarded unreliable by the CUP leaders. Studies on the population policies of the CUP show the approach of the CUP leaders which was that the only way to create a homeland in Anatolia was to establish a Muslim majority in those territories, and that the dissolution of the empire could only be prevented through this majority.¹⁷⁷

The Balkan Wars changed the demographic composition of the Ottoman Empire because of the loss of territories and the influx of Muslim refugees, but it also gave rise other population movements such as the exchange of populations with Bulgaria and Greece. This was a period of expulsion of minorities not only from the Ottoman lands but also from the Balkans. While there was pressure on the Christian peoples in the Ottoman Empire, a similar process was implemented by the Balkan states against the Muslims. Therefore, these years were characterized by ongoing migrations between the states representing an exodus of minorities.¹⁷⁸ In this context, the exchange of

¹⁷⁶ M. Şükrü Hanioglu, “Turkism and the Young Turks, 1889-1908”, in *Turkey beyond Nationalism: towards Post-Nationalist Identities*, ed. by Hans-Lukas Kieser, London, I.B. Tauris, 2006, p. 19.

¹⁷⁷ For instances see, DüNDAR, *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası*; Adanır-Kaiser, “Göç, Sürgün Ve Ulusun İnşası”, pp. 18-27; Taner Akçam, ‘*Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur*’, *Osmanlı Belgelerine Göre Savaş Yıllarında Ermenilere Yönelik Politikalar*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2008; DüNDAR, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*; Ülker, “Contextualising ‘Turkification’”, pp. 613-636; Zürcher, “The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of”; Uğur Ümit Üngör, “Seeing like a nation-state: Young Turk Social Engineering in Eastern Turkey, 1913-50”, *Journal of Genocide Research*, vol. 10, no. 1 (March 2008), pp. 15-39; Şeker, “Demographic Engineering”, pp. 461-474.

¹⁷⁸ Onur Yıldırım, *Türk-Yunan Mübadelesinin Öteki Yüzü: Diplomasi ve Göç*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006, p. 38; Justin McCarthy, *The Ottoman Peoples and the End of Empire*, London, Arnold Publishers, 2001, pp. 90-94; Justin McCarthy, *Death and Exile, The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims 1821-1922*, Princeton, The Darwin Press, 1999, pp. 135-177; İlhan Tekeli, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndan Günümüze Nüfusun Zorunlu Yer Değiştirmesi ve İskan Sorunu”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 50, 1990, p. 60. For a general evaluation of the changes in the Ottoman population on the basis of religious groups see Justin McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities, The Population of Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Empire*, New York, New York University Press, 1983.

populations was negotiated between the Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria just after the Balkan Wars for an important number of Bulgarians and Muslims who fled to the other side during the war. This population movement on both sides induced Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire to sign an agreement on 29 September 1913 concerning the voluntary population exchange. The Greek population also became subject to a similar agreement. In the early months of 1914, the Greek population living in the Western coastal areas of Anatolia was forced to leave the Ottoman Empire and as a result of this pressure about 150,000 Ottoman Greeks fled to Greece. Another exchange of populations agreement with Greece was signed in 1914 in the face of these events. However, the outbreak of World War I prevented its implementation.¹⁷⁹

These policies and the expulsion of the non-Muslims were one side of the process, but the Muslim communities were also subject to demographic policies of the CUP government to secure a Muslim and Turkish population in Anatolia. Dündar claims that they were not settled in randomly; instead, the Muslim immigrants and refugees were subject to a settlement plan.¹⁸⁰

In this process, the Armenian question was again internationalized in the form of an Armenian reform plan. A plan was proposed by Russia, and the Ottoman government could not avoid but adopt a Reform Scheme in February 1914 under the pressure of the Great Powers. According to this scheme, there would be two zones under the administration of two European inspectors. The first zone consisted Erzurum, Trabzon and Sivas, and the second one consisted Van, Bitlis, Harput and Diyarbakır. On 25 May 1914, the Ottoman government signed the contract with two European inspectors, Hoff from Norway and Westenenk from the Netherlands. However, the outbreak of World War I

¹⁷⁹ Yıldırım, *Türk-Yunan Mübadelesinin Öteki Yüzü*, p. 39; Zürcher, “The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of”, pp. 6-8; Akçam, ‘*Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur*’, pp. 83-85. For more information see Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, pp. 187-225; for criticism towards Dündar see Ahmet Efiloğlu, “Fuat Dündar’ın Osmanlı Belgelerinde Kaybolan “Modern Türkiye’nin Şifresi””, *Belleten*, no. 270 (August 2010), pp. 531-570.

¹⁸⁰ Dündar, *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası*, p. 11.

stalled the implementation of the plan, and the Ottoman government dismissed these inspectors on 31 December 1914 before they had even started work.¹⁸¹

3.6 The Deportation Decision of the Ottoman Government

The deportation of the Ottoman Armenians was brought to the agenda in a process which witnessed the radicalization of the CUP policies. The deportation was implemented during the war first as a regional measure but soon turned into an empire-wide program. The defeats at Sarıkamış and the Suez Canal, the incidents at Zeytun and Dörtyol, the landing of the Allied forces at Gallipoli, the Van uprising and the loss of Van became influential in the escalation of the CUP policies. Therefore, analyzing the developments within World War I is important to evaluate the decision of the CUP government to deport the Armenians.¹⁸² Based on the most recent work on the subject, this section aims to reconstruct this process and present an understanding of the course of events. From this point of view, the shifting circumstances within the war need to be discussed.

The relations between the CUP and ARF deteriorated prior to the war. The CUP tried to reach an agreement with the ARF in August 1914 in case of "either a Turkish advance on Russia or Turkish support for a Caucasian rebellion against Russia", and the failure of this attempt gave rise to estrangement. The representatives of the CUP and the government; Dr. Bahaddin Şakir and Naci Bey, held a meeting with the ARF leaders in Erzurum in August 1914 (during the ARF World Congress). The ARF leaders expressed that they would defend the Ottoman Empire in the event of a Russian invasion, however, they did not guarantee the cooperation of the Caucasian Armenians

¹⁸¹ Gürün, *Ermeni Dosyası*, pp. 188-192; Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide*, pp. 64-65. For an evaluation of the negotiations between the Unionists and Tashnaks on the Reform Scheme of 1914 see Rober Koptaş, "Zohrab, Papazyan ve Pastırmacıyan'ın Kalemlerinden, 1914 Ermeni Reformu ile İttihadçı-Taşnak Müzakereleri", in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri*, pp. 175-191.

¹⁸² Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide*, pp. 69-71, 83-90.

under Russian rule if there was an Ottoman advance on Russia. This reply disappointed Istanbul.¹⁸³

In addition, telegrams regarding the Armenian volunteers who were Ottoman subjects and participated in Russian paramilitary organizations were being sent from the Third Army region, headquartered in Erzurum, in the last months of 1914. The Ottoman center also wanted to be informed about the number of Armenians who passed over to the Russian side. Besides, “the attacks against the postal roads, the cutting of telegraph lines, attacks on police stations, and other hostile actions were duly and regularly reported to the capital.” As the war conditions worsened for the Ottoman Empire, military deserters and armed gangs also began to be considered as internal threats.¹⁸⁴

Intelligence reports also prompted the Ottoman fear of Russo-Armenian collaboration. The Third Army Commander, Hasan İzzet Paşa reported on 24 September 1914 that the Russians tried to provoke Ottoman Armenians with the help of the Caucasian Armenians. With the promise of giving the conquered Ottoman lands to the Armenians, they apparently tried to form gangs in the Armenian villages. It was also stated that the Russians encouraged the Armenian soldiers in the Ottoman army to desert to the Russian side with their weapons. The report gave rise to the adoption of certain measures including the banning of taking weapons and ammunition over the border and that the Armenian soldiers had to be removed from the combat troops as much as possible.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ Dikran M. Kaligian, “The Armenian Revolutionary Federation under Ottoman Constitutional Rule, 1908-1914”, Dissertation, Boston College, 2003, pp. 343-347; Kaiser, “Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies”, pp. 176, 211. For more information on the relations between the CUP and Armenian political organizations see, Arsen Avagyan and Gaidz F. Minassian, *Ermeniler ve İttihat ve Terakki İşbirliğinden Çatışmaya*, Istanbul, Aras Yayıncılık, 2005.

¹⁸⁴ Taner Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2012, pp. 140-145.

¹⁸⁵ Document no: 1894 (24 September 1914), *Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi*, no: 83 (March 1983), p. 7: “Hududu geçen ve elinde pasaportu olmayan gayr-ı Müslim kesen yakalanacak, huduttan silah ve cephane geçirmek teşebbüsünde bulunanlar hemen itlaf edilecek, şimdiden Ermeniler mümkün mertebe gayr-ı muharipler nezdine ayrılacak, aleyhimizde bir hareket vukuunda derhal şiddetle bastırılacak ve mütecasiri itlaf olunacaktır.”

The Russian advance on the eastern borders of the empire and the Ottoman defeat in Sarıkamış by the middle of January 1915 also negatively affected the relations between the CUP and Armenian organizations since some Armenians fought on the Russian side. This increased the suspicions about the loyalty of Armenians and the Russian advance into eastern Anatolia fostered the fear of a Russian-Armenian collaboration which might lead to a secession of eastern provinces from the empire. The situation was not only bad at the eastern border. The military campaign at the Suez Canal also ended with defeat by the beginning of February. A further incident occurred involving Armenian deserters in Zeytun (today called Süleymanlı in Maraş) and local Armenians' assistance to Entente operations on the Mediterranean coast near Dört Yol followed.¹⁸⁶ In February 1915, the Armenian soldiers in the Ottoman army were disarmed and placed in labor battalions.¹⁸⁷ The Zeytun and Dört Yol events were also significant in another respect in that fighting at Dört Yol and Zeytun led to deportations from Dört Yol in March and from Zeytun in April 1915. However, these deportations were regionally-based at this stage.¹⁸⁸

Although the deportation was initially a regional measure, it soon turned to an empire-wide policy within months. The landing of Anglo-French forces at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915 had already been expected by the CUP when the news of Van uprising came on 20 April 1915, and then the arrests of 24-25 April 1915 took place. Moreover, the situation in Van and a Russian advance in eastern Anatolia became influential in the deportation decision for the Van, Bitlis and Erzurum provinces on 9 May 1915. A turning point came with the

¹⁸⁶ Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide*, pp. 4, 70-83; Dündar, *Crime of Numbers*, pp. 70-73; Zürcher, "The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of", pp. 8-9.

¹⁸⁷ "Ermeni efrad gerek seyyar ordularda ve gerek ordularda ve gerek seyyar ve sabit jandarmalarda katiyen hidemat-ı müsellahada kullanılmayacaktır ve Kumandanlar ve Karargahın maiyet ve dairelerinde dahi istihdam olunmayacaktır.", 25 February 1915, Genelkurmay, No 1/131, KLS 2287, Dosya 12, F. 9. Quoted from Gürün, *Ermeni Dosyası*, p. 212.

¹⁸⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 50/141; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/35 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, Ankara, Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2007, pp. 111, 121-122); BOA, DH.ŞFR 52/51 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler (1915-1920)*, Ankara, 1995, p. 21.). For a detailed analysis of Zeytun affair see Kaiser, "Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies", pp. 176-182.

fall of Van to the Russians on 19 May 1915. The Armenians continued to hold the city until the arrival of the Russian forces and it seems that the CUP leaders viewed this as the materialization of their suspicions about the Russian-Armenian collaboration.¹⁸⁹

The Van uprising is regarded as a significant event in the radicalization of the CUP government towards the Armenians. The intelligence reports included news regarding the Russian-Armenian collaboration, the gangs of Armenian deserters and their flight to the Russian side. These reports were presented to the Ministry of Interior as evidence that there would be an attempt to carry out a big revolt inside the country.¹⁹⁰

McCarthy, Arslan, Taşkıran and Turan also evaluate the Van uprising as a planned rebellion of the Armenian nationalists against the Ottoman Empire. In this framework, the arming of the Armenians around Van before the outbreak of the war and the military training of about twelve thousand Ottoman Armenians in Russia were deemed to be the preliminary stage of the “planned revolt”. In particular, special emphasis was placed on the activities of the Armenian deserters. These deserters escaped from the army with their weapons and established gangs. There were instances of attacks by these gangs against the Muslim villagers and the cutting of telegraph lines, also some of the gangs passed over to the Russian side. These scholars approached these attacks and the desertions from the army as parts of a “plan”, namely the general Armenian rebellion.¹⁹¹ They stated that: “What previously had been described as ‘banditry’ or ‘disloyalty’ that would soon be crushed was now admittedly a ‘rebellion’”. Furthermore, these scholars took a position in support of the measures of Cevdet, the governor of the Van province, against the Armenians:

¹⁸⁹ Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide*, pp. 70-71, 83-85; DüNDAR, *Crime of Numbers*, pp. 74-85; Zürcher, “The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of”, pp. 8-9.

¹⁹⁰ *Arşiv Belgeleri ile Ermeni Faaliyetleri, 1914-1918, Vol. I*, Ankara, Genel Kurmay Basımevi, 2005, pp. 97-108, 123.

¹⁹¹ Justin McCarthy et al., *The Armenian Rebellion at Van*, Salt Lake City, The University of Utah Press, 2006, pp. 176-251.

Cevdet was unquestionably taking precautions against the rebellion in the city. New police posts were manned. Gendarmerie units were stationed in the Muslim district that separated the Old City from the Armenian district in the Western Garden City. Armenian young men were called to serve in the army as road builders and agricultural laborers---a matter of duty and law, but also a way to remove potential rebels.¹⁹²

Akçam, on the other hand, points to the fact that the events which were described as a “revolt” or an “uprising” were clashes with the deserters. However, the defeat of the Ottoman army at Sarıkamış gave rise to a shift in the evaluation of such kind of events even if their “nature” did not change:

The reality that emerges from all these documents is that the incidents in question were simply the work of armed bandit gangs of Muslim and non-Muslim military deserters that appeared-particularly in the eastern provinces-in the first months of the Ottoman entry into the war between fall 1914 and the first few months of 1915: it is simply not possible to speak of a planned, organized Armenian revolt. What is also seen, especially after the Ottoman defeat at Sarıkamış in the first months of 1915, is a change in how the Unionist Party and government viewed and interpreted these events.¹⁹³

Hilmar Kaiser also comments on these claims of an organized Armenian uprising:

These assertions focus on a number of incidents like the so-called ‘Defense of Van’ in April and May 1915, and clashes at Zeitun in March 1915. The authors interconnected these events in order to prove an alleged master plan coordinated by Armenian revolutionaries located in Constantinople and abroad. However, this conspiracy theory lacks support from the records of the Ottoman Fourth Army. No imminent rising was anticipated; people were deported for other reasons.¹⁹⁴

Minassian focuses on the deterioration of relations between the Armenian and Muslim communities in Van and describes the uprising as the self-defense

¹⁹² McCarthy et al., *The Armenian Rebellion at Van*, pp. 196, 202.

¹⁹³ Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime against Humanity*, pp. 162, 170.

¹⁹⁴ Kaiser, “Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies”, p. 175.

of the Armenians against the attacks of the Ottoman government.¹⁹⁵ An American missionary in Van, Grace Higley Knapp, underlined the impact of the assassination of Ishkhan and Vramian, two notable Armenian revolutionaries, by the governor of Van (Cevdet Bey) and also referred to the clash between the Armenian and Turkish soldiers as triggering factors of the uprising.¹⁹⁶ Knapp comments that:

The fact cannot be too strongly emphasized that there was no “rebellion”. As already pointed out the Revolutionists meant to keep the peace if it lay in their power to do so. But for some time past a line of Turkish entrenchments had been secretly drawn around the Armenian quarter of the Gardens. The Revolutionists, determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible, prepared a defensive line of entrenchments.¹⁹⁷

In any case, it seems that the local Armenians had already been trained by the local Armenian political organizations for self-defense in case of an all-out attack directed against them.¹⁹⁸ Finally, the deportation of Armenians from six provinces (1-Van province, 2-Erzurum province, 3-Bitlis province, 4-Adana province except Adana, Sis and Mersin cities, 5-Maraş sanjak with the exception of Maraş city, and 6-Aleppo province excluding Aleppo city) was ordered on 23 May 1915 after the fall of Van.¹⁹⁹ The atrocities that occurred after this order reached the outside world and the Allied countries made a declaration on 24 May 1915 which announced that Ottoman leaders and officials would be held responsible for crimes committed against the Christian

¹⁹⁵ For detailed information see, Anahide Ter Minassian, “Van 1915”, in *Armenian Van/Vasporakan*, ed. by Richard G. Hovannisian, California, Mazda Publishers, 2000, pp. 209-244.

¹⁹⁶ Grace Higley Knapp, *The Mission at Van, in Turkey in War Time*, 1916, pp. 13-16.

¹⁹⁷ Knapp, *The Mission at Van*, p. 14. She also stated that: “...the Revolutionists conducted themselves with remarkable restraint and prudence; controlled their hotheaded youth; patrolled the streets to prevent skirmishes; and bade the villagers to endure in silence—better a village or two burned unavenged than that any attempt at reprisals should furnish an excuse for massacre.”, p. 13.

¹⁹⁸ McCarthy et al., *The Armenian Rebellion at Van*, pp. 184-185.

¹⁹⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/91; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/92; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/93; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/94.

population during the mass deportations. This declaration induced the CUP leaders to establish a legal basis for the deportations. On 27 May 1915, the Ottoman government enacted a provisional law for this purpose. The provisional law gave military commanders the authority to deport the people of a village or town individually or as a whole if they were suspected of spying or treason. Even though there was no term referring to Armenians, it was obvious through the practice that the law would be used for the deportation of the Armenians.²⁰⁰

The implementation of the deportations presented an escalation²⁰¹ as the regional deportations to the inside of Anatolia turned into an empire wide program with the deportations towards Syria and Der-Zor. For instance, the first deportations from Dörtyol and Zeytun were directed to Konya.²⁰² However, on 24 April 1915, the direction of the deportations changed from the interior of Anatolia to Aleppo, Zor and Urfa.²⁰³ The deportations from Kayseri would follow a similar route. While by the beginning of June 1915, the first deportees were sent to Aksaray, the destination was changed a little later.²⁰⁴

This process illustrates that deportations was not just a temporary war-time measure taken against Armenian political organizations. Its execution implied that it was beyond the security concerns of the Ottoman government. As explained above, the policies regarding homogenization of the population began to be applied in the Balkan states and the Ottoman Empire before the advent of World War I. However, this process evolved into a radical execution

²⁰⁰ Kaiser, “Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies”, pp. 54-55. For the original text and transcription of the provisional law (“*Vakt-ı Seferde İcraat-ı Hükümete Karşı Gelenler İçün Cihet-i Askeriyece İttihaz Olunacak Tedabir Hakkında Kanun-u Muvakkat*”) see Kardeş, “*Tehcir*” ve *Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, pp. 17-20.

²⁰¹ Fuat Dündar underlines the radicalization of the central government policies, and states that the Armenian deportations gradually escalated. Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, pp. 275-276, 345-347; Fuat Dündar, “Aktar ve Kırmızı'nın Eleştirisi Vesilesiyle: Algılama ve Ölçüyü Tutturma Sorunu”, *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 9 (Fall 2009), pp. 235-236.

²⁰² Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*, p. 182.

²⁰³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 52/93 (24 April 1915)

²⁰⁴ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/36 (9 June 1915)

in the empire during the war with the Armenian deportations. In its fullest form and stage, these deportations aimed to change the demographic composition of the country. For the CUP cadres, it would mean the “purification” of Anatolia from the “unreliable” elements and thus eradicating the demands for reform and independence. As Akçam points out the deportation of Armenians seems not to be a military requirement but instead it was directly related with the “question of Armenian reforms” which was deemed a “threat to the empire’s national security” by the CUP leadership.²⁰⁵ Thus, deportations which began at a regional level soon turned into an overarching policy targeting the entire Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire.

²⁰⁵ Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime against Humanity*, pp. 125-126: “In the course of the war, following a series of military defeats, the Ottoman rulers came to believe that the issue of Armenian reforms had become a lethal threat to the empire’s national security and territorial integrity. The policy decisions regarding the Armenians can thus be seen to have emanated from the dual context of general ethnic cleansing in Anatolia and the military defeats that transformed the long-standing question of Armenian reforms into an existential national security issue for the Ottoman state.”

CHAPTER 4

THE DEPORTATION OF THE KAYSERI ARMENIANS

4.1 The Implementation of the Deportation Order in Kayseri

The district of Kayseri neither became a battle area during the war nor did it encounter an invasion. Therefore, the main event which influenced the social and economic structure in the sanjak was the deportation of the local Armenians. Their deportation transformed both the demographic composition and the socio-economic life of the city. In order to analyze this process, first the change in its population during World War I is to be evaluated.

According to the census results of 1914, the total population of Kayseri sanjak was 263,074 consisting of; 184,292 Muslims, 26,590 Greeks, 48,659 Armenians, 1,515 Catholics and 2,018 Protestants. In other words, the non-Muslims comprised thirty percent of its total population in that year.

TABLE 4: The Population of Kayseri Sanjak According to the Census of 1914

Counties	Muslims	Greeks	Armenians	Armenian Catholics	Protestants	Total
Kayseri	101,924	19,662	30,105	1,513	1,614	154,818
Develi	30,948	2,085	15,689	2	404	49,128
İncesu	14,559	3,773				18,332
Bünyan-i hamid	36,861	1,070	2,865			40,796
Total: Kayseri sanjak	184,292	26,590	48,659	1,515	2,018	263,074

Source: Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, pp. 186-187. The population census of the Armenian Patriarchate for the period from February 1913 to August 1915 gives more or less the same number (52,000 Armenians) for Kayseri Armenian population with the Ottoman census results for 1914. Raymond H. Kevorkian, Paul B. Paboudjian, *1915 Öncesinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Ermeniler*, Istanbul, Aras, 2012, p. 62.

Most of the Armenians lived in the central county (*kaza*) of Kayseri, but there was also a considerable number in the *kaza* of Develi. While there was no

Armenian in the county of İncesu, there was a small Armenian community in the *kaza* of Bünyan. The Armenians of the sanjak not only lived in the county centers, but there was also an important Armenian village community especially in Develi and Kayseri *kazas*. In the *kaza* of Kayseri, Armenians populated Germir, Tavlusun, Talas, Derevenk, Gesi, Efkere, Belegesı, Mancusun, Nirze, Darsiyak, Erkilet, Muncusun and Belviran villages. Armenian populated areas in the *kaza* of Develi were; Çomaklı, İncesu, Cücün, Söğütlü, Sazak, Taşhan, Karacaviran, Kazlıgömedi, Yağdıbaran, Yenice villages and the township (*nahiye*) of Tomarza. In the *kaza* of Bünyan, there were only the following four villages that had an Armenian community; Gigi, Sıvgın, Ekrek and Sarioğlan. While some of these villages were only inhabited by Armenians (such as Derevenk, Belegesı, Söğütlü, Sazak, Taşhan, Kazlıgömedi, Yağdıbaran, Gigi, Sıvgın, Ekrek), in many of these villages Muslims, Greeks and Armenians lived together.²⁰⁶ This demographic structure underwent a drastic change as a result of the Armenian deportations.

After the explosion of a bomb in the house of an Armenian in Everek in February 1915, a “violent” investigation campaign began in Kayseri to detect the Armenian revolutionary communities within the district.²⁰⁷ This campaign included a search for arms and the arrest of the leaders of the Armenian organizations and prominent Armenians, alleged of being involved in the Armenian revolt (*Ermeni tertibat-ı ihtilaliyesi*). Even though the report of the American missionary highlighted the fact that the weapons and bombs found in the Armenian houses were acquired by the Armenians after the 1896 Armenian massacres and 1909 Adana events for self-defense in the face of occurrence of

²⁰⁶ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40 (22 September 1915). This document has a census data regarding Kayseri population on village basis of nationalities (*millet*). See attachment 1 for census data.

²⁰⁷ “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 824”, “*Turkish Atrocities*”: *Statements of American Missionaries on the Destruction of Christian Communities in Ottoman Turkey, 1915-1917*, compiled by James L. Barton, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Gomidas Institute, 1998, pp. 131-132; The US National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), RG 59, 867.4016/95.

a similar event²⁰⁸, the local authorities in Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior that there was a preparation in the sanjak for the “Armenian revolt” and these munitions were evaluated as the evidence of an organized Armenian rebellion. From then on, messages concerning the existence of Armenian revolutionary committees in Kayseri and information about their weapons became an important topic of official correspondence.²⁰⁹

The Armenian organizations rejected the argument of the Ottoman state regarding disarmament:

The disarmament, pursued with passion for months, is one of the most senseless and defiant proceedings of the Young-Turk Government. During the first years of the Ottoman Constitution, The Committee “Union and Progress” itself encouraged the armament of the Armenians, seeing in them the most convinced and aured partisans of the new regime. During the reactionary movement of March 31, 1909 (old style) the Ittihad appealed to the armed assistance of the Armenians, especially in the provinces, to fight the enemies of the Constitution. Moreover, the Armenians as well as all the partisans of the new regime found it absolutely necessary to carry arms on them, just for self-defense, because

²⁰⁸ NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/32; “NARA, RG256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807”, “*Turkish Atrocities*”, p. 121. An American missionary explains the reason of the existence of bombs in NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/95: “Up to the middle of April I was of the opinion that a revolver was really sufficient to defend one’s life but I soon learned that a revolver did not help at all in cases as we are at present undergoing and according to the reports I received from eye-witnesses of the massacres of 1896, the men broke into the houses not by twos and threes but in companies of three hundred. Even if only the fourth part of the above mentioned men broke into a house what use would a revolver be? Bombs have been in existing during the massacres of 1896 and 1909. It was owing to the bombs that one single house really escaped for the man stood on the roof threatening to throw bombs on the murderers and they fled.”

²⁰⁹ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 6/1; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 50/127; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 7/21 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 110-111, 123, 141-150.) A document dated 18 September 1915 gave the list of the weapons collected from the Armenians. See BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 11/48 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 258-259.). See also *Arşiv Belgeleri ile Ermeni Faaliyetleri, 1914-1918, Vol. I*, pp. 114, 127, 179. The war period was also a battle of propaganda for the sides of the war. The Armenian deportation took a special part in this respect. The Ottoman propaganda books and pamphlets focused on the activities of the Armenian political organizations and tried to demonstrate that these organizations were in preparation of an organized revolt against the Ottomans. For the CUP’s official propaganda book see *Ermeni Komitelerinin Amal ve Hareket-i İhtilaliyyesi İlan-ı Meşrutiyetten Evvel ve Sonra*, Istanbul, Matbaa-i Amire, 1332 (1916). On the other hand, its British equivalent focused on the Ottoman massacres of the Armenians, see *Miscellaneous no. 31 (1916), The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915-16, Documents presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs by Viscount Bryce*, London, 1916.

of the threatening growth of anti-constitutional and anti-christian elements. Since July 10/23 1908, the Armenians never made their profit of the troubles of the Young Turk Government. If they had had the idea of a rebellion, they could have created many pretexts, without waiting for the present general war.²¹⁰

On 24 April 1915, orders concerning the Armenian Committees such as the Dashnak and Hinchak parties were sent to the localities, including Kayseri. The local branches of these committees were to be closed down by the order of the Ministry of Interior and their files to be seized. Moreover, the leaders and members of the committees and the important and detrimental (*muzır*) Armenians which were known by the government were to be arrested and court-martialed. If necessary, the people whose residence in their former place was regarded an inconvenience these people could be interned in a suitable location within the province or district and their escape had to be prevented. Searches for weapons should also be implemented if required.²¹¹ In the meantime, Enver Paşa as the chief commander of the army informed the military commanderships of this order and instructed that they had to immediately respond to demands of the civil administration in the implementation of this order.²¹²

In Kayseri, searches for weapons and the arrest of Armenian notables and community leaders were carried out during the spring of 1915. The harsh campaign against the Armenians forced the local community leaders to hand over all weapons to the authorities by the end of May 1915, which they had acquired after the 1896 and 1909 incidents. However, handing over the

²¹⁰ Library of Congress, The Papers of Henry Morgenthau, reel. 22, “Notes, July 15/28, 1915, Daschnaktzoutioun Committee Balkan Section, Sofia”. Missionary reports from Kayseri highlighted that while it was announced that all citizens had to give up their weapons, only the Armenians were forced to deliver their arms, “Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls’ School in the Year of the Deportation”, ABCFM, reel. 629; “NARA, RG256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 824, Story of Talas 1914-1917, Theda B. Phelps”, “*Turkish Atrocities*”, p. 132.

²¹¹ “...komiteler rüesa ve erkanından müteşebbis eşhas ile hükümetçe tanınan mühim ve muzır Ermenilerin hemen tevkifi...”, DH.ŞFR, 52/96 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 125-126.)

²¹² Document no: 1829 (26 April 1915), *Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi*, no: 81 (December 1982), pp. 135-136.

weapons did not put an end to the government operations. There followed the arrest of the Armenian notables and leaders, who were allegedly members of the Armenian revolutionary committees. As a result, many Armenian notables were tried at Court Martials and some were sentenced to death²¹³, the others were given deportation orders and sentenced to hard labor (*tebid ve kürek*).²¹⁴ As it can be remembered, the deportation of the Armenian population of six provinces consisting of Van, Erzurum, Bitlis, Adana, Maraş and Aleppo was already ordered by 23 May 1915 and the provisional law was enacted for the deportations on 27 May 1915.

A document from the American archives dated 13 July 1915 gives information about this process:

...[t]welve Armenians were hung in Cesarea on the pretext that they have obeyed the secret instructions of Henchagist and Tashnagist Committees convoked at Bucarest. Besides these executions, thirty-two persons have been condemned at Cesarea to punishments varying from ten to fifteen years hard labor. These are chiefly honest merchants who have no connection whatever with political parties.²¹⁵

By September 1915, 1,095 people had been condemned by the Kayseri Court Martials.²¹⁶ Kalfaian attaches the court decision regarding these executions:

²¹³ Raymond Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide, A Complete History*, New York, I.B. Tauris, 2011, pp. 514-517. The American missionary reports have detailed information regarding the investigation campaign in the sanjak. See NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/31; NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/32; NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/95; NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/190; “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 824”, “*Turkish Atrocities*”, pp. 132-133; “Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls’ School in the Year of the Deportation”, ABCFM, reel. 629.

²¹⁴ See BOA, DHEUM.2.Şb, 9/112 (11 August 1915). At this document, the district governorate of Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior concerning the court-martialed Armenians, who were accused of involving in the organization of revolt (*tertibat-ı ihtilaliyye*) in the sanjak, and also attached the list of them with their punishments (*idam, kürek ve tebid*).

²¹⁵ NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/158. Another report from the American archives gave details of the hanged twelve men in Kayseri: “...12 Armenians have been hung at Cesarea (three Dashnaguists, three Huntchaguists and six merchants).” NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/75.

²¹⁶ Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, p. 517; Vahakn N. Dadrian, “The Agency of “Triggering Mechanisms” as a Factor in the Organization of the Genocide”, *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, vol. 1, no. 2 (September 2006), p. 119.

...[w]ith the intention of unleashing a general uprising against the Ottoman Empire, the revolutionary Hntchag and Dashnak Armenian Committees conspired against the government at a joint meeting convened in Bucharest (Rumania). Besides resolving to incite parts of the Armenian population of the Empire against the government, the said committees also accumulated hand grenades, dynamite and other destructive weapons.²¹⁷

Studies which were built on the memoirs of the Kayseri Armenians who experienced this process of searches, arrests and executions highlighted the “fierceness” of the authorities. These sources particularly underline the role of Salih Zeki, governor (*kaymakam*) of Develi, who would be the governor of Der-Zor in 1916 and was accused of massacring the deportee Armenians in the region. Zeki was appointed to his post as *kaymakam* of Develi after the explosion of the bomb (in the house of Kevork Defjian in Everek). It is claimed that he was responsible for the massive number of arrests of party members and many leading Armenians, besides torturing and killing them.²¹⁸

On February 29, 1915 a bomb exploded by accident in the house of a native of Everek. From that day on the whole male population of Chomaklou above military age was gradually rounded up and sent to prison. Those of military age had already been drafted. From the date of the explosion of that bomb we were to experience four months of horrors, such as the unearthing of concealed weapons, the searches for missing documents, the most crippling beatings, slashing, murders.²¹⁹

On 1 June 1915, while the search for arms and arrests continued, the Istanbul government reminded Kayseri and other provinces of the implementation of the arrest and deportation order to the leaders of the

²¹⁷ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p. 139. The Armenian *murahhas* (religious representative) in Kayseri was also condemned by the Court Martial because of being involved in the organization of Armenian revolt. See the documents BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/64; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 8/37; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 10/58 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 170, 173, 230-232).

²¹⁸ For detailed information on this process see, Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, pp. 513-22; Dadrian, “The Agency of “Triggering Mechanisms””, pp. 107-126; Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, pp. 101-139; Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, pp. 357-369.

²¹⁹ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p. 183.

Armenian Committees and dangerous Armenians and warned them not to send Armenians to areas where they would be able to engage in same activities.²²⁰

After this order, the deportation of Kayseri Armenians began with the deportation of the Armenian inhabitants of the Küçük İncesu village of Develi²²¹ which had a population of 912 Armenians and 222 Muslims.²²² On 4 June 1915, the district governor sent a telegram to the Ministry of Interior requesting permission to deport the Armenian community of Küçük İncesu village because of the existence of an Hinchak branch in the village. The document identified the village as a center of insurrection (*ihtilal ocağı*) and suggested the deportation of this village community to Konya.²²³ The next day, the Ministry of Interior accepted this request and ordered the deportation of the whole Armenian community to an area which did not have an Armenian population; such as Aksaray in Konya province.²²⁴ Following the order, 160 Armenian families consisting of about six hundred people were sent to Aksaray on 8 June 1915.²²⁵ After the deportation of the Armenian population of the Küçük İncesu village, the district governorate immediately demanded the settlement of one hundred sixty immigrant households to replace the deported Armenian families with the aim of preventing the destruction of the buildings and in order to have a sufficient labor force to bring in the harvest.²²⁶ Istanbul agreed on the settlement of one hundred sixty households of immigrants to replace the deportees.²²⁷

²²⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/201 (13 July 1915) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 158.)

²²¹ NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/95

²²² BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40

²²³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 473/133 (4 June 1915)

²²⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/246 (5 June 1915)

²²⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 474/110 (9 June 1915); BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/36 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 162.)

²²⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 476/50 (19 June 1915)

²²⁷ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 8/21 (20 June 1915)

After the deportation of this village community to Aksaray, this deportation to an area within the interior of Anatolia was regarded problematic by Istanbul. Therefore, on 12 June 1915, the Ministry of Interior ordered a halt to deportation from the district, since such a deportation would increase the number of Armenians and would make them majority at their destinations.²²⁸

This interruption of the deportation did not last long and the orders continued to come one after another from the center. For example, the district governorate applied to the Ministry of Interior to deport thirty households from Derevenk village in the middle of July 1915. The governor of the sanjak, Zekai Bey, proposed the deportation of all the Armenians, including the women and children, and settlement of Muslim immigrants in their place.²²⁹ The Ministry gave its approval and the deportation of all the Derevenk villagers was ordered.²³⁰ However, this created complications at the local governorate level as the villagers of Derevenk applied for conversion to Islam. The district governor hesitated over whether he could deport these Armenians if they became Muslims and he asked Istanbul for instructions.²³¹ The Ministry of Interior ordered to continue the deportation even if the Armenians had converted to Islam.²³² Such orders were not only sent to Kayseri; a similar one was sent to Ankara on 3 August 1915.²³³

²²⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/326 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 164.)

²²⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 479/26 (8 July 1915); “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807”, “*Turkish Atrocities*”, p. 122. Even though this telegram stated that there were thirty Armenian households to be deported, Derevenk was wholly an Armenian village with 217 women and 237 men in 98 households. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40. In another source, the number of Armenians was asserted to be 310. Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, p. 514.

²³⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/380 (10 July 1915)

²³¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 479/100 (12 July 1915)

²³² “*Ermenilerin ihtidası sırf ilca-yı menfaat ile olduğu için ihtidaları üzerine tebidleri tehir edilmeyecektir.*” BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/427 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 198.)

²³³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/232: “*Sırf ilca-yı menfaatle vuku bulan bu kabil ihtidaların esas itibariyle bir kıymet-i resmîyesi yoktur. Bina’en aleyh bu suretle memleketlerinde kalmak çarelerine tevessül eden mühtediler hakkında katiyyen istisnai muamele yapılmaması ve bu*

In fact, the approach of the Ministry regarding the conversion of the Armenians had been different only a little while before. On 22 June 1915, the provinces of Van, Trabzon, Erzurum, Bitlis, Mamuretülaziz, Diyarbakır, Sivas and the district governorate of Canik received orders that the Armenians who had converted individually or collectively within their provinces and *livas* were allowed to stay, but the converts staying together had to be distributed within the province or district.²³⁴ The German and American documents contained the information that many Armenians converted during this process and stayed in their homeland. There were not only individual but also collective conversions of some Armenian villages, especially in the Black Sea Region.²³⁵

However, by July 1915, the Ottoman government had changed its approach towards the converts. On 1 July 1915, the Ministry of Interior had addressed this issue. It considered the conversions insincere and unreliable and as only being a response to the deportation order. Thus, since the conversions were regarded as a tactic to prevent deportation, the continuation of deportations was ordered even if the Armenians had already converted to Islam.²³⁶ Akçam evaluates this policy change on the basis of “governability”:

Wherever Armenians could be dissolved within the Muslim majority, religious conversion was allowed. But wherever assimilation constituted a danger, the Ittihadists abandoned the policy and turned instead to physical annihilation. Even at that stage, however, Armenians were again

gibi cali ve muvakkat ihtidalarla atf-ı ehemmiyet olunmaması ve bunun su-i istimaline meydan verilmemesi.”

²³⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/100

²³⁵ Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime against Humanity*, pp. 292-295. The mass conversion of Armenians to Islam was not a new issue. During the Armenian massacres of 1894-1896, many Armenians became Muslim because of the fear of death. While some of those converts turned to Christianity soon, some remained Muslim. The official Ottoman policy regarding these conversions was to accept individual conversion requests; but mass conversion demands were not accepted since it was thought that foreign consuls and missionaries could claim that these were forced conversions. It seems that there is a close relation between the mass conversions and massacres. For a detailed analysis of this process see Selim Deringil, “‘The Armenian Question is Finally Closed’: Mass Conversions of Armenians in Anatolia during the Hamidian Massacres of 1895-1897”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 51, no. 2 (2009), pp. 344-371.

²³⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/254

allowed to assimilate (for example through conversion), as long as they were deemed “governable”.²³⁷

On the other hand, Kaiser underlines the role of Diyarbakır governor, Reşid, in the change of the central government policy.

The order did not satisfy Reshid Bey, who warned that those who had converted out of fear during the 1895 massacres had later generally ‘committed apostasy’. The governor was convinced that such dishonest conversions would cause harm in the future. Therefore he suggested that conversions should not be allowed under any circumstance.²³⁸

Despite the government order, the continuation of conversion in many places with the backing of local officials²³⁹ led the Ministry of Interior to send another order related to this subject on 20 July 1915. The new telegram emphasized that it was learnt that some Armenians to be deported were left in their place because they had converted to Islam, and they had been assisted by some officials. The Ministry reminded the localities of its former order which evaluated this kind of conversion unreliable and therefore, had no value. In this respect, the provinces and *livas* were instructed not to make an exception of these converts.²⁴⁰

By the end of July 1915, the Armenians were all deported *en famille* from the surrounding counties of the sanjak. The district governorate informed

²³⁷ Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime against Humanity*, pp. 290-291.

²³⁸ The mentioned order is DH.ŞFR, 54/100. Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians*, p. 274.

²³⁹ Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime against Humanity*, p. 296.

²⁴⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/49 (20 July 1915). Kaiser mentions the measures of the Third Army to prevent assistance to the Armenians: “The abductions of Armenian women and children attracted the attention of the Third Army. Mahmud Kamil Pasha grew increasingly concerned that the deportation of Armenians from his area of control did not generate the intended results. Apparently, many Muslim villagers were sheltering Armenians. Put differently, they opposed the government’s policies. In response, the general issued an order condemning the practice on 23 July 1915. From that moment on, Muslims who sheltered Armenians were considered to be resisting the government. Accordingly, the authorities were under orders to execute them in front of their houses and the building had to be burned down. The commander was adamant that not a single Armenian should remain, including those who had converted to Islam. Thus, these new Muslims had to be deported as well.” Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians*, pp. 244-245.

the Ministry of Interior that Talas Armenians was the next group to be deported.²⁴¹ On 5 August 1915, the deportation of “all Armenians” except for the Catholic Armenians to the destination areas had been ordered with a coded telegram.²⁴² There were 14,799 Orthodox Armenians, 1,187 Protestants and 1,391 Catholics in the city center. The village of Talas also had a large community consisting of; 4,636 Orthodox Armenians, 41 Protestants and 19 Catholics.²⁴³

The deportation order for Talas and Kayseri city center was posted in the market and on public buildings on 8 August 1915. According to the proclamation, the Armenians of Talas should leave within four to five days and those in the city center in ten days. The Armenian populations of these areas, numbering at least twenty thousand people, were deported with this order.²⁴⁴ The official deportation announcement for Kayseri stated:

1. All Armenians inhabiting the district of Caesaria will be deported to the state of Aleppo.
2. Only Catholics will be exempt.
3. All the shops belonging to deportees will be closed and sealed by the police.
4. The purchase and sale of household effects is strictly forbidden. Those who traffic in such illicit trade will be subject to Court Martial.
5. Those Armenians being deported must deposit their cash assets in the bank or transfer them to relatives elsewhere.
6. All those being deported must submit a list to the government in ten days, indicating a) the amount of cash they will carry on their persons, b) the locale of their shops, c) the quantity and quality of merchandise they would leave either in their homes or in their shops, and d) the locality of their properties and their boundaries.
7. The caravan to depart within ten days will pursue the highway leading to Nigide (sic.). The government will assist in transporting their personal effects.

²⁴¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/21(25 July 1915)

²⁴² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/276

²⁴³ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40

²⁴⁴ While some reports stated that four days were given to Armenians of Talas, the others stated that five days were given to them to be ready for deportation. ABCFM, reel. 629; “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807”, *“Turkish Atrocities”*, p. 123.

8. Muleteers and coachmen are constrained to rent their facilities to deportees in accordance with tariffs established by the government. It is therefore unnecessary to make any travel arrangements beforehand.
9. Officials of the police department are hereby instructed to keep under constant surveillance the trafficking of personal effects throughout the journey.
10. It is probable that the departing Armenians have redeemable obligations to Moslems. In such events the debtors are instructed to submit a list of their indebtedness to the government by unstamped mail, the validity of which the creditors must be able to substantiate.
11. _____
12. To those about to leave their homes, at most one month's notice will be given. Those ready to depart anytime during that period must inform the authorities and a special committee will be appointed to categorize articles which a given deportee would be leaving in his home or shop.
13. Those who do not leave within the time limit allowed for departure, will be evicted from their living quarters forcibly; and in the event of their being available no means of transport, they will be forced to proceed on foot. For the children, the government will, of course, think of means of transfer.²⁴⁵

Three other telegrams extended the exemptions to the deportation order on 15 August 1915. Families of soldiers and officers (*asker, zabitan ve zabitan-ı sıhhiye aileleri*), those of Armenian deputies, and Protestant Armenians, who were not yet deported, were exempted from deportation. The Ministry also wanted information about the number of the already-deported and the remaining Protestant Armenians.²⁴⁶ According to missionary reports, these exemptions came too late since many of these Armenians had already been deported:

Before our wagons were hired, however, an announcement of “forgiveness” was made, for all Protestants, Catholics, and soldiers’ families. This mercy had come too late for most places and the majority

²⁴⁵ Article 11 was left blank by Kalfaian in the original manuscript. Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, pp. 144-146. Kalfaian stated the date of the deportation announcement as 26 July (probably in old style) which conforms with 9 August 1915 in the Gregorian calendar.

²⁴⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/18; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/19; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/20 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 214-5.). The missionary reports confirmed that Protestants, Catholics and soldiers’ families were exempted from the deportation. “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807”, “*Turkish Atrocities*”, p. 123; NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/31.

of Armenian soldiers of Turkey had already seen their families deported and their houses desolated...²⁴⁷

The mayor of Kayseri sanjak, Ahmet Rıfat [Çalıka], was entrusted with the deportation of the population in Bünyan. The mayor implemented the deportation by forming a commission which included Cemil Bey (the representative of the CUP), Feyzizade Osman Bey (a member of Kayseri municipality) and Sami Bey (a police officer). More than 600 Armenian households were deported from Ekrek village:

The village (Ekrek) was blockaded in the evening. The village board of alderman was called and they were notified that the Armenians would be deported in accordance with a government decree which had ordered their deportation because of the war and the disloyalty of the Armenians to the government. The Armenians had to be ready by morning. They could take along whatever they wanted. By the beginning of next morning, the village community about 600 households was sent from the village in oxcarts with their belongings under the guard of gendarmerie...No one was allowed to enter until the village community had evacuated then the village was surrendered to a committee, which was composed of the governor of the sub-district (*bucak müdürü*), the gendarmerie commander, Mustafa Effendi, and some other people, on the condition that it had to be conserved until a future order was received.

The villages of Soyugun (Sıvgın) and Kiki (Gigi), and the Armenians in the Bünyan *kaza* center were also deported by this commission. Çalıka points out that some Armenians were protected by their Muslim neighbors and hidden.²⁴⁸ Gigi (195 people), Sıvgın (646 people) and Ekrek (1,411 people) were wholly Armenian populated villages before the deportation. There were

²⁴⁷ ABCFM, reel. 629. According to the Ottoman census results, there were 2,018 Protestants and 1,515 Catholics in Kayseri before the deportation. The number of Catholics decreased to 634, and the number of the Protestants was 507 by October 1916. It means that many of the Protestants and Catholics had been deported despite the exemption orders of the government or had been deported before the issuing of these orders. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/28; Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, pp.186-187.

²⁴⁸ *Kurtuluş Savaşında Adalet Bakanı Ahmet Rıfat Çalıka'nın Anıları*, ed. by Hurşit Çalıka, İstanbul, 1992, pp. 23-24.

also 281 Armenians in Sariođlan village and 490 in the *kaza* center of Bünyan.²⁴⁹

The center regularly received information about the number of deportees. On 26 August 1915, the district governorate totaled the results of the process in the sanjak, and informed the Ministry that prior to the deportation there were 49,947 Armenians in Kayseri. Of these; 46,463 were Orthodox, 1,517 were Catholics and 1,967 were Protestants. By the end of August 1915, 16,487 Orthodox Armenians, 116 Catholic and 587 Protestant Armenians were deported from the *kaza* of Kayseri and its surrounding counties (*kazas*). The district governorate notified the Ministry of Interior that the Armenians of the *kaza* centers of Kayseri and Develi had not yet been deported. However, it was announced that these would be deported within fifteen days and thus there would be no Armenian except the converts in the sanjak. Catholics formed only one per thousand of the Muslim population while Protestants formed five per thousand.²⁵⁰ On 29 August 1915, the Ministry of Interior ordered various provinces and *livas* not to deport the Protestants, Catholics, families of soldiers and the remaining artisans who were to remain in line with the needs of the district.²⁵¹

In Kayseri, the deportation was completed by the middle of September by this time 44,271 of the Armenians in the district had been deported to the provinces of Aleppo, Syria, and Mosul. 765 Armenians, who were among the deported, had escaped but had been arrested and re-deported by the district governorate. The number of remaining Armenians stood at 4,911 comprising Protestants, Catholics and the families of soldiers.²⁵² Table 5 shows the

²⁴⁹ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40. According to the Ottoman census of 1914, there were 2,865 Armenians in the county of Bünyan. Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, pp. 186-187.

²⁵⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 485/90 (26 August 1915)

²⁵¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/292

²⁵² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 489/63 (17 September 1915); BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/75 (18 September 1915) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 260.)

distribution of the population on the basis of religion by 22 September 1915 as tabulated by the district governorate:

TABLE 5: The Population of Kayseri Sanjak by 22 September 1915

		<i>Liva of Kayseri</i>	<i>Kaza of incesu</i>	<i>Kaza of Develi</i>	<i>Kaza of Bünyan</i>	Total population before deportation	The number of deportees	Existing population
Muslim	women	47,217	7,213	14,185	17,527	86,442		86,442
	men	50,707	7,577	15,239	19,318	92,841		92,841
Greek	women	9,482	1,892	914	698	12,986		12,986
	men	10,067	1,782	1,121	615	13,585		13,585
Armenian	women	14,139		7,092	1,446	22,677	21,526	1,151
	men	14,249		7,960	1,577	23,786	21,676	2,110
Protestant	women	753		184		937	457	480
	men	832		198		1,030	748	282
Catholic	women	693				693	155	538
	men	824				824	474	350

Source: BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40. The document did not state the Protestants and Catholics were Armenian or not. Besides it did not define the category of Armenian was Orthodox Armenians or not.

The district governorate also summarized the measures against the Armenian committees. The list of the committees in Kayseri before 1915 was

as follows: the CUP which had been established with the Constitutional regime; *Neşr-i Ulum Cemiyet-i İslamiyesi* founded under the chairmanship of mufti Ahmed Remzi Efendi; the Dashnaksutun under the chairmanship of Kevork Besabyan; the Hinchaks under the chairmanship of Minas Minasyan; *Yerizunzeghan* (?) under the chairmanship of the Armenian *murahhas* Hasref; *Incil* under the chairmanship of Kevork Kundakçıyan; *Erciyes* under the chairmanship of the dentist Agop; Ramgavar under the chairmanship of Nişan Halaçyan; *Terkişreti* (?) under the chairmanship of Papas Aristikas; *Huluçati* under the chairmanship of Arusyan. In the sanjak, not only the Dashnak and Hinchak parties but all other Armenian committees were also shut down in accordance with the orders from the Ministry of Interior. The leaders and some members of the Dashnaks and Hinchaks had been sentenced to death with the accusation of planning an Armenian revolt. The members and leaders of other committees were also accused of being involved in Armenian revolt. While some were imprisoned, others were deported.²⁵³

4.2 The Conversion to Islam: An Area of Struggle among Different Actors

After the requests for conversion from the Derevenk Armenians, a similar issue emerged regarding the Armenian soldiers and their families. In the deportation order dated 5 August 1915, only the Catholic Armenians were exempted. This created a problem between the local and military authorities about the deportation of Armenian soldiers' and the officers' families. On 9 August 1915, the district governorate of Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior that there were Armenian doctors and pharmacists serving in the military, and their families were among those to be deported. The governorate asked if these families could be exempted from deportation.²⁵⁴ The Ministry of

²⁵³ BOA, DH.EUM.6.Şb, 7/8. Kevorkian states that they were hanged on 15 June 1915, *The Armenian Genocide*, p. 516.

²⁵⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR 483/42 (9 August 1915)

Interior replied that the Ottoman General Staff would decide the procedure concerning these families.²⁵⁵

On 10 August 1915, the district governor again contacted the Ministry of Interior about the situation of the Armenian soldiers and their families since the Military authorities had given certificates to the Armenian soldiers to postpone the deportation of their families. Moreover, some soldiers in the labor battalions applied to their commanders for conversion, with their families, to Islam. Again the district governorate wanted to learn whether the deportation of these families would be postponed or not.²⁵⁶

The postponement of these families' deportation was criticized by the governor of the sanjak. Even if the district governorate refrained from deporting Catholics and the families of the soldiers since the military authorities opposed deportation of these families, the governor Zekai Bey demanded a revision of this situation from the Ministry of War since these exemptions would only lead to the Armenians' remaining in their homes.²⁵⁷ This reveals that the district governorate of Kayseri had problems with the military authorities concerning the conversion process of soldiers' families, and in this context it warned the Abandoned Properties Commission (*Emval-i Metruke Komisyonu*) by claiming that the transactions related to Armenians had to be dealt by the civil administration, and therefore, the documents about the conversion of the soldiers had to be directed to the civil administration.²⁵⁸

The local authorities in Kayseri continued to complain of military authorities on 15 August 1915 by stating that the military authorities in the sanjak interfered in the duties of the civil administration including police, public order (*inzibat ve asayiş*) and Armenian deportations. In reply to this

²⁵⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/360 (10 August 1915)

²⁵⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 483/70 (10 August 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 483/71 (10 August 1915)

²⁵⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 483/101 (12 August 1915)

²⁵⁸ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p.163.

complaint, the Ministry of Interior wrote to the General Staff to order commanderships not to interfere in the matters of civil administration.²⁵⁹

The official orders for the exemption of the Armenian soldiers and the officers' families were sent to the provinces and sanjaks on 15 August 1915.²⁶⁰ Even though the Ministry of Interior had exempted some groups from the deportation, it continued not to favor the conversion requests. In reply to the telegram from Kayseri about the conversion requests of the Armenian soldiers and their families, it was ordered that the conversion requests would not be accepted.²⁶¹

This correspondence is evidence of controversy between the local-civil and military authorities in Kayseri about the scope of deportations. Both sides tried to maintain control and have the last word in the fate of the Armenians. While the military did not give permission to the deportation of the soldiers' and officers' families, the civil administration wanted to control the conversion process and considered that the military interfered in its authority. The extension of exemptions to the families of soldiers and officers can be evaluated as the achievement of the military in having the last word about the soldiers and their families. However, as stated above this order came months after the start of deportations and many of these families had already been deported.

Dadrian also mentions the problems between the civil and military authorities in Kayseri:

In early August 1915, however, at Talat Pasha's behest, military commanders were advised by a circular from the High Command that in areas outside the theaters of war, the responsibility for handling the deportations would henceforth devolve upon civilian authorities. The emerging cleavage between civilian and military authorities on this issue found its expression in several reports dispatched by Colonel Sahabeddin to his superior in Ankara, in which he complained about the instigations

²⁵⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 484/19 (15 August 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/51 (17 August 1915)

²⁶⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/18

²⁶¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 483/71 (10 August 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/94 (18 August 1915)

alleging rebellious activities by the Armenians. With special reference to such Kayseri-district villages as Erkilet and Mancusun, for example, he accused Zekai, the district's governor, of falsely accusing the Armenians of armed assaults.²⁶²

The rivalry between the military and civil administration over control of the Armenian deportation was also the case in other regions such as the area under control of the Fourth Army. It was, in fact, a struggle of the "leadership in the organization of deportations empire-wide" between the two leading figures of the CUP, Talat and Cemal Paşas.²⁶³

The families of the soldiers and officials were exempted from deportation, but they were distributed within their provinces or *livas* in proportion to their ratio within the total Muslim population. The remaining families of the Armenian soldiers would be distributed to exclusively Muslim villages so that their number would not exceed five percent of those villages' population²⁶⁴ and in this way the remaining Armenians in Kayseri were distributed to Muslim villages.²⁶⁵ Stephen Svajian recalled:

In October, orders came that those Armenians who were not deported because they were Protestant or Catholic or the families of the soldiers, or had not accepted the Muslim religion, were going to go to nearby Turkish villages in tens and twenties.²⁶⁶

However, the negative attitude of the Ministry of Interior about the conversion demands changed in November 1915. The Ministry informed the localities that the request for conversion to Islam would be accepted for the

²⁶² Dadrian, "The Agency of "Triggering Mechanisms"", p. 118.

²⁶³ Kaiser, "Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies", pp. 183-187.

²⁶⁴ BOA, DH.EUM.VRK, 15/49 (16 August 1915)

²⁶⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 489/63; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/75 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 260.); BOA, DH.ŞFR 490/15 (20 September 1915)

²⁶⁶ Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 369. The missionary reports also confirmed the distribution of the remaining Armenians to the Muslim villages. ABCFM, reel. 629; NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807", "*Turkish Atrocities*", p. 125.

Armenians, who were among the exempted groups or who had not deported and remained in their former residence area.²⁶⁷ It seems that this order was evaluated in a different way in Kayseri since all the remaining Armenians were forced to become Muslim. The American missionaries claim that the Armenians were told that unless they became Muslim, they would be deported.²⁶⁸ In addition, the missionary reports underlined the impact of another element in the conversion of Armenians and stated that the Armenians converted to secure their return to Kayseri or Talas from their exiled villages:

Not more than five women (with their children) were allowed to a village, often not more than three or four. There they lived in want and fear until-after months of this life-many of them yielded and became Moslem to save their children....We believe that there are about 5.000-mostly women-who when we left had become Moslem and had returned to Cesarea and Talas...²⁶⁹

Svajian, a Kayseri Armenian who was a child at the time of deportation and remained in the sanjak during the war years, confirmed that his family was obliged to accept Islam in order to remain.²⁷⁰ Since the remaining Armenians had converted to Islam, the district governorate of Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior that there was no Armenian in the district at the end of 1915.²⁷¹ Balakian, who was deported and passed through Kayseri in 1916, also witnessed that around ten percent of the Kayseri Armenians remained in the sanjak by converting to Islam.²⁷²

²⁶⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 57/281 (4 November 1915)

²⁶⁸ “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 824”, *“Turkish Atrocities”*, p. 137; ABCFM, reel. 629.

²⁶⁹ “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807”, *“Turkish Atrocities”*, pp. 124-127.

²⁷⁰ Svajian *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 362.

²⁷¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 502/30 (22 December 1915)

²⁷² Grigoris Balakian, *Armenian Golgotha, A Memoir of the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1918*, trans. by Peter Balakian, New York, Vintage Books, 2009, pp. 179-80.

However, conversion of Armenians to Islam created problems within the bureaucracy in Kayseri in relation to the Armenians who were tried in Court Martial. The district governor sent a strongly-worded complaint to the Ministry concerning the chairman of the Kayseri Court Martial, Tevfik Bey and a member of the Court Martial, Squadron leader Şahab Bey. According to the governor, the chairman and the member cleared the names of some rich and influential Armenians at the court and released them. They also helped some Armenians in their conversion to Islam. It is understood from the telegram, there was no clear evidence, but the governor states that an opinion was formed about these two men having engaged in corruption, therefore, he wanted them to be removed from their duties.²⁷³ Demands for the removal of Tevfik Bey and Şahab Bey from the Kayseri Court Martial continued to be sent to the Ministry of Interior, and by 30 November 1915, the district governor asked for the abrogation of the Kayseri Court Martial. Since all the Armenians became Muslim, the governor thought there was no need for the court anymore in the sanjak.²⁷⁴ According to Kevorkian, at Kayseri Court Martial, Şahabeddin (probably Şahab) was opposed to the deportation of the families of soldiers and converts. This situation created a conflict between him and the *kaymakam* of Develi, Zeki.²⁷⁵

Since an important number of Armenians remained in Kayseri, the Ministry of Interior questioned their number and the reason why they had been allowed to remain.²⁷⁶ The district governorate informed the Ministry:

There are 1,435 Armenians in the central *kaza*, 1,090 in the villages of central *kaza*, 1,171 within Develi *kaza*, 161 in İncesu *kaza*, and 947 in Bünyan *kaza*. A total of 4,804 Armenians, most of whom are children and women whose men were previously deported, remained by converting to Islam....The converts who were distributed to the villages are generally

²⁷³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 496/1 (4 November 1915)

²⁷⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 498/33 (20 November 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 498/63 (22 November 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 499/58 (30 November 1915)

²⁷⁵ Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, p. 521.

²⁷⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/56 (20 January 1916)

the families of soldiers.... 1,435 Armenians in the central *kaza* applied to the authorities before the deportation to become Muslim and their application was accepted by the existing commission since they are artisans. They are doctors, pharmacists, carpet makers, clock makers, silversmiths, carpet dyers, pastrami makers, furrier,(?), tailor, cart maker (*arabacı ustası*), head scarf maker (*yazmacı*), butchers, plumber (*lağımçı*), miller (*değirmenci*), tinsmith (*tenekeci*), and carpenter. They are only artisans, and there is not a wealthy person among them.²⁷⁷

This information shows that apart from the exempted groups many Armenians remained in Kayseri by converting to Islam. The local authorities gave permission to the artisans to become Muslim and to remain in the city. It seems that conversion was favored by some local authorities to prevent deportation of Armenians who were regarded essential to the economy of the city.

The analysis of this process demonstrates that not only was the conversion of Armenians a complicated issue but there were also different types of conversion. First, some Armenians became Muslim at the beginning of deportations with the encouragement and/or consent of local administrators in Kayseri. In this respect, many Armenian craftsmen and officials and also families who did not want to be deported became Muslim. Secondly the Catholics, Protestants and families of soldiers and officials were exempted from deportation, but were then told that they had to convert to Islam otherwise they would be deported. Thus, nearly all of these exempted persons residing in Kayseri became Muslim. The last group to be converted was the Armenian children and girls in the American mission building. The process of their conversion will be evaluated below.

The deportation of Armenians stopped with an order of the Ministry of Interior on March 1916, which announced that Armenians would no longer be deported;²⁷⁸ however, this only offered temporary respite since a little later the

²⁷⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 506/92 (24 January 1916)

²⁷⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 62/21(in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 357.): “Görülen lüzum ve icab-ı idari ve askeriye binaen badema Ermeni sevkîyatının tatili takarrur ettiğinden şimdiye kadar çıkarılanlardan başka artık hiçbir sebep ve vesile ile Ermeni ihraç olunmaması tamimen tebliğ olunur.”

deportations continued.²⁷⁹ The Ministry of Interior also continued to collect data regarding those Armenians that had been deported and those who remained after March 1916.²⁸⁰ The answer from Kayseri was that there were no Armenian in the sanjak since all those who remained had converted to Islam.²⁸¹

4.3 The Demography of the Armenians at the End of the Deportations

The statistics prepared for Talat Paşa show the number of total deported Armenians for the provinces and sanjaks including Kayseri as 924,158 and the number of deported Kayseri Armenians as 47,617. Table 6 below tabulates these data:

TABLE 6: The Number of Armenian Deportees

The names of the provinces and sanjaks	Number of deportees
Province of Ankara	47,224
Province of Erzurum	128,657
Province of Adana	46,031
Province of Bitlis	109,521
Province of Aleppo	34,451
Province of Hüdavendigâr (Bursa)	66,413
Province of Diyarbakır	61,002
Province of Sivas	141,592
Province of Trabzon	34,500
Province of Mamuretülaziz (Elazığ)	74,206
Sanjak of İzmit	54,370
Sanjak of Canik (Samsun)	26,374
Sanjak of Karesi (Balıkesir)	8,290
Sanjak of Karahisar (Afyon)	7,327
Sanjak of Kayseri	47,617
Sanjak of Maraş	27,101
Sanjak of Niğde	5,101
Sanjak of Konya	4,381
Total	924,158

²⁷⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 65/51; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 65/176; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 69/260; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 69/262; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 70/6; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 70/92

²⁸⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 63/72 (22 April 1916)

²⁸¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 517/52 (24 April 1916)

Source: Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 77. Ara Sarafian highlights that the number of the total deported Armenians is not right at *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*: "The total number of deported Armenians is given as 924,158, a figure simply reflecting the number of Apostolic (or Gregorian) Armenians in these provinces according to official Ottoman statistics for 1914. The list does not include the European provinces of the Ottoman Empire, nor Kutahya or Van. It also does not mention the deportation of Catholic and Protestant Armenians." Ara Sarafian, *Talaat Pasha's Report on the Armenian Genocide*, London, Gomidas Institute, 2011, pp. 67-68. Indeed, there is no data for Istanbul, Edirne, Urfa, Menteşe, Van, Teke, Kale-i Sultaniye, Eskişehir, Bolu, İçel, Kastamonu, Kütahya and Aydın at Table 6.

Table 7 not only supplies the number of deported Armenians but also contains significant details regarding the number and distribution of the existing Armenian population within the empire at the end of the deportation process. The data gives both the number of native Armenians and those Armenians who had been born in other provinces but were living in those provinces.

TABLE 7: The Number of Armenians at the End of the Deportations

	Native Armenians	Outsider Armenians	Armenians of the province in other provinces	The number of Armenians in 1914
Ankara	12,766	410	4,560	44,661
Mosul	253	7,033	0	0
Niğde	193	850	547	4,939
Izmit	3,880	142	9,464	56,115
Kütahya	3,932	680	0	4,023
Eskişehir	1,258	1,096	1,104	8,620
Bolu	1,539	551	56	3,002
Afyonkarahisar	2,234	1,778	1,484	7,498
İçel	252	116	0	350
Karesi	1,852	124	1,696	8,663
Kayseri	6,650	111	6,778	47,974
Adana	12,263	4,257	19,664	51,723
Maraş	6,115	198	2,010	27,306*
Sivas	8,097	948	3,993	141,000
Beyrut	50	1,849	0	1,224
Kastamonu	3,437	185	211	9,052
Konya	3,730	14,210	3,639	13,078
Aydın	11,901	5,729	0	19,710
Suriye	0	39,409	0	0
Zor	201	6,778	0	63
Hüdavendigâr	2,821	178	10,251	59,038
Aleppo	13,679	13,591	19,091	37,031
Urfa	1,144	6,687	451	15,616
Erzurum	0	0	3,364	125,657
Bitlis	0	0	1,061	114,704
Van	0	0	160	67,792
Diyarbakır	0	0	1,849	56,166
Trabzon	0	0	562	37,549
Elaziz	0	0	2,201	70,060
Istanbul	80,000	0	0	80,000
Total	177,247	106,910	94,206	1,112,614**

Source: Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 109. There is no date for this table but it could be 1916 or 1917.

* There is a difference between the numbers in 1914 Ottoman census results and in the official reports of Maraş sanjak. According to 1914 census results, there were 27,842 Gregorian, 4,480 Armenian Catholics and 6,111 Protestants in Maraş. But, its district governorate informed the Ministry of Interior that there had been around 46,000 Armenians in Maraş before the deportation and 40,000 were deported from the sanjak. Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, p. 186; DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/47; DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/24; DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/38.

** There is a note about the number of Armenians in the original report: "The number of Gregorian Armenians in the 1914 census is 1,187,818 and Armenian Catholics 63,967 bringing their total to 1,256,403[sic.]. Because of the incomplete nature of the data, the true figure for these communities should be around 1,500,000. The number of Armenians who are today counted as locals and outsiders is 284,157 and this figure should be increased by 30 percent bringing their number to around 350,000 to 400,000." Sarafian, *Talaat Pasha's Report*, p. 20.

In fact, the data for some provinces is missing from this table since the Armenian population of Edirne, Kale-i Sultaniye (Çanakkale), Çatalca, Menteşe, Antalya (Teke), Jerusalem and Canik were not listed.²⁸² For example, 25,476 Armenians were deported from Canik sanjak, and 1,977 Armenians were living in the district in October 1915.²⁸³ In Edirne province, in November 1916 there were about 4,600 Armenians remaining from the previous population of twenty thousand.²⁸⁴ 1,738 Armenians were also deported from Kale-i Sultaniye, with 597 Armenians remaining.²⁸⁵ Teke reported that there were 560 Armenians in the sanjak on 5 October 1916.²⁸⁶

The correlation between this table and the archival documents illustrates that the data in this table were derived from the archival documents in the Ministry of Interior/Public Security Directorate Second Section (DH.EUM.2.Şb-*Dahiliye Emniyet-i Umumiye İkinci Şube*). For instance Ankara reported that 12,766 Armenians remained in the province.²⁸⁷ The same number is cited for Ankara in the table. As another instance, the existence of 6,120 Armenians was indicated in the report from Maraş sanjak.²⁸⁸ There is also a close correlation of the numbers in the reports of Kastamonu (3,436 native Armenians and 188 outsider Armenians recorded),²⁸⁹ and Hüdavendigâr

²⁸² According to the 1914 census there were 19,725 Armenians in Edirne, 630 Armenians in Antalya, 27,058 Armenians in Canik, 842 Armenians in Çatalca, 1,310 Armenians in Jerusalem, 12 Armenians in Menteşe, and 2,474 Armenians in Kale-i Sultaniye. Karpas, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, p. 188.

²⁸³ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/53

²⁸⁴ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/36

²⁸⁵ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/46

²⁸⁶ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/26

²⁸⁷ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 75/46

²⁸⁸ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/38

²⁸⁹ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/66

provinces (2,999 Armenians recorded).²⁹⁰ For Kayseri, it can be seen that the numbers are the same in the report from the sanjak and in the table prepared for Talat Bey.²⁹¹

4.3.1 The Number of the Kayseri Armenians after the Deportations

In 1916, there were 6,761 Armenians in the sanjak of Kayseri comprising 6,650 native and 111 outsider Armenians.²⁹² There were also 6,979 Kayseri Armenians in other Ottoman provinces. The distribution of the total Kayseri Armenians throughout the empire is given at Table 8.

TABLE 8: The Distribution of the Kayseri Armenians

Kayseri	6,650
Adana	539
Ankara	257
Aydın	1,600
Beirut	39
Bolu	3
Eskişehir	8
Aleppo	838
İçel	40
Karesi	1
Konya	16
Mosul	182
Niğde	17
Sivas	113
Syria	2,683
Urfa	580
Izmit	14
Zor	49
Total Kayseri Armenians	13,629

²⁹⁰ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/29

²⁹¹ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/28

²⁹² Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 117. Three of the outsider Armenians in Kayseri were from Istanbul, 87 were from Ankara and 21 were from Sivas. Even though there is no date at the report prepared for Talat Paşa, as will be shown below (BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/28) the number of 6,761 Armenians was reported by the district governorate to the Ministry of Interior on 22 October 1916. Besides, the number of 111 outsider Armenians were reported from Kayseri to the Ministry in February 1917 (BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 34/12; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 546/97).

Source: Sarafian, *Talaat Pasha's Report*, p. 43.

In reply to the telegram of the Ministry of Interior to the localities about the number of remaining Armenians,²⁹³ a report was prepared by the district governorate of Kayseri. According to this report, there were a total of 6,761 Armenians in the sanjak on 22 October 1916. The document emphasizes that all the remaining Armenians were converted and therefore, theoretically and religiously speaking, there were no Armenian (Orthodox), Protestant or Catholic Armenians within the city. However, this detailed document still classifies these remaining converted Armenians as a separate category. According to this document, 634 of these converts were originally Catholic Armenians, 507 were originally Protestant Armenians, 3,430 were originally native Armenians (i.e. Orthodox), 2,060 were members of the Armenian soldiers' families, and 15 of the converts were outsider (*yabancı*) Armenians with 115 Armenians staying in Kayseri with special permission. Table 9 presents the related table which was attached to the document.²⁹⁴

²⁹³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 68/112 (24 September 1916). In this telegram, the Ministry of Interior requested detailed information regarding the remaining Armenians by classifying them as natives, outsiders, Catholics, Protestants, families of soldiers, converted Armenians and people who remained with special permission.

²⁹⁴ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/28 (22 October 1916) (http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/Forms/resim/Sevk%20Edilen%20Ermenilerin%20Miktar%C4%B1/Kayseri/belgeler/050_DH_%20EUM_2_%C5%9Eb_74_28_1%20ve%202.pdf) The number of Armenians in Kayseri decreased after 1916. BOA, DH.EUM, 2/41; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 50/13. For example, in these documents the district governor requested permission to deport 5 Armenians since they had been sentenced by the Court Martial, but because of their hiding, could not be punished until that time. Their remaining in Kayseri was regarded improper by the district governorate which requested from the Ministry to deport these Armenians (11 August 1917).

TABLE 9: The number of Armenians in the Sanjak of Kayseri by 22 October 1916

		Under the control of Bahçebaş 1 police station	Under the control of Kışıkapaı police station	Under the control of Talas township	Under the control of Effkere township	Within the county of Develi	Within the county of Bünyan	Total
Converts who were originally Armenians	men	1,160	69	122	25	62	47	1,485
	women	1,351	105	219	91	78	101	1,945
Converts who were originally Armenian Catholics	men	167	7	-	-	82	21	277
	women	258	9	-	-	59	31	357
Converts who were originally Armenian Protestants	men	152	7	7	-	82	15	263
	women	110	11	33	-	60	30	244
Converts who were families of Armenian soldiers	men	50	15	74	15	430	212	796
	women	210	50	150	35	562	257	1,264
Converts who were originally outsider Armenians	men	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
	women	11	-	-	-	-	-	11
Converts who stayed with special permission	men	-	-	-	-	59	3	62
	women	-	-	-	-	50	3	53
Total		3,473	273	605	166	1,524	720	6,761

Source: BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/28 (22 October 1916)

In the first stage of deportations, the Ministry of Interior determined that the conversion requests from the Armenians were a tactic to prevent deportation, and ordered them to be deported even if they had been converted.²⁹⁵ However, there were more than six thousand Armenian converts in Kayseri and not all of them were Protestants, Catholics or the families of soldiers. In other words a considerable number of Armenians stayed in the sanjak through conversion to Islam. 3,430 Armenians were not among the exempted groups. In this respect, it seems that conversion functioned as a mechanism in some Armenians' remaining in Kayseri contrary to the orders of the center.

4.3.1.1 The Memoirs of a Convert

Svajian's family was among the Armenians who were to be deported in 15 August 1915. The departure of the family was prevented by an uncle, Garabed Kasakian who was a treasurer (*sandık emini*) in Kayseri Municipality. The mayor, Rifat Bey, obtained permission from the district governor for Kasakian and his family to remain in Kayseri. Thereupon, Kasakian took his brother's family into his house and thus prevented their deportation with this special permission.²⁹⁶ The mayor of Kayseri confirmed this event in his memoirs and adds that many Armenians were protected by their Muslim neighbors and friends in this process and were not deported.²⁹⁷ This event illustrates that some Armenians were protected by local administrators from different ranks in the bureaucracy and exempted from deportation through their intervention. Kasakian was protected by the mayor and remained with the special permission of the district governor (*mutasarrıf*) upon the request of the mayor.

Even though the family of Kasakian remained with the permission of the district governor, after a while it was announced that the Armenians, who wish

²⁹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/254; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 479/100 (12 July 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/427

²⁹⁶ Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 362.

²⁹⁷ *Ahmet Rifat Çalika'nın Anıları*, p. 26.

to remain, had to become Muslim, otherwise they would be deported. The mayor, Rıfat Bey, and the other Turkish friends of the treasurer Garabed Kasakian again intervened in the process. They visited Kasakian and advised him to convert: “Garabed Efendi, you don’t lose anything. Let these bad days pass and when the war is over, you return to your religion again. Don’t go into exile.” Taking this advice and having heard the stories about the deported Armenians’ suffering and deaths the family agreed to convert.²⁹⁸ Svajian explains the way in which his mother became a Muslim:

In front of the Mufti’s office there was a large crowd, all Armenians waiting their turn to be converted. But we did not have to wait. The midwife, an impressive looking person said, “Make way”, and the Armenians opened a path for us. The room we entered was large. We noticed that Artin Alboyajian’s family was there too. He was an old man of eighty.... He was repeating the words which the Mufti read from the Koran. After he had finished, we lined up in front of the Mufti and he asked us the following questions: 1. Are you accepting the true faith (hak dini kabul itdinizmi?), 2. Are you giving up the controversy of One and Trinity (Uchlik birlik davasından vazgeçtinizmi?). We answered affirmatively. He read a passage from the Koran which began like this, “Ashhadu annai...” and we repeated the Arabic words. Then he congratulated us.... Then we went to a corner where a woman gave each of us a gift-a Turkish shawl. She showed us how to wear them and how to cover our faces so that only our eyes could be seen. There were eight of us, four children and four adults.²⁹⁹

One aspect of conversion was the Islamization of the remaining Armenian population. It was especially influential over the children who attended schools, the mother of Svajian recalls:

In 1915, my son Stephan began to attend the Turkish school established in the courtyard of St. Gregory Church which was taken over by the government...He began to sing patriotic songs and learned how to read the Koran like a Moslem or Turkish boy. He soon forgot the Armenian he had learned in Armenian school. My daughter, of course, stayed home.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁸ Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 362.

²⁹⁹ Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 363.

³⁰⁰ Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 372.

4.3.1.2 The Armenian Girls and Children at the American Mission

The Armenian children and girls in the American mission building would be forced to accept Islam during the course of the war. On 26 June 1915, the Ministry of Education gave instructions to the provinces of Diyarbakır, Aleppo, Trabzon, Erzurum, Sivas, Bitlis, Mamuretülaziz, Van and the sanjak of Maraş that the remaining Armenian children under 10 years old had to be collected and placed in orphanages.³⁰¹ By 12 July 1915, a detailed order regarding the Armenian children was sent to various provinces and *livas* including Kayseri:

For the purpose of the care and upbringing [*bakım ve terbiye*] of children who probably will be left without a guardian [i.e., become orphans] during the course of the Armenian's transportation and deportation, their [the children's] distribution to notables and men of repute in villages and kazas [counties] where Armenians and foreigners are not found, and the payment of thirty guruş [kurush] monthly from the special appropriations for immigrants for the children who will be left over after the distribution and will be given to those who do not have the means of subsistence, are seen as suitable. It is notified by circular that this be communicated to those for whom it is necessary and it be carried out as required in that way, and after this coded telegram is shown to those necessary it be destroyed.³⁰²

In Kayseri, by November 1915 there were around three hundred Armenian children in the Talas and Zincidere American Missions. The district governorate of the sanjak was willing to take these children from the Mission and give them to their families.³⁰³ They stayed safe for a while since on 3 November 1915 the Ministry of Interior ordered the sanjak of Kayseri not to touch these children on, probably to prevent a reaction from the United States.³⁰⁴ However, this situation would not last long. By the beginning of May

³⁰¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/150

³⁰² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/411, quoted from Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*, p. 317.

³⁰³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 495/77 (1 November 1915)

³⁰⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 57/270

1916, the children were seized from the American missionaries and the military seized the American missionary buildings.³⁰⁵

The German Ambassador Wolff-Metternich interpreted this change in policy towards the German and American missionary institutions as a measure against the preservation of Armenian national feeling:

The Turkish government has rightly understood that the schools and orphanages run by foreigners have a great influence on the awakening and development of Armenian national feeling. It is logical from its standpoint to take them under strict control or completely have them close.³⁰⁶

At the end of April 1916, Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior that the Ottoman General Staff had demanded the transfer of 394 children from these institutions to the government orphanages, and wanted to appropriate the American mission buildings in the sanjak to use as a military hospital. The district governorate wanted permission to implement the demand of the General Staff if this would not be counter to the former orders of the Ministry about maintaining good relations with the Americans. On receipt of the permission, 94 of the children would be transferred to orphanages in Kayseri and the remainder would be sent to other provinces.³⁰⁷

On 30 April 1916, the Ministry of Interior gave instructions to various provinces about the Armenian women and children:

1-Families without guardians (without a man) since their men have been deported or are serving in the army will be distributed to villages and towns where there are no foreigners or Armenians. Their expenses will be

³⁰⁵ Even though I do not know whether there was any link between the departure of American Ambassador Morgenthau and the change in government's attitude towards these institutions, Morgenthau left the Ottoman Empire in early 1916. Henry Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, Detroit, Michigan, Wayne University Press, 2003, pp. 268-272.

³⁰⁶ "DE/PA-AA/R 14092, Report of Ambassador Wolff-Metternich to Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg, dated 10 July 1916", quoted from Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*, p. 308. For more examples on this policy change see Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*, pp. 328-331.

³⁰⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 518/23 (29 April 1916)

provided from the immigrants' fund, and families will adjust to local customs.

2- Young and widowed women will be married.

3-Children up to twelve years old will be distributed to our orphanages.

4-If the number of orphanages is not sufficient, the children will be given to wealthy (*sahib-i hal*) Muslims to be assimilated into local customs.

5-If sufficient wealthy Muslims cannot be found to accept the children then they will be distributed to live with villagers who will be paid thirty *gurush* per month from the immigrants' fund for the living expenses of each child...³⁰⁸

A few days after this order, the evacuation of the American Mission buildings in Kayseri and distribution of the children to "our" (Ottoman) orphanages was approved by the Ministry of Interior.³⁰⁹ Thereupon, the Mission buildings in Talas and Zincidere were appropriated by the district governorate with the objects inside it and given to the Sanitary Department of the Military (*Sihhiye-i Askeriye*). There were 92 girls and 170 boys housed in these buildings and all their families had been deported. They were all taken to Kayseri. The girls were sent to government orphanages and the boys were given to reliable notables (*şayan-ı itimat eşraf nezdine misafir edildikleri*).³¹⁰ The American missionaries confirmed this process, as follows: "The girls were put into two large buildings, one of them the Protestant church and Catholic church adjoining which had been thrown into one and was now being used as an orphanage. The boys were at first scattered among Turkish houses..."³¹¹ From then on, upon the instruction from central government the missionaries were forbidden to visit the children.³¹²

A short time later this distribution of the children to the houses of notables was not found to be appropriate by the government, therefore, on 18

³⁰⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 63/142 (30 April 1916)

³⁰⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 63/178 (3 May 1916)

³¹⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 519/3 (8 May 1916)

³¹¹ "Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls' School in the Year of the Deportation", ABCFM, reel. 629.

³¹² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 63/276 (11 May 1916). The American missionaries also stated that their visit to children was forbidden a few days after the removal of the children. "Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls' School in the Year of the Deportation", ABCFM, reel. 629.

May 1916 it ordered that a house be rented and turned into an orphanage.³¹³ Thereon, a new orphanage for the girls with a capacity of fifty beds was established in the sanjak. The district governorate avoided giving the older children to the Muslim notables, and they were looked after in the orphanage. Furthermore, an attempt was made for these girls to marry suitable men in particular to prisoners of war since their settlement expenses were provided by the government and also abandoned properties were given to these prisoners of war to open workshops.³¹⁴

The district governorate not only applied for the supervision of the children in the American missions but also for the children of convert women who were incapable of looking after the children. The governor requested that these children be taken from their mothers. However, they numbered about three hundred which was beyond the capacity of the local orphanages. Therefore, the district governorate proposed to the Ministry of Interior that these children be accepted by the Istanbul Military School.³¹⁵ The Ministry did not find this proposal appropriate and instead suggested making an effort to send these children to orphanages in neighboring provinces.³¹⁶ Thus, correspondence began between Kayseri and Adana province to send the children to orphanages in Adana.³¹⁷

The missionary reports state that the Armenian girls, taken from the American Mission, were forced to convert and marry Muslim immigrants, but they did not accept these marriages. Meanwhile, Muslim names were given to the younger children and the boys were circumcised.³¹⁸ This process corresponded with the influx of immigrants and refugees to the sanjak. Under

³¹³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 64/67 (18 May 1916)

³¹⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 520/75 (22 May 1916)

³¹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 520/12 (17 May 1916)

³¹⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 64/82 (20 May 1916)

³¹⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 520/75 (22 May 1916)

³¹⁸ NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/31; "Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls' School in the Year of the Deportation", ABCFM, reel. 629.

these circumstances, the allocation of the girl's orphanage to the immigrants and refugees was planned by the district governorate of Kayseri. The governor suggested the distribution of the converted girls to their relatives and transfer of the non-converts to the Red-Crescent Hospital (*Hilal-i Ahmer Hastanesi*) in Zincidere to serve as nurses.³¹⁹ While sending the girls to their relatives was approved, those without relatives would remain in the orphanage. So the orphanage began to be used as a guesthouse for the immigrants.³²⁰ Sixteen non-converted Armenian girls were then sent to the Red-Crescent Hospital in Zincidere to serve as nurses.³²¹ As for the boys: "The school boys were sent away! The older ones to Angora for military training. The next younger to Adana to school and the youngest to Evkere to the orphanage where they are supposed to be taught trades and agriculture."³²²

4.3.1.3 A Comparison of the Numbers

The analysis of the demography in other provinces and sanjaks during the war shows that Kayseri was an important area concerning the conversion of the Armenians. First the number of remaining Armenians, who were not among the exempted groups, was higher compared to many districts in which most of the remaining Armenians belonged to the exempt groups. For example, there were around 60,000 Armenians in Hüdavendigâr province before the deportation, and 2,999 Armenians remained in the city at the end of deportations. It is evident that conversion to Islam was not common in the province during this process since by 30 October 1916 there were only 52

³¹⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 532/15

³²⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 68/95

³²¹ "Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls' School in the Year of the Deportation", ABCFM, reel. 629; "Extract from letter from Rev. H.K. Wingate, Talas, Nov. 14th. 1916", reel. 636.

³²² "Talas, June 12, 1916", ABCFM, reel. 633. Taner Akçam also points out the different treatment of Armenian children on the basis of various age-groups. Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*, pp. 325-327.

converts, and almost all of those remaining came from the exempted groups.³²³ Another instance was the sanjak of Izmit where 53,262 Armenians resided before the deportation. By 25 October 1915, there remained only 3,002 consisting of Protestants, Catholics, the families of soldiers and infirm Armenians.³²⁴

These districts and Kayseri had similar number of Armenians before 1915, but it seems that the attitude of the local authorities during the deportations had a serious impact on the number of remaining Armenians. In Kayseri, the numbers reveal that the local administrators favored that Armenians, who were not among the exempted groups but were either craftsmen or officials, would remain after conversion to Islam. On the other hand, in Hüdavendigar and Izmit, the remaining Armenians were mostly composed of the exempted groups such as Protestants, Catholics or the families of soldiers. Therefore, the numbers in Kayseri (6,761 Armenians) were higher than in the provinces mentioned above. Unfortunately, I do not know the reason of this differentiation in the attitudes of the local authorities.

The memoirs and American missionary reports confirm that all remaining Armenians in Kayseri including Protestants, Catholics and families of soldiers were forced to become Muslims. However, in most of the other areas, there was no such forced conversion and thus only a small part of the remaining Armenians converted to Islam. For example 2,754 Armenians stayed in Eskişehir sanjak, and only 291 of them had become Muslim by 8 November 1916.³²⁵ Another example is related to the district governorate of Maraş that reported on 11 December 1916 that 40,064 Armenians had been deported from

³²³ 1,032 of the remaining were Protestants, 52 were converts, 1,136 were Catholics, 84 remained because of disease, 536 were the families of soldiers, officers or officials, and 159 remained with a special permission or as a result of other different reasons. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/29. Before 1915, there had been 58,921 Gregorian Armenians, 1,278 Armenian Catholics and 992 Protestants in Hüdavendigar. Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, p. 176.

³²⁴ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/57

³²⁵ 808 of these Armenians were the families of soldiers, 249 were Catholics and Protestants, 64 remained with special permission, 1,099 were railway workers, 243 were soldiers and officers, and only 291 were converts. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/32.

the sanjak and 6,120 Armenians remained. Again, in Maraş only 145 of the Armenians converted to Islam.³²⁶ In fact, Maraş was another distinct region with a high number of remaining Armenians,³²⁷ however, it has to be emphasized that a considerable number of them were Catholic and Protestant Armenians. In the sanjak, there were 45,427 Armenians (8,476 households) before deportation consisting of; 33,260 Orthodox Armenians, 6,476 Protestant Armenians, 4,303 Catholic Armenians and 1,388 Latin Armenians. By 27 September 1915, 34,180 were deported and 1,357 were sent to the army, thus, 9,890 of the Maraş Armenians remained (306 Latin Armenians, 3,827 Protestant Armenians, 3,125 Catholic Armenians, and 2,632 Orthodox Armenians).³²⁸ On 28 October 1915, the Ministry of Interior ordered Maraş to stop deportation until further notice.³²⁹

However, this situation would change within a year. The first step began when the Fourth Army Commander Cemal Paşa was informed that there were a large group of remaining Armenians within the district governorate of Maraş. On 13 April 1916 receiving this information, Cemal Paşa ordered the governor of Maraş that these remaining Armenians must be immediately deported.³³⁰ It is understood from the correspondence from the Ministry of Interior that there were also claims that the governor of Maraş protected the Armenians.³³¹ Thereupon, on 18 April 1916 the Ministry of Interior wanted information about the number of the remaining Armenians within the sanjak, and then upon the

³²⁶ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/38

³²⁷ There was also a significant number of remaining Armenians (12,766) in Ankara province. Before the deportation, there had been 44,507 Orthodox and 7,069 Catholic Armenians in the province. Among the remaining 765 persons in Boğazlıyan and 2,326 in Akdağmadeni converted to Islam. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 75/46; Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, p. 172. Besides, about 12,000 Armenians remained from 50,000 in Adana which was also a high number compared to most other provinces. Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 109.

³²⁸ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/47 (27 September 1915)

³²⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 57/182 (28 October 1915)

³³⁰ *Arşiv Belgeleriyle Ermeni Faaliyetleri 1914-1918, Vol. VIII*, Ankara, Genelkurmay Basımevi, 2008, pp. 107-108.

³³¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 516/11 (15 April 1916)

request of the 4th Army the district governorate began to deport the remaining Armenians.³³² In the meantime, the Ministry of Interior informed the 4th Army Commander, Cemal Paşa that an investigation was to be opened regarding the claims about the governor of Maraş having protected the Armenians.³³³ On 26 April 1916, Talat Paşa explained the situation in Maraş to Cemal Paşa as; “there are 3,845 men and around five thousand women in Maraş, and it is understood that about 3,500 of them are Gregorian while the rest are Catholics or Protestants. These Gregorian Armenians were left behind because of the former order regarding the halt to deportation. Therefore, it is not thought that the district governor had protected the Armenians.”³³⁴

This correspondence triggered another wave of deportation from Maraş. According to the report from the district governorate, 39,901 Armenians had been deported by 18 October 1916, with 6,283 Armenians remaining within the sanjak. 163 Armenians were also deported by 11 December 1916 and thus the number of the remaining Armenians decreased to 6,120.³³⁵

Akçam states that there were instances of forcible conversion of the remaining Armenians in some districts such as Sivas and Antep. However, the scope of these forcible conversions is not known but it seems that forcible conversion also became effective in Syria. In this region, approximately 150,000 Armenians were forced to become Muslims.³³⁶ The memoir of an Armenian deportee, Nazeli-Hacıgül Pamukciyan, confirms this conversion process. She was deported from Kayseri in 1915 and lived in Damascus until 1919. Pamukciyan tells that an order was sent from the Ottoman government to Cemal Paşa to deport the Armenians within his district towards the interior. In

³³² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 63/40 (18 April 1916) ; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 516/93 (20 April 1916)

³³³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 63/100 (25 April 1916)

³³⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 63/110 (26 April 1916)

³³⁵ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/24 (18 October 1916); BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/38 (11 December 1916)

³³⁶ These were called as “Cemal’s Armenians” and there is a debate over the intention of Cemal Paşa when forcing these Armenians to conversion: to save their lives or not. Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime against Humanity*, pp. 304-305.

reply to this order, Cemal Paşa informed the government that there were no Armenians in his district since all of them had become Muslim. Pamukciyan believes that this reply saved their lives.³³⁷

Talha Çiçek, who analyzed Cemal Paşa's Syria governorate during World War I, states that the forced conversion of Armenians was a way of surpassing Talat's policies concerning the Armenians and through conversions Cemal tried to legitimize the settlement of Armenians within his district.³³⁸

...Cemal's aim in Syria was neither to destroy the Armenian race or culture nor to create an ethnic balance to the Arabs. Instead, he dispersed them through Syria to make them a "harmless minority" (*zararsız cüziyet*) and, in this sense, engaged in ethnic engineering. In addition, the pasha tried to do his best, both during the deportations and in their aftermath, to protect the Armenian deportees. To save them from the policy of deliberate negligence by the radical wing of the central government, Cemal pretended to force them to change their religion and established a special committee for the resettlement of mainly "converted" Armenians. He also opened orphanages for Armenian children. Both consular reports and the accounts of the Armenians themselves indicate that all of these activities were measures to protect them against the policies of the radical group within the CUP. In this way, Cemal mainly intended to "transform the dangerous Armenian multitude [*külliyet*] into harmless minority [*cüziyet*]"³³⁹.

These examples illustrate that localities have distinct dynamics and the practice of conversion took form in line with these distinct features. For example, in the eastern provinces such as Diyarbakır and Elazığ, the very small number of Armenians that were left behind was craftsmen and needed because of their skills.³⁴⁰ A different example occurred in Bitlis where some of the

³³⁷ Kevork Pamukciyan, *Ermeni Kaynaklarından Tarihe Katkılar, cilt III, Zamanlar, Mekanlar, İnsanlar*, ed. by Osman Köker, Istanbul, Aras Yayıncılık, 2003, p. 286.

³³⁸ Çiçek, *War and State Formation in Syria*, pp. 124-128.

³³⁹ Çiçek, *War and State Formation in Syria*, p. 29.

³⁴⁰ 431 Armenian craftsmen remained in Diyarbakır because they were needed. The number of their families was 1,051. DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/61; In Elazığ, 96 craftsmen were left. Their number with their families was about four hundred. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/63. According to Kaiser, the province of Diyarbakır reported on 1 May 1916 that "...3,354 local Armenians were still in the city and outlying areas. Most of these people were craftsmen. Furthermore, 362 Armenian women and children had come from other regions and were staying with the local Muslim population. The majority of Armenians had converted to Islam. In Beshiri

remaining Armenians did not stay with official permission of the government, but instead they were taken under the protection of some of the *aghas* and the Kurds.³⁴¹

4.4 Conclusion

In Kayseri, a little more than ten percent of the Armenians were left behind, and all of them were forced to convert. On the one side, it was the forced Islamization of the Armenian population; but on the other side, a comparison with other provinces/*livas* shows that conversion functioned as a “protective” mechanism for a considerable number of Armenians. The attitude of some local administrators was decisive in this process. Stay of some Armenians was favored and thus these Armenians escaped from deportation. These examples illustrate that turning to Islam was not a one-sided process.

The German consul in Aleppo, Rössler, evaluated the forced conversion in Kayseri, thus:

The forced conversions to Islam were also brought to our notice from other places a few weeks ago. In Kaisaria, the command was given to deport the Armenians to Sivas. This deportation meant their death. Possibly in order to save them, the Mutesarrif publicly announced that those who converted to Islam would be spared. Many converted. A number of Protestant and Catholic clerics refused to be converted. By means unknown to myself, it came about that they were deported not to Sivas but to Erigli, whereby the danger on the roads was less.³⁴²

The conversion of some Armenians during the deportation process is evaluated by many Turkish scholars as an evidence to refute the genocide claims. However, the aim here is not to support such an approach. Instead, it is

subdistrict sixty-four Armenian households stayed with the tribes.” Kaiser also stated that the province gave higher numbers regarding the remaining Armenians in July 1918 (3,944 converts and 3,818 Armenians), but either they were natives or outsiders were not recorded in the telegram. Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians*, pp. 267, 270-271.

³⁴¹ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/37

³⁴² DE/PA-AA/R 14090, “From the Consul in Aleppo (Roessler) to the Reichskanzler (Bethmann Hollweg)”, 31 January 1916 (Retrieved 2 January 2014, from <http://www.armenocide.net/>)

to illustrate the diversity in the implementations of the deportation in various localities. In this respect, in a district like Kayseri, in which the deportation of Armenians was applied with very harsh measures and many leading Armenians were executed by the Court Martial, some local officials helped the conversion of an important number of Armenians either to protect them or probably to take bribes or because of the craftsmen need of the city. The comparison with other districts shows that there was not such a favoring in many other cities of Anatolia.

As stated above, the remaining Armenians were all forced by the district governor to convert unlike the examples in other districts. It can be considered that the existence of a relatively high number of Armenians directed the governor to such a compulsion. Svajian recalls that during the War, Enver Paşa visited Kayseri and once he “asked the Turkish leader of Kayseri how many Armenians remained in the city after the deportations. They replied that there were still a sizable number but that they were necessary for the city because they were skilled tradesmen and posed no threat since they had adopted the Islamic religion.”³⁴³ The district governorate also aimed to assimilate the Armenian children by forcefully transferring them to state orphanages and placing them in Muslim households. Thus, it is obvious that Islamization of the remaining Armenians was also a goal of the district governorate.

The number of the Armenians within the sanjak was questioned by the Ministry of Interior after receiving the report from Kayseri that there were more than six thousand Armenians living in the sanjak on 22 October 1916 (DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/28). In February 1917, the district governorate sent another table with small modifications and emphasized that the remaining Armenian population was composed of convert women with children and the families of soldiers who were elderly:

³⁴³ Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 51.

TABLE 10: The number of Armenians in Kayseri sanjak by February 1917

	Under the control of Bahçebaşı police station	Under the control of Kızıkapı police station	Under the control of Talas township	Under the control of Efkere township	Within the county of Develi	Within the county of Bünyan	Total
Converts who were originally Armenians	men	1,160	69	122	25	47	1,485
	women	1,351	105	219	91	101	1,945
Converts who were originally Armenian Catholics	men	167	7	-	-	11	267
	women	258	9	-	-	21	347
Converts who were originally Armenian Protestants	men	152	7	7	-	10	258
	women	110	11	33	-	20	234
Converts who were families of Armenian soldiers	men	50	15	74	15	252	836
	women	210	50	150	35	252	1,259
Converts who stayed with special permission	men	4	-	-	-	3	66
	women	11	-	-	-	3	64
Total		3,473	273	605	1,524	720	6,761

Source: BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 34/12

However, this information did not satisfy the Ministry of Interior rather they required a detailed report showing the homeland of these Armenians, how

they had arrived and remained in Kayseri.³⁴⁴ In reply, the district governorate informed the Ministry about the 111 outsider Armenians within the sanjak tabulating where they came from, when they came to Kayseri, and in which quarter of the sanjak they lived.³⁴⁵ It is also a remarkable point that although the district governorate informed the Ministry of Interior by September 1915 the number of the remaining Armenians as 4,911 (DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/75), the number of the remaining were reported as being 6,761 over the coming years. The surplus of 1,850 persons is considerable but the reason for this is unknown. It is seen from the above mentioned documents that there were only 111 outsider Armenians in the sanjak, thus the increase was not related to the arrival of outsiders. It is possible that the district governorate did not present accurate numbers to the Ministry of Interior because of the high number of the Armenians that had remained, or may be these 1,850 Armenians had hid or had been hidden during the deportations and subsequently were not deported by the district governorate after they were detected.

In this context, there had been an individual instance of re-conversion to Christianity. The district governorate linked such kind of re-conversion demands to the existence of American missionaries in the sanjak. According to the governor, the continuation of relations between the converts and American missionaries, and financial support from the missionaries to the converts, especially to the women without men, gave rise to the revival of their original faith. It is understood that these converts continued their dietary regime which did not fit the tenets of Islam, they did not work on Sundays and used their old names in their homes. A leading convert confessed to the district governor that he still believed in the Christian faith and could not be a Muslim anymore. The governor thought that the Americans within the sanjak encouraged him to do this, and believed that there would be other appeals by individuals in the community to return to their former religion. While the district governor

³⁴⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 73/3

³⁴⁵ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 34/12; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 546/97. The same number (111 outsider Armenians) was also recorded in Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 117.

apparently showed a moderate attitude towards the man by saying that he had freedom of faith, on the other hand the governor wanted the Ministry of Interior to take precautions against such possible appeals. Even though there had been no more demands afterwards, the governor suggested that this man be executed after a decision from the religious court on the grounds that this reconversion threatened interior security.³⁴⁶

The response of the Ministry of Interior is important since it evaluated conversion to a religion as a matter of personal conviction, and therefore, instructed against such treatment.³⁴⁷ One report from an American missionary also mentions this reconversion:

The religious persecution seems to have lessened as a pastor of the leading protestant Church in Cesarea, after remaining a Moslem over a year determined that he could bear it no longer and though the consequence of his action might be death he would no longer remain under the lie of Moslem pretence. So he went bravely to the governor and presented him with a simple statement of his feeling and confession of his false position. The governor was surprised and apparently pleased with the simple honesty of the man. Nothing further has been done by the government so far as we know though the pastor was taken as a soldier just a few days ago along with other men. Some of his Armenian friends and neighbors however, were very angry and threatened his life as they feared his action would bring exile upon the whole community.³⁴⁸

³⁴⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 545/14 (6 February 1917)

³⁴⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 72/187 (8 February 1917)

³⁴⁸ "Notes from Talas Station, Stella N. Loughridge", (21 March 1917), ABCFM, reel. 638. The American missionaries left Kayseri and turned to the United States after the entrance of the US to World War I in April 1917.

CHAPTER 5

THE ISSUE OF ABANDONED PROPERTIES IN KAYSERI (1915-1918)

The laws and regulations regarding the abandoned properties which were supposed to provide the guidelines for the redistribution process had limited impact in reality. The orders from the Ministry of Interior sent with coded telegrams as well as certain characteristics of the localities were more influential in the implementation process than the legal framework. As will be shown, aspects such as the appointment of officials to the Abandoned Properties Commissions, auctions, sales and the distribution of the abandoned properties were all organized on the basis of the power relations among the different social actors. However, it is still imperative to take a brief look at the legal framework before examining the details of the actual process.³⁴⁹

5.1 The Legal Arrangements³⁵⁰

In relation to the Armenian deportation, administration of the deportees' properties emerged as a significant issue. Even though the provisional law of 27 May 1915 concerning the deportations did not include an article about the abandoned properties, consecutive regulations on this matter would begin with the Ottoman cabinet's decision of 30 May 1915. This decision stated that the abandoned properties of the Armenians or their equivalent value would be sent to the deportees, and the government would settle immigrants and tribes in the

³⁴⁹ It has to be highlighted that examination of the correspondence between the center and Kayseri directed me to this conclusion; however, it is obvious that this conclusion is deficient for the *Emval-i Metruke Defterleri* and the records of the Liquidation Commissions are not open to the scholars. The analysis of these documents and record books can direct us to other conclusions and evaluations.

³⁵⁰ The Greek abandoned properties were not subject to same regulations with the Armenian. For information about the Greek abandoned properties see, Ahmet Efilođlu and Raif İvecan, "Rum Emval-i Metrukesinin İdaresi," *History Studies*, vol. 2/3 (2010), pp. 129-150.

evacuated villages. The other kind of abandoned immovable properties such as olive groves, orange groves, orchards, mulberry orchards (*dutluk*), workshops, inns, factories and storehouses would be auctioned off or rented out. The income from the sale or the rent would be transferred to a subdivision of treasury (*mal sandıkları*) in the name of the original owner to be sent to the original owner. Moreover, commissions would be established to safeguard and administer the properties and to monitor the settlement process. These commissions, consisting of a chairman and two members (an administrative official and a revenue official) directly attached to the Ministry of Interior, could also establish secondary commissions (*tali komisyonlar*) and employ officials.³⁵¹ An ordinance regarding the settlement and subsistence of the deportees was also sent with the Ottoman cabinet's decision of 30 May 1915 (“*Ahval-i harbiyye ve zaruret-i fevkalade-i siyasiyye dolayısıyla mahal-i ahire nakilleri icra edilen Ermenilerin iskan ve iaşesiyle hususat-ı saireleri hakkında talimatname*”). According to this ordinance, the deportees could take all their movable properties and livestock with them.³⁵²

Thus, the Ottoman cabinet's decision and the ordinance did not have detailed information on the abandoned properties. A detailed regulation would be prepared on 10 June 1915 with a new ordinance: “*Ahval-i Harbiyye ve zaruret-i fevkalade-i siyasiyye dolayısıyla mahall-i ahire nakilleri icra edilen Ermenilere aid emval ve emlak ve arazinin keyfiyyet-i idaresi hakkında talimatname*”. This ordinance pointed out that the Commissions would administer the Armenian abandoned properties. The houses/buildings (*mebani*) of the deportees would be sealed by an official or a special committee (*heyet-i mahsusa*) which would be authorized by the Commission. The owner and the value of the abandoned properties would be registered and these properties

³⁵¹ BOA, MV, 198/24 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 155-157.)

³⁵² *Arşiv Belgeleri ile Ermeni Faaliyetleri, 1914-1918, Vol. I*, pp. 430-431. While the General Staff document gives the date of this ordinance 28 May 1331 in Julian calendar, both Hilmar Kaiser and Nevzat Onaran state the date of it 17 May 1331 in Julian calendar. This dissertation also uses the date of 17 May 1331. Kaiser, “Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies”, p. 56; Onaran, *Emval-i Metruke Olayı*, pp. 323-325.

would be transferred to be stored in places like churches, schools or inns which could be used as storehouses. An official report had to be prepared about the registration and this would be given to the local authorities with a copy of the report to be delivered to the Abandoned Properties Commission. If the owner of the movable property was unknown, it had to be registered in the name of the village.³⁵³

The ordinance of 10 June 1915 also stated that the livestock and the perishable goods among the movable properties were to be sold at an auction by a committee authorized by the Commission, and if there were crops on the land, they would also be auctioned. The income from these auctions would be transferred to the *mal sandıkları* in the name of the original owner or in the name of the village if the owner was unknown. The sales also had to be recorded. Properties, religious books and paintings within the churches would be recorded and then sent to the new settlement areas of the deportees. The lands and houses of the deportees also had to be recorded and the official register had to be given to the administrative commission (*idare komisyonu*). A power of attorney (*vekaletname*) issued after the date of deportation would not be accepted. The ordinance also regulated the settlement process in the abandoned properties. Accordingly, the immigrants would be settled in the evacuated villages. Land and house would be distributed to the immigrants considering their needs and agricultural capabilities. After the settlement of immigrants was completed, nomads would be settled in the remaining property. It was planned that urban immigrants would settle in urban regions, and additionally land would be given to them according to their economic and financial status and abilities. Buildings; such as workshops, inns, factories, storehouses, public bathhouses and those not suitable for the settlement of the immigrants could be sold at auction. The houses which remained vacant after the settlement of the immigrants would be auctioned. The unsold land and properties would be rented for up to two years. Again, the income of the sale or

³⁵³ *Arşiv Belgeleri ile Ermeni Faaliyetleri, 1914-1918, Vol. I, pp. 435-438.*

rent would be transferred to the *mal sandıkları* in the name of the original owner and then would be paid to that person according to future notification.³⁵⁴

This ordinance authorized the Abandoned Properties Administrative Commissions (*Emval-i Metruke İdare Komisyonları*) to administer all the abandoned properties. These commissions would answer directly to the Ministry of Interior regarding their activities and would perform their duties only according to the orders of the Ministry. They were required to report their views, surveys and activities to the Ministry and to the local authorities at least once every fifteen days. The local authorities had to implement the notifications of the Commissions regarding the abandoned properties. The Commissions, formed by a chairman and two members (an administrative official and a revenue official), would also oversee the settlement of the immigrants. If there was no Commission in the locality, then the local administration would be responsible for the implementation of the regulations. The whole process had to be recorded in the relevant books or official reports.³⁵⁵

Even though this ordinance included detailed articles about the management of the abandoned properties, there was no mention of the rights of the creditors. This triggered a crisis between foreign countries and the Ottoman government since many foreign companies and banks applied to their governments to secure their investments and interests in the Ottoman lands. Thus, the rights of the foreign creditors emerged as an important issue between the embassies of these governments and the Ottoman government. Germany sent a memorandum to the Ottoman Empire on 4 July 1915 and Austria-Hungary gave a memorandum on 26 August 1915. Both of these memorandums highlighted the possible losses of German and Austria-Hungarian firms in the Ottoman Empire as a result of the Armenian deportations. These firms had commercial and financial relations with the Armenians but since on the deportation of the Armenians the storehouses and

³⁵⁴ *Arşiv Belgeleri ile Ermeni Faaliyetleri, 1914-1918, Vol. I, pp. 435-438.*

³⁵⁵ *Arşiv Belgeleri ile Ermeni Faaliyetleri, 1914-1918, Vol. I, pp. 435-438.*

workshops had been sealed by the Ottoman authorities. Thus, the foreign firms were no longer able to collect the debt of these deportees. On 13 September 1915, Germany sent another memorandum regarding the interests of the German citizens. This memorandum stated that the German institutions carrying on business in the Ottoman lands could not collect their credits from the deportees. In addition, the abandoned properties were sold only to a certain part of the society and at very low prices. Germany emphasized that in case of the losses of German institutions the responsibility lay with the Ottoman Empire. Austria-Hungary also sent a similar memorandum on 21 September and warned that all responsibility about the losses of the Austria-Hungarian institutions rested with the Ottoman government.³⁵⁶

On 10 August 1915, the Ministry of Interior addressed this issue and informed the provinces and sanjaks that a regulation for the payment of the deportees' debts would be sent, and until its arrival these debts had to be recorded.³⁵⁷ The next day, the Ministry of Interior warned the provinces and the Abandoned Properties Commissions against the profiteering over the abandoned properties after learning that the movable abandoned properties of the Armenians had been sold at under market prices. Thus, the owners of the properties incurred excessive losses. The Ministry ordered not to permit the entrance of strangers, suspicious or unknown persons to the evacuated areas, and any of these people who tried to enter the areas should be immediately removed. If any unsuitable people bought property, the sale transaction could be dissolved. The illicit gain had to be decisively prevented.³⁵⁸

³⁵⁶ Kaiser, "Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies", pp. 58-59; Önder Duman, "Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Osmanlı Devleti ile Müttefikleri Arasında Bir Diplomatik Kriz: Ermeni Emval-i Metrukesi ve Borçları", *Ermeni Araştırmaları*, no. 22 (Summer 2006), pp. 124-131. For the texts of the memorandums see BOA, HR.SYS, 2873/5_3 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 324-337.)

³⁵⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/368 (10 August 1915). The Ministry of Interior readdressed the issue on 24 August 1915 reminding that a regulation would be sent concerning the payment of deportees' debts and lists of their debts had to be prepared (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/184).

³⁵⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/388 (11 August 1915) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 210-211.)

The provisional law of 26 September 1915 which regulated the rights of the creditors was prepared after these memorandums (“*14 Mayıs 1331 Tarihli Kanun-ı Muvakkat Mucibince Aher Mahallere Nakledilen Eşhasın Emval ve Düyun ve Matlubat-ı Metrukesi Hakkında Kanun-u Muvakkat*”). This provisional law included that the liquidation of the properties, debts and credits of the deportees would be carried out by the courts with respect to the records prepared by the commissions established for this purpose. The Ministry of Religious Foundations would record the properties of the religious foundations and the remainder of the properties would be recorded by the Ministry of Finance. The funds from the liquidation were to be given to the original owner. It is remarkable that if a “fraud” was detected by the courts in the property transfers that occurred up to fifteen days prior to the deportation, those transfers would be cancelled.³⁵⁹

The law also regulated the procedures about creditors’ claims. Beginning from the coming into force of this law, the creditors (and also the people having claims over the abandoned properties) who resided in the Ottoman lands had to apply within two months and those abroad had to apply within four months to the commissions either directly or through an attorney to establish their rights. These claimants had to show a place of residence in the place of commission’s seat. The commissions would prepare reports about these applications and sent the application to the court. The claimants could appeal before the court within fifteen days of the report being prepared. The court decision on this issue would be definite and no further appeal would be allowed. The abandoned properties which were not litigated would be auctioned and the sale price be transferred to the *mal sandıkları* in the name of the original owners. The complainant could not apply for the liquidated properties even they had been proved right in the court. Besides, immovable abandoned properties could be distributed to the immigrants. It is significant

³⁵⁹ Onaran, *Emval-i Metruke Olayı*, pp. 319-322; Kardeş, “*Tehcir*” ve *Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, pp. 27-31. On 28 August 1915, the Ministry of Interior requested information whether there was any sale or transfer of the Armenian properties to foreigners (*ecanib*) 8 days before the start of the deportation or during the deportations (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/280). The provisional law of 26 September 1915 enlarged this time limit for the sale and transfer of abandoned properties to 15 days prior to the deportation.

that this provisional law openly used the term of “liquidation” (*tasfiye*) and the “Liquidation Commissions”. The Interior, Religious Foundations, Finance and Justice ministries were authorized to implement the provisional law.³⁶⁰

On 8 November 1915, a regulation was prepared for the implementation of this provisional law (“*Aher Mahallere Nakledilen Eşhasın Emval ve Düyun ve Matlubat-ı Metrukesine Mütedair 17 Zilkade 1333-13 Eylül 1331 Tarihli Kanun-u Muvakkatın Suver-i İcraiyesi Hakkında Nizamname*”). This regulation proposed the establishment of a committee (*heyet*) and a liquidation commission. The committee would tabulate all property transfers taken place fifteen days prior to Armenians’ deportation or after the notification of the deportation order had been issued and would deliver the list of these transfers to the liquidation commission. Moreover, the committee would prepare record books (in duplicate) of the immovable properties of the deportee natural and legal persons. Then, it would give one copy to the office of the register of deeds (*defter-i hakani kalemleri*) and the other to the administrative council which would assess the value of the properties. After the assessment of value, these books would be delivered to the Liquidation Commission. The regulation contained detailed provisions about the establishment of Liquidation Commissions, their duties and areas of authority. This information indicates that the Liquidation Commissions had a wide range of authority. They had the right to appropriate all abandoned properties and had to be careful to auction off these properties over their real values. Religious objects would be registered and protected, and the educational materials had to be given to educational institutions. The transactions of the Commissions would be inspected by the central government. The Interior, Justice and Finance ministries were authorized to implement the regulation of 8 November 1915.³⁶¹

³⁶⁰ Onaran, *Emval-i Metruke Olayı*, pp. 319-322; Kardeş, “*Tehcir*” ve *Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, pp. 27-31. These regulations did not satisfy Germany and Austria-Hungary, thus, they sent other memorandums to the Ottoman Empire emphasizing the inadequacy of the regulations to meet the losses of the German and Austria-Hungarian institutions. Duman, “*Ermeni Emval-i Metrukesi ve Borçları*”, pp. 127, 144-150.

³⁶¹ A sample of the *Emval-i Metruke Tasfiye Komisyonu Defteri* (the record book of the Abandoned Properties Liquidation Commission) was attached to the regulation. For detailed information about the formation and authorities of the Liquidation Commissions and the

By January 1916, thirty four Liquidation Commissions had been established in the following locations; Istanbul, Tekfurdağı, Adana, Cebel-i Bereket, Kozan, Erzurum, Bursa, Gemlik, Bilecik, Yozgat, Ankara, Samsun, Ordu, Trabzon, Sivas, Merzifon, Tokad, Izmit, Adapazarı, Eskişehir, Sivrihisar, Kayseri, Develi, Aleppo, Maraş, Antakya, Bitlis, Diyarbakır, Konya, Mamuretülaziz, Niğde, Karahisar-ı Sahib, Urfa and Karesi.³⁶² It is remarkable that there were two commissions in Kayseri sanjak; the Kayseri and Develi Liquidation Commissions. This demonstrates the significance of the Kayseri district as a center of the Armenian community where their wealth was located. Apart from Kayseri, only in two other district governorates had more than one commission. These were; the Eskişehir and Sivrihisar commissions within Eskişehir sanjak and the Izmit and Adapazarı commissions within Izmit sanjak.

5.2 The Implementation

According to the regulations concerning the administration of the deportees' properties, the Armenians could not sell or rent their property. Therefore, nearly all Armenian property was left behind. Special Commissions were formed to take control of such properties. These Commissions were to sell the properties and to send the income of such sales to the owner of the property after paying any debt the owner might have. In practice this process led to the transfer of the Armenian property to Muslims at a low price.³⁶³ Kayseri sanjak was an important mercantile center in which the Armenians had composed 20 percent of the total population of the sanjak and had been active

attached sample see, *Düstur, Tertib-i Sani*, Dersaadet, Matbaa-i Amire, 1336 (1920), pp. 775-788; Kardeş, "Tehcir" ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı, pp. 53-68.

³⁶² BOA, DH.EUM.MEM, 73/43. BOA, DH.MB.HPS, 156/89 and BOA, DH.HMŞ, 12/81 gave the same list of the commissions. In another document (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 59/239) which was sent to the Liquidation Commissions from the Ministry of Interior, thirty two commissions were recorded as follows: Tekfurdağı, Adana, Cebel-i Bereket, Kozan, Yozgat, Ankara, Erzurum, Bitlis, Haleb, Maraş, Antakya, Hüdavendigâr, Gemlik, Bilecik, Diyarbakır, Sivas, Merzifon, Tokad, Samsun, Ordu, Trabzon, Konya, Mamuretülaziz, Izmit, Adapazarı, Eskişehir, Sivrihisar, Kayseri, Develü, Niğde, Karahisar-ı Sahib and Urfa Liquidation Commissions.

³⁶³ Adanır- Kaiser, "Göç, Sürgün Ve Ulusun İnşası", pp. 24-25.

participants in commercial sector; therefore, the deportation of most of this community led to the emergence of considerable assets on the market and raised the question of who would acquire them.

An insight into this situation can be seen in Talas, one of the more developed villages of Kayseri. In this village, the deportees were given four days to prepare for deportation and the first to be deported were the most prominent Armenians such as wealthy merchants, teachers and lawyers. At first, the sale of all goods by the deportees was restricted since the goods were to be appropriated by the government, however, this restriction was somewhat lifted. One American missionary evaluated this shift in policy: “This restriction on selling goods was lifted slightly, as we understood at the plea of the local Turks who wished to secure their share in making good bargains from the distracted people.”³⁶⁴

According to Jannie C. Birrage, an American Missionary in Kayseri, many deportees did not have the money for the preparations such as transportation vehicles or clothes proper for a long journey. Therefore, “they tried to sell their goods but this was forbidden unless they brought them to open market squares. But the Turks would pay almost nothing.”³⁶⁵ The extract below from the report of an American missionary in Kayseri clearly describes the environment during the deportation process and the appropriation of abandoned properties by the local population:

The impression was given that the deportation was of a temporary character and they would shortly be allowed to return. Naturally when the contents of thousands of homes were thrown upon the market, and the

³⁶⁴ “Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls’ School in the Year of the Deportation”, ABCFM, reel. 629. Raymond Kevorkian stated that the prosperity of Talas Armenians raised the interest of village notables to the abandoned properties: “It is, moreover, patent that the prosperity of the Armenians of Talas had aroused the appetites of certain village notables. Armenian sources note in particular the rapacity of Talaslı Hacı Ahmed Effendi; Zade Osman; Salih Mehmed; Seyeddin Evladları Ali; Mehmed; Tafiloğlu Tefvik; Alizadeoğlu Kazım; the president of the municipality of Talas, Ali; Mahmud, a sergeant in the gendarmerie; Hekim Balihın Hasan; and Eli Küçük Mehmed, who were both the executioners of the Armenians of Talas and also the main beneficiaries of their elimination.” Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, p. 519.

³⁶⁵ “Jannie C. Birrage (?), Cesarea/The atrocities in Turkey which I have personally seen”, ABCFM, reel. 630.

buyers, who were for the most part Turks, understood that it was a forced sale, the prices received were ridiculous. In many cases, seen in my own eyes, valuable property was taken by force and a mere excuse in the shape of money thrown to the disposer. Shops with stocks valued at thousands of liras had to be left intact. Valuables, such as carpets and jewellery, were left in charge of the Ottoman Bank.³⁶⁶

Thus, in these forced sales, since the Armenians were obliged to accept any price given for their household goods, they were only able to raise a small amount of money. Furthermore, many items in their houses were stolen.³⁶⁷

Theda B. Phelps from Talas describes this situation:

The people were only allowed to sell a few of their things—just enough to get a little money for the journey. Some of them of course were able to sell a good deal and to give away or hide many of their things. Many of them came to us begging us to store their rugs and valuable things. It was impossible for us to do so as the Government was watching us very closely and asked us for a written statement of everything we had belonging to the Armenians. The Greeks as well as the Turks took advantage of the Armenians, going to their homes begging, stealing or buying their things from them.³⁶⁸

In the meantime, the Armenians to be deported sent money to their relatives in Istanbul. Thereupon the district governorate applied to the Ministry of Interior for advice on how to manage these money transfers. The Ministry gave permission for the deportees to transfer of money.³⁶⁹

On 22 June 1915, the Ministry of Interior warned the provinces and sanjaks to be careful not to involve the local population in the matters of abandoned properties and furthermore, the ministry ordered that secondary

³⁶⁶ NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/32

³⁶⁷ “NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/212”, *United States Official Documents on the Armenian Genocide, Volume I: The Lower Euphrates*, compiled and introduced by Ara Sarafian, Watertown, the Armenian Review, 1993, p. 85; Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 362; “Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls’ School in the Year of the Deportation”, ABCFM, reel. 629: “Later I saw the house of a Turk official simply crammed with beautiful and valuable things from the rich houses of this little town.”

³⁶⁸ “NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 824”, “*Turkish Atrocities*”, p. 135.

³⁶⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 485/98 (27 August 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/289 (29 August 1915)

commissions (*tali komisyonlar*) should consist of civil servants and treasury officials.³⁷⁰ In a coded telegram dated 28 June 1915, the district governorate of Kayseri was reminded that a commission had to be formed to register and conserve abandoned properties. It was also stated that the related regulation was posted on June 10.³⁷¹ Even though the exact date of the establishment of commissions in the district is unknown, it can be deduced from the above-mentioned telegrams, there were at least twenty days between the start of the deportations on 8 June 1915 beginning with the deportation of the Armenians in Küçük İncesu village³⁷² and the order for the formation of a commission within the district (28 June 1915, BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/226).

By 25 July 1915, the district governorate informed Istanbul that the Abandoned Properties Commissions had already been formed in Kayseri, and they had begun to register the abandoned properties and houses.³⁷³ These commissions initially focused on the preservation and then on the liquidation³⁷⁴ of the abandoned properties. After May 1916, the commissions were brought under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Finance.³⁷⁵

5.3 The Distribution of the Abandoned Properties

In the coming chapter, the fact that the Armenian abandoned properties served to strengthen the “national bourgeoisie” in Kayseri will be analyzed,

³⁷⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/106. The next day (23 June 1915), Kayseri sent a telegram (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 476/140) to the Ministry of Interior to ask what was the meaning of “being careful not to involve the local population in the matters of abandoned properties.”

³⁷¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/226 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 179.)

³⁷² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 474/110 (9 June 1915); BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/36 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 162.)

³⁷³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/21 (25 July 1915)

³⁷⁴ Abandoned Properties Commissions turned to Liquidation Commissions with the law of 26 September 1915 (*14 Mayıs 1331 Tarihli kanun-ı muvakkat mucibince aher mahallere nakil edilen eşhasın emval ve diyun ve matlubat-ı metrukesi hakkında kanun-u muvakkat*). For the law see, Onaran, *Emval-i Metruke Olayı*, pp. 319-322.

³⁷⁵ BOA, HR.SYS, 2873/3_35 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 368.); BOA, HU.Kr, 109/3 (13 May 1916)

however, this was not the sole area of benefit. The abandoned properties were also used to meet the needs of the military, for the settlement of immigrants/refugees, and to meet the needs of some state agencies.

5.3.1 The Military

By 12 August 1915, a central government order was sent to various provinces and sanjaks stating the Armenian abandoned properties could be transferred to the military if they need them.³⁷⁶ The list of the allocated properties had to be prepared and sent to the Ministry of Interior.³⁷⁷ In Kayseri, there were significant Armenian stores such as Yosefyan, Ibranosyan (or used as Abranosyan) and Yazıcıyan which specialized in the trade of items including; dry goods, medical materials and chemicals.³⁷⁸ The abandoned stock in these stores would be appropriated by the authorities in accordance with the needs of the military.

For example, in a document dated 7 August 1915, it was stated that there was a large amount of American clothing and cotton textiles held by the Armenians residing in the city of Kayseri. The appropriation and shipment of these clothes and textiles to Istanbul were ordered by the military authorities (*Levazımat-ı Umumiye Dairesi*).³⁷⁹ In addition, the goods held in the Yosefyan store seem really important for the military. Even though the store had been seized (*hacizli*) by the Deutsche Bank, the medicines, medical equipment, stationary and other kind of goods were appropriated by the military.³⁸⁰ One

³⁷⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/210 (12 August 1915).

³⁷⁷ BOA, DH.HMŞ, 12/32 (22 November 1915)

³⁷⁸The Yazıcıyan store generally sold dry goods and purchased carpet and lace. The Ibranosyan store in Kayseri was one of the branches of a wide store network of the Ibranosyan Company. It was a very big store selling all sorts of goods. Dadayan, *Günümüz Türkiye'sinde Ermenilerin Ticari-Ekonomik Faaliyeti*, p. 75; Tuzcu, "Seyyahların Gözüyle ve Konsolosluk Raporlarında", p. 543.

³⁷⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/319 (7 August 1915)

³⁸⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 519/67 (12 May 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 530/15 (27 August 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 532/88 (19 September 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 527/69

document records that the military seized medical materials amounting to 300 liras but there were still goods amounting 15,000-20,000 liras in this store.³⁸¹

In particular, the military authorities demanded copper, cotton cloth, wood, coal and soap. Other items that were required by the Army were; leather, textiles, animals, medical equipment, nails, tents and some foods such as rice, sugar and oil.³⁸² The Red Crescent Society also applied to the district governorate of Kayseri for the use of abandoned properties particularly for American linen, cotton cloth and gauze.³⁸³ Moreover, sale of the medicine, surgical instruments and medical equipment taken from the abandoned properties was banned and delivery of these items to the Central Medical Authority was requested.³⁸⁴

5.3.2 The State Institutions

The military was not the sole state institution to take control of the Armenian abandoned properties; such properties were also confiscated by other government agencies in Kayseri to be used as schools, government offices and prisons. In this respect, the Ministry of Interior ordered the allocation of the school buildings in the evacuated Armenian villages and property therein to be used by the Muslim immigrants who would settle in the Armenian villages.³⁸⁵ In addition to Armenian schools, large Armenian mansions were also used as schools. For instance, a 21 room house of Dikran Frinkyan was turned into a

³⁸¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 520/43 (18 May 1916)

³⁸² Kalfaian *Chomaklou*, pp. 151, 155, 157.

³⁸³ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p. 161.

³⁸⁴ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, pp. 171, 173.

³⁸⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/101; Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p. 169. For information on the Armenian schools in Kayseri see, “*Salname-i Nezaret-i Maarif-i Umumiye, 1316, 1317, 1318*”, Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 218-224; Esmâ İğüs Parmaksız, “Ermeni Tarihçi Arşag Alboyacıyan’ın Kayseri Ermenileri Tarihi Adlı Eserine Göre Kayseri’de XIX. Yüzyıl ile XX. Yüzyıl Başlarında Faaliyet Gösteren Ermeni Okulları”, in *Hoşgörü Toplumunda Ermeniler, Vol. II*, Kayseri, Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007, pp. 137-159 (Retrieved May 1, 2014, from, http://www.metinhulagu.com/images/dosyalar/20120311230018_0.pdf); Der Matossian, “Ottoman Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri in the Nineteenth Century”, pp. 200-202, 214-215.

school after his deportation in 1915.³⁸⁶ The Ministry of Education documents confirm that the abandoned properties were utilized in Kayseri for educational purposes. For example, one abandoned building was turned into a Teacher Training College for boys (*Darülmualimin*) in the sanjak.³⁸⁷

The abandoned properties were also used for the construction of a new governor's house which in Develi was built with the timbers (amounting 8,821 *gurush* 10 *para*) from abandoned properties. Moreover, two abandoned houses were turned into a new prison in Develi. The conversion of the houses to a prison required architectural renovation using materials such as timber which were again provided from the abandoned properties.³⁸⁸

Another area in which the Armenian abandoned properties were utilized was to compensate for the expropriation prices in Kayseri. While the district governorate had to pay an expropriation price in return for the expropriated properties, this price was not paid; instead, the abandoned properties were allocated to the individuals whose houses and workshops had been expropriated by the local administration for public service such as for the construction of roads and a prison. In this respect, some workshops were expropriated (*istimlak*) and then demolished to enlarge the Kayseri-Yozgat road. The owners of the expropriated workshops did not receive financial compensation, but the district governorate covered their losses (amounting to six thousand *gurush*) by allocating abandoned Armenian workshops in the Uzun Çarşı (Long Bazaar) which belonged to the wife of Mıgırđıçyan Bedros.³⁸⁹ The governorate also made use of the abandoned properties as compensation for property that needed to be demolished in order to construct a new prison. In the Kale quarter of Kayseri, more than eighty houses were expropriated and demolished to build the new prison. The owners of these

³⁸⁶ BOA, DH.İ.U.M.EK, 50/45 (14 April 1919).

³⁸⁷ BOA, MF.MKT, 1216/17 (16 May 1916)

³⁸⁸ BOA, DH.MB.HPS, 49/30

³⁸⁹ BOA, DH.UMVM, 103/61 (1 July 1918)

houses were given Armenian abandoned houses in return for their expropriated properties.³⁹⁰

Furthermore, the abandoned properties were used to meet the essential needs of people. In order to meet the needs of the population, the Ministry of Interior gave permission to auction off the movable abandoned goods, since the appropriation of such goods by the state institutions caused shortages of some essential goods.³⁹¹ It is obvious that the abandoned properties became a significant source for the Treasury during the war years and thus the Liquidation Commissions were instructed to pay a reward (*ikramiye*) to people who reported the place of the concealed abandoned properties amounting to five per cent of the auction price of the abandoned properties.³⁹²

5.3.3 The Settlement of the Immigrants, Refugees and Prisoners of War (*Üsera-yı İslamiye*)

During World War I, the term “immigrant” (*muhacir*) denoted an individual who had left his/her homeland and settled in the Ottoman Empire, while “refugee” (*mülteci*) was used for the individual forced to migrate to the Ottoman interior because of the enemy occupation of the Ottoman lands.³⁹³ Both immigrants and refugees settled in Kayseri during World War I, and abandoned properties were utilized in the process of their settlement.

In order to settle the immigrants and tribes in the evacuated Armenian villages, data requested from the provinces and *livas* about the progress in Armenian deportation, the location and names of the evacuated villages, if there was need for the transfer of immigrants, how many of them was needed to settle in, and whether there were tribes around the region that were to be settled in those areas.³⁹⁴ The abandoned properties commissions were

³⁹⁰ BOA, DH.UMVM, 104/42 (19 April 1919)

³⁹¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/330 (29 August 1915)

³⁹² BOA, DH.HMŞ, 12/80

³⁹³ İpek, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*, p. 18.

³⁹⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/412 (12 July 1915)

authorized to settle the immigrants and tribes in the evacuated villages. They had to report to the Ministry about the settlement process once every fifteen days. Settlement of immigrants in these villages was regarded as a measure for the development of agriculture and the economy which declined with the Armenian deportations.³⁹⁵

The settlement of immigrants in the evacuated Armenian villages began almost simultaneously with the deportation. The local authorities applied to the Ministry of Interior for the transfer of the Muslim immigrants to Kayseri in order to settle them in place of the deportees.³⁹⁶ The first group consisting of two hundred sixty households would come from Ankara province to be settled in the sanjak.³⁹⁷ There had been large influxes of immigrants to the Ottoman lands during and after the Balkan Wars. Some of these immigrants had been sent to Ankara.³⁹⁸ In 1915, Bosnians composed the main bulk of these immigrants within Ankara province and there were also Albanian and Macedonian immigrants.³⁹⁹

The sanjak of Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior about the settlement process. In line with the demands from the district governorate of Kayseri for the transfer and settlement of immigrants in the evacuated Armenian villages, 180 immigrant households were settled in former Armenian villages such as Sıvgın (in Bünyan), İncesu (in Develi) and Derevenk (in Kayseri) until 31 August 1915. In addition 45 household Rumelian immigrants were settled in Yağdıbaran (in Develi).⁴⁰⁰ *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*

³⁹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/442 (13 July 1915)

³⁹⁶ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb., 8/21; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 476/50; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/380; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/9; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/49; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/21; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 479/26

³⁹⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/49 (27 July 1915)

³⁹⁸ Ahmet Halaçoğlu, *Balkan Harbi Sırasında Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri (1912-1913)*, Ankara, TTK, 1995, pp. 78-79, 128-129; İpek, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*, p. 121. It was recorded in the statistics prepared for Talat Bey that 9,335 immigrants consisting of 2,111 households had been sent to Ankara Province. Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, pp. 39-41.

³⁹⁹ BOA, DH.MB.HPS, 153/40; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 56/290; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 494/78

⁴⁰⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 486/96 (31 August 1915)

shows that only 1,445 Balkan immigrants, composed of 328 households, had been settled in Kayseri sanjak. Since the total number of Balkan immigrants was recorded as 339,074, it is evident that Kayseri was not an important area in terms of their settlement.⁴⁰¹

In addition to the Muslim immigrants, nomadic tribes were also settled in the evacuated villages. For instance, people from the Aydınlı tribe were settled in the evacuated villages in Develi.⁴⁰² Taşhan and Sazak were other such villages for the settlement of tribes. These were the Armenian villages around Tomarza, 388 Armenians had lived in Taşhan and 228 had lived in Sazak before 1915.⁴⁰³ After the deportation of Armenians, 510 nomadic people (102 households) were settled in Taşhan, and 295 (45 households) were settled in Sazak. The governor was even willing to transfer some other tribes from the sanjak of Kozan to settle in the other evacuated villages.⁴⁰⁴

The Ottoman government had also planned the utilization of the abandoned properties and land not only for the settlement of *muhacirs*, but also for the settlement of Arab families, who had been deported from Syria.⁴⁰⁵ *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi* records that more than one thousand Arab families (1,379) were sent to Anatolia by Cemal Paşa. These families were settled in Ankara, Hüdavendigâr, Aydın, Sivas, Konya and Kastamonu provinces and

⁴⁰¹ Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, pp. 39-41. After the Balkan Wars, 177,352 immigrants in 1329 (in Rumi calendar), 120,566 immigrants in 1330 and 41,156 immigrants in 1331 came to the Ottoman lands.

⁴⁰² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 486/96 (31 August 1915)

⁴⁰³ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40. According to Kevorkian, the number of Armenians in Taşhan village was 750 and in Sazak village was 400. Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, pp. 521-522.

⁴⁰⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 487/42 (4 September 1915). The document did not include any detail regarding these settled tribes within the Kayseri district or the tribes which would come from the Kozan sanjak. For information regarding the tribes around Kayseri district see Emir Kalkan, "Kayseri'ye Yerleşen Türk Toplulukları", *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no. 17 (April 1982), pp. 86-102; Mustafa Keskin, "Kayseri Yöresindeki Aşiretlerin İskanı Hakkında", *Geçmişteki İzleriyle Kayseri*, Kayseri, 2006, pp. 80-94; M. Metin Hülâgü, "Kayseri ve Çevresinde Kuzugüdenli Aşireti ve Eşkiyalık Olayları", *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 15 (2003/2), pp. 37-44.

⁴⁰⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 59/107

Eskişehir and Karesi sanjaks.⁴⁰⁶ Even though it was planned by the central government to settle some of them in Kayseri, by 12 March 1918, there were only two Arabs within the sanjak who had been deported from the Fourth Army region.⁴⁰⁷

Refugees from the eastern border lands⁴⁰⁸ were also sent to settle in the sanjak. Due to the advancement of Russian armies in the eastern lands of the Ottoman Empire, Van, Bitlis, Muş, Erzurum, Trabzon, Gümüşhane and Erzincan became invasion areas. This situation had already led to the migration of local people to the interior beginning in spring of 1915. Central Anatolia was one of the settlement regions for the eastern refugees called “*Şark Mültecileri*”. Refugees came to Kayseri from two directions. The refugees of Erzurum district came to the interior by the Sivas-Tokat-Amasya-Çorum-Yozgat-Ankara route. This migration began with the invasion of Erzurum by Russian forces in February 1916. Some of the Erzurum refugees settled in the Kayseri sanjak. Diyarbakır-Urfa-Maraş-Adana route was the second way in which refugees from Van, Muş and Bitlis regions reached Kayseri.⁴⁰⁹

In this process, the Turkish and Kurdish refugees were separated and settled in different zones. The Turkish refugees were settled in areas such as Urfa, Maraş, Antep which were densely populated by the Kurds, and the Kurdish refugees were sent to the interior of Anatolia (locations; such as Ankara, Kayseri, Konya, Kastamonu, Kütahya and Niğde) which were densely

⁴⁰⁶ Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 65.

⁴⁰⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 579/151 (12 March 1918). This number probably increased in the following months of 1918 since the district governorate informed the Ministry of Interior on 1 September 1918 that the persons who had been deported from the Fourth Army region and living in Kayseri were originally from Egypt, Algeria and Tunisia. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 594/19 (1 September 1918)

⁴⁰⁸ For more information on the Eastern refugees see Tuncay Öğün, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi, Vilayat-ı Şarkîye Mültecileri (1915-1923)*, Ankara, Babil Yayıncılık, 2004.

⁴⁰⁹ İpek, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*, pp. 130-131, 139. The American missionary Theda B. Phelps confirmed that there were many Turkish refugees in Kayseri from the Erzurum district. “Story of Talas, 1914-17” (NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807), “*Turkish Atrocities*”, p. 142.

populated by the Turks. The other refugees, neither Turk nor Kurd, would be settled in Amasya, Tokad and Malatya.⁴¹⁰

The Ottoman government planned to settle the Kurdish refugees in the western provinces. For this purpose, information was gathered from the provinces and sanjaks on the demography of these districts before the implementation of this project. On 26 January 1916, the Ministry of Interior asked the governors of the provinces of Konya, Kastamonu, Ankara, Sivas, Adana, Aydın, Trabzon and sanjaks of Kayseri, Canik, Eskişehir, Karahisar and Niğde whether there were Kurdish communities or Kurdish villages within their districts.⁴¹¹ On 10 February, Kayseri replied that there was neither a Kurdish population nor Kurdish villages within the sanjak and the Kurdish refugees could be settled in Kayseri like the other immigrants.⁴¹² Then, the transfer and settlement of the Kurdish refugees in the sanjak took place in May, June and July 1916.

On 6 May 1916, Diyarbakır province notified that 70 households composed of 499 refugees had been sent to Kayseri.⁴¹³ Then, 98 Kurdish refugees (24 households) were sent on 15 May 1916, a further 1,102 (178 households) were sent on 30 May and 197 (41 households) on 11 June.⁴¹⁴ On 21 May 1916, the Ministry of Interior ordered the governorate of Mamuretülaziz province that the Turkish refugees had to be sent to Urfa, Zor, Maraş and Antep, and the Kurdish refugees should be sent to Kayseri, Yozgat, Ankara and Canik districts.⁴¹⁵ The Ministry was informed that by 8 June 1916, 982 refugees (124 households) were sent to Ankara, and 298 (67 households) had been sent to Kayseri by the province of Mamuretülaziz. Moreover, on 24

⁴¹⁰ Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, pp. 411-418, 500-509.

⁴¹¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/140 (26 January 1916)

⁴¹² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 508/95 (10 February 1916)

⁴¹³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 518/86 (6 May 1916)

⁴¹⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 519/98 (15 May 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 521/50 (30 May 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 522/101 (11 June 1916)

⁴¹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 64/93 (21 May 1916)

June 1916, 2,948 refugees had been sent to a number of districts: 31 to Ankara, 18 (3 households) to Konya, 22 (5 households) to Niğde and 2,873 (571 households) to Kayseri.⁴¹⁶ These documents show that Kayseri had become one of the centers for the settlement of Kurdish refugees.

Svajian explains the settlement of eastern refugees in the vacant Armenian houses:

It was in March 1916, that we heard that Erzerum had fallen into the hands of the Russians. The Russian advance in the eastern front forced many Turks and Kurds to leave their homes and migrate west. Many refugees thus came to Kayseri and the government gave them vacant Armenian houses to occupy ... During the summer, the government gave them the Armenian orchards at Besh Tepeler, with fruit-bearing trees, almost free.⁴¹⁷

By the spring of 1916, the number of the immigrants and refugees reached significant numbers within the empire. There were 707,504 refugees throughout the empire and 30,000 of these refugees (about 4-5 percent of the total) had been settled in Kayseri.

⁴¹⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 522/83 (8 June 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 523/116 (24 June 1916)

⁴¹⁷ Svajian also stated that refugees had damaged the houses and orchards since they used the panels, all kind of woods and even roof as fuel in the winter. The orchards were also destroyed that after collecting the fruits in the summer, they cut the trees and used them for heating in the winter. Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, p. 373.

TABLE 11: The Distribution of the Refugees in the Ottoman Lands in the Spring of 1916

Adana province	13,618
Ankara province	108,042
Aleppo province	26,315
Diyarbakır province	84,000
Sivas province	116,000
Kastamonu province	10,104
Konya province	4,346
Mamuretülaziz province	5,088
Trabzon province	60,000
Mosul province	150,000
Urfa sanjak	40,133
Izmit sanjak	699
İçel sanjak	426
Eskişehir sanjak	2,316
Bolu sanjak	2,500
Canik sanjak	36,000
Kayseri sanjak	30,000
Karahisar-ı Sahip sanjak	616
Maraş sanjak	6,666
Niğde sanjak	5,635
Total	707,504

Source: Öğün, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi*, p. 37 (data from DH.İ.UM, E-15/54).

The numbers continued to increase over the coming years. By March 1918, there were 825,991 refugees, and 384,996 immigrants within the Ottoman lands.⁴¹⁸ As one of the centers for the settlement of refugees and immigrants, there were 30,096 immigrants and refugees in Kayseri sanjak by March 1917.⁴¹⁹

In addition to the abandoned houses used for the settlement of the immigrants and refugees, there were also the other abandoned commodities

⁴¹⁸ *Meclis-i Ayan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.2, İçtima Senesi.4, 41. İnikad (24 Mart 1334/24 March 1918), p. 217.

⁴¹⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 547/23 (4 March 1917); Pirme Ministry Republican Archives (*Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi*, hereafter BCA) BCA, 272.00.74/65.13.1 (4 March 1917). The statistics, prepared for Talat Bey, recorded that the total number of eastern refugees in the empire was 702,905 and 25,061 of these refugees were settled in Kayseri sanjak. Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 49.

distributed among these people for their needs. For example, the Ministry of Interior ordered that the goods in the Ibranosyan (Abranosyan)⁴²⁰ and Yosefyan stores should be distributed to the refugees and the remainder which was surplus to the needs of the refugees within Kayseri would be sent to other provinces. The Ministry wrote that it negotiated with the Deutsche Bank for the Yosefyan store and with Abranosyan⁴²¹ for his store in order to purchase the goods in these stores to distribute them among the refugees.⁴²²

Apart from the immigrants and refugees, Muslim prisoners of war⁴²³ who agreed to take Ottoman nationality were also settled in abandoned properties in Kayseri. They were considered to be a source of manpower to fill the economic gap which had emerged as a result of the Armenian deportation. Their settlement in place of the deported Armenians was encouraged by the Ottoman government, accordingly, forty-nine prisoners of war were sent to Kayseri and forty-three became Ottoman nationals. These forty-three prisoners of war were settled and the district governorate utilized the abandoned properties to provide

⁴²⁰ According to Dadayan, the owner of the Ibranosyan Company, Maruke Ibranosyan was tried in Kayseri in 1915 and sentenced to death but got rid of death sentence after converting to Islam. Dadayan stated that Maruke took the name of Ibranoszade Süleyman Sırrı, and all branches of his company were closed. Dadayan (ed.), *Günümüz Türkiye'sinde Ermenilerin Ticari-Ekonomik Faaliyeti*, p. 75. The Ottoman archival documents also confirm the trial of him. However, these documents highlight that Abranosyan was court-martialed in Kayseri but was acquitted. He was described as a well-known merchant who did not have any relation with the Armenian organizations (*komitecilikle alakasız*). The documents also confirmed that he converted to Islam. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 14/50-A, BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 14/62.

⁴²¹ On 30 March 1916, the Ministry of Interior sent a telegram (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 62/181) to the provinces and sanjaks regarding the Abranosyan Trading House: "Please conduct a thorough investigation and report on whether the Abranosyan Trading House has branches within your province/provincial district, whether they have acted as intermediaries for the sending and distribution of funds sent to the Armenians by Armenians of foreign citizenship or by American consulates, and the status and actions of [government] officials who assisted them [in their efforts].", quoted from Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*, p. 436.

⁴²² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 69/266 (13 November 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 70/244 (13 December 1916).

⁴²³ Hundreds of thousands Russian soldiers fighting against Germany were taken prisoner during the war. There were a considerable number of Muslim soldiers among them. The Muslim prisoners of war in the German, Austrian and Romanian prison camps were sent to the Ottoman Empire to be settled in Anatolia. In addition, Muslim prisoners of war captured in Bitlis and Kut'ülamare were settled in the Ottoman lands after they agreed to take Ottoman nationality. İpek, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*, pp. 262-263.

capital, fixed assets and shops for them.⁴²⁴ The number of Muslim prisoners of war settled in the Ottoman lands was almost one thousand (958 people) and they were sent to following places; Adana province (50 people), Istanbul (30 people), Izmit sanjak (136 people), Eskişehir sanjak (102 people), Hüdavendigâr province (163 people), Karahisar sanjak (47 people), Kayseri sanjak (49 people), Konya province (302 people), and Niğde sanjak (79 people).⁴²⁵

The Ministry of Interior continued to collect information regarding the abandoned properties. On 29 July 1917, it requested that the provinces and *livas* sent the Ministry the following data; the number of deportees and the value of their non-movable properties; the number of remaining Armenians and how many of them lived in their own homes; the number of abandoned houses that had been allocated to the immigrants, and how many houses had been auctioned by the Ministry of Finance.⁴²⁶

The exact number of the Armenian houses in Kayseri that were used for the settlement of these groups is unknown. However, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi* contained a significant table regarding the number of the empty abandoned properties (probably by the year of 1917). This table records that there were 3,000 empty Armenian abandoned houses (*hane*) in the sanjak of Kayseri.⁴²⁷ It is obvious that there were many more Armenian houses in Kayseri sanjak. Even in the *kaza* of Kayseri, there were 5,439 Armenian houses before the deportation,⁴²⁸ so it seems that *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi* only considered the empty houses.

⁴²⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 57/261, BOA, DH.ŞFR, 496/119, BOA, DH.ŞFR, 518/30

⁴²⁵ Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, pp. 59-61. Nedim İpek stated that 755 Muslim prisoners of war were settled in different parts of Anatolia. They were citizens of Austria (1), Afghanistan (1), France (8), England (51), Romania (31) and Russia (662). But, as stated above the total number was a little more than 755. For example, İpek did not count the settled ones in Kayseri in this total. İpek, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*, p. 263

⁴²⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 78/225 (29 July 1917)

⁴²⁷ Bardakçı *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 91.

⁴²⁸ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40. The document gives the number as 5,539, but I calculated the total as 5,439.

5.4 The Properties of the Remaining Armenians

Categorically, the property belonging to the remaining or converted Armenians were not liquidated. For example, on 23 November 1916, the Ministry of Interior gave the governor of Diyarbakır province orders that the remaining non-Muslims had the ownership rights over their movable and non-movable properties.⁴²⁹ For Kayseri, there is no document that directly focused on this topic. In this framework, there was only an application from the district governorate sent to the Ministry of Interior about the properties of the converts who had been deported. Kayseri hesitated over the liquidation of the properties of the converted deportees.⁴³⁰ However, the Ministry's response was that "the properties of the deportees have to be liquidated without taking into account either they are converts or not".⁴³¹

Although the properties of the remaining Armenians were not officially liquidated, there were instances of robberies:

A few weeks after the deportation, in spite of the fact that imperial clemency had been proclaimed for Catholics, Protestants and soldiers' families, they were told that they must leave their houses and be sent to surrounding Moslem villages. They were not exiles, they were told; they might keep the keys of their homes and their goods would be safely guarded. So these poor women and children, for there were very few men left, were scattered about in the villages of the Turks...No sooner were they gone than their houses were opened and their property stolen and scattered.⁴³²

⁴²⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 70/79 (23 November 1916). Akçam and Kurt also highlight that the properties of the non-deported Armenians were not liquidated. The authors use both this telegram and another telegram which was sent to Sivas province (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/253) stating that the properties of the people, exempted from deportation, were not subject to liquidation. Akçam- Kurt, *Kanunların Ruhü*, p. 19.

⁴³⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 509/116 (17 February 1916)

⁴³¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/224 (8 March 1916)

⁴³² "Story of the Girls of the Talas Girls' School in the Year of the Deportation", ABCFM, reel. 629.

In the interview with X who was the grandson of an Armenian family that remained in Kayseri during the war years, he confirms that the property of his family was not expropriated. However, he explained that for a while a part of their house was allocated to immigrants. But since the immigrants did not want to live in Kayseri, they left the city and thus the family of X continued to have control of their house.⁴³³

Another facet of the problems regarding the properties of the Armenians was related to the Armenian orphans. The Ministry of Interior addressed the issue and instructed the provinces and Abandoned Properties Commissions that the orphans, who had converted to Islam, had married or had been placed in the care of the trustable Muslim families, would preserve their personal property, and if their legator (*muris*) had deceased, they would receive their hereditary share (11 August 1915).⁴³⁴ However, this decision of the Ministry actually meant that the Armenian abandoned properties could be appropriated by the Muslims who had married or adopted these orphans.

This is supported by a document from Diyarbakır which explained that there were Armenian girls, women and children staying with some notables in the province. These notables had tried to appropriate the abandoned properties of the deportees, who were the relatives of these girls, women or children, through marriage or adoption.⁴³⁵

5.5 The Abandoned Properties as a Diplomatic Issue

There were many complaints about the liquidation of the Armenian abandoned properties in Kayseri from both inside and outside the empire. Foreign countries reacted since the Armenians had debts to citizens of countries like Germany and the United States. For merchants of Kayseri had

⁴³³ I have conducted this interview with X in Istanbul in May 2013.

⁴³⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/382: “*İhtida eden veyahud izdivac edenlerle beray-ı teslim ve terbiye şayan-ı itimad zevat nezdine bırakılan çocukların emlak-i zatiyyeleri ibka ve murisleri vefat etmiş ise hisse-i irsiyyeleri ita olunur.*”

⁴³⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 601/103

ties with foreign firms, the appropriation of some Armenian stores led to foreign countries requesting that these stores be preserved intact so they could collect debts owed by deported Armenians. One instance concerned the Singer Sewing Machine Company of the United States.⁴³⁶ The American Consul of Mersin, Edward I. Nathan, reported the potential damage of the deportation to the American institutions by 26 July 1915:

Apart from the misery and distress to the deported persons the effect of these measures on the province is incalculable. The loss of the best commercial element and the principal handicraftsmen is bound to injure local economic conditions. Special pleas on this basis have been made to the Government by various interests and even German financial and commercial interests notably those of the various agricultural machine companies which do business as well as the Singer Manufacturing Company and the petroleum companies will also be affected.⁴³⁷

When the United States asked the Ottoman government to protect the Singer Sewing Machine stores in Kayseri, whose keys had been delivered to the police department by the deportees, the Ministry of Interior instructed the Abandoned Properties Commission of Kayseri to take the required measures for the protection of these stores in order to prevent payment of a restitution to the company for the stores (16 September 1915).⁴³⁸

⁴³⁶ Edwund Naumann mentioned his encounter with a German merchant, Bernard Housefranz, who made sell of Singer sewing machines in Kayseri by the beginning of 1890s. The German merchant told Naumann that the Singer sewing machines had been sold in Anatolia for a long time. Edmund Naumann, “*Von Goldenen Horn zu den Quellen des Euphrat*”, quoted in *Seyahatnamelerde Kayseri*, p. 190. Quataert, *Ottoman Manufacturing*, p. 23: “Ottoman use of sewing machines seems to have been quite limited until the very end of the 19th century. At that time, entry of the American firm, the Singer Sewing Machine Company, into the Ottoman market stimulated their vastly-expanded use....Offering a well-made and cheaper product, the Singer firm quickly captured the lion’s share of the Ottoman market...”

⁴³⁷ Library of Congress, The Papers of Henry Morgenthau, reel 7. Another example of such a situation emerged about the life insurances. The American Ambassador Henry Morgenthau narrated the conversation between him and the Minister of Interior, Talat Paşa, about the life insurances of the deportees from American companies such as the New York Life Insurance Company and the Equitable Life of New York. According to him, Talat Paşa demanded the list of the Armenian policy holders and wanted the payment of their life insurances to the Ottoman government for many of them passed away. Morgenthau stated that he rejected this demand. Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau’s Story*, p. 233.

⁴³⁸ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p. 167.

A similar request came for the Yosefyan store, which was in debt to the Deutsche Bank. It was reported to the Ministry of Interior that the medical materials and some other equipment had been taken from the store. Due to this situation, Istanbul warned the district governorate of Kayseri not to take the goods from the Yosefyan store which had been seized by the Deutsche Bank. The document stated that the Ministry promised the Bank they would preserve the goods in the Yosefyan store.⁴³⁹ It is notable that this situation was reported to the Ministry by the Liquidation Commission of Kayseri. This can be interpreted as a sign of conflict between the district governor and the Liquidation Commission over the use or control of abandoned properties.⁴⁴⁰ In reply to the warning of the Ministry, the governorate wrote that the medical materials had been removed from the store since the military was urgently in need of these materials and an official record (*tekalif-i harbiye mazbatası*) would be given in exchange for these medical materials. It was also stated that from then on the store would be preserved.⁴⁴¹

Nevertheless, the correspondence between the Ministry and the district governorate of Kayseri over the Yosefyan store did not end with these telegrams. The local authorities continued to apply to the Ministry for the materials such as sodium carbonate (for the production of soap) and stationary equipment on the grounds that the military needed them. Finally, the equipment held in the store was allocated to the military.⁴⁴² This is an important event since it shows that the state institutions were not in total harmony over the use of the abandoned property. In this instance, the Ministry, the local authorities, the military and the Liquidation commission were parties to the process and it is evident that there were conflicts among these actors over the control of the abandoned property.

⁴³⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 64/10 (14 May 1916)

⁴⁴⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 519/67 (12 May 1916)

⁴⁴¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 520/43 (18 May 1916)

⁴⁴² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 527/69 (6 August 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 530/15 (27 August 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 532/88

5.6 The Procedural Disputes over the *Emval-i Metruke*

When the results of the distribution of the Armenian abandoned properties are analyzed, it is seen that this process created tension in the socio-economic realm since a new source of power emerged as a result of deportations. The appropriation of this new source can be evaluated as a new area of struggle or as an economic battle on the basis of appropriating these properties.⁴⁴³

As a part of this struggle, profiteering from the abandoned properties emerged as a problem in Kayseri. The sale of Armenian properties by giving rise to the profiteering of some at the expense of others created a reaction of the government in that preventing of such unfair profiteering was officially requested from the district governorate of Kayseri.⁴⁴⁴ In a document sent from the governor of Kayseri to the Abandoned Properties Commission about the sales of property at such ridiculous prices, the governor ordered the Commission to prohibit such improper transactions (26 August 1915). This document not only reveals that the abandoned properties were sold at very low prices but also shows that there was a tension between the governor and the Abandoned Properties Commission for the governor of Kayseri did not consider that the transactions of the Commissions as appropriate.⁴⁴⁵ The correspondence between the district governorate of Kayseri and the Abandoned Properties Commission continued during August 1915. In one of these documents, the governor of Kayseri informed the commission that after the

⁴⁴³ Joel Migdal, "The State in Society: an Approach to Struggles for Domination", in *State Power and Social Forces Domination and Transformation in the Third World*, ed. by Joel S. Migdal, Atul Kohli, Vivienne Shue, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 22.

⁴⁴⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/383

⁴⁴⁵ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p. 157: "It has been noted that such articles as wood, coal, copper, and cotton goods left by Armenian deportees, are already on sale here and there for ridiculous sums. Therefore strictly prohibit such transactions, and gathering the articles in depots, register them and place under guard, or send them to military requisition depots. It is especially imperative that copper in any form be taken over by the Military Requisitions, and that commerce in such articles be prohibited immediately, and after ascertaining where and in what quantities they are available, the account be submitted to us.... Along with these items also look for soap."

deportation of Armenians, locals who wanted to own such abandoned properties had appealed to the authorities for this purpose. While the Abandoned Properties Commission had to carefully scrutinize the transactions, it is understood from the complaint of the *Mutasarrif* that there had been hasty transactions from which arose complaints of corruption. In order to prevent further complaints and provide reliable transactions, the governor instructed the commission that the transactions had to be first directed to the district governorate of Kayseri and then be carried out by the police department in the transfer of the *emval-i metruke*.⁴⁴⁶

The failure of the Commission in the management of abandoned properties was also reported to Istanbul by the district governor who stated that the abandoned properties issue was very important in Kayseri but the locals and officials were not able to handle these matters quickly and appropriately. Therefore, on 25 September 1915, he requested from Istanbul the appointment of the chairman and members of the commission to replace the local officials.⁴⁴⁷ Two months later, the district governor Zekai Bey criticized the chairman and members of the commission for their mismanagement and lack of ability. He reported that their mismanagement led to the corruption of lower level officials who were employed at the commission. The *Mutasarrif* wanted from Istanbul the appointment of a new chairman and a new member for the Commission who were experienced and efficient.⁴⁴⁸ Upon this request, the Ministry of Interior changed the chairman and member of the commission and

⁴⁴⁶ Kalfaian, *Chomaklou*, p. 159: "Presently, owing to the deportation of Armenians, their shops are closed, some of them are making incessant appeals for permission to transfer their property to others. However, commissions should be careful not to consent to transfers to people using assumed names, and are obliged to scrutinize. Nevertheless, owing to hasty transactions, the police department had been giving oral directives; consequently there has developed an inaccurate public opinion concerning the police department's arbitrary attitude and corruption. In an effort to forestall such misunderstandings already there have been inquiries relative to mobile and immobile properties and decisions have been rendered. It has been deemed proper that transactions be directed to the office of the *Mutasarrif* and then be carried out by the police department. It is requested that this manner and procedure be honored so as to ensure the reliability of the transaction."

⁴⁴⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 489/25 (25 September 1915)

⁴⁴⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 498/103 (25 November 1915)

ordered the protection of the abandoned properties until the establishment of the Liquidation Commission in line with the law.⁴⁴⁹ The complaints were not only about the mismanagement of the commission, but the district governor also complained about other officials. In one of these telegrams, he stated that the *kadı* of Bünyan committed misconduct in the deportation of the Armenians and at the procedures regarding abandoned properties. The *Mutasarrıf* requested removal of the *kadı* from his duty.⁴⁵⁰

The appointment of a new chairman and member to the Abandoned Properties Commission did not end the complaints from the governor. The new chairman of the Commission was also criticized by Zekai. According to his telegram, the new chairman, Halim Bey, established a cadre for the central *liva* which, with 25 officials, was unnecessarily large and employed people who were unsuitable such as Tevfik Bey, who was removed from the Court Martial in regard to his corruption. The *Mutasarrıf* wanted Istanbul to send an order related to the reformation of the cadre.⁴⁵¹

The conflict between the district governor and the chairman of the Commission can also be seen in other documents. For example, chairman Halim applied to the Ministry of Interior on 26 December 1915 with the request of coded text (*şifre miftahı*) for telegrams. Halim also stated that he had wanted coded text from the district governorate, but received the reply that this would not be given to him.⁴⁵² Upon receiving this telegram, the Ministry of Interior stated that coded text of the Ministry could not be sent but the Commission could connect with the cipher/code of the Directorate of Immigrants.⁴⁵³ These telegrams show that there were different types of codes for the official correspondence between the Ministry of Interior and different

⁴⁴⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 58/220 (7 December 1915)

⁴⁵⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 490/102 (25 September 1915)

⁴⁵¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 502/54 (23 December 1915)

⁴⁵² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 502/97 (26 December 1915)

⁴⁵³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 59/155

authorities. Even though the real context of the request of the chairman for the coded text is unknown it is possible to speculate. That this was the commission chairman's effort to secure secret correspondence with the center and to bypass governorate control. This can also be read as a reflection of the struggle over the issues concerning the abandoned properties between Zekai Bey and Halim. It is probable that Halim tried to appear as a figure, as being a person who, apart from the district governor, had direct communication with the Ministry.

This conflict between the district governor and the chairman of the local Liquidation Commission continued during the auctions of Armenian properties in January and February 1916.⁴⁵⁴ At this time, the men could not agree on which way the abandoned properties should be sold. The governor applied to the Ministry of Interior to sell the movable assets in the abandoned workshops to the Muslim companies without auctions. The *Mutasarrif* demanded successively from the Ministry to send an order to the Commission in this line⁴⁵⁵ since he considered that sale by auction was an inappropriate way for the formation of Muslim companies and for the development of trades among the Muslims. The governor explained his reservation that some companies could not buy the movable abandoned goods because of the competition in an auction and it was impossible to prevent competition in open auctions. This situation would mean dissolution of some companies which could not purchase anything of the abandoned property. According to the governor, setting the price of the goods and sale without auctions could be adopted. This would serve to Islamize the trades. The district governorate of Kayseri demanded that the Ministry ordered the Liquidation Commission to agree to such sales.⁴⁵⁶

Contrary to this demand, the chairman of the Liquidation Commission, Halim Bey, stated that auction was more appropriate for the sale of movable

⁴⁵⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 504/33; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 505/86; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 505/89; BOA, DH.ŞFR 60/95

⁴⁵⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 504/33 (5 January 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 505/86 (16 January 1916)

⁴⁵⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 505/86 (16 January 1916)

abandoned property.⁴⁵⁷ The same day, the Ministry of Interior ordered the Liquidation Commission to auction of the abandoned properties for the transfer of these properties to the mentioned companies with the aim of exploitation by the Muslim tradesmen.⁴⁵⁸

Although the district governorate of Kayseri tried to interfere in transfer of abandoned properties, in this instance, the Ministry of Interior supported the position of the Commission. This stance of the Ministry probably stemmed from the fact that the regulations regarding the liquidation of the abandoned properties accepted auction as the way of liquidation. As for the position taken by the *Mutasarrif*, it could be speculated that the governor did not regard that auctions benefitted the petty bourgeoisie, since many of them were unable to compete against the powerful merchants in the auctions. Thus, he proposed setting a price which would prevent competition and allow more people to benefit from the abandoned properties. As a second option, it is also possible that the district governor wanted the benefit of a “defined” company from these sales but this company could not compete in the auctions. The next chapter will evaluate Zekai Bey's active participation in the formation of new joint stock companies in the sanjak, and the interference of the governor could also have stemmed from his attempt to secure the capital transfer to these companies.

As indicated above, some Armenian properties were auctioned in January and February 1916. These auctions continued to produce complaints because of obvious corruptions at the sales.⁴⁵⁹ Hence, the Ministry of Interior continued to warn the district governorate of Kayseri and the Kayseri Liquidation Commission against such kind of illegal enrichments resulting from the sale of the abandoned property.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 505/89 (17 January 1916)

⁴⁵⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/95 (17 January 1916)

⁴⁵⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 507/125 (4 February 1916)

⁴⁶⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/31 (16 February 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/37 (17 February 1916)

Raymond Kevorkian describes how a committee was formed by local notables to appropriate the Armenian property:

The task of seizing Armenian property was entrusted to a committee responsible for “abandoned property” headed by Nagibzade Ahmed and Kadili Daniş Bey. Thirteen of their collaborators-Murad Bey, an official in the Land Registry Office; Abdülaziz Bey; Taşçızade Mehmed; Attarzade Kamil; Bohcelizade Ahmed; Imamzade Reşid; Imamoğlu Ali; Elekcioğlu Husezin (sic.); Hacılarlı Mustafa; Ibrahim Safa; Şeyh İbrahimoğlu Fuad; Katibzade Nuh; and Kürkcüzade Ömer Hulusi-founded a corporation, the Birlik Cemiyeti, which acquired the Armenian assets put on sale for virtually nothing. They first acquired a khan and then “purchased” the manufacturing establishments of the Yazejian, Mendigian, Balian and Jamjian brothers.⁴⁶¹

Stephen Svajian, who lived in Kayseri during the war as a convert, also narrates the sale of abandoned properties in Kayseri. According to him, the Armenian abandoned properties were auctioned cheaply. “Turkish Aghas bought them and many became rich overnight. The common Turks did not participate. The Greeks, who were businessmen, bought the Armenian stores with the merchandise in them and made easy money.” In addition to such easy money, those who bought this stock also benefited from the circumstances of war. As the war continued, shortage of the goods such as wool, cotton, copper, iron, sugar and soap led to an up to ten-fold rise in the prices of these goods.⁴⁶² It can be deduced that this kind of rise in the prices became another source of enrichment for the people who purchased the stock in the Armenian stores.

5.7 The Claims of the Malpractices and “Corruption”

The deportation process and the sale of abandoned properties triggered controversies among the leading figures in the bureaucracy. In this respect, the Ministry of Interior was notified of the claims of malpractice and corruption. In this period of official capital transfer, "corruption", in official terms, was prevalent in many regions including Kayseri. However, it has to be highlighted

⁴⁶¹ Kevorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, p. 519.

⁴⁶² Svajian *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, pp. 372-373.

that the use of these terms such as corruption and war profiteering denotes the approach of the Ottoman government, and which in fact did not oppose the expropriation of Armenian abandoned properties. Instead it considered uncontrolled appropriation of these properties as corruption. An analysis of these allegations illustrate that the important political and social figures in the sanjak also did not present a critical approach regarding the deportations. In this respect, when analyzing the claims of malpractice and corruption, it has to be kept in mind that neither the Ottoman government nor its representatives in the localities aimed to protect the rights of the deportees. Instead, the deportation and the emergence of abandoned properties were considered by many people as a new source of power. The government was also aware of the importance of this source and tried to control and to liquidate the property in line with its policies. Claims of corruption have to be evaluated from this perspective.

In Kayseri sanjak, an important controversy occurred between Zekai Bey, the *Mutasarrıf*, and Cemil Bey, the representative of the CUP in the sanjak (*İttihat Terakki murahhası*), and Şahab Bey, the commander of the military forces in the district (*fırka kumandan vekili*). There were secondary (*tali*) commissions whose members were appointed locally before the establishment of the Abandoned Properties Commission in Kayseri. Cemil Bey and Şahab Bey had been employed in these *tali* commissions. However, the district governor complained that while they had to deliver their duties to the Abandoned Properties Commission after its establishment, Cemil and Şahab continued to be employed at the Commissions for the new chairman of the Abandoned Properties Commission avoided dismissing them. Zekai stressed that the chairman of the Commission was repeatedly asked to dismiss them, but they continued in post, and according to the governor of the sanjak, this led to misconduct within the Commission, and the lower level officials became involved in corruption.⁴⁶³ As a result of the *Mutasarrıf*'s complaints, the Ministry of Interior ordered the removal of Cemil Bey and Şahab Bey from the

⁴⁶³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 498/103 (25 November 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 499/59 (30 November 1915)

commission and a new chairman and members of the commission were appointed.⁴⁶⁴ Ahmet Rıfat Çalika, who was the mayor of Kayseri during the war, also noted the controversy between the *Mutasarrıf* and Colonel Şahab Bey.⁴⁶⁵

A coded telegram, sent to the Ministry of Interior by Zekai Bey, shows the extent of the controversy among these leading figures, which emerged as a result of the Armenian deportation. In this telegram, the district governor accused Cemil and Şahab of immorality stating that these men drank every night with other civil servants. Zekai Bey stated that the people expected virtuous acts from these leading figures of the CUP but they employed the converted Armenian children at the booze nights, and their interest in Armenian women and children was unacceptable. Furthermore, some people threatened the converted Armenians and collected money in the name of the club with which they got into partnership. Zekai Bey blamed Cemil and Şahab for this situation and demanded their removal from their positions to protect government and the Committee (CUP).⁴⁶⁶

Even though the validity of these accusations cannot be proven, it is obvious that there was a great controversy among these leading figures stemming from the question of who would control the process of deportation. It seems that Cemil and Şahab were influential figures who did not recognize the authority of the governor over the deportation and the abandoned properties processes. The governor wanted them removed from their duties to eradicate the existence of a rival authority in the sanjak which could diminish his authority. This controversy is important in showing that the governors and the leading figures in the localities were not a uniform bloc, but rather each figure had his own interests and acted to maximize them.

⁴⁶⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 58/220 (7 December 1915)

⁴⁶⁵ *Ahmet Rıfat Çalika'nın Anıları*, pp. 20-21.

⁴⁶⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 511/90 (1 March 1916). The governor sent another telegram (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 513/7) regarding the same issue on 14 March 1916. He focused on the corruption (*irtikab ve dolandırıcılıkları*) of these men and requested from the Ministry to implement required measures against them.

The Ministry of Interior was also aware of the corruption and illegal practices during the deportation process within the localities. A committee was formed to investigate these claims in Hüdavendigâr, Ankara, İzmit, Karesi, Kütahya, Eskişehir, Kayseri, Karahisar-ı Sahib and Niğde. Such commissions were also established in other regions.⁴⁶⁷

As the mayor of Kayseri during World War I, the memoirs of Çalika provide significant information. Çalika considered that the district governor, Zekai Bey, was constrained since there were no respectable officials and *kaymakams* (governors of *kazas*) to implement the deportation orders.⁴⁶⁸ In Kayseri, even the members of the Liquidation Commission were involved in corruption. It was reported that abandoned goods were found in the houses of Yusuf Bey and Şevki Bey who were members of the Commission. After the investigation of the inspector (*mülkiye müfettişi*), the abandoned properties were restored.⁴⁶⁹ In addition to the member of the Commission, the former governor of Develi, the *kadı*, mufti, district revenue officer (*mal müdürü*) and other officials were all reported as being involved in corruption in the matters of abandoned property and tithes.⁴⁷⁰

The corruption of officials over the abandoned properties was an important subject and the prevention of such situations was repeatedly ordered to the provinces and sanjaks by the Ministry. One dimension of this corruption was related to the Armenian abandoned houses which were occupied by the officials and the local notables for a low price. The Ministry ordered that these houses had to be evicted for the settlement of refugees and immigrants since there were many refugees and immigrants who were in need of

⁴⁶⁷ BOA, MV, 199/35 (29 September 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 58/38 (16 November 1915) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 276-277, 320)

⁴⁶⁸ Çalika stated that because of this situation, Zekai Bey entrusted him with the deportation of Bünyan whose *kaymakam* was described as disturbed (*meczup*). *Ahmet Rifat Çalika'nın Anıları*, pp. 23-24.

⁴⁶⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 531/74 (10 September 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 532/87 (19 September 1916)

⁴⁷⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 535/72 (20 October 1916)

accommodation.⁴⁷¹ Another dimension was the involvement of the officials in the auctions. The Ministry of Interior instructed the provinces, sanjaks and Abandoned Properties Commissions not to give permission for officials to participate in the auctions and purchase abandoned commodities (3 August 1915).⁴⁷²

The enrichment of some people from *emval-i metruke* also gave rise to a reaction within the sanjak and complaints came from Kayseri targeting “war profiteers” (*harp zenginleri*) who took advantage of the abandoned properties. There are many documents regarding war profiteers and their misappropriations of the abandoned properties. They demonstrate that notables of the city, officials and members of the Abandoned Properties Commission took part in this process.⁴⁷³ It is understood from these documents and also from the memoirs of Ahmet Rıfat Çalika (the mayor) that the city notables and officials collaborated to acquire abandoned properties and a group of war profiteers emerged among them. Çalika cites the profiteering allegations against some local notables and officials that chief clerk (*tahrirat müdürü*) Sabri, head clerk of the city commission Nurullah, and local notables İmamzade Reşit, Hayrullah, Taşçızade Ömer with his brothers Mehmet and Hüseyin, Karabeyzade Mustafa, Kürkçüzade Ömer and Germirli Ali Efendi collaborated to decrease the price of the abandoned properties by manipulation and bought these properties at cheaper prices. The accusation dropped due to statute of limitations (*zaman aşımı*) and therefore, not brought before the court. In addition, it was stated that some leading local officials such as Ziya, the Prosecutor, Tevfik, the head of the Kayseri Court Martial, and Halim, the chairman of the Abandoned Properties Commission, abused their positions and purchased the commodities (abandoned properties) which were actually consigned to them. Again this accusation dropped due to statute of limitations and not brought before the court. Allegations of corruption also include the

⁴⁷¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 68/155 (2 October 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 69/148 (1 November 1916)

⁴⁷² Akçam, ‘*Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur*’, p. 216.

⁴⁷³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 531/74; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 532/87; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 535/72; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/133

claim that local notables and officials collaborated to appropriate the commodities of Yazıcıyan store.⁴⁷⁴ Çalıka gives a document about the crimes related to the deportation:

TABLE 12: The Alleged Crimes Related with the Deportation and Investigation Results

Related person	Investigated activity
Governor of Develi, Zeki; Gendarme guard, Muharrem; Gendarme soldiers, Dursun, Hacı Tahir, Melek Gazi, Küçük Süleyman, Ömer, Osman, and İbrahim	Torturing and killing Armenians. Articles 45* and 103** have to be applied.
Governor (<i>Kaymakam</i>) Zeki	Taking money and raping a woman
<i>Mutasarrıf</i> Zekai; Muslim judge of Develi, Sezai; Police officers, Rükni, and Halil; Police commissioner, Asım; Governor of Bünyan, Halil; Administrator of township (<i>nahiye müdürü</i>), Kevkep	Massacring many Armenians or ordering massacre of Armenians. Articles 45 and 170*** have to be applied.
Administrator of township, Celal; Gendarme Noncom (<i>onbaşı</i>), Hüseyin; Noncom Abdurrahman; Ömer; Şükrü; Mehmet	Torture. Article 103 has to be applied.
Local notable, Katıpzade Nuh Naci; tradesmen, Hacı Kamil, and Bıçakçioğlu Mehmet; Police officer, Ahmet	Breaking into the Yazıcıyan store and taking the commodities from there. Article 220**** has to be applied.
Chief clerk, Sabri; head clerk of the city commission, Nurullah; Local notables, İmamzade Reşit, Hayrullah, Taşçızade Ömer and his brothers, Mehmet and Hüseyin, Karabeyzade Mustafa, Kürkçüzade Ömer, and Germirli Ali Efendi	Collaborating to decrease the price of the abandoned properties by manipulation and purchasing these properties of cheaper prices. Article 239***** has to be applied but accusation dropped due to statute of limitations.
Prosecutor, Ziya; the head of the Kayseri Court Martial, Tevfik; the chairman of the Abandoned Properties Commission, Halim	Purchasing the commodities, which were deposited with them, by abusing their positions. Article 82***** has to be applied but accusation dropped due to statute of limitations.
Township director (<i>nahiye müdürü</i>), Osman	Beating some Armenians. Accusation was prescribed.
Yazıcıyan Mihran	Article 65***** has to be applied.

⁴⁷⁴ Ahmet Rifat Çalıka'nın Anıları, pp. 34-35.

Source: *Ahmet Rifat Çalika'nın Anıları*, pp. 34-35.

*Article 45: "If several persons unitedly commit a Jinayet or Junha or if a Jinayet or Junha is composed of several acts and each of a gang of persons perpetrates one or some of such acts with a view to the accomplishment of the offence, such persons are styled accomplices and all of them are punished as sole perpetrators...", *The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code, A Translation from the Turkish Text*, by John A. Strachery Bucknill and Haig Apisoghom S. Utidjian, London, Oxford University Press, 1913, p. 32.

**Article 103: "If any of the members of the Courts or Councils or any of other officials of the State commands or carries out the tormenting or torturing of accused persons in order to make them confess their offence he shall be punished with the punishments of temporary confinement in a fortress and perpetual deprivation of rank and office; and if subordinate officials have done this by order of their superior above them these punishments are carried out with regard to the person making this order; and if the tortured person dies from the effects of it or if any sort of injury or defect befalls one of his limbs in consequence of the torment the punishment for a murderer or wounder is also carried out with regard to the official who has ventured to do this.", *The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code*, p. 80.

***Article 170: "The person who premeditatedly kills an individual or willfully kills one of his ancestors of either sex even though without premeditation is put to death.", *The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code*, p. 125.

****Article 220: "Those who commit theft by making a hole through the wall of or by going up over by a ladder or by breaking or opening with a special instrument or in other ways the window or door of places which, although not places where men reside or connected with any inhabited place, are closed or are circumscribed with walls, are placed in kyurek temporarily. Those who commit theft by way of breaking or of opening with a special instrument the doors of the rooms or safes or bolted boxes or cupboards in a house or in the appurtenances thereof, even though not entered into by making a hole through a wall or by setting up a ladder or by opening with a special instrument, are also placed in kyurek temporarily.", *The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code*, p. 174.

*****Article 239: "Those who by purposely publishing among the people matters which are not true or are of the nature of calumny or by offering a price more than the rate asked for by the vendor, or who, being the principal holders of an article of merchandise or provisions, by leaguering together in order not to sell or not to allow to be sold at more than a certain price that an article or, by adopting other fraudulent ways or means, dare to raise or reduce the prices, which free trade would otherwise settle, of merchandise or goods or of the paper moneys or treasury bonds of the State are punished with imprisonment for from one month to one year and a fine from five Mejidieh gold pieces to one hundred Mejidieh gold pieces is taken; and if the action and conduct stated above takes place in respect of meat, bread, firewood, charcoal or similar provisions or things which are of the primary necessities of the people the punishment stated above is carried out in two-fold.", *The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code*, p. 188.

***** Article 82: "Whoever steals State properties or goods in cash or in kind is, after the thing which he has stolen has been in twofold recovered and taken back from him and delivered over to the Treasury of the State, confined in a fortress for not less than five years and in addition the punishment of perpetual deprivation of rank and office is also awarded.", *The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code*, p. 69.

***** Article 65: "Those who, being of a gang of rebels or ruffians, before making attempts at rebellion or ruffianism or before investigations are commenced report to the officials of the Government those who are accomplices in the offence or who after the commencement of the investigations procure the means of causing the accomplices in the offence to be arrested are exempt from the punishment to be carried out with regard to the others; but they are kept under police supervision for not exceeding two years.", *The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code*, p. 59.

The Ottoman archival documents confirm information given in Çalıka's memoirs in terms of the complaints about the corruption claims regarding above-mentioned local notables such as Nuh Naci Bey, Kürküzade Ömer, head clerk of the city commission, Nurullah.⁴⁷⁵

In addition to these allegations, it has to be taken into account that the sale of the abandoned properties continued for months. For example the movable abandoned properties from the Armenian shops were auctioned in the early 1916. This time between the deportations and sale of abandoned properties was open to corruptions and misuses. Besides, there were many abandoned houses which were not used for the settlement of immigrants or refugees in the first months of the deportation since the main bulk of them came to the sanjak in 1916. This brings the question whether there was an “open pillage” until the implementation of official liquidation. As it shown in the Table 12, there was a claim that Yazıcıyan store was illegally entered by some leading figures and the commodities therein were removed. The governorate of the sanjak also informed the Ministry of Interior about seizure of abandoned properties and the trial relating to these events.⁴⁷⁶

5.8 Conclusion

The deportation process and the struggle over abandoned properties in Kayseri illustrate how local activities shaped the issue of the appropriation of the Armenian abandoned properties. The interaction among different social actors within the localities is a key element to understand the distribution process of the *emval-i metruke*. As seen from the regulations regarding the abandoned properties, the state tried to take the *emval-i metruke* appropriation process under its control. However, this study demonstrates that the socio-economic structure of the localities and the way local actors functioned

⁴⁷⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/54; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/133; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/154; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 627/7; BOA, DH. KMS, 51-1/66

⁴⁷⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 487/118

affected the implementation of this policy. In this respect, the relationship between the local notables and local officials, who were responsible for the implementation process, has to be researched and analyzed further as a significant element affecting the implementation process of these policies.⁴⁷⁷

Archival data and memoirs demonstrate that the deportation of Armenians had a significant impact on Kayseri. First, the sanjak was deprived of an important manpower. Since the Armenians were influential in the commercial and economic production activities in Kayseri, their absence created a vacuum, which was filled by Muslim entrepreneurs. The Armenian shops and properties were sold to them to extremely cheap prices. Thus, the *emval-i metruke* served in the process of the nationalization of the economy. This process also created a struggle over the appropriation of the abandoned properties. City notables, officials and military officers were involved in a controversial scheme over the auction of these properties. The distribution process gave rise to many complaints because of the enrichment of some at the expense of others. The documents exemplify that these war profiteers were accused but not tried at the court. As a result, a new entrepreneur class emerged in Kayseri from among these war profiteers.

It has to be underlined that in a process which witnessed the emergence of such huge assets in the form of abandoned properties and in a process of an official capital transfer from the Armenians to the Muslims, it would be unwise to expect that there would be no corruption. Therefore, the complaints of corruption have to be evaluated in this context. Neither the Ottoman government nor the local authorities were against the transfer of Armenian properties to the Muslims or the enrichment of Muslim tradesmen, but the main concern was the implementation of these transfers in order and in the control of authorities. The complaints of the district governor blaming other influential figures of the district including the CUP representative, local notables and the chair of Court Martial were the examples of a power struggle. The governor

⁴⁷⁷ As Migdal has emphasized: "Rarely can any social force achieve its goal without finding allies, creating coalitions, and accepting accommodations." Migdal, "The State in Society: an Approach to Struggles for Domination", p. 21.

did not want to see the rise of individuals/groups that would be outside his control and authority. Besides, the complaints of individuals from the district against the corruptions in the auction of abandoned properties can be regarded as the reaction of the “losers” who could not manage to appropriate the Armenian properties.

An eye witness report summarizes the process of the disposal of Armenian property in Kayseri:

...the Government promulgated its ‘Emval-i Metrukiye’ law and sent commissions to different parts of the country to care for the property of the deported. This property was gathered from the abandoned houses, and what was not stolen or seized by officials for their own private account, was stored in the churches and later sold by public auction. The proceeds have not yet reached the Armenians...

The next step was to demand, from all who held in their possession property belonging to deported Armenians, all such property. The jewellery, rugs, goods and even the money on account of Armenians in the branch of the Imperial Ottoman Bank had to be delivered to the ‘Emval-i Metrukiye’ commission.

A further step was the deliberate destruction of Armenian property, which went on for months, even years after the deportation. Churches were stapped and desecrated, crosses and bells were taken down, the tomb stones in the courtyards were broken off and used for making a marble fountain at the Government ‘Konak’. Hundreds of houses were torn down and the material sold. Gardens were stripped of their fruit trees which were used as fuel. Villages were filled with refugees from the Caucasus who sold all the grain the store-rooms, took out all windows, doors, window irons and finally even the roof timbers and sold them, and drove off all the herds, leaving the villages heaps of ruins. It speedily became evident that the announced temporary deportation was meant to be a permanency.⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷⁸ NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/32, (January, 1919)

CHAPTER 6

THE ECONOMY AS A CONTESTED TERRITORY: THE TRANSFORMATION OF KAYSERI'S ECONOMIC LIFE AFTER THE DEPORTATIONS (1915-1920)

The economy of Kayseri experienced an important transformation with the outbreak of World War I and the deportation of the Armenians. In order to understand this process, this chapter analyzes both the central government policies regarding the transformation of economic life and their implementation in the sanjak of Kayseri. The rise of the “national economy” policy is important in this context. This provides us a framework to evaluate the aims of the Ottoman government in the economy arena. However, the implementation of that policy in the localities is another subject and this chapter shows that the local actors were not passive agents during the implementation process. Instead they used it to maximize their interests. In this context, first the “national economy policy” and then the utilization of the abandoned properties to Turkify the economy are analyzed.

6.1 The “National Economy” Policy

After the 1908 Constitutional Revolution, the Ottoman cabinets followed a policy of economic liberalism although the significance of securing economic independence was also popularized during this period. Free trade was supported and a protectionist economic policy was not implemented during the first years of the revolution. During this time, the CUP supported the interests of capitalists and large landowners. Even though the new regime tried to expand agricultural production with irrigation projects and credit facilities, there was no attempt to change the agrarian ownership structures with a comprehensive land reform. At the same time, the government encouraged foreign trade and investments. The Unionists believed that if they followed

liberalism and applied rational financial policies, the European powers would renounce the capitulations, however, their expectations did not materialize. Neither the foreign investment greatly increased nor did the European powers agree to abolish the capitulations. Besides, Britain and France did not agree to offer a loan with good conditions to the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁷⁹

As the expectations of the new regime were not fulfilled, the idea of a “National Economy” gained importance especially after the 1913 Coup D’état (*Bab-ı Ali Baskını*). Various intellectuals highlighted the semi-colonized position of the Ottoman Empire and supported a more nationalistic economic policy rather than liberalism. Alexander Helphand, known as “Parvus,” was one prominent protagonist. He wrote a series of influential articles on the importance of nationalist economic policies and the creation of a “national bourgeoisie” in “*Türk Yurdu*” (Turkish Homeland). The journal, established in 1911, was an important and influential mouthpiece of Turkish nationalism. Other thinkers included Moise Cohen (Tekin Alp), Yusuf Akçura, and Ziya Gökalp. They highlighted the importance of a “National Economy” policy in order to liberate the Ottoman Empire from European dominance. The aim of the “National Economy” policy, inspired by the writings of the German economist, Friedrich List, was economic independence which was regarded compulsory for the political independence. The most important component of such a “National Economy” policy was the formation of a “national bourgeoisie” in place of the existing “comprador” bourgeoisie, composed of non-Muslim Ottomans.⁴⁸⁰

⁴⁷⁹ Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, pp. 179-183.

⁴⁸⁰ Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, Ankara, Yurt Yayınları, 1982, pp. 23-35; Jacob M. Landau, *Tekinalp, Turkish Patriot 1883-1961*, Leiden, Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituutte Istanbul, 1984, pp. 11, 17; M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu, “Helphand-Parvus and his Impact on Turkish Intellectual Life”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 40, no. 6 (Nov. 2004), pp. 152-153; Taha Parla, *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 1989, pp. 187-188, 190; François Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*, Ankara, Yurt Yayınları, 1996, pp. 66-67, 71, 93-95; Adanır-Kaiser, “Göç, Sürgün ve Ulusun İnşası”, pp. 22-23; Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, pp. 182-183.

6.1.1 First Attempts to Nationalize/Turkify the Economy

The rise of nationalism and the national economy policy had also influenced the local notables of Kayseri. One of them, Ahmet Hilmi Kalaç, illustrated the impact of these ideas in his memoirs claiming that Ottomanism had lost its legitimacy in the eyes of Kayseri notables. To exemplify this situation, he pointed out that the local newspaper *Erciyes* did not refer to Turks in the early editions. However, the term of “Turkish newspaper” (*Türk gazetesi*) was added to the title of the newspaper starting with the 15th issue. Kalaç stated that the Armenians of the city were disturbed by this term and asked the governor of Kayseri to remove the word Turk from the newspaper title. Kalaç commented that “they aimed to terminate the Turkish entity and soul under the name of Ottomanism as in the old days.” He added that the word Turk was not removed from the newspaper; instead they increased the speed up their national movement.⁴⁸¹

In this context, in his memoirs Kalaç also cites the first attempts to Turkify the economy of the sanjak. According to him, even though the Turks were involved in trade life to some degree, the dry goods trade was in the hands of the Armenians and Greeks in Kayseri. In order to deal with this kind of trade, the Islam Facility Company (*İslam Suhulet Şirketi*) was established by Turks in 1911. However, the name of the company was changed to the Ottoman-Islam Facility Company (*Osmanlı-İslam Suhulet Şirketi*). Kalaç explained this change in terms of the “politics and mentality of the time”. Since Ottomanism was not abandoned in 1911, the term “Ottoman” was added to the name of the company in consideration of the minorities (*ekalliyet*). However, Kalaç asserted “it was not hard to understand from the term of “*İslam*” that the company was restricted to the Turks. It is understood that there is a gradual

⁴⁸¹ Kalaç *Kendi Kitabım*, p. 58. Bülent Akkaya, who has prepared a master thesis about *Erciyes* newspaper, confirms that the term “Turkish newspaper” was added to its title. According to him, Armenians reacted to this term and they began to publish a newspaper, *Majak*, against *Erciyes*. Bülent Akkaya, “H. 1330/M. 1912 Tarihli Erciyes Gazetesinin 14-21’inci Sayıları (Transkripsiyon ve Değerlendirme)”, unpublished MA Thesis, Erciyes University, 2006, p. 17.

tendency for Turkism and an effort to secure an existence in the economic arena.”⁴⁸²

The corporation charter of the company was prepared and many people from Kayseri became its shareholders. The company opened a shop in the winter of 1911. The main founders of the company were Nalbantzade Süleyman Agha, Yedekçizades and Uşakizade Osman Bey. Kalaç emphasized the importance of this development as “in Kayseri, the foundation of the national economy was laid and the first war began with the establishment of this company. The existence of the Turks in the economic realm which had begun to diminish before the Constitutional period in the decline of the Ottoman Empire began to revive.”⁴⁸³

As seen from Kalaç's memoirs, the first attempts to nationalize economy began earlier than 1915; however, the outbreak of World War I provided more opportunities in this respect. In particular, abandoned properties became the most important source to fund the desired national economy and to strengthen of a national bourgeoisie.

6.2 Post-Deportation Transformation of the Economy

6.2.1 Abandoned Properties in the Service of the “National Bourgeoisie”

The CUP government turned to nationalist economic policies with the advent of World War I. Capitulations were unilaterally abrogated on 9 September 1914 which would be valid from 1 October 1914. This act gave the CUP the chance of following its own economic policy since a new trade regime with new customs tariffs was introduced to protect the national production. In addition, the CUP government ended the privileged tax-free status of foreign firms by bringing them under Ottoman laws on 13 December 1914. Besides, the use of Turkish in business transactions and official documents became mandatory on 23 March 1916. The government also

⁴⁸² Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, pp. 62-63.

⁴⁸³ Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, p. 63.

encouraged the development of an entrepreneur class among the Muslim traders, artisans, and even among the bureaucracy. The promulgation of the Law for the Encouragement of Industry (*Teşvik-i Sanayi Kanun-u Muvakkatı*) at the end of 1913 (14 December 1913) had already been an important step in this direction. Muslim businesses were supported by the state in accordance with this law.⁴⁸⁴

War-time conditions brought the appropriate environment for the strengthening of the Muslim bourgeoisie with the emergence of spectacular opportunities for capital accumulation because of the many shortages. The Ottoman center also supported capital accumulation by Muslim businessmen through speculation, resulting in high profits. Earlier the Ottoman Empire had supplied Istanbul with imports from the Balkans and Russia.⁴⁸⁵ The War cut off these imports, and therefore, Istanbul turned to the countryside (Anatolia) for all kinds of provisioning.⁴⁸⁶ The shortages and the rising demand for these supplies gave rise to a black-market.⁴⁸⁷ The main beneficiary of this process were the groups closely associated with CUP cadres for only they had access to means of transportation which was under government control. Muslim merchants and large landowners who secured political patronage gained great

⁴⁸⁴ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat*, pp. 70-83, 171-172.

⁴⁸⁵ Erik Jan Zürcher, "Young Turks, Ottoman Muslims and Turkish Nationalists: Identity Politics 1908-1938", in *Ottoman Past and Today's Turkey*, ed. by Kemal H. Karpat, Leiden, Brill, 2000, pp. 158-9; Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey*, pp. 60-62.

⁴⁸⁶ The close of the Straits during the war and thus cut of the trade with Mediterranean, the entrance of Russia to the war and the rise of flour prices in Rumania gave rise to problems in the supply of provisions for the capital. As a result of this cut in imports, many of the provisions had to be supplied from Anatolia. There would be some imports after the occupation of Serbia and Rumania by the Central Powers, but these would not be in high quantities. Zafer Toprak, *İttihat Terakki ve Cihan Harbi*, Istanbul, Homer Kitabevi, 2003, p. 127, 177; Vedat Eldem, *Harp ve Mütareke Yıllarında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomisi*, Ankara, TTK, 1994, pp. 56, 60-61. Vedat Eldem mentioned the development of flour production around Istanbul and Izmir in that period. Before the war, importation of flour from Russia and Rumania was more profitable than to transfer it from Anatolia because of high transportation costs. However, the flour importation decreased during the war. In December 1915, the Ottomans could import only a sum of flour from Rumania. Eldem, *Harp ve Mütareke Yıllarında*, pp. 40-41, 43.

⁴⁸⁷ For the rise in the prices of basic consumption goods in Istanbul between 1914 and 1919 see Eldem, *Harp ve Mütareke Yıllarında*, pp. 50-51.

profits during this war economy. The Armenian and Greek properties were bought by local Muslims at below market prices. The Armenian deportation opened new economic fields which would be filled by the Muslim entrepreneurs. Consequently, capital accumulation in the hands of Muslim traders, large landowners and artisans increased.⁴⁸⁸

The abandoned property played a critical role in this process. As a central policy, the government ordered the use of these properties for the rise of national companies and to consolidate the position of Muslim tradesmen in the commercial life of the country. The Muslim tradesmen of Kayseri also benefited from the official capital transfer.

On 5 January 1916, the governor of Kayseri sent a telegram to Istanbul stating that Muslim tradesmen had established companies in the sanjak to acquire commercial commodities from among the abandoned property, and proposed the sale of these commercial goods in installments to these companies.⁴⁸⁹ The next day, the Ministry of Interior sent an order to the *vilayets* and *mutasarrıflıks* about the use of the abandoned properties. The order emphasized that the movable abandoned property had to be conserved by the authorities since they would be given to the Muslim companies under suitable conditions. The founders, directors and commercial representatives of these companies were to be selected from respectable citizens. In order to secure the participation of tradesmen and farmers in the establishment of the companies, the stock certificates (*senet*) should be one lira or half a lira. These had to be registered in the name of the shareholders to prevent a takeover of shares by foreigners. The order specified that this policy aimed to promote the growth of commercial life among the Muslim people.⁴⁹⁰ It is evident that the abandoned property had become a vehicle to stimulate Muslim establishments

⁴⁸⁸ Zürcher, “Young Turks, Ottoman Muslims and Turkish Nationalists”, pp. 158-9; Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey*, pp. 60-62; Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*, p. 57.

⁴⁸⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 504/33 (5 January 1916)

⁴⁹⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 59/239 (6 January 1916). BOA, DH.HMŞ, 12/45 included the same order sent to the Liquidation Commissions.

within the country. These establishments emerged as a direct result of government policy.

On 16 May 1916, the Ottoman government reminded the localities of its former orders and stated that the Armenian stores and workshops should not be left unexploited. It ordered the transfer of their commodities to Muslim companies under suitable conditions and for the required assistance be given to the companies. The abandoned property had to be sold to Muslim aspirants.⁴⁹¹

6.2.2 The Establishment of the Joint-Stock Companies

A significant component of the national economy policy to fund the national bourgeoisie was the establishment of joint-stock companies and banks by Turks or Muslims. The CUP had supported the establishment of companies since 1908. Before that date, there had been 86 joint stock companies in the Ottoman Empire. However, from 1908 to 1918 the number of companies rose considerably and 236 companies were established in ten years with 113 being established in the first five years of the Constitutional regime (1908-1913). Both Muslims and non-Muslims became shareholders and foreign investments played an important part in these companies. However, the other 123 companies, which were formed during the war years (1914-1918), were mostly owned by Turkish-Muslims and with only a small share being foreign investment. In 1918, there were 129 Ottoman joint-stock companies in operation with only 9 having been established before 1908.⁴⁹²

Before 1908, most of the joint-stock companies had been established in Istanbul. In Anatolia, there had been no joint-stock company except in Izmir where 5 companies had been formed. With the constitutional regime, the creation of joint-stock companies spread in Anatolia. From the 236 companies formed between 1908 and 1918, 51 were established in the following Anatolian

⁴⁹¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 64/39 (16 May 1916)

⁴⁹² Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat*, pp. 57-8, 62-3. Also see A. Gündüz Ökçün, "1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Anonim Şirket Olarak Kurulan Bankalar", *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri, Metinler/Tartışmalar, 8-10 Haziran 1973*, ed. by Osman Okyar, Ankara, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1975, pp. 409-484.

cities; Izmir (14), Bursa (3), Kayseri (2), Trabzon (1), Konya (12), Erzurum (1), Aydın (2), Yozgat (1), Izmit (3), Karaman (1), Akşehir (1), Ankara (2), Eskişehir (2), Karahisar (1), Kastamonu (2), Manisa (1), Uşak (1), and Edirne (1). 1916 and 1917 were the most active years in the establishment of these companies in the Anatolian cities. Ten companies were founded in 1916, and fifteen in 1917. It is a significant point that these companies remained limited to Western and Central Anatolia. With the exception of Erzurum and Trabzon, there were no companies in the eastern part of the empire.⁴⁹³ Apart from Istanbul and Izmir, “national” companies were most common in Konya. The first national bank in Anatolia was also established in the city which, after the development of irrigation projects for the Konya plain, had become a significant crop production area.⁴⁹⁴

The CUP members were actively involved in the formation of the “national companies”. A significant example was Kara Kemal, the CUP representative in Istanbul (*İttihat Terakki murahhası*). He took the initiative to establish three “national companies” in Istanbul. These companies made an important level of profit during the war years with the backing of the political power of the CUP. National joint-stock companies were also established in the provinces. Due to the war situation, there was a demand for the Anatolian crops and this demand contributed to the accumulation of the wealth of local notables.⁴⁹⁵

Another significant pillar of the “national economy” policy was the foundation of national banks which were regarded essential for the financial independence of the Ottoman Empire. Instead of the Ottoman Bank which became a symbol of foreign financial control and tutelage, the Ottoman National Prestige Bank (*Osmanlı İtibar-ı Milli Bankası*) established in 1917 upon the direct initiative of the CUP by the leading figures of the party; Cavid

⁴⁹³ For the list of the joint-stock companies within the Ottoman Empire see Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*, pp. 355-365.

⁴⁹⁴ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*, pp. 62, 155.

⁴⁹⁵ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*, pp. 58-62.

Bey (deputy of Biga and minister of finance), Hüseyin Cahid (Istanbul deputy) and Tevfik Bey (merchant). The CUP aimed to create a powerful national bank with the shareholders being Ottoman subjects. The Ministry of Finance also contributed to its foundation by buying its shares. The provinces also followed this pattern and local national banks were formed by local notables, land owners and merchants.⁴⁹⁶

6.2.2.1 The Establishment of the Joint Stock Companies in Kayseri

The national economy policy bore fruit in Kayseri since during the war years two joint-stock companies had been established in the city. Whereas there had been no joint stock company in the sanjak before World War I, the Kayseri National Economy Corporation (*Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi*) and Village Economy Bank (*Köy İktisat Bankası*) were founded in 1916. These institutions were formed by local notables, merchants and land owners of Kayseri, but the main feature of these founders was their link to the CUP.⁴⁹⁷ The establishment of the companies in the localities with the initiative of the CUP members was a basic tendency of the period. The main beneficiary of this policy were the people who had money to invest in these companies; in other words the local notables and merchants, who had relations with the Unionists and collaborated with them, mostly benefited from this policy and accumulated considerable wealth. They worked under the protection of the government. The Unionists also benefited from these initiatives.⁴⁹⁸

The *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi* and *Köy İktisat Bankası* clearly exemplify this link. Most of their founders were CUP members. Of the seven founders of the *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi* the following four were

⁴⁹⁶ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*, pp. 137-153; A. Gündüz Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye’de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan Anonim Şirketler, İktisat Eğitim ve Araştırma Projesi Seminer Çalışmaları*, Ankara, 1973, p. 18.

⁴⁹⁷ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*, pp. 157-8, 363.

⁴⁹⁸ Feroz Ahmad, “Doğmakta Olan Bir Burjuvazinin Öncüsü: Genç Türkler’in Sosyal ve Ekonomik Politikası, 1908-1918”, *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, İstanbul, Kaynak Yayınları, 1999, pp. 53-55.

members of the CUP: Kürkçüzade Ömer Efendi (wool and gum tragacanth merchant), Taşçızade Mehmet Efendi (dry goods and livestock merchant), İmamzade Raşit Efendi (carpet merchant and manufacturer), Hacılarlızade Mustafa Efendi (merchant). The other founders were Çalığazade Rıfat Efendi (mayor of the sanjak), Katipzade Nuh Naci (pastirma merchant), and Drazzade Mazhar Nurullah Efendi (head clerk of the council-*encümen başkatibi*, carpet manufacturer).⁴⁹⁹ The founders of the company illustrate the relationship between the CUP, local merchants and local officials. Both the mayor and head clerk of the council participated in the establishment of the company with the leading CUP members who were also important merchants in the sanjak. Thus, the CUP cadres had close connections with the local notables and local officials in the implementation of the national economy policy.

The Company had a wide sphere of activity covering all the financial and commercial activities. It offered advance payment (*avans*) so merchants and peasants could purchase goods and acted as middleman in the sale and purchase of these goods. The company could also embark upon agricultural and industrial enterprises. The *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi* dealt with trade in the first years of its foundation and made a large profit. It was established with a capital of 46,000 Ottoman liras and the following year its capital had risen to 70,000 Ottoman liras. The profit continued to rise and the capital reached 200,000 Ottoman liras within two years of its foundation. The company lost its influence in the market with the end of the war, but it continued to function until 1936 when it was dissolved by the shareholders.⁵⁰⁰

The *Köy İktisat Bankası* was established with the initiative of the *mutasarrıf* Zekai Bey in 1916. This company aimed to solve local credit problems. The peasants were obliged to buy the shares of the bank paying with an amount of wheat or barley. The bank, whose startup capital was 10,000

⁴⁹⁹ Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 43-44.

⁵⁰⁰ Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 44-45; Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat*, p. 157.

Ottoman liras, collected wheat and barley amounting 7,000 liras, and with the rise of grain prices five hundred per cent in 1917, its capital rose to 50,000 Ottoman liras. All its founders were the members of the CUP, they were; İmamzade Mehmet Bey (land owner and livestock merchant), Uşşakizade Osman Zeki Bey (landowner who would be a deputy in the First Turkish National Assembly), Mehdizade Mazhar Bey (gendarme officer), Gözübüyükzade Sabit Efendi (head clerk of the religious court who would be a deputy in the First Turkish National Assembly), and Bahçecizade Hacı Mehmet Efendi (land owner and city councilor). The Bank did not function after the War of Independence and was dissolved in 1928.⁵⁰¹

The report prepared by the manager of the Agricultural Bank (*Ziraat Bankası*) in Kayseri pointed the fact that the crops were given by the villagers as a donation or taken by force. Since there was no document given for the value of these crops, the capital of the company was embezzled by some merchants. The report also explains the situation of the company in 1920:

Some of its founders are deputies in Ankara now, and others are in Kayseri; but none of them has an interest in the company. The company did not issue a share certificate until now, and did not give a document in exchange for the collected crops from the villagers who suffered because of this situation... There is no record of the company and it did not follow any procedures.⁵⁰²

It is a remarkable fact that both of these joint stock companies were established under circumstances of war and made a great profit in that period, however, with the end of the war their activities came to a standstill.

6.2.2.1.1 The *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi*⁵⁰³

⁵⁰¹ Ökçün *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 45-46; Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat*, pp. 153, 156-157.

⁵⁰² Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 46-48.

⁵⁰³ Ökçün stated that the company was founded on 11 July 1916. However, there are documents in the Ottoman archives giving its foundation earlier than this date as the beginning of 1916. Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, p. 426; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 505/86 (16 January 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 507/98 (2 February 1916); BOA,

The district governor of Kayseri, Zekai Bey, stated on 2 February 1916 that he had founded a company in Kayseri with a capital of 30,000 liras. 12,000 of the total capital had been collected and the capital would be ready within a month. The company would deal with all financial and commercial activities. Zekai Bey emphasized that the company was in line with the government order for the transfer and sale of the abandoned properties to the Muslim companies, and he sent a telegram to Istanbul asking them to recommend an able and trustworthy person to be appointed as director of the company.⁵⁰⁴

The Ministry of Interior (*Umur-u Mahalliye Vilayet Müdüriyeti*) replied that it was difficult to find a person who had the necessary skills and expertise to manage a company that had so many activity areas, and asked how much the director would be paid. The Ministry also suggested that one of the shareholders could be appointed as director. This would be more appropriate since the director could be more interested in the welfare of the company if he had a share and the ministry asked the governor's opinion about a suitable candidate from the shareholders. A copy of the corporation charter was also requested.⁵⁰⁵ Zekai Bey replied that the salary of the director would be about twenty to twenty five liras but he had to be competent in commercial and banking activities. In addition, he responded that none of the shareholders was suitable to fill the position. Thus, he needed the Ministry's recommendation for a director. Besides, the appointed director could take a share in the company and this process both would contribute to the wellbeing of the company and also the appointee's personal wealth.⁵⁰⁶ The correspondence between the center and Kayseri about the appointment of the director continued and Zekai Bey requested the appointment of a director to the company urgently since the capital of the *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi* had reached about 45,000

DH.ŞFR, 509/46 (13 February 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/307 (13 February 1916); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 511/83 (1 March 1916).

⁵⁰⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 507/98 (2 February 1916)

⁵⁰⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/307 (12 February 1916)

⁵⁰⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 509/46 (13 February 1916)

liras.⁵⁰⁷ It can be understood from other documents from the Ottoman archives that one of the shareholders, Kürküzade Ömer Efendi, became the director of the company.⁵⁰⁸ It seems that the director changed in the following years, since Attarzade Kamil Efendi was the director by August 1919.⁵⁰⁹

6.2.2.2 The Establishment of the Joint-Stock Companies in Other Districts

Before 1915, the Muslim and non-Muslim Ottomans, and foreigners had participated in the foundation of the joint stock companies. For instance, the *Osmanlı Ticaret Bankası* was established by Ottoman Armenians in 1911. Companies had also been founded by Muslim Ottomans such as *Istanbul Bankası* (1911), *Emlak ve İkrizat Bankası Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi* (1914), *Asya Bankası Anonim Şirket-i Osmaniyyesi* (1914). The joint-stock companies established by both Ottoman subjects and foreigners were generally Istanbul-based. However, after 1915, the joint stock companies were predominantly founded by Muslim Ottoman subjects, such as *Osmanlı İtibar-ı Milli Bankası* (1917), *Milli İktisat Bankası* (1918), *İktisat Anonim Şirketi* (1918) and *İtibar ve Ticaret Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi* (1918). In the localities, there was a close collaboration among the local Muslim merchants, land owners and CUP cadres in the establishment of joint stock companies.⁵¹⁰

This relationship, which was evident in the foundation of joint stock companies in Kayseri, could also be seen in other districts such as Aydın. In 1913, *Aydın İncir ve Himaye-i Zürra Osmanlı Anonim Şirketi* was established, and two of its six founders were members of the CUP (Ethem Bey and Topçuoğlu Nazmi Bey who would be Minister of Commerce in the Republican period). *Milli Aydın Bankası* formed in 1914 was another instance. Half of its twenty founders were also CUP members (Kazım Nuri Bey, Topçuoğlu Nazmi

⁵⁰⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 511/83 (1 March 1916)

⁵⁰⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/154

⁵⁰⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 640/113

⁵¹⁰ For information regarding the banks established between 1909 and 1920 see Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 5-62.

Bey, Necip Bey, Hacı Ömer Efendizade İzzet Bey, Hacı Yapyazade Hafız Ahmet Efendi, Karagözzade Şükrü Bey, Osmanzade Rüştü Bey, Kuşadalı Hacı Mahmudzade Hasan Bey, Balcızade Hamit and Hakkı Beys). The governor of Aydın province also supported the formation of this company, and the Agricultural Bank participated in its foundation.⁵¹¹

Manisa Bağcılar Bankası established in 1917 was another joint stock company that emerged under the initiative of the Unionists. Thirty-five of the 58 founders were CUP members such as Akhisarlı Mustafa Fevzi Bey (deputy of Manisa), Karaosmanoğlu Halit Paşa (head of the CUP in Manisa), Sındırgılıoğlu Mehmet Bey (head of the CUP in Akhisar), and Hasan Vasfî Bey (head of the CUP in Salihli), and also a Jew was among the founders of the company who was also a CUP member (Bohor Gomel Bey). Some Greek grape growers also became shareholders of the company before the Turkish War of Independence. This Bank was established to compete against the foreign and non-Muslim merchants of Izmir involved in the grape trade. These merchants had formed a union and tried to keep grape prices low.⁵¹²

To sum up, there were two types of organizations during World War I. In the first type, the Muslim/Turkish merchants and landowners founded companies in order to solve credit problems and compete with foreign or non-Muslim Ottomans. Most of their founders were CUP members or were close to the CUP; therefore, the CUP took initiative in their formation such as *Manisa Bağcılar Bankası* and *Milli Aydın Bankası*. In the second type, the joint stock companies were not established to solve the credit problems or to compete with other merchants. It was the economic gap emerged after the deportation of non-Muslims led to the formation of these companies. The Muslim-Turkish merchants tried to fill this gap with the organization of companies. The *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi* illustrates this second type. The *Köy İktisat Bankası*

⁵¹¹ Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye’de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 34-37, 159-161. According to Ökçün, this bank was established against the organizations which controlled fig trade in the district.

⁵¹² For the list of its founders see Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye’de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 52-56, and Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*, pp. 161-162.

which was founded directly by the district governor can also be considered in this context.⁵¹³

6.2.3 The Implications of the National Economy Policy

The orders sent from the center to Kayseri about the establishment of companies on the one hand highlighted the importance of the establishment of new companies at the localities. On the other hand, the "profiteering" through these companies and "corruption" stemming from the acquisition of the abandoned properties were criticized. Local governors were charged with preventing such unlawful profiteering especially through the acquisition of the abandoned properties at lower prices than their market value.⁵¹⁴ Even though this attitude of the Ministry of Interior can be seen as contradiction, it seems that the government wanted the transfer of capital to Muslims to be "legal". However, it is evident that in reality this process would not be completed without corruption or profiteering.

One example was the acquisition of the commodities from an Armenian store for 2,000 liras which were sold within two days for 10,000 liras by a Muslim company which had been hastily established. This type of rapid enrichment over abandoned properties was criticized by the center. The Ministry highlighted that even this single event was sufficient to show that the auction of the abandoned properties were not implemented in an appropriate and legal way in Kayseri. It emphasized that the aim of the establishment of Muslim companies was to encourage them to trade and develop Muslim institutions within the country. In conformity with this purpose, the Muslim companies had to be supported as much as possible, however, this support should be provided in accordance with the law and regulations. The abandoned properties had to be offered at auction and the participation of people in the

⁵¹³ Ökçün, *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan*, pp. 162-164.

⁵¹⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/383 (11 August 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/275 (8 February 1916), BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/37 (17 February 1916)

auctions had to be secured instead of giving these properties wholesale and at very cheap prices.⁵¹⁵

Abandoned commodities were transferred to the Muslim companies, but these companies sold such commodities at least twice as much or more than their purchase price, and immediately dissolved themselves after these sales. On 16 February 1916, the Ministry of Interior reiterated the former orders concerning the establishment of Muslim companies. However, it also ordered local authorities to act against trade monopolies and profiteering, and stated that abandoned properties had to be transferred in auctions in accordance with the laws and regulations. Moreover, the participation of the individuals dealing with trades and the other people in the auctions was advised by the Ministry.⁵¹⁶

The way in which Muslim companies were established in the sanjak and the auctions were also described in the reports of the American Missionaries:

Shops were broken open, and the contents sold to Turkish buyers, at ridiculous prices. A company was formed of leading committee people at the head of which was the Mutessarrif (sic.) himself, which bought in the stocks of all the larger jobbing establishments. At the beginning some Greek merchants entered into competition but they were given to understand that it was best to keep out, with the result that the committee sold to the committee stocks of several thousand pounds value for as many hundreds.⁵¹⁷

The company, which the missionary wrote about, was probably the *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi* whose founders were leading Unionists. Arşak Alboyacıyan mentioned this as the *İttihad Şirketi* (the company of the Union) which appropriated underpriced Armenian abandoned properties. He stated that the properties of the rich deported Armenian families were obtained by the local notables in the liquidation process.⁵¹⁸ Profiteering over the *Kayseri*

⁵¹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/275 (8 February 1916)

⁵¹⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/31 (16 February 1916)

⁵¹⁷ NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/32. This report was prepared by an American missionary who was stationed at Talas during the war years.

⁵¹⁸ Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria, Vol. II*, pp. 1420-21.

Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi also became subject of a document from 1919 which was about the trial of the managers of the company in the Court Martial with the allegation of profiteering. The associates of the company were named in the document as the “nouveaux riche” (*yeni zenginler*).⁵¹⁹ For example, Kürkçüzade Ömer, the former director of the *Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi*, had been in need before the war, but in 1919 he was doing business in Istanbul valuing 100,000 liras.⁵²⁰

The Ottoman government was aware of the fact that there were companies that had been established only for the purpose of buying the abandoned properties at extremely low prices and then selling them to higher prices; in other words they did not aim to trade but just profiteering. In the eyes of the government, this kind of corruption would not promote the development of Muslim companies but would serve to enrich some at the expense of others. Therefore, the government warned the district governorate of Kayseri over such abuses and ordered the prevention of the illegal exploitation by companies which had only been founded for profiteering from these properties. Thus, the auction of the abandoned property was ordered to be carried out again.⁵²¹

6.2.4 The Collapse of the Artisanal Production and the Shortage of Labor

The elimination of one of the most significant portion of Ottoman bourgeoisie with the Armenian deportations meant the transfer of their funds to the Muslims and thus gave rise to the enrichment of them with the transfer of Armenian capital. In this respect, this process served the implementation of the national economy policy and the development of the national bourgeoisie especially among the local notables and leading local Unionists. On the other hand, the economic gap emerging as a result of the Armenian deportations caused a shortage of skilled labor in many sectors of the economy which could not be easily filled. The deportation of the Armenians negatively affected trade

⁵¹⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 640/113 (7 August 1919)

⁵²⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/154

⁵²¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/37 (17 February 1916). The documents did not state to whom these companies re-sold these abandoned properties.

and agricultural production in Kayseri. Balakian wrote that the deportation of the Armenians coincided with the harvest period, and therefore, fields full of wheat were not harvested:

The fields of Tomarza, once full of ears of wheat, and the surrounding lands that had belonged to the Armenians now lay fallow and abandoned. There was neither plow handle nor plowman; there was neither plow nor ox fit for harness... We had barely gotten out of town and entered the plain when an extraordinary scene appeared before our eyes. The entire spacious plain was covered with yellowish fields; it was autumn in spring. In fact, the plain was yellow because of the hundreds of unharvested wheat fields. The deportation of the Armenians had coincided with autumn, thus the departing Armenians had been forbidden to reap the harvest.⁵²²

Tomarza had been densely populated by Armenians before the deportation. There had been 3,459 Armenians and only 290 Muslims in the township.⁵²³ The district governorate was also aware of the fact that the harvest would not be reaped because of the deportation of Armenian villagers. Therefore, the governorate demanded the settlement of immigrants in the evacuated Armenian villages to prevent devastation and theft of the harvest.⁵²⁴ However, the number of immigrants sent to Kayseri was vastly inadequate. Already by July 1915, the governorate of the sanjak stated that two thousand immigrant households were needed,⁵²⁵ but, only 260 households could be sent to the sanjak from Ankara province. Since Kayseri needed more, the transfer was demanded of more immigrants from Istanbul or other provinces to the sanjak.⁵²⁶ Under these circumstances, the district governorate requested the settlement of nomadic tribes in the emptied Armenian villages.⁵²⁷ Such kind of

⁵²² Balakian , *Armenian Golgotha*, pp. 180-181.

⁵²³ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40

⁵²⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 476/50; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb., 8/21; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 479/26; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/380; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/9; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/49

⁵²⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/9 (24 July 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/21 (25 July 1915)

⁵²⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 481/49 (27 July 1915)

⁵²⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 487/42

complaints was also sent from other provinces. For example, Dündar stated that Diyarbakır province asked for the transfer of 10,000 immigrants and Sivas province applied for the transfer of 5,000 immigrants to settle in the evacuated villages. However, both of these provinces were informed that there were not enough immigrants to fulfill their wishes.⁵²⁸ It seems that most of the Balkan immigrants had already settled by the beginning of Armenian deportations and thus the number of the remaining unsettled immigrants was not sufficient to meet the demand of provinces.

There were also problems regarding the farms where the Armenians had been tenant farmers. In Kayseri, such a situation emerged about the *Harmancık Çiftliği* when the Armenian tenants of this farm were deported. This meant that the owner of the farm, Lieutenant Necip Bey, could not take the rent from the deported tenants and also there were no tenants left in the farm. To resolve this situation, Lieutenant Necip Bey applied for the payment of the rent from the abandoned properties of these deportees to him, and also he requested the settlement of new Muslim tenant farmers in his farm. The harvest of the farm was reaped by the people who came from the neighborhoods. These people accepted the work of harvesting on condition that they could take a share of the harvest.⁵²⁹

The shortage of labor in agriculture was not only a problem in Kayseri, but also in other provinces and *livas*. In order to resolve the shortage of labor, the labor battalions were channeled into harvesting, however, this was not enough to fill the gap. Therefore, it was planned to utilize the Greek population as the labor force for harvesting and road construction. The Greeks of İzmir,

⁵²⁸ Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, pp. 290-291. Kaiser also confirms that Armenian deportations negatively affected the economic life of Diyarbakır as production in some sectors came to a standstill. Because of the need for skilled craftsmen, conversion of some Armenian craftsmen to Islam was allowed in some sub-districts. Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians*, p. 290.

⁵²⁹ The officials of the Abandoned Properties Commission did not give permission to the entrance of new Muslim tenants to the farm since the confiscation of the *Harmancık Çiftliği* was planned. BOA, DH.İ.UM, 84-2/30

Ankara and Kayseri were included in this plan.⁵³⁰ The remaining Armenians were also considered as a source of labor force, and in Kayseri, they were used in the construction of Bünyan-Yozgat road.⁵³¹

There was a shortage of labor not only in the field of agriculture but also in artisanship after the Armenians had been deported. On 2 November 1915, the Ministry of Interior requested that the provinces and sanjaks inform the Ministry, within one week, about the number of artisans needed in their districts. As stated in chapter 5, Muslim prisoners of war were distributed within the empire to fill the economic gap in artisanship. The Ottoman government expected that prisoners of war would renounce their existing citizenship and accept Ottoman nationality. The local authorities would then supply the prisoners of war with shops, capital and fixed asset in that they could engage in production. The abandoned properties would be utilized in this scheme. Furthermore, the marriage of the prisoners of war with the widows and orphan girls among the Muslim immigrants would be encouraged.⁵³² In response to the telegram of the Ministry, Kayseri sent the following list of needed artisans; four architects, twenty two saddlers, two lumbermen, three pharmacists, 115 ironsmiths, twenty two clockmakers, 222 carpenters, 104 stonecutters, ten yarn dyers, five printers, ten restaurateurs, twenty silversmiths, twelve cutlers, seventy-eight tailors, 107 shoemakers, ten weavers, nineteen blacksmiths and many other craftsmen. In total, there was a need for 1,182 artisans within the sanjak, and materials would be supplied by the district governorate.⁵³³

⁵³⁰ BOA, DH.İ.U.M, 59-1/1-47

⁵³¹ The district governorate stated that the Muslims were also sent to Bünyan for the construction of Bünyan-Yozgat road. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 497/82 (15 November 1915); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 498/19 (19 November 1915)

⁵³² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 57/261 (2 November 1915)

⁵³³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 496/119 (10 November 1915). As stated above, there was shortage of labor not only in Kayseri but other provinces also suffered from this situation. For example, Diyarbakır province demanded 758 craftsmen in reply to this telegram. Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians*, pp. 290-291.

This high number in the list shows that there was a serious shortage of labor in artisan trades. The number of Muslim prisoners of war was not enough to fill the economic gap since only forty-nine Muslim prisoners of war were sent to Kayseri and forty-three of them accepted Ottoman nationality. They were settled in the sanjak, and capital, fixed assets and shops were provided to by the district governorate.⁵³⁴

This demonstrates that the Armenian deportations also mean that important knowledge and skills had been lost. Balakian mentioned the lack of qualified manpower:

We visited with a few local Turks, who were pained to tell us that the town had neither a shoemaker nor a smith to repair a broken plowshare; all the artisans in their district had been Armenians and were deported. Thus the Turks were forced to make a two-day trip all the way to Kayseri to have their shoes repaired-again, by Armenians who had managed to remain there by converting to Islam. But it must be stressed that only 10 percent of the Armenians of Kayseri and the surrounding regions wished to save themselves by Islamization.⁵³⁵

6.3 Conclusion

The economic structure of Kayseri experienced a significant transformation during the war years. The deportation of the Armenians and appropriation of their properties were the basic reasons for this transformation. The Armenian abandoned properties were used to strengthen the Muslim entrepreneurs and fund the national economy policy. The establishment of joint stock companies was one dimension of this policy. Prior to the war there were no joint stock companies, however, two companies were established during the war years with the support and direct involvement of the local authorities and the CUP cadres. These companies did not prosper after the war, since in reality they were used as a vehicle of easy enrichment of the shareholders by acquiring the abandoned properties cheaply.

⁵³⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 518/30 (30 April 1916)

⁵³⁵ Balakian *Armenian Golgotha*, pp. 179-180.

The process created a group of war profiteers who emerged as an entrepreneur class in the coming years. The nouveaux riche, who had accumulated considerable wealth during the war years, came to the fore in the Republican Era as the most influential personalities in Kayseri;⁵³⁶ some even migrated to Adana and became the new entrepreneurs of the industry there.⁵³⁷ Therefore, it can be said that even though long lasting companies could not be formed during the war years, the national economy policy bore fruit in the sanjak with the strengthening of the Muslim entrepreneurs. The transfer of Armenian properties to leading Muslims, in other words the Muslim landholders, merchants and officials, made the rise of nouveaux riche possible.

On the other hand, it seems that the local Muslim entrepreneurs were involved in this process in order to benefit from the central government's policy of official capital transfer from the Armenians to Muslims. They aimed not to "nationalize economy" but to maximize their own interests. In this respect, even though the local actors were articulated in the implementation of the policies and benefited from them, it is evident that there would be no harmony between the targets of the central government and the local actors. Because of that, the "corruption" is an expected aspect of this process.

During the "nationalization of the economy", possibly different implementations in various localities took place. The attempts to "nationalize" economy, from the perspective of the central state, could not be implemented in the same way. The features of the localities need to be considered when

⁵³⁶ Both Ahmet Hilmi Kalaç and Ahmet Rıfat Çalika focus on the period of national resistance and the beginning of the Republic. Kalaç and Çalika refer to some local notables and officials (which were mentioned above as the war profiteers), and describe them as the leading people of the national resistance. Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, pp. 144-159; Ahmet Rıfat Çalika'nın *Anıları*, pp. 36-60.

⁵³⁷ Aslı Emine Çomu evaluates the critical role of the local notables and merchants of Kayseri, who had settled in Adana after World War I and became the leading people in the economic life of the city as the new entrepreneurs of the new regime. She especially emphasizes Nuh Naci Yazgan: "Some of these immigrants from Kayseri actively participated the efforts of the Turkish state considering the formation of a Turkish and Muslim entrepreneur class... Nuh Naci (Yazgan), an Anatolian businessman who attended the Sivas Congress as delegate for Kayseri, was one of the candidates of the Turkish state considering the transfer of the abandoned estates to Turkish businessmen. He was given the duty of the reestablishment of the factory that was formerly known as Simyonoğlu Factory", Çomu, "The Impact of the Exchange of Populations", pp. 96-97.

evaluating the process. The factors such as the socio-economic status of the deportees, their involvement in the commercial and industrial sectors of the locality, and economic structure of the district had a great impact on the rise of different implementations. Therefore, different localities can present different stories concerning the implementation.

CHAPTER 7

THE RETURN OF THE ARMENIANS (1918-1920)

The Ottoman defeat in World War I was definite by the end of 1918. Under these circumstances, the cabinet of Talat Paşa resigned, and on 30 October 1918 the Armistice of Mudros was signed between the Ottoman Empire and Allied powers, followed by the fleeing of Enver, Cemal and Talat Paşas from the empire. From then on, the coming Ottoman cabinets reversed the former policies regarding deportees under the pressure of the Ottoman defeat and the pressure from the allies. In this context, at the end of October 1918, an order was issued to authorize the return of the surviving deportees who were willing to return, and it was sent to the provinces and sanjaks. The deportees who had been previously living in the provinces of Erzurum, Trabzon, Van, Bitlis, Diyarbakır, Mamuretülaziz and the sanjak of Erzincan and wanted to return to their provinces, would be allowed to return after being provided with a secure travel, food and settlement in communication with the local authorities.⁵³⁸ However, it was also instructed that the deported non-Muslims⁵³⁹ who did not want to return would not be forced to return.⁵⁴⁰ On 4

⁵³⁸ There is a controversy regarding the date of this document. There are two dates at the telegram. While the date originally seems to be “18 October 1918”, there is also the number of “20” as the day. The Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives also cites the date of the document “14 Muharrem 1337” (20 October 1918). BOA, DH.ŞFR, 92/187 in *Türk-Ermeni İhtilafı Belgeler (Turkish-Armenian Conflict Documents)*, eds. by Hikmet Özdemir and Yusuf Sarınoy, Ankara, TBMM Kültür Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, 2007, p. 493.

⁵³⁹ During the war, not only Armenians but also Greeks had been deported. While Armenians had been deported out of Anatolia, there was a different deportation policy regarding the Greeks. The Greeks living in the coastal areas of Aegean, Black Sea and Marmara regions had been deported to inner Anatolia, and settled either in Greek villages or in evacuated Armenian villages in these inner regions. For more information see Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, pp. 225-247. For the policies towards the Greeks during the war period also see Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity*, pp. 97-123. Efiloğlu claims that Dündar misunderstood the Greek deportation and opposes his argument regarding the deportation of Greeks to inner Anatolia during World War I. Ahmet Efiloğlu, “Fuat Dündar'ın “Tehcire Gereken ve Hak Ettiği Anlamı Veren Kitabı”: Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi”, *Yücel Dağlı Anısına “geldi Yücel, gitti Yücel. Bir nefes gibi...”*, ed. by Evangelia Balta et al., Istanbul, Turkuaz Yayınları, 2011,

November 1918, the Ottoman parliament abrogated the provisional law of 27 May 1915.⁵⁴¹

Outsider Armenians and Greeks in Kayseri who had come to the sanjak from other districts could also return to their homelands if they wanted to.⁵⁴² The district governorate communicated with the local authorities in the homeland of these deportees for their return.⁵⁴³ In the meantime, the release of the Armenian political prisoners was also ordered.⁵⁴⁴ In line with this order, on 25 January 1919 Kayseri informed the Ministry that all political prisoners in the sanjak had been released.⁵⁴⁵ Even though there is no detail about the number of political prisoners or the nature of their political crimes in this document, it is probable that most were accused of being involved in the “Armenian revolt”.⁵⁴⁶

pp. 177-200. *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi* gives the number of the Greek deportees as 93,088 (4,166 from Istanbul; 58,955 from Edirne; 986 from Çatalca; 13,558 from Hüdavendigâr and 15,423 from Kala-i Sultaniye). Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi*, p. 79.

⁵⁴⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 93/26 (3 November 1918); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 93/142 (13 November 1918)

⁵⁴¹ *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 11. İnikad, (4 Teşrinisani 1334/4 November 1918), pp. 114-116.

⁵⁴² There were more than a hundred Armenians and Greeks in Kayseri who had been deported from a number of districts to the sanjak, such as Boğazlıyan, Erzurum, Kemah, Refahiye, Gümüşhane, Karaman, Zara, Alucra, Erzincan, to Kayseri. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 602/102 (16 November 1918)

⁵⁴³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 603/70 (24 November 1918)

⁵⁴⁴ BOA, HR.SYS, 2569/1 (21 November 1918) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 404.); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 94/61 (5 December 1918); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 95/212 (22 January 1919)

⁵⁴⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 611/123 (25 January 1919).

⁵⁴⁶ A bill of law regarding the amnesty for political prisoners was also negotiated in the Ottoman Parliament in the end of 1918. For the discussions on the bill of law see *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 21. İnikad (5 Kanunuevvel 1334/5 December 1918), pp. 226-238; *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 22. İnikad (7 Kanunuevvel 1334/7 December 1918), pp. 242-242, 244-253; *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 24. İnikad (11 Kanunuevvel 1334/11 December 1918), p. 283; *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 25. İnikad (12 Kanunuevvel 1334/12 December 1918), p. 304.

A report of American missionaries dated January 1919 gives the following information regarding these political prisoners:

On the evidence so gathered some of the leading Armenians were brought to trial before a court martial, condemned to death and hanged, I think it can trustfully be said that the majority of those who suffered in this way (i.e. by hanging) were active in revolutionary propaganda. On the other hand hundreds of men were cast into prison on suspicion, many with or without trial were sent out of prison to be killed on the road and many others were left, even without trial to languish in prison for three and four years. Some of these were still in the Cesarea prison less than two months ago, according to information I have received from there.⁵⁴⁷

Even though the district governorate authorized the return of the deportees, the correspondence between Kayseri and the Ministry of Interior demonstrates that the return process was not so easy for many deportees. There were some Armenians who were not willing to return, and some others were willing to return but could not since they no longer had a house or residence in their hometowns. They were in need of help, and therefore, the district governorate applied the Ministry of Interior for the payment of a daily fee/remuneration to these Armenians and Greeks, who did not or could not return to their homelands. The Ministry also found the payment of a daily fee/remuneration to the needy deportees necessary.⁵⁴⁸ The authorities in Kayseri communicated with the local authorities in the hometowns of the deportees to arrange the return of those who were willing to return. The Armenians who did not want to return to their homeland continued to stay in the sanjak, and a daily fee/remuneration (*yevmiye*) was paid to those in need.⁵⁴⁹

Not only Greeks and Armenians but also Muslim prisoners of war who had assumed Ottoman nationality and were settled in the Ottoman territories were left free to return to their countries. However, the condition was that they

⁵⁴⁷ NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/32

⁵⁴⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 604/51 (2 December 1918); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 94/124 (14 December 1918)

⁵⁴⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 611/123 (25 January 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 612/57 (27 January 1919)

had to give back all the properties they had been allocated; such as their land, capital, workshop and house.⁵⁵⁰

By 19 March 1919, the total number of returnees within the empire (both Armenian and Greek) was 232,679⁵⁵¹ reaching 276,015 by the beginning of June 1919.⁵⁵² A report of the US consul in Aleppo, dated 31 May 1919, gives the following information regarding the number of returnees from the Aleppo district:

Up to date 36,319 have been returned to their homes, the numbers and destinations being as follows, viz: Constantinople: 2,518, Smyrna: 65, Konia: 234, Adana: 10,056, Mersina: 663, Tarsus: 368, Osmania: 309, Sis: 691, Hadjin: 1,518, Dortyol: 1,022, Ekbez: 150, Hassan Beyli: 690, Aintab: 4,221, Marash: 4,825, Killis: 491, Antioch: 499, Alexandretta: 1,097, Beylan: 29, Islahia: 247, Hamidia: 165, Kars Bazaar: 386, Beredjik: 31, Kessab: 44, Aleppo: 1,027, Ourfa: 1,382: Mardin:78, and through other channels, and for destinations impossible to stipulate, 3,513. A great many more have been able to return to their native country, on their own resources, and of which no account can be kept. It is estimated that there are still about 15,000 deported Armenians and others in the city of Aleppo.⁵⁵³

The newspaper, *İleri*, stated on 3 February 1920 that the total number of Armenians and Greeks, who returned to their homeland with the help of the government, was 335,883.⁵⁵⁴ Even though we do not know how many of these returnees were Armenian, it is claimed by Günaydın that the number of Armenian returnees was about 300,000-400,000 including those who returned

⁵⁵⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 95/206 (22 January 1919)

⁵⁵¹ BOA, BEO, 341903_3-4 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 465.).

⁵⁵² BOA, HR.SYS, 2487/10 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 489.).

⁵⁵³ NARA, RG 59, 867.00/897

⁵⁵⁴ *İleri*, no: 745, 3 February 1920

by their own means.⁵⁵⁵ Dündar states that the number of returnee Greeks was given as 140,000 in a report by the “Greek Relief Commission”.⁵⁵⁶

Like the number of the total returnees within the empire, the number of Kayseri Armenians who returned to their homeland is not exactly known. I could not find any information about this number in archives. However, if the total number of returnees was approximately 300,000-350,000⁵⁵⁷ at best, the number of returnees in Kayseri would still not be that high compared to the total number considering that the number of Kayseri Armenians in other provinces and *livas* except Kayseri was only 6,979 according to *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi* (probably in 1917). It is also possible that some of those had died by the end of 1918.

The return of Armenians also meant the rise of new problems for many deportees since this process led to new issues; such as the delivery of Armenian women and children to the Armenian community, restitution of the abandoned properties and flight of the non-Muslim population to coastal cities.

7.1 The Delivery of the Armenian Women and Children

The fate of the Armenian women who married Muslims became a significant problem at the end of the war. The Armenian community wanted these women to be returned to their community. Nevertheless, their return was not easy considering that many had been living in the Muslim households for nearly four years and had children. The return of these women to their community would mean leaving their children behind.

⁵⁵⁵ Adem Günaydın, “The Return and Resettlement of the Relocated Armenians (1918-1920)”, MA thesis, METU, 2007, pp. 42-43.

⁵⁵⁶ Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, pp. 245-246.

⁵⁵⁷ Before the Treaty of Sevres, the Armenian Patriarchate claimed that by 1921 there were 644,900 Armenians in the Ottoman lands. Hikmet Özdemir, Kemal Çiçek, Ömer Turan, Ramazan Çalık, Yusuf Halaçoğlu, *Ermeniler: Sürgün ve Göç*, Ankara, TTK, 2004, pp. 120-126. Dündar thinks that these numbers did not reflect the reality, and in fact the number of returnees was smaller. He asserts that the Armenian Patriarchate gave high numbers regarding the remaining Armenians in order to demonstrate that there was enough number of Armenians for the establishment of great Armenia. On the other hand, the Istanbul government also gave higher numbers to alleviate the pressure of the Allied powers. Dündar, *Kahir Ekseriyet*, p. 208.

On 21 October 1918, the Ministry of Interior took an important decision about the converts and instructed that the individuals, who had been converted to Islam by force, oppression or fear, were free to return to their original religion.⁵⁵⁸ Within this framework, on 8 February 1919, the conversion of Armenians under the age of twenty was declared null. The register of these converts had to be corrected as Armenian. For the conversion of Armenians over twenty, the converts were free to decide whether they would return to their former religion.⁵⁵⁹

On 28 November 1918, the Ministry of Interior instructed the local authorities that Armenian women, who had married Muslims be returned to their families, and since the Ottoman Constitution (*Kanun-i Esasi*) adopted the freedom of conscience, women were also free to return to their former religion. However, such reconversion meant that their marriage would no longer be valid and they had to be delivered to their families. For other situations the courts decided what to do.⁵⁶⁰ For instance, if a woman who wanted to return to her former religion did not want to get a divorce from her husband, the courts decided what was to be done.⁵⁶¹ While some Armenian women were allowed to return to their communities leaving their Muslim husbands behind, some others did not want to leave. In such cases, the Ministry of Interior, against the pressure from the Armenian community, ordered the local authorities not to force Armenian women to divorce if they did not want to leave their Muslim husbands.⁵⁶²

⁵⁵⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 92/205 (21 October 1918), cited in İbrahim Ethem Atnur, *Türkiye’de Ermeni Kadınları ve Çocukları Meselesi (1915-1923)*, Ankara, Babil Yayıncılık, 2005, p. 173. This order was repeated on 5 November 1918. BOA, HR.SYS, 2569/1_5 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 400.).

⁵⁵⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/100 (8 February 1919)

⁵⁶⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 93/300 (28 November 1918)

⁵⁶¹ BOA, BEO, 341055 (18 December 1918), (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 415).

⁵⁶² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 99/110 (10 May 1919) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 485.)

The obligatory delivery of the Armenian women and girls under the age of twenty to their communities caused problems in Kayseri where the district governorate stated that the Armenian religious authorities in the sanjak requested the delivery of these girls without seeking their consent, and in this context the governorate asked for the confirmation of the related order on 31 July 1919.⁵⁶³

On 7 August 1919, the district governorate addressed the issue again. In Efkere, there were ten converted Armenian women. The Armenian religious authorities proposed reconversion to Christianity but these women did not want to leave Islam stating that they had Muslim husbands and children. However, two of these women were under twenty years old, and the Armenian religious authorities insisted on their delivery even if they did not want to return to their community. The district governorate asked the Ministry of Interior for an opinion about this issue.⁵⁶⁴

The British documents also pointed out the problems about the return of Islamized women:

It is believed that the majority of the Christian children who were in Moslem houses have been returned, but the same cannot be said of the women. Independently of the unwillingness of Moslems to surrender women who are inmates of their houses and have at least outwardly professes their faith, difficulty is often encountered in persuading the women themselves to return to their families. In some cases they are terrorized into declaring falsely that they are contented with their lot; in others, and especially when they have borne children to their Moslem masters, they have fear a cold reception from their own community, with very little prospect of a happy family life.⁵⁶⁵

Another important issue in the return process was the delivery of Armenian girls and children that were forcibly held in the Muslim households or orphanages. The Ministry of Interior addressed the issue on multiple

⁵⁶³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 639/129 (31 July 1919)

⁵⁶⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 640/127

⁵⁶⁵ “Admiral Calthorpe to Earl Curzon, Constantinople, 30th July, 1919”, in Bilal Şimşir, *İngiliz Belgelerinde Atatürk (1919-1938), Vol. I* (April 1919-March 1920), Ankara, TTK, 1992, p. 57.

occasions, first on 21 October 1918 and then in November 1918, ordering the immediate delivery of these Christian girls and children to their families and relatives or to their community.⁵⁶⁶

On 18 January 1919, the Ministry of Interior ordered the local administrations either to return the Armenian children to the Armenian community organizations where available, or to undertake their protection where there was no such organization. The local administrations also were to inform the Ministry about this issue.⁵⁶⁷ In reply, Kayseri informed the Ministry that the Armenian orphans were delivered to a commission which was formed by leading Armenians, and they were supplied with food. Some Armenian girls and children, who were staying with Muslim families and notables, wanted to continue staying with these Muslim families until the arrival of their families or relatives. Also, the related people were notified of the permission for the return of converts to their former religion, and some leading Armenians changed their registry on this basis.⁵⁶⁸ In another report, the Ministry of Interior stated that the Armenian orphans in the Talas and Kayseri orphanages were delivered to a commission formed by Armenians.⁵⁶⁹

However, the correspondence between Kayseri and the Ministry of Interior shows that there were significant complaints in the sanjak regarding Armenian orphans and children: “It is reported and complained that Armenian orphans are in a miserable state in Kayseri; the converts were not set free, children who are with the Muslim families are still not delivered to their communities and people’s needs were not met.” On 26 January 1919, the Ministry ordered the local authorities not to give rise to such complaints.⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 92/196 (21 October 1918), cited in Atnur, *Türkiye’de Ermeni Kadınları ve Çocukları Meselesi*, p. 133; BOA, HR.SYS, 2569/1_1 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 401-403.)

⁵⁶⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 95/163 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 427-428.)

⁵⁶⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 611/45 (21 January 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 611/123 (25 January 1919)

⁵⁶⁹ BOA, DH.EUM.ECB, 21/63

⁵⁷⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 95/261 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 444.)

The district governorate addressed the issue the next day and stated that more than 250 Armenian orphans were delivered to the commission of the Armenian community, and their food was supplied on a regular basis. The Armenian children staying with the notables began to be returned to their families and relatives regardless of their wish to stay with these notables.⁵⁷¹

The Ministry of Interior continued to issue orders about the delivery of Armenian children and converts, and sent these orders to the local authorities. The Ministry was informed that in some districts Armenian children and converts held by the Muslim families for their safekeeping had not yet been delivered to their families or their religious leader despite the notification for the delivery of children and converts. The Ministry repeated on 1 February 1919 that these children had to be delivered to related persons immediately.⁵⁷²

By the beginning of February 1919, around 440 Armenian orphans, girls and women had been delivered to the commission in Kayseri. However, it was also stated that there was a problem in the administration of the commission since it did not have a religious leader (*reis-i ruhani*), as a result of which, according to the district governorate some children wanted to remain in the households of the families with which they were staying. These children were temporarily left to stay with these families in line with their demands.⁵⁷³ However, the continuation of the problem about the delivery of the Armenian girls and children staying with the Muslim families led the Ministry of Interior to issue another order on 5 February 1919 stating that the Armenian girls and children staying with the Muslim families had to be immediately taken from these Muslim households and delivered to the commission formed by Armenians.⁵⁷⁴ The pressure from Allied powers on behalf of Armenians was a

⁵⁷¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 612/57 (27 January 1919)

⁵⁷² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/15 (1 February 1919)

⁵⁷³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 613/52 (4 February 1919)

⁵⁷⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/76 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 448.)

significant factor in these decisions of the Ottoman government regarding the Armenian girls and children.⁵⁷⁵

Simultaneously, another problem emerged about the orphans. Some Muslim orphans,⁵⁷⁶ assumed to be non-Muslim, were also delivered to the Armenian community. While ordering the freedom of religion for the non-Muslim children, girls and women, and the compulsory delivery of younger children to their communities' religious leaders, the Ministry of Interior strictly prohibited the delivery of Muslim orphans to the non-Muslims.⁵⁷⁷ In this respect, the delivery of 220 Muslim orphans from Kayseri to the Armenian Patriarchate on 26 May 1919 was widely criticized.⁵⁷⁸

In order to overcome such problems, the Ministry of Interior addressed this issue again on 23 September 1919 and instructed the district governorate of Kayseri to prepare a detailed account book showing that the orphans of the refugees were Muslim. In addition, this book had to be signed by the representatives of the Allied countries in the sanjak. Muslim orphans could be sent to the orphanage in Istanbul after the completion of these procedures to prevent the occurrence of any related problems.⁵⁷⁹

The questions about the nationality of Kayseri orphans were also addressed in the Ottoman Parliament in February 1920. The Kayseri deputy Rıfat Bey asked about the fate of Muslim orphans taken by the Armenian Patriarchate claiming that they were Armenians. In reply to the question of Rıfat Bey, the Minister of Education explained that around 320 orphans had been gathered in Kayseri but the Municipality could not afford to supply food for them. Therefore, the district governorate applied to the Ottoman

⁵⁷⁵ Atnur, *Türkiye'de Ermeni Kadınları ve Çocukları Meselesi*, p. 151.

⁵⁷⁶ According to a report from August 1917, there were 1,294 orphans in the city. Some of them were non-Muslim, and the rest were orphans of the Muslim immigrants and refugees. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 562/2 (8 August 1917)

⁵⁷⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/248 (20 February 1919)

⁵⁷⁸ Atnur, *Türkiye'de Ermeni Kadınları ve Çocukları Meselesi*, p. 161.

⁵⁷⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 103/220 (23 September 1919)

government to send the orphans to Istanbul. Upon their arrival in Haydarpaşa, these orphans were taken by the representatives of Allies, and delivered to the Armenian Church in Beyoğlu. More than two hundred were given back to the Ottoman authorities since they were Muslims, but the rest were taken by the Armenian Patriarchate claiming that they were Armenians. The Minister also underlined that procedures were still going on regarding the return of the orphans who were assumed to be Muslims but held by the Patriarchate.⁵⁸⁰

In the years to come, Kayseri became an orphanage center under the supervision of Near East Relief (NER):

One of the largest centers of orphanage activity in Anatolia is in and about Talas. Permission has been secured to remove the Armenian Orphanage from Yozgat to Cesarea [Kayseri]. A new Turkish Orphanage has been opened at Zingedere under the direction of Dr. Hassan Ferid Bey. The Turkish children formerly in the orphanage at Talas are being removed to Zingidere.⁵⁸¹

The number of orphans within Anatolia Area is recorded as follows in a report of NER dated 1 June 1922:

⁵⁸⁰ *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.4, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.1, 10. İnikad (16 Şubat 1336/16 February 1920), p. 103; *Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.4, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.1, 17. İnikad (1 Mart 1336/1 March 1920), p. 303. According to Lerna Ekmekçioğlu, one side of keeping these Muslim children with the Armenian orphans could be explained as a kind of revenge against the sufferings of the Armenian community during the war years. She cited the memoirs of an orphan who tried to Armenianize a Muslim child at the Yesayan Orphanage: “They Turkified thousands from among us. Now it is our turn to at least Armenianize one among them.” However, it was not only related with revenge, but there was also a “war of statistics” on the basis of Wilsonian self determination principle. Lerna Ekmekçioğlu, “A Climate for Abduction, a Climate for Redemption: the Politics of Inclusion during and after the Armenian Genocide”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 55, no. 3 (2012), pp. 542-543.

⁵⁸¹ NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/588. In another report dated 1 September 1921, the number of total orphans in Kayseri was recorded 3,190 (2,755 Armenians, 260 Greeks and 175 Turks). NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/433.

TABLE 13: The Distribution of the Orphans in Turkey by June 1922

Station	Total	Armenians	Greeks	Turks	Jews	Others
Adana	154			154		
Ankara	69	69				
Kayseri	2,986	2,176	360			
Kayseri homes	851	851				
Zincidere				250		
Istanbul / Central Com.	9,399	3,917	1,652	3,650	180	
Istanbul / Case Com.	5,626	1,928	1,639	544	1,418	97
Miss Cushman	831	831				
Harput	4,330	3,176		267		
Harput/Malatya		137	750			
Konya	810	725	20	55		
Konya/homes	41	41				
Merzifon	547	354	191			
Samsun	1,459	397	833	229		
Sivas	3,276	1,340	666	525		
Sivas/homes		745				
Trabzon	319	146	116	57		
	30,698	16,833	6,427	5,731	1,598	99

Source: NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/588

7.2 The Flight of the Armenian Population

One of the significant features of the return process in Kayseri was the flight of the Armenian population from the sanjak. Just after the permission was granted for the return of deportees in October 1918, the non-Muslim population of Kayseri began to apply to the local authorities to obtain travel cards or secretly took flight.⁵⁸² By the end of January 1919, Kayseri pointed out that after the permission for the free travel of Armenians, the Armenians and converts in the city were left free to travel. Thus, every day 20-30 Armenian or converted families from the population of the sanjak applied to acquire travel cards to go to Istanbul, Izmir and Adana. From December 1918 to the end of January 1919, more than two hundred people obtained travel cards, and there were also many families who secretly emigrated. The governor

⁵⁸² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 603/106 (26 November 1918). The document did not specify whether these Armenians were returnees or remaining Armenians.

did not favor this population movement since he evaluated it as a kind of migration, and asked Istanbul what to do about this tendency to go to central cities such as Istanbul, Adana and Izmir.⁵⁸³ The Ministry of Interior shared the opinion of the governor and confirmed that this mass movement of the local Armenians is a kind of inner migration. Therefore this population movement had to be prevented and the reasons had to be investigated. The Ministry also instructed not to prevent individual trips.⁵⁸⁴

When the district governor investigated the reason for this flight, Armenians who had gone to Adana, Izmir and Istanbul stated that they wanted to go to make a living. But the governor found a relationship between their flight and the gathering of Armenians in Adana.⁵⁸⁵ Besides, the growing insecurity in the localities triggered the migration of the Armenian population to the coastal areas:

The state of public security goes from bad to worse, and as has already been stated in recent reports the spread of the “National Movement” has given a fresh impetus to outlawry and brigandage, the forces of which are now being enlisted in a Crusade nominally for the defense of Turkish independence.

...The returned refugees are either unable to recover their lands, or fear to cultivate them owing to the prevailing insecurity. They complain that they are boycotted by their Moslem neighbors and their tendency is to return to the coast towns...⁵⁸⁶

Being a neighbor city to Kayseri, Adana became a center of the Armenian-Turkish clashes⁵⁸⁷ and the rise of conflict within the region

⁵⁸³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 609/24 (21 January 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 611/123 (25 January 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 612/57 (27 January 1919)

⁵⁸⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 95/277 (31 January 1919) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 445-446).

⁵⁸⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 613/16 (2 February 1919)

⁵⁸⁶ “Admiral Calthorpe to Earl Curzon, Constantinople, 30th July, 1919”, pp. 56-57.

⁵⁸⁷ The Armistice of Mudros was signed on 30 October 1918. Afterwards, the French forces occupied the Cilicia region in December 1918 in line with the 1916 Sykes-Picot Agreement. The clashes between the Armeno-French forces and Muslims began just after the occupation. The area remained under the French occupation until the evacuation of the French forces in the

prompted the population movement. There were rumors that the Muslims of Kayseri prepared to massacre the Armenians which caused the Armenian population to flee from the sanjak.⁵⁸⁸

It is understood that complaints were sent from the sanjak regarding the deterioration of public order. Kayseri claimed that there was no such situation within the sanjak. The district governor believed that the Armenians and Greeks propagated in this line. According to him, the few incidents of robbery, larceny and brigandage were due to the inadequate number of gendarmes that were not enough to prevent such events. The district governor asserted that if there was a discontent among the leading people, this would be related with the fact that the Unionists were still powerful in the district among the government officials and notables. These people were not happy with the existing situation and hoped for the re-rise of the CUP.⁵⁸⁹

The existence of many Armenian immigrants in Adana gave rise to overcrowding and housing problems in the city. The rush of Armenians to the district exacerbated the problem. Therefore, the Ministry of Interior warned the authorities in Kayseri, Konya and Niğde to investigate the original homeland of the Armenian and Greek immigrants and not to accept their application to go anywhere apart from their homeland.⁵⁹⁰ In reply to this telegram, Kayseri informed the Ministry that there were no Armenian or Greek immigrants within the sanjak. Nevertheless, the local Armenian and converted families applied to get travel cards and then left the city. Some had also left secretly. It was pointed out that travel cards would no longer be given to the Armenians and converts who wanted to go to Adana.⁵⁹¹

end of 1921. For more information see Kemal Çelik, *Milli Mücadele'de Adana ve Havalisi (1918-1922)*, Ankara, TTK, 1999.

⁵⁸⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/98 (8 February 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/313 (26 February 1919)

⁵⁸⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 627/80 (28 April 1919)

⁵⁹⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 97/41 (4 March 1919)

⁵⁹¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 619/42 (6 March 1919)

Furthermore, the sanjak notified the Ministry that there were Muslim and Armenian gangs around the region.⁵⁹² Some instances of killings of the Armenian people also occurred within the region.⁵⁹³ On 19 August 1919, the district governorate of Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior that the Armenians were afraid of possible Muslim attacks because of the rise of Bolshevik ideas and the clashes at the Ottoman-Armenian border. Such fears led to the emigration of Kayseri Armenians to Istanbul, Konya and Adana.⁵⁹⁴ In view of such rumors and the tendency of local Armenians to emigrate, the Ministry of Interior asserted that all rumors were untrue: “the aim of people who encourage Armenians to migrate is to call for the intervention of foreign countries showing that the security in Anatolia is violated.” The Ministry requested an investigation be made on people who encouraged Armenians to migrate by untrue intelligence. Moreover, the local authorities had to pay special attention to maintain order and provide security of life and property without exception.⁵⁹⁵

The American Missionary H. K. Wingate confirms the flight of the non-Muslims from the sanjak: “Christians, whether Greek or Armenian, feel very anxious, and continue to emigrate as fast as possible.”⁵⁹⁶ The change in the local administration triggered another wave of emigration:

A few days ago we had a complete overturn of the local government here, Emr Ullah, a military officer and member of Mustapha Kemal’s party being in charge of both the civil and military departments. This change has caused a panic among the subject races and by day and by night both Greeks and Armenians are leaving for the South...Only the orphans and

⁵⁹² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 640/10 (1 August 1919)

⁵⁹³ BOA, DH.KMS, 50-2/40 (18 August 1919) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 500).

⁵⁹⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 642/68 (19 August 1919)

⁵⁹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 102/189 (19 August 1919)

⁵⁹⁶ ABCFM, reel. 636 (Talas, Cesarea, Turkey in Asia, H. K. Wingate, August 18, 1919)

the poor who cannot provide for the expense of the journey will remain here.⁵⁹⁷

Commander Emrullah Bey, the conscription inspector (*Ahız-ı Asker Kalem Müfettişi*), was the contact person between Mustafa Kemal Paşa and Kayseri.⁵⁹⁸ Wingate thought that the emigration of the non-Muslims could only be stopped if their security of life and property could be guaranteed.⁵⁹⁹

In the coming days, the mass migration of the Armenians to Adana became the focus of official correspondence. The Muslim population of Adana applied for the prevention of the Armenian migration because of the beginning of clashes between Armenian mobs and Muslims around Sis, and the distribution of arms to the Armenians by the French.⁶⁰⁰ The Wilsonian principles set forth the right of sovereignty for the Turkish parts of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, constituting majority became important for Turks and Armenians.⁶⁰¹ In line with this principle, Adana gained significance. While Armenians tried to gather in Adana, the Ottoman authorities tried to prevent the formation of an Armenian majority in the district. On 29 September 1919, the Ministry of Interior ordered Kayseri to prevent Armenians, who were not Adana Armenians, from going to Adana.⁶⁰² Such orders were also sent to other provinces and *livas*.⁶⁰³

⁵⁹⁷ ABCFM, reel. 636 (The American School for Boys, Rev. Henry K. Wingate, Talas Cesarea, September 18, 1919)

⁵⁹⁸ Kars, *Milli Mücadelede Kayseri*, p.19. Emrullah Bey was appointed to Kayseri by the beginning of September 1919 to replace Fehmi Bey. *Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Kataloğu*, 754/301/85 (30 August 1919), 986/304/39.

⁵⁹⁹ ABCFM, reel. 636 (The American School for Boys, Rev. Henry K. Wingate, Talas, Cesarea, September 21, 1919)

⁶⁰⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 649/39 (25 October 1919)

⁶⁰¹ For more information see Dündar, *Kahir Ekseriyet*, pp. 171-241.

⁶⁰² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 104/106 (29 October 1919)

⁶⁰³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 104/182 (From the Ministry of Interior to Mamuretülaziz, 9 November 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 104/229 (From the Ministry of Interior to Diyarbakır, 16 November 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 104/265 (From the Ministry of Interior to Eskişehir, 22 November 1919); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 106/121 (From the Ministry of Interior to Mamuretülaziz, 25 January 1920)

While the migration of Armenians tried to be prevented, Kayseri was instructed to transfer the immigrants to Adana. But the district governorate informed the Ministry that there was no immigrant population in the sanjak but, there were local Greeks and Armenians who wanted to go to cities such as Adana and Izmir. Since these were among the local population of Kayseri sanjak, the district governorate wanted to know how to respond to these Greeks and Armenians who wanted to go to these cities.⁶⁰⁴

The British reports had significant information regarding this flight and also the number of returnees:

In consequence of the situation in the neighborhood of Kaisariyeh, a number of Armenians and some Greeks have been taking refuge in Cilicia. On Sept. 30th there were 1,600 of these at Adana and 600 at Tarsus. Besides these 5,700 Armenians in the course of repatriation to the North are held up at Adana making a total of 7,900 Armenian refugees in Cilicia.⁶⁰⁵

Many of the Kayseri Armenians left the city during this process. The district governorate only tried to prevent their migration to Adana in line with the orders of the central government.⁶⁰⁶ From the beginning of June 1919 to 8 November 1919, 958 Armenians left the city selling their houses and properties⁶⁰⁷, and 64 Armenians went to other provinces from the *kazas* (Develi, Bünyan and İncesu) of Kayseri.⁶⁰⁸ After receiving this information about the migrant Armenians, the Ministry of Interior instructed Kayseri to

⁶⁰⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 650/73 (5 November 1919)

⁶⁰⁵ “Enclosure in no. 81, Precis of a Report by the Chief Administrator on the Situation in Cilicia during the first week of October 1919”, FO, 371/4185, in *İngiliz Belgelerinde Atatürk (1919-1938), Vol. I*, p. 228.

⁶⁰⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 650/43 (6 November 1919)

⁶⁰⁷ 258 Armenians went to Istanbul, 37 went to Izmir, 64 went to Konya, 105 went to Ereğli, 304 went to Adana, 59 went to Tarsus, 106 went to Mersin, 7 went to Aleppo, 13 went to Karaman and 7 went to Çankırı from the Kayseri city. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 650/101 (9 November 1919). The total of them was 960.

⁶⁰⁸ 56 of these Armenians went to Istanbul, 4 went to Eskişehir, 1 went to Tarsus and 3 went to Ereğli from these counties. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 651/32 (15 November 1919).

authorize the travel of Armenians who had acquired travel cards before the prohibition decision of the Ministry about the travel of Armenians to Adana. It is understood that there were 44 Armenians in this case.⁶⁰⁹

On 24 February 1920, the district governorate informed the Ministry about the flight from Develi. According to the *kaymakam* of Develi, some Armenians used their travel cards to leave the county to go to Istanbul (70 Armenians), Eskişehir (4 Armenians), Adana (16 Armenians), Mersin (1 Armenian), Konya (1 Armenian), Ödemiş (1 Armenian), and Ereğli (3 Armenians). But most of the migrant Armenians, approximately seven hundred, secretly fled the county without travel cards to go to Adana and Haçin.⁶¹⁰

7.3 The Restitution of the Abandoned Properties

With the return of Armenians, the restitution of the Armenian properties was brought to the agenda of the Ottoman government and related orders were sent to the localities. For example on 28 October 1918, the Ministry of Interior ordered the province of Diyarbakır to evacuate the abandoned properties as the Armenians returned and also to prevent the destruction of these properties.⁶¹¹ However, in some districts the properties abandoned by Greeks and Armenians were destroyed, upon which the Ministry had to issue a further warning for the provinces and sanjaks to prevent such events.⁶¹² In addition, the community properties of the Armenians; such as schools, chapels and other similar institutions, which had been occupied during the war, had to be evacuated and given back to their community as quickly as possible.⁶¹³

⁶⁰⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 105/32 (3 December 1919)

⁶¹⁰ According to the *kaymakam* of Develi, approximately one hundred Armenians had come to Kayseri from the Adana region but they secretly returned to Adana. In addition to them, seven hundred Armenians migrated to Adana and Haçin. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 659/98 (24 February 1920)

⁶¹¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 92/285 (28 October 1918)

⁶¹² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 93/31 (November 1918)

⁶¹³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 93/108 (9 November 1918); BOA, HR.SYS, 2569/1_1 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, p. 402)

The restitution of the abandoned properties was also implemented in Kayseri. By 7 November 1918, 69 houses in Kayseri city had been evacuated and prepared for the returnees. The district governorate stated that 5 of these properties were delivered to their owners and to the related persons (*müteallikat*).⁶¹⁴ The number of houses, evacuated and prepared for the returnees in Kayseri city and *kazas*, reached 136 by 23 November 1918. Some were delivered to their owners and to the related persons. The district governorate also underlined that it acted carefully for the prevention of these properties from falling into ruin.⁶¹⁵

Following the emergence of problems about the restitution of the abandoned properties, the Ministry of Interior addressed the issue again on 18 and 22 December 1918 and sent instructions regarding possible problems. According to these instructions, the authorization of return only covered the deportees; hence the requests from Greeks and Armenians who had gone abroad would not be accepted until further order. The abandoned properties which were used by the military, officials, and local population would be immediately evacuated while the evacuation of the abandoned properties that had been given to the Muslim immigrants would be gradual and dependent on the return of their real owners. Thus, no one would be left homeless. It was especially important for the Ottoman government not to give rise to the suffering of the Muslim immigrants when restituting the abandoned properties. The Muslim immigrants and refugees who settled in the abandoned properties also had to evacuate them. Nevertheless, in order to prevent them from becoming homeless, these immigrants and refugees had to be transferred to the properties which were used by the local population, officials and officers and whose owners had not returned yet. If this was not possible, a few families

⁶¹⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR 601/78 (7 November 1918)

⁶¹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR 603/53 (23 November 1918). The Ministry of Interior also asked for information on the number of Armenians and Greeks deported from the sanjak, the number of Greeks and Armenians who fled abroad, the number of abandoned properties, and the number of Greeks and Armenians who had been sent from surrounding areas to Kayseri or who were relocated within the *liva*. BOA, DH.ŞFR, 93/236 (21 November 1918)

could stay together in proper houses. If these instructions did not solve the settlement problem, the homeless immigrants and refugees could be placed in the vacant/abandoned properties or public buildings in the surrounding immigrant villages or in the houses of local Muslims. In order to prevent Muslim immigrants being left homeless until they could find a permanent residence, two or three Greek and Armenian families could be temporarily placed together.⁶¹⁶

The properties of the Greeks also had to be restituted. But since these properties had not been liquidated, serious problems did not emerge regarding the issue. On the other hand, problems regarding the properties that had been abandoned by Armenians were more complicated. The Armenian properties were divided into two categories. The first included the properties which had not been acquired by the Ministries of Finance and Religious Foundations. These properties had to be evacuated and given back to their real owners who returned. There were problems about the liquidated Armenian properties, those which had been transferred to the public treasury and whose title deed registry records had been accordingly revised. Such properties could only be restituted if the related officials granted permission for their restitution. If these properties could not be given back, rent had to be paid to their real owners. For the restitution of the liquidated properties, first the former law had to be abolished and a new law had to be codified. The coming laws had to be taken into consideration in the restitution of the houses and lands of the Greek and Armenian returnees.⁶¹⁷ The restitution of the abandoned properties, and settlement and housing of the returnees were implemented by the Directorate of Immigrants (*Muhacirin Müdüriyet-i Umumiyesi*).⁶¹⁸ On 21 January 1919,

⁶¹⁶ BOA, BEO, 341055 (18 and 22 December 1918) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 412-417).

⁶¹⁷ BOA, BEO, 341055 (18 and 22 December 1918) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 412-417). Again the instructions emphasized that schools, chapels and the real estate of these institutions had to be delivered to the community to which they belonged.

⁶¹⁸ BOA, DH.HMŞ, 4-2/11-20 (25 January 1919)

Kayseri reported that the Armenian churches and their properties were delivered to the Commission of the Armenians in the sanjak.⁶¹⁹

As stated above, there were problems about the transferred and liquidated properties. Complaints were made regarding the restitution of the movable abandoned goods which had been transferred and used within government offices. In some places, these goods were not restored to their real owners, and continued to be used in government offices. Thereupon, the Ministry of Interior requested the restitution of these goods to their owners, and if their owners had not returned yet, the goods were to be kept until their return.⁶²⁰ On 11 March 1919, the Ministry wanted from the province of Elaziğ restoration of formerly liquidated abandoned properties to the related persons and correction of the records later on in order to prevent complaints and disturbance.⁶²¹

Furthermore, on their return, many deportees found that their houses no longer had any furniture. These movable properties had been appropriated by some people during the war and were not delivered to their real owners after their return. On 8 May 1919, the Ministry of Interior ordered that while the movable properties, which had not been sold or pledged (*terhin*), had to be immediately delivered to their original owners; the sold and pledged materials had to be restored upon request after completing the related procedure. The Ministry underlined that a new law was being codified on this subject and the local administrations had to act accordingly.⁶²²

The returnee Armenians not only applied for the restitution of their properties but also for a compensation for their loss. For example Dikran Frinkyanyan from Kayseri whose mansion had been turned into a school after his deportation applied for the compensation for his loss. He stated that his house

⁶¹⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 611/45 (21 January 1919)

⁶²⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/230 (19 February 1919)

⁶²¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 97/105 (11 March 1919)

⁶²² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 99/103 (8 May 1919). The Ministry of Interior informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding the aids to the non-Muslim returnees on the basis of provinces on 19 March 1919. For the list of these aids see, BOA, BEO, 341903_3-4 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 465-470).

had been ruined while being used as a school, and therefore, requested the repair of damage. In addition, he asked to be paid the rent arrears for the previous years.⁶²³

7.3.1 The Abandoned Properties of the Deceased Deportees

There was confusion regarding the restitution of the properties of the deceased deportees. The district governorate of Kayseri informed the Ministry of Interior that every day ten to twenty death certificates were brought to the civil registry as if they had passed away in Kayseri and the related procedure was implemented in the civil registry about the deportees, who passed away in other districts, according to these death certificates. This way, the families of the deceased tried to inherit the abandoned properties. The district governorate was not sure about the procedure regarding the deportees who passed away in other districts, and therefore, asked the Ministry for an order.⁶²⁴

Since most of the deportees lost their lives during the deportation, this was one of the most important topics of the return process. While the families of the deportees tried to claim their inheritance, it seems that there was a procedural problem regarding the death certificates. According to the article 31 of the Law of Civil Registry, the related procedures about the deceased would be implemented upon the submission of death certificates which would be obtained from the quarter or villages in which the deceased resided. However, because of deportation many returnees could not obtain such an official paper from the districts where their legators (*muris*) died. As a solution, the Ministry of Interior gave the instruction that the death certificates which were prepared by the commission of elders (*heyet-i ihtiyariyye*), which had also been generally deported with these deportees, would be accepted, and the procedures would be implemented upon the submission of these death certificates.⁶²⁵

⁶²³ BOA, DH.İ.UM.EK, 50/45 (14 April 1919)

⁶²⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 612/67 (28 January 1919)

⁶²⁵ BOA, ŞD, 50/14 (March 1919). Article 31 of *Sicil-i Nüfus Kanunu* (the Law of Civil Registry) (14 Ağustos 1330-27 August 1914): “*Vefat vukuunda müteveffanın ve pederinin ismini ve müteehhil olup olmadığını ve müteehhil ise kimin zevci veya zevcesi olduğunu ve*

A similar situation is observed in the correspondence of the Ministry of Interior with other provinces. The Ministry informed Diyarbakır province that a new law would be codified to reconstitute the properties of the deported Armenians and Greeks who had died. Therefore, if the owner of these properties was known, the hereditary shares (*hisse-i irsiyye*) of the heirs would be given to them before the codification of the new law.⁶²⁶ As it is seen in these events, the Ministry favored the restitution of the abandoned properties to the heirs of the deceased deportees.

Regarding this matter, Üngör and Polatel interpreted a telegram from the Ottoman archives (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 99/35) as a sign that the Ministry only gave permission for the restitution of the abandoned properties with the condition of the return of the original owner. This means that the heirs could not receive their hereditary shares. Üngör and Polatel commented as follows: “The Ministry now had to deal with this reality on the ground and issued the ad hoc directive that only the ‘real owners’ (*sahib-i hakikiler*) could reclaim property upon ‘appearance in person’ (*isbat-ı vücud*).”⁶²⁷

In the archival document which led the authors to this conclusion, the Ministry of Interior, in reply to a telegram of Bitlis, prohibited the restitution of the abandoned properties to the Muslim attorneys and guardians (*vekil ve vasi*) of the Armenians and stated that these properties could only be restored to the real owners upon their return.⁶²⁸ In fact, the evaluation of only this document could give rise to the above-quoted comment of Üngör and Polatel. However, this evaluation does not seem to be totally correct since the authors did not consider the context of the telegram (BOA, DH.ŞFR, 99/35).

sinnini ve san'atını ve maskatı re'sini ve sebebi vefatını ve vefatının yevm ve kabil ise saatini mübeyyin iki şahit huzurunda vefiyat vukuatına ait usul dairesinde bir ilmühaber tanzimile mahallî nüfus idaresine vermeğe muhtaran mecburdur.”

⁶²⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 93/60

⁶²⁷ Üngör-Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction*, p. 99.

⁶²⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 99/35 (4 May 1919): “C. 22 Nisan 335 şifreye. Tehcir olunan eşhasdan mahall-i sairede bulunanların memleketlerine avdetleri halinde metruk emval-i menkule ve gayr-ı menkulelerinin ancak kendilerine teslimi icab eder. Serd olunan mütalaya nazaran İslam olan vekil ve vasilerine teslimi muvafık değildir.”

This diversification in our comments stems from the fact that Üngör and Polatel did not analyze the telegrams received by the Ministry of Interior. Without such analysis, they commented on the reply of the Ministry, which might have directed the authors to take a different position. However, the reply of the Ministry has to be evaluated considering the question of Bitlis. It seems that the Ministry's telegram was sent in reply to a telegram of Bitlis which was classified as BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/150. In this telegram, Bitlis informed the Ministry that some Armenian women appointed their attorneys among the people of Bitlis to receive their own movable and immovable properties. However, it was understood from the relevant papers (*hüccet-i şeriyye*) that these women stayed with Muslim families. The governor thought that the delivery of these properties to their Muslim guardians could give rise to abuses. Therefore, he wanted to learn whether it was lawful to deliver the properties of these women to their Muslim attorneys and guardians.⁶²⁹

It seems that the governor of Bitlis was concerned about the appropriation of the abandoned properties by the Muslims who were the guardians of Armenian women. He saw this transfer as a kind of abuse. In reply to this telegram, the Ministry of Interior shared the opinion of Bitlis, and asked for the prevention of property transfers to the Muslim *vekil* and *vasi* families of Armenian women.⁶³⁰

Üngör and Polatel evaluated only the first part of this telegram (*Tehcir olunan eşhasdan mahall-i sairede bulunanların memleketlerine avdetleri halinde metruk emval-i menkule ve gayr-ı menkulelerinin ancak kendilerine teslimi icab eder*) and stated that the Ministry of Interior had given a directive that “only the ‘real owners’ (*sahib-i hakikiler*) could reclaim property upon ‘appearance in person’”. However, this comment disregards the context of the related telegram which was clearly stated in the second sentence of the same telegram sent from Istanbul: *Serd olunan mütalaaya nazaran İslam olan vekil ve vasilerine teslimi muvafik değildir*. In other words, the Ministry of Interior

⁶²⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 626/150 (22 April 1919)

⁶³⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 99/35 (4 May 1919)

opposed the transfer of the properties that had been abandoned by Armenians to the Muslim guardians (*vekil ve vasi*) of Armenian women, and against their demands the Ministry stated that these properties could only be restored to their real owners when they returned. Furthermore, other instances from Diyarbakır and Kayseri illustrate that the Ministry of Interior favored the restitution of abandoned properties to the heirs of the deceased deportees, and considered preparing a new law in this regard. Therefore, the document concerned cannot be considered as the decision of ‘appearance in person’ (*isbat-ı vücud*) for the restitution of the properties. From another aspect, this correspondence can even be regarded as an attempt to prevent the seizure of the abandoned properties by Muslims.

Indeed, this was not the only telegram sent from Bitlis on this subject. On 12 February 1919, Bitlis reported that Armenian children, who were composed of girls and boys at the age of 13-14 staying with Muslims, applied for the reclamation of their properties. The governor believed that these applications were actually the result of the wishes of the Muslims with whom these children stayed in relation to the appropriation of the properties of the children. Therefore, he wanted to know what to do about this kind of practices.⁶³¹ In this telegram, the governor of Bitlis was again concerned about the transfer of the Armenian properties to the Muslims with whom the Armenian women or children were living.

7.3.2 The Problems in the Restitution of the Properties

The abandoned properties, which had been allocated to Muslims in exchange for their expropriated houses, became a source of problem in the restitution process. In the Kale quarter of Kayseri, some houses had been expropriated by the district governorate to construct a new prison. But the official correspondence suggests that expropriation was not done in accordance with the related legislation since neither the value of the houses had been assessed nor their price had been paid to their owners. Instead, the owners of

⁶³¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 615/24

these houses had been settled in the properties that had been abandoned by Armenians in return for their expropriated houses. This application had been reported to the Ministry of Finance, which carried out the procedures regarding these abandoned properties, but the Ministry of Finance did not approve this implementation.⁶³²

While the official correspondence still continued, the return of deportees and restitution of their properties were approved. In order to reconstitute the Armenian houses, people who had been settled in these properties in exchange for their houses had to evacuate them and return to their former houses. But there was a great problem since their houses were destroyed after the transfer of the prisoners. The Ministry of Interior pointed out that not only the expropriation procedure but settlement of these people in properties abandoned by Armenians were also not legal. With reference to the laws on the abandoned properties, the value of the abandoned properties had to be defined and this value had to be paid for the allocation of these properties. Even though legal procedures were not implemented in the settlement of these people in the abandoned properties, the Ministry did not want these people to suffer, and therefore, gave the instruction that the expropriation prices (*bedel-i istimlak*) be paid to the owners of the expropriated houses from the subsidy of the next year.⁶³³

In April 1919, the owners of these expropriated houses applied to the Ministry of Interior complaining that the expropriated prices had still not been paid. In the Kale quarter of Kayseri, more than 80 houses had been expropriated, and the owners of these 80 houses were obliged to evacuate the Armenian abandoned houses, in which they had been settled, upon the return decision for the deportees. Thus, more than four hundred people became homeless. Even though they applied to the district governorate of Kayseri for the payment of *bedel-i istimlak*, they did not receive any payment in return for their houses. Thus, they informed the Ministry of Interior about their situation

⁶³² BOA, DH.İ.U.M, 7-3/1-22 (15 December 1918)

⁶³³ BOA, DH.İ.U.M, 7-3/1-22 (15 December 1918)

and requested the payment of expropriation price. Thereupon the Ministry ordered Kayseri to protect the rights of these people.⁶³⁴

Another problem about the restitution of the abandoned properties emerged regarding the donated properties and sale transactions. On 15 February 1919, the Ministry of Interior informed various localities that a new law was being prepared for the restitution of the abandoned properties, compensation for losses and other related subjects. In order to prevent any further problems, the localities were warned not to give permission for the sale or pledging of the abandoned properties since such transfers of the abandoned properties among individuals could exacerbate the restitution process.⁶³⁵

Such an event emerged in the sanjak of Kayseri. A woman named Hacı Gülizar Gürünyan (?) applied to the Ministry of Interior to reclaim her printing press and some other related equipment which had been donated to the local CUP Club by her son, Hacı Sarkis, under oppression and threats. She stated that all her properties had been plundered and seized during the deportation despite the fact that she had converted to Islam, and she did not have any means of support except these equipments. Therefore, she wanted the restitution of this printing press, which was in the Kayseri Government Office now, including the rental payment for its use during the war.⁶³⁶

The Ministry of Interior referred this application to the district governorate of Kayseri and gave instructions to launch an investigation of the situation. If the claims of Gülizar were true, her properties had to be delivered to her son Sarkis and rent arrears for the war period had to be paid to him. The Ministry also attached the list of the machines and equipments which was reclaimed by her such as printing machine, paper cutting machine, tables, sofas and carpet. After taking these instructions from the Ministry, the district governorate investigated the situation and informed the Ministry that Sarkis, also known as convert Şevket, was a pressman (*matbaacı*) from Kayseri and

⁶³⁴ BOA, DH.UMVM, 104/42 (19 April 1919)

⁶³⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 96/195 (15 February 1919)

⁶³⁶ BCA, 272.00.11/14.52.15

donated these machines on his own will on 29 September 1915 to the local CUP Club with legal documents. Then the printing house of the *liva* purchased the printing press for five thousand gurush. Furthermore, it was informed that Sarkis had already sold the paper cutting machine to the bookseller Tevfik Efendi and also received its price.⁶³⁷

In reply to this investigation report, the Ministry of Interior stated that according to the statement of Gülizar Gürünyan the machines and other equipment belonged to her, and therefore, even if her son Sarkis had donated these properties by his own will, this donation was invalid since he was not the owner of these properties. The Ministry then ordered the district governorate of Kayseri to further investigate the matter to determine the owner and value of the properties. Following the investigation, the district governorate reported that the machines belonged to Gürünlüoğlu Sarkis and there was no information or transaction proving that they belonged to his mother, Gülizar Gürünyan. The printing machine had been bought by the Provincial Special Administration (*idare-i hususiye*) for 5 thousand gurush, and its current value was 25 thousand gurush. It seems that the Ministry of Interior was not satisfied by this report, and ordered the district governorate to conduct another investigation taking into account Gülizar's claims. The Ministry also stated that if Gülizar was right, these properties had to be delivered and their rent had to be paid.⁶³⁸

Unfortunately the result of this application is not included in the file. Thus, I do not know whether the machines with other equipment had been returned to the owner. It is obvious that while the Ministry of Interior favored the claims of Gülizar, the local authorities were not willing to restore these items and claimed that the donation was willingly done by Sarkis not as a result of a threat or oppression. Even though it is not possible to say anything further about this complicated matter, one can still speculate that most probably Gülizar was right when she claimed that her son Sarkis had been threatened to

⁶³⁷ BCA, 272.00.11/14.52.15

⁶³⁸ BCA, 272.00.11/14.52.15

donate the machines to the local CUP Club. Even if there was no open threat, it can be thought that Sarkis was obliged to donate his properties to live in “safety” as a convert in Kayseri if he was not deported. There is not exact information if Gülizar and Sarkis were deported or not. Under any circumstances, this donation does not seem to be a normal transaction.

Üngör ve Polatel analyzed the same document, and stated that:

For example, lumberman Melkon Garabedian from Kayseri was murdered in 1915 and his wife Gulezar was deported. Their workshop and the movable properties in it, including a printing press, a paper machine, boxes of printing paper, sofas, tables and tools, had all been confiscated by the local CUP branch. In 1919 their son Sarkis returned to Kayseri alone and reclaimed his parents’ property. But the government refused to render him the property because none of it was registered in his name. Only after a profound background check was Sarkis Garabedian allowed to keep the printing press.⁶³⁹

However, I could not find such information in the same file. There is no information confirming or falsifying the deportation of neither Gülizar nor Sarkis. Besides, the properties were not reclaimed by Sarkis, but his mother Gülizar reclaimed the properties. Finally, it is seen that the Ottoman government did not refuse the claims of Gülizar but instead wanted from the district governorate of Kayseri to investigate her claims and restore the properties if they were true. The other instances from Kayseri also illustrate that the Ministry of Interior favored the restitution of the properties to the heirs of the deceased. However, there is no information regarding the implementation of such orders. It is probable that the local authorities in Kayseri raised difficulties in the restitution of the properties to the Armenians. A representative of the American Committee for Relief in the Near East stated that: “...[p]robably the worst state of affairs in Turkey existed in the Kaiseriya district, where the Turks are in a majority, and very bigoted. They are still showing signs of bad behavior.”⁶⁴⁰

⁶³⁹ Üngör-Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction*, p. 99.

⁶⁴⁰ “Work of the American Committee for Relief in the Near East and Armenian Patriarchal Committee”, 19/5/1919, FO, 608/79

It is remarkable that even though laws and regulations were prepared regarding the issues of deportation and abandoned properties, the practice was not directly shaped by these codifications. Instead, the Ministry of Interior was in the focus. As seen in many instances mentioned before, both the local authorities and the individuals applied to the Ministry regarding their hesitations, questions or even their complaints. It is a striking point that the corruption complaints were sent to the Ministry during the war. This shows that they were not considered basically as legal matters, but instead regarded as an “internal matter” which had to be dealt by the Ministry of Interior. Because of this, even at the end of the war, we can see the example of Gülizar Gürünyan who applied to the Ministry, not to the courts, for the restitution of her properties. This situation is an indication that *Dahiliye* replaced the legal system. However, I need to make it clear that this comment has been derived from my analysis of the Ministry of Interior documents. The analysis of court records for the World War I period can change my view of the situation if it demonstrates that there were instances of trials regarding the Armenian abandoned properties, and that the courts had a role in this process.

The attitude of the local governors was the other significant factor in the restitution process. The archival documents show that the governors in some localities were unwilling to restore the Armenian properties to the returnees even if the Ministry ordered the restoration of them. The Ministry of Interior was informed of such a situation on 19 April 1919. The related document stated that about forty Armenians returned their village of Pirkinik, in Sivas province, and reclaimed their houses and lands. The local authorities in Sivas raised difficulties and did not restore their lands and houses. Thereupon, the Ministry of Interior wanted from the governorate of Sivas province to investigate the complaint and stated that if there were such occupied properties, they should be restituted to their original owners.⁶⁴¹

Another document from Eskişehir also illustrates that the restitution of the properties was delayed and therefore the returnees became miserable. It is

⁶⁴¹ BOA, DH.KMS, 49-2/15 (19 April 1919)

stated that even though the Armenians of Bey, Virancık and Alınca villages returned, they were not transferred to their villages. Besides, the document points out that the immigrants made irreparable damage to the houses in their evacuation. The Ministry again ordered the restoration of such properties to the returnees immediately.⁶⁴² Urfa was another district in which difficulties arose in the restitution process: “Armenian refugees returning to their homes are asked to prove their ownership. As they can only produce Armenian witnesses, difficulties usually arise. The Kadi, who is well spoken of, tries to assist the refugees.”⁶⁴³

The British archival documents provide detailed information regarding problems in the restitution process. The opposition of the immigrants and refugees to the restitution of the properties to their original owners and problems arising from this fact were recorded in these documents. For example, the Circassian refugees from the Erzurum region who had come to Maraş after the Russian advance in 1916 and settled in the Armenian abandoned houses refused to restore the houses to the returnee Armenians and threatened them. The British document stated that: “Since the Armistice, about 2,000 Armenian refugees have returned to Marash; about half are natives of the place. They are nearly all quite destitute, and have to be rationed by the Armenian Committee.”⁶⁴⁴ Another report explains the restoration process in Bilecik:

At Bilejik, the Mixed Commission, composed of two Armenians and two Moslems, presided by the Mayor, have looked into and settled, from the 15th April to the 4th October, 1919, one hundred claims. Hundreds of other cases, referring to the restitution of Armenian houses occupied by Turkish refugees, have been dealt with direct by the local authorities, but the buildings, as usual, have been returned in such a pitiable or dilapidated condition that the majority are uninhabitable; about one-fifth

⁶⁴² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 95/226 (25 January 1919)

⁶⁴³ “G.H.Q Intelligence Summary”, 5 February 1919, FO, 608/108

⁶⁴⁴ “G.H.Q Intelligence Summary”, 5 February 1919, FO, 608/108

of the Armenians, viz., about 5,000, deported from this town, have returned; the remainder are to be considered as lost.⁶⁴⁵

7.3.3 The Muslim Refugees and Immigrants

The return of eastern refugees to their homelands began with the reconquest of Muş and Bitlis on 8 August 1916. Nevertheless, Muş was reconquered by the Russian forces on 25 August 1916, and the Muş refugees could not return. Since the living conditions were not normalized in these districts which had turned into battle grounds, the Ottoman government tried to prevent the return of refugees, but failed.⁶⁴⁶ The main return movement of the refugees began after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in November 1917. With the signing of Erzincan Armistice between the Ottoman Empire and Bolsheviks on 18 December 1917, the war between these countries ended, and the Russian forces began to retreat from the Ottoman provinces.⁶⁴⁷

The signing of Armistice resulted in refugees rushing back to their hometowns, but they were generally under poor conditions both on the roads and in their hometowns. The Ottoman government tried to control the return of the eastern refugees but failed. For example, on 31 March 1918, the Ministry of Interior instructed Kayseri not to send the refugees to their homelands without an order from the center.⁶⁴⁸ On 4 May 1918, the Ministry of Interior addressed the issue again, and instructed the provinces and sanjaks including Kayseri not to allow the return of Erzurum refugees explaining that the conditions of the district were not appropriate to provide food and settlement for the refugees. The returnees suffered as a result of these conditions, and some even died on the road. Despite all the issued orders, the Ministry of Interior could not control

⁶⁴⁵ “Enclosure in No. 86, Captain Hadkinson to Vice-Admiral Sir J. de Robeck, November 12, 1919”, pp. 241-242.

⁶⁴⁶ Ögün, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi*, pp. 56-57.

⁶⁴⁷ Ögün, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi*, p. 58.

⁶⁴⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 85/292 (31 March 1918)

the return process and most of the eastern refugees had already returned to their homelands by the end of 1918.⁶⁴⁹

The reports of Kayseri illustrate that the return movement of the refugees was also effective in the sanjak. While on 24 January 1918, there were 17,770 refugees and immigrants from the occupied territories (*memalik-i müstevliye*),⁶⁵⁰ this number had decreased to 9,641 by 2 June 1918.⁶⁵¹ The return of the refugees continued in the following months according to the accounts of the district governorate stating that on 5 September 1918 there were 1,416 immigrants and 5,808 refugees (total 7,224).⁶⁵² Since most of the eastern refugees had already returned to their homelands by the end of 1918, the limitations on their return were removed in May 1919.⁶⁵³

It appears that the number of eastern refugees had highly decreased in the sanjak by the beginning of 1919. These numbers are important to evaluate the return process of the deportees. With the return of Armenians, the refugees and immigrants who were settled in the properties that had been abandoned by Armenians faced with the problem of becoming homeless. As stated above the Ottoman government tried to prevent such situations⁶⁵⁴, but it was a very complicated issue in the districts which had high number of refugees and immigrants. However, in Kayseri the refugee and immigrant population was not high enough to create a settlement problem. Even though there were more than thirty thousand refugees and immigrants in March 1917, most had already

⁶⁴⁹ Ögün, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi*, pp. 73-74.

⁶⁵⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 576/87 (24 January 1918): 16,367 from Erzurum district (such as Pasinler-Hasan Kale, Namrevan, Bayburd, Hınıs, Eleşkird, Refahiye and Erzincan.), 900 from Trabzon province (Trabzon, Gümüşhane and Kelkit), 485 from Bitlis province and 18 from Van province.

⁶⁵¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 586/17 (2 June 1918)

⁶⁵² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 594/103 (5 September 1918). Apart from the settled immigrants and refugees, the district governorate subsidized 957 immigrants and 2,530 refugees.

⁶⁵³ Ögün, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi*, p. 74.

⁶⁵⁴ BOA, BEO, 341055 (18 and 22 December 1918) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 412-417).

gone to their homelands before the return of the deportees and there were around seven thousand left in September 1918. And considering that the number of returnee Armenians on empire-level was only one-third of the deportees (at best 300,000-350,000 Armenians could return from the more than 900,000 Armenians), it can be suggested that most Armenians, who were the actual owners of the properties in which the refugees and immigrants had been settled, did not return. Thus, the return of the deportees did not produce a significant pool of homeless refugees or immigrants in Kayseri.

The newspaper *İleri* gives the total number of eastern refugees within the empire as more than 800,000 and the number of Balkan War immigrants as 442,775 at the beginning of February 1920.⁶⁵⁵ On 10 April 1920, the number of refugees waiting to return was 407,604 and the number of returnee refugees was 448,932 in the Ottoman lands according to the same newspaper. 8,448 of these refugees were in the Kayseri sanjak.⁶⁵⁶ The rise in the number of refugees compared to the above mentioned number of seven thousand (7,224 exact) refugees and immigrants in September 1918 can be related to the establishment of Armenia in Yerevan. The Muslims in and around Yerevan were forced to migrate to the inland of Anatolia, and some came to Kayseri.⁶⁵⁷ By the end of March 1923, the number of eastern refugees in the sanjak who wanted to return their homeland had decreased to 2,166.⁶⁵⁸

⁶⁵⁵ *İleri*, no: 745, 3 February 1920

⁶⁵⁶ The list of the refugees in the empire waiting to be sent to their homelands was as follows: Adana 7,432; Ankara 61,397; Aydın 1,071; Aleppo 26,740; Hüdavendigâr 1,295; Diyarbakır 35,940; Sivas 64,163; Kastamonu 2,031; Konya 22,824; Mamuretülaziz 23,538; Eskişehir 1,249; Urla 6,507; İzmit 2,728; Bolu 5,770; Canik 116,672; Çatalca 134; Kayseri 8,448; Maraş 8,687; Mentеше 2,431; Niğde 8,597. Quoting from *İleri* (10 April 1920), Öğün, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi*, p. 78.

⁶⁵⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 645/47 (3 September 1919)

⁶⁵⁸ The number of eastern refugees within the country decreased to 70,000-80,000 by this date, and 23,880 of them were still waiting to be sent to their homelands (3 in İzmir, 56 in Elazığ, 56 in Ankara, 115 in Bursa, 530 in Diyarbakır, 4,900 in Sivas, 97 in Erzincan, 10 in Eskişehir, 2,743 in Aksaray, 2,250 in Amasya, 789 in Urfa, 430 in Burdur, 1,671 in Bolu, 186 in Denizli, 314 in Silifke, 197 in Gaziantep, 1,150 in Karahisar-ı Şarki, 72 in Karahisar-ı Sahip, 2,166 in Kayseri, 2,742 in Kırşehir, 120 in Çankırı, 127 in Mardin, and 3,112 in Maraş). *TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.1, Cilt.28, İctima Senesi.4, 14. İctima (31 March 1923), pp. 273-274.

As stated formerly, the return of Armenians led to the rise of significant problems between the returnees and immigrants who had been settled in the Armenian abandoned houses in many districts. However, there was not such high a number of refugee or immigrant population within Kayseri sanjak to produce conflicts on the restitution of properties.

7.3.4 The Impact of Insecurity

The growing insecurity in several localities was also one of the factors that impeded the restitution of the abandoned properties. The British High Commissioner in Istanbul, Admiral Calthorpe tells about the problems regarding the restitution of the properties:

Owing to the weakness and neglect of the local authorities, arrangements for the restitution of Christian property appears to have come to a standstill excepting during the temporary presence of British officers. In several districts, owing to growing insecurity, the returned Christian refugees are now showing anxiety to leave again for the coast, rather than to be placed in possession of their lands and houses, and in some cases where the deportation and massacre of Armenians was carried out with special thoroughness, practically no survivors are forthcoming to claim absence of any power to enforce obedience, insistence on the execution of these measures may not act merely as an irritant, but be productive of more harm than good to returned refugees.⁶⁵⁹

It can be considered that the growing insecurity became a problem in many places. As the flight of the Armenians from Kayseri illustrates, it was also a problem around the sanjak which was very close to Adana. As Adana became a controversial area between the Armenian and Turkish forces during the years 1918-1921, Kayseri reacted to this situation with the rise of national defense organizations (*müdafaa-i hukuk*) within the city.

Especially since the plan for the Congress which has been held in Sivas was promulgated, the Turks have recovered much of their old confidence,

⁶⁵⁹ “Admiral Calthorpe to Earl Curzon, Constantinople, 30th July, 1919”, p. 57.

have adopted their old policy of asserting their authority over the foreigners, and of browbeating the Christian population.⁶⁶⁰

There was also an instance of an attack by the Turkish National Forces (*Kuva-yı Milliye*) to the Armenian villagers in Develi. The district governorate reported that eight Armenians in Karacaviran village of Develi had been kidnapped by the national forces. Four were killed and one was wounded. The remaining three managed to escape.⁶⁶¹ The brigands also attacked and plundered the houses of non-Muslims: “A few nights ago brigands entered the town of Enderlik near Talas, intimidated the people by firing guns, and looted the house of a wealthy Greek, getting away with a lot of plunder. The brigands have not been found.”⁶⁶² This environment and the lack of security probably disaffected the restitution of the abandoned properties despite orders of the Ottoman center. Therefore, the subject of the restitution of the abandoned properties has to be analyzed considering possible variations locality by locality.

Encouraged by the Armistice, and the declaration of the Ottoman Government that the deported are now free to return to their home...their condition is made still worse by the fact that although the central government has apparently changed its attitude toward them, nevertheless the attitude of the local officials with whom they come in vital daily contact, has not changed to such a degree as to cause them to take definite step to improve the lot of these people. The provincial authorities lack food and means to do all that is needed, but they are not doing even that which is possible.

Those of the deported who reach their home at last are finding them either in ruin as a result of general plunder, or else they are occupied by Moslem refugees from European Turkey, the Caucasus, or elsewhere. The latter refuse to give up the home they occupy, and the Moslem officials naturally support the Moslem occupant rather than the Armenian new-comers, who were the former owners. Thus the Armenians find themselves on the streets of their own villages, surrounded by hostile people and officials and without means of work and support... It must be

⁶⁶⁰ ABCFM, reel. 636 (The American School for Boys, Rev. Henry K. Wingate, Talas, Cesarea, September 12, 1919)

⁶⁶¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 660/114 (13 March 1920)

⁶⁶² ABCFM, reel. 638 (The American School for Boys, Henry K. Wingate, Talas, Cesarea, Turkey in Asia, September 27, 1919)

borne in mind that those returning are almost entirely women and children.⁶⁶³

The memoir of Kalaç confirms that by the beginning of 1919 the authority of government in the sanjak had been weakened. Security was compromised, and banditry and brigandage were prevalent.⁶⁶⁴ His memoir is also significant in that he told about the protection of the leading figures which were allegedly involved in crimes committed during the deportation. Even though Istanbul ordered an investigation of these crimes and trial of the criminals in Court Martial⁶⁶⁵, the suspected individuals, most of whom were the prominent merchants and Unionists, were not delivered to the Istanbul Court Martial but instead they were hidden. Kalaç mentions the attitude of the local administrators: “The district governor was old and weak. The gendarme battalion commander and the police commanders were not happy with the policies of the central government.” The CUP branch in Kayseri was closed, but the commodities and documents of the branch were not delivered to the authorities, instead they were removed from the office and transferred to another place with the efforts of Gözübüyük Sabit Bey. Furthermore, the Kayseri representative of the CUP was protected and hidden; nobody revealed his place.⁶⁶⁶ In the meantime, the occupation of Adana by the French and clashes between the Armeno-French forces and Muslims led to the formation of national resistance committees, one of which was *Cemaat-i İslamiye* that was founded in Develi.⁶⁶⁷

⁶⁶³ NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/398

⁶⁶⁴ Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, p. 144.

⁶⁶⁵ BOA, MV, 213/60 (11 December 1918); BOA, MV, 213/62 (14 December 1918) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, pp. 407-410)

⁶⁶⁶ Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, p. 145. It seems that the local protection of these individuals was one of the reasons in the failure of the trials. For more information regarding this subject see Taner Akçam, *İnsan Hakları ve Ermeni Sorunu, İttihat ve Terakki'den Kurtuluş Savaşı'na*, Ankara, İmge, 2002, pp. 482-595. There was also information regarding the court-martialing of the leading people in Kayseri at the end of war in BOA, DH.ŞFR, 640/113. This document shows that there was a tendency in the sanjak not to deliver these people to the Istanbul Court Martial.

⁶⁶⁷ Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, p. 147.

By August 1919, two centers of authority derived in the country: the first was the national movement which emerged in the east and the other was the official government in Istanbul. The time came for Kayseri to select one of these axes and take direction in this line. After the Erzurum Congress, we have heard about the meeting of a congress in Sivas. We have collected a secret meeting in order to decide either Kayseri would participate to this Congress or not....There was forty to fifty persons attended to this meeting...It was decided that Katipzade Nuh Naci and me would go to Sivas to participate the Congress... İmamzade Ömer Bey also joined us.⁶⁶⁸

The memoirs of Kalaç, who was a leading person during this period and also would be one of the elites of the Republican period, is important to analyze the conditions of this transition period. It is evident that from the middle of 1919 on, there were two centers of authority in the Ottoman territories: the official government in Istanbul, and the newly emerging national movement. As Kalaç stated, the notables and leading officials of Kayseri sided with the new national movement, and a branch of *Anadolu ve Rumeli Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti* (Association for the Defense of Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia) was established in the sanjak.⁶⁶⁹

The analysis of this period seems highly difficult in this complicated environment. Even though the Istanbul government enacted laws and decrees to restore the rights and properties of the deportees, the implementation of these laws and decrees differed according to the conditions of the localities especially after mid-1919. With the rise of the national movement and local

⁶⁶⁸ Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, pp. 149-151. Kalaç gives the names of notables who attended this meeting: Katipzade Nuh Naci, Hacılarlızade Mustafa, Taşçızade Mehmet, Hacı Niyazizade Faik, the mayor Çalıkoğlu Rıfat, Nakipzade Sadık and his brother Ahmet, Narinzade Hacı, accountant Abidin, Dırazzade Reşit and Nurullah, İmamzade Reşit and his brother Ömer, Uşakzade Osman, Mustafa Nisari, mufti Remzi, Mehterzade Osman, Ağırmaslı Mustafa, Mazhar Karakaya, Yedekçizade Mehmet and Hüseyin, Behçetizade Ahmet, Ramazanoğlu Musa, Kığılamazzade Tevfik, Behçelizade Ahmet, conscription inspector (*Ahz-ı Asker Kalem Muameleleri Müfettişi*) Fehmi and himself Halacoğlu Ahmet Hilmi.

⁶⁶⁹ Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, p. 155. Aktar and Kırmızı presented a similar situation from the province of Diyarbakır. The CUP cadres and local notables in the province who were also alleged of being involved in crimes against the Armenians during the deportations coincided with the cadres which have participated in the nationalist movement. Aktar- Kırmızı, "Diyarbakır, 1915", pp. 314-316.

resistance organizations, the appointed Ottoman administrators lost their authority. A British report from October 1919 describes the situation:

After the Armistice the Turks had been conciliatory and well-disposed. He expected to receive the punishment of his past misdeeds, and was prepared for it. He welcomed decently enough the returning remnants of the Christian population. All that was now altered and the final seal had been set on the change by the recent change of government. Constantinople and the provinces now went hand in hand. The new Grand Vizier might be politically colourless, personally honest and well-intentioned. It mattered nothing, because every act of the Central government was subject to the supervision and control of the leaders of the movement in the province.⁶⁷⁰

The restitution of the Armenian properties halted in many districts because of this complicated environment and deterioration of security in Anatolia. The boycotts against the non-Muslims and the fear of further massacres also led to the flight of them to central cities or foreign countries.⁶⁷¹

This period was characterized by an increasing insecurity problem in Kayseri which led to the flight of non-Muslim population from the sanjak, and the confusion about which was the real authority. In these complex and complicated conditions, it is really difficult to determine whether the deportees could reclaim their properties and whether the orders of Istanbul were fully implemented. The limited information in the archival documents and memoirs is not enough to reconstruct the complete story of this period. Just as we do not know the total number of the returnees, we also do not have enough information about the process in the restitution of their properties in the localities. This study does not cover the period after 1920. But the analysis of

⁶⁷⁰“From Richard Webb to Earl Curzon”, 18 October 1919, FO, 608/275

⁶⁷¹ “Enclosure I in no. 61, Captain Perring to Vice-Admiral Sir J. de Robeck, Samsoun, October 1, 1919”, FO, 406/41, and “Enclosure in No. 86, Captain Hadkinson to Vice-Admiral Sir J. de Robeck, November 12, 1919”, FO, 406/41, in *İngiliz Belgelerinde Atatürk (1919-1938)*, Vol. I, pp. 160, 241; “From J. M. de Robeck, British High Commission, Constantinople”, 11 November 1919, FO, 608/79. For a detailed report regarding this problems on the Black Sea coast see “Vice Admiral Sir J. de Robeck to Earl Curzon”, 24 November 1919, FO, 608/275; “Enclosure 1 in No. 1 Captain Perring to Sir J. de Robeck”, 29 October 1919, FO, 608/275; and “Enclosure 2 in No. 1 Report by Captain Perring on his visit to the Coastal Towns of Unieh, Fatsa, Ordu, Kerasun, Trebizond, Rize and Batoum”, FO, 608/275.

the transition period, from 1920 to 1923, in other words the period from the closing of the last Ottoman parliament to the foundation of the Turkish Republic, is also important and necessary to explore in future relevant studies.

7.4 The Decree of 8 January 1920

After the first official order in October 1918 authorizing the return of deportees, the first legal regulation for the new status of the properties that had been abandoned by Armenians was issued on 8 January 1920 (“*Aher mahallere nakil edilmiş olan eşhasın 17 Zilkade 1333 tarihli kararname mucibince tasfiyeye tabi tutulan emvali hakkında kararname*”). This decree stated that immovable properties which were registered in the name of the Ministries of Finance and Religious Endowments and which were still held by these Ministries would be returned to their original owners if they were alive or to their heirs if they were deceased. If these properties were expropriated (*kamulaştırılmış*), the expropriation would be valid. The original owner could also reclaim the properties which had been sold by these Ministries if the owner had not agreed to the sale. The original owner could inform the Office of the Register of Deeds within two years about his/her approval or refusal of the sale of his/her property. If the owner did not apply to the Office of the Register of Deeds within this time period, it meant that the owner had approved the sale, and in that case, the amount of the sale would be given to him/her. If the deceased original owners did not have any heirs, related legal procedures would be applied with regard to their properties; but, the community and charity institutions of the deportees would be supported financially in return for these immovable properties. The unsold movable properties of the deportees would also be delivered to their real owners. If the movable properties had been sold, the amount of the sale was to be delivered after deducting the expenses of the auction. If the deceased deportee did not have any heirs, the amount was to be given to his/her religious leader to be distributed to the orphans and the poor. The money collected by the Liquidation Commissions on behalf of the deportees was to be returned. Besides, this decree abrogated the

provisional law of 26 September 1915 and the regulation of 8 November 1915.⁶⁷²

Unfortunately there are not many studies analyzing the implementation of the central government policies regarding the restitution of abandoned properties for the period of Armistice (1918-1920). Still, it can be said that the government policy did not present continuity with the former CUP policies. It seems that the number of returnees was very small and additionally it can be speculated that many returnees could not reclaim their properties despite the orders of the Istanbul government. Nevertheless, it is necessary to recognize the change in policy and analyze the localities one by one to demonstrate the relevance or irrelevance of the continuity thesis regarding this subject.

Üngör and Polatel addressed the efforts of Istanbul government for the return of the deportees and restitution of their properties and stated that the process was ‘thwarted’ with the adoption of the principle of ‘appearance in person’ (*isbat-ı vücud*) to reclaim a property:

Restitution became an obstacle very soon after return. The heirs of murdered and deceased deportees encountered difficulties reclaiming property. The principle of ‘appearance in person’ (*isbât-ı vücud*) was in force and only the person to whom the property was registered could claim it back. But many of those people were dead and the documentation had often been lost.⁶⁷³

As illustrated in the former pages, my research of the return and restitution processes in Kayseri (from the end of 1918 to 1920) does not fit this analysis. We see both the return of the deportees and restitution of their properties. Moreover, the Istanbul government gave orders for the restitution of the properties to the heirs of the deportees even if they did not have related papers. Of course, we do not exactly know whether the local governors obeyed the orders of the Istanbul government or how many of the liquidated properties were actually restored, but the analysis of this process within Kayseri sanjak

⁶⁷² *Düstur, II. Tertip, Vol. 11*, Istanbul, Evkaf Matbaası, 1928, pp. 553-561.

⁶⁷³ Üngör-Polatel, *Confiscation and Destruction*, pp. 99, 122.

shows that there was a change of policy between the CUP governments and the Armistice governments. In this respect, Kayseri did not prove the validity of the continuity thesis. The analysis of the process in other localities for the Armistice period will greatly advance the literature demonstrating if the examples in Kayseri were exceptional or there were many similar practices.

However, this policy which favored the restitution of the abandoned properties was not applied after 1920. This new period was shaped by the rise of the Turkish National Forces in Anatolia. This study does not analyze the post-1920 period since it is beyond the time limit of this dissertation. But it has to be highlighted that this new power had different policies compared to the last Ottoman cabinets which had a very mild attitude towards non-Muslims. The Turkish National Forces, which rose against the Greeks on the Aegean coast and the Armeno-French forces on the south and east, reversed the policies of the last Ottoman cabinets and indeed made things different for the returnees. First of all, the decree of 8 January 1920 was abrogated on 14 September 1922 by the Grand National Assembly⁶⁷⁴ and thus the provisional law of 26 September 1915 and the regulation of 8 November 1915 came into effect again. On 15 April 1923, certain articles of the provisional law of 26 September 1915 were changed and on 29 April 1923 a new ordinance came into force for its implementation.⁶⁷⁵

For example, the American missionary Theda Phelps mentions the problems of inheritance regarding the properties of non-Muslims after 1920: “No Armenian heir is recognized unless he be the actual son or brother, so that property of great value has thus become the property of the government and is rented by auction. Armenians who own fields and homes are thus forced to be objects of charity.”⁶⁷⁶ There were still many abandoned properties in Kayseri

⁶⁷⁴ *Düstur, III. Tertip, Vol. 3*, Istanbul, Milliyet Matbaası, 1929, p. 127.

⁶⁷⁵ Akçam-Kurt, *Kanunların Ruhü*, pp. 89-100; Onaran, *Emval-i Metruke Olayı*, pp. 161-184, 344-361. For an analysis of the legal arrangements which came into effect in the Republican period regarding the abandoned properties see Akçam-Kurt, *Kanunların Ruhü*, pp. 81-257.

⁶⁷⁶ ABCFM, reel. 507 (May 1922, Near East Relief Units, Sivas and Cesarea); NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/582 (July 7, 1922)

by the end of 1922, and these became a significant source of income for the government:

In Turkey there is an office for the custodianship of property belonging to absent owners. From the title one would judge it to be the duties of this office one is lead (?) to believe that the interests of absent property owners are most carefully guarded. The custodian is supposed to rent out the property and take charge of it until such a time as the owner may return. In Talas and Cesarea there are dozens of houses that formerly belonged to Armenians, who were massacred in 1915-16. Wives and children of other relatives of the owner are not allowed to assume ownership now, no matter how definite the proof of the death of the owner. The government keeps the property and leas (?) the rental received, a person hiring one of these houses not only paying rent to the government but also the yearly tax.⁶⁷⁷

7.5 The Demography of Kayseri in the 1920s

According to an Armenian Patriarchate report there were approximately 600,000 Armenians within the Ottoman boundaries in 1921. It is stated that there were 4,000 Armenians and 3,500 Armenian orphans in Kayseri.⁶⁷⁸ However, this data seems to be a rough estimate. In another study, the number of Armenian population within the sanjak in 1922 is recorded as 5,916:

⁶⁷⁷ NARA, RG 59, 867.4016/915 (December 4, 1922)

⁶⁷⁸ NARA, 860 J.584 in Özdemir et al., *Ermeniler: Sürgün ve Göç*, pp. 121-126.

TABLE 14: The Population of Kayseri Sanjak in 1922

	Counties	Kayseri city	Develi	Bünyan	İncesu	Total
Total	men	62,748	19,147	19,213	9,426	110,534
	women	63,573	20,045	19,637	8,662	111,918
Muslim	men	50,055	17,683	18,640	7,646	94,024
	women	50,492	18,738	19,013	6,747	94,990
Greek	men	10,103	1,199	573	1,780	13,655
	women	9,764	1,022	624	1,915	13,325
Armenian	men	2,072	265			2,337
	women	2,617	285			2,902
Protestant Greek	men	262				262
	women	280				280
Catholic Armenian	men	165				165
	women	251				251
Protestant Armenian	men	91				91
	women	170				170

Source: Hıfzı Nuri, *Türkiye'nin Sıhhi İctimai Coğrafyası, Kayseri Sancağı*, Ankara, Öğüd Matbaası, 1922, p. 20.

A significant source to compare the population of Turkey with the Ottoman is the population census of 1927. This census is very detailed, and the table below classifying the population in Kayseri on the basis of religions is important to evaluate the demographic change in the localities.

TABLE 15: The Population of Kayseri according to the Census of 1927

	G	Muslim	Catholic	Protestant	Orthodox	Armenian	Christian	Jew	Other religion
Kayseri city	M	18,843	60	37	5	490	68	11	3
Kayseri city	W	18,546	27	55	1	787	192	4	5
Kayseri villages	M	27,846	3	4	59	123	2	-	-
Kayseri villages	W	32,289	6	12	56	178	1	-	-
Kayseri total	M	46,689	63	41	64	613	70	11	3
Kayseri total	W	50,835	33	67	57	965	193	4	5
Bünyan	M	17,413	-	1	4	41	33	-	-
Bünyan	W	19,958	2	1	1	15	19	-	-
Develi	M	23,145	76	2	135	162	7	-	-
Develi	W	26,859	122	148	34	153	9	-	-
İncesu	M	8,275	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
İncesu	W	9,432	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
Pınarbaşı	M	21,570	1	-	4	18	45	-	1
Pınarbaşı	W	23,940	3	1	2	7	13	-	-
Counties total	M	117,092	140	44	208	834	155	11	4
Counties total	W	131,024	160	217	94	1,144	234	4	5
Total		248,116	300	261	302	1,978	389	15	9

Source: 28 Teşrinievvel 1927, *Umumi Nüfus Tahriri, Fasikül II*, Ankara, Hüsütabiabı Matbaası, 1929, pp. 43-44. ("M" is used to define "men", and "W" is used to define "women". "G" is used for "Gender".)

The analysis of this table shows that the non-Muslim population of Kayseri district had highly decreased by 1927. The Armenian deportation and also the expulsion of the Orthodox Christians in line with the population exchange agreement between Greece and Turkey deeply changed its demography. There were 3,230 Christian non-Muslims within the district who called themselves Christian, Orthodox, Armenian, Protestant and Catholic. It has to be underlined that this table classified the non-Muslim population according to their responses. Therefore, there is a problem in the categories. For example we do not know who a Christian is; either s/he was an Orthodox,

Protestant, Catholic or Armenian Gregorian.⁶⁷⁹ In terms of residence, it is clear that Kayseri city is the most densely populated area regarding the number of non-Muslims (1,722 people). Develi was another area of settlement with 848 non-Muslims.

⁶⁷⁹ 28 Teşrinievvel 1927, *Umumi Nüfus Tahriri, Fasikül III*, p. 30.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The dissertation analyzes the implementation of the deportation order and its impacts on the Ottoman locality of Kayseri sanjak. However, it has to be pointed out that the study does not particularly focus on the reasons for the Armenian deportation which has already been extensively studied.

This study asserts that to analyze the deportation process, acknowledging the orders and aims of the center constitutes only one part of the story; equally important is how they were implemented. The evaluation of the Armenian deportations in Kayseri illustrates that certain flexible applications of the government orders might have given rise to “unexpected/undesired” results such as the relatively high number of the remaining Armenians or their conversion to Islam in the sanjak. This illustrates well the necessity to go beyond the central government policies and evaluate how they were implemented in different localities since there could be variations in the implementation of the government orders. Only through identifying the variations, the actual stories can be grasped as demonstrated in the previous chapters.

The recent studies on the demographic policies of the CUP illustrates⁶⁸⁰ that the Armenian deportations became a means of solving the demographic problem which can be explained as an effort to secure the Turkish/Muslim majority in Anatolian lands by taking advantage of the war conditions. As a result, the implementation did not remain limited to the war zones and a great majority of Armenian population was forced to migrate. Even the remaining Armenians in localities, such as Kayseri, were distributed among the Muslim villages within the borders of the provinces and *livas* in such a way that they

⁶⁸⁰ Dündar, *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası*; Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*.

would not exceed 5 to 10 percent of the total Muslim population in each village. With these forced migrations, the number of Armenian population within the provinces was reduced to a manageable size by the authorities.

The demographic policies of the state not only targeted non-Muslims but the Muslim groups were also influenced by the government policies. After the Russian occupation of eastern lands, the Kurdish refugees settled in the western provinces of the empire, while the Turkish settled in eastern lands. These instances show that compact groups were distributed demographically and thus religious and ethnic groups which were considered to make trouble were pacified. The central government tried to control the demographic change in the localities, and in this respect wanted the district governorate of Kayseri to prepare a detailed data tabulating the population village by village on the basis of religions.⁶⁸¹

The analysis of the deportation process in the sanjak of Kayseri shows that certain central government orders regarding the conversion of the Armenians and their deportations were loosely implemented in the district. In this respect, the evaluation of the conversion practice in Kayseri sanjak became important to answer the question of what was actually experienced in localities. 3,430 Gregorian Armenians, who were not among the exempted groups, converted to Islam and remained in the sanjak. The factors such as the protection of some local officials, the artisan need of the sanjak and probably bribing had a role in the conversion process. This is an important contradiction with the central government policies which ordered deportation of the Armenians even if they converted to Islam. Thus more than six thousand Armenians, including the exempted groups, remained within Kayseri which was a high figure compared to many other Ottoman provinces and *livas*.

In this respect, this study highlights that the deportation process included complex and controversial components. Massacres and protection, “resistance and collaboration”⁶⁸², and plunder and official liquidation existed side by side

⁶⁸¹ BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40 (22 September 1915)

⁶⁸² Kaiser, “Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies”, p. 210.

throughout the deportations. The limited number of studies on localities illustrate that there was neither a unified governor block nor a uniform implementation. Thus, the existence of these complex attitudes has to be kept in mind. For example while very harsh measures, including tortures, Court Martial and killings were adopted in Kayseri after the explosion of a bomb in Develi, the district governorate gave more than 6,000 Armenians the permission to remain in the sanjak on the condition that they converted to Islam. Kaiser also addresses a similar situation in Aleppo:

Bekir Sami's opposition to CUP policy is remarkable as he entertained racist perceptions of Armenians calling them 'microbes'... a man who entertained racist notions at times stood up against the central authorities and pleaded for Armenians. Bekir Sami was probably a racist; he was, however, not willing to engage in acts of genocide.⁶⁸³

It also has to be stated that this dissertation does not claim that our concluding remarks are necessarily valid for other localities. On the contrary, there would be variations. As Üngör and Kaiser have demonstrated, the Diyarbakır instance became very atrocious with nearly total destruction of its Armenian community and the Armenians who had been deported over the same way shared the same fate.⁶⁸⁴ On the other hand, Kaiser's and Çiçek's comments on Aleppo are illuminating of the point that there was resistance against the central government orders from the highest ranking officials of the CUP within the province regarding the Armenian deportations.⁶⁸⁵ In this respect, the general paradigm in the related literature which approached the localities as passive agents of the Ottoman center needs to be revised. It is seen that the localities presented different stories concerning the Armenian

⁶⁸³ Kaiser, "Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies", p. 208.

⁶⁸⁴ Üngör, "'A Reign of Terror', CUP Rule in Diyarbekir Province, 1913-1923"; Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians*.

⁶⁸⁵ Kaiser, "Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies", pp. 209-210; Çiçek, *War and State Formation in Syria*, p. 107: "...Cemal's distance from and resistance to the policies implemented by Talat regarding the Armenians demonstrate that there was a significant divide in the Ottoman cabinet regarding the treatment of the Armenians."

deportations. Factors such as the local governors and their relation with the Ottoman center, their autonomization practices, and the relations between the Armenians and the local officials became influential in the development of the different stories.

The variations in the implementation of government orders can be demonstrated with a detailed evaluation of the documents sent from the localities to the central government on a daily basis. Even though there are general studies based on the central government orders that have greatly contributed to our understanding of the process, a focus on the localities could bring about some revisions or verifications regarding the correspondence of the general accounts with the actual situation. It is evident that the evaluation of the received telegrams will change some parts of the general comments and conclusions. Besides, it is problematic to write on the execution of the government policies in localities only by evaluating the central government orders despite the existence of documents sent from the districts. This dissertation is one of the first studies which evaluated those received coded telegrams.

As an important contribution of this study, it detailed how the liquidation of the Armenian abandoned properties actually happened in Kayseri by evaluating the telegrams sent from there. The fate of the abandoned properties in the sanjak also demonstrates that the Armenian deportations were not temporary. The turn of the Abandoned Properties Commissions to Liquidation Commissions in a short time and their liquidation can be evaluated in the sense that the new demographic balance would be maintained by the government.

The analysis of the received telegrams to explore the impacts of the Armenian deportations on the transformation of Kayseri sanjak shows that local actors, such as the district governor, the abandoned properties commission, and the local notables, were influential in the deportation process and also in the liquidation of the abandoned properties. In this respect, the related chapter focuses on the alliances, competition and problems among the local actors regarding the abandoned properties. I analyze the complaints regarding the distribution of the abandoned properties, and try to illustrate how

the emergence of such a significant source of wealth triggered the struggle of appropriation.

As abandoned properties were utilized for many purposes, such as meeting the needs of the state institutions and military, creating settlement for immigrants and refugees, and strengthening the Muslim entrepreneurs, the appropriation process also gave rise to the emergence of a power struggle among the leading figures of the sanjak. The analysis of the documents exemplifies that especially the corruption allegations had to be evaluated on the basis of the power struggle mentioned above. It has to be kept in mind that the Ottoman center wanted the distribution of the Armenian assets and the enrichment of Muslim tradesmen through this process. The main source of conflict was over the control of the official capital transfer. The authorities did not want the emergence of non-controllable actors in the “nationalization of the economy”.

As a result of the capital transfer, there was a significant transformation in the socio-economic realm. With the establishment of two joint-stock companies in the sanjak, the Armenian assets and capital were officially allocated to the Muslim entrepreneurs. Those companies emerged as direct initiatives of the local CUP cadres. However, the evaluation of the process shows that there was a tension between the aims of the Ottoman center and the actors of the process, the local notables. While the government tried to nationalize economy by allocating the abandoned properties to the Muslims, for the Muslim entrepreneurs this process meant easy enrichment. Therefore, even though the companies did not become long-lasting, they served to the rapid enrichment of their shareholders.

The nouveaux riches of Kayseri not only became the influential figures of the national resistance and the Republican period but some also appeared as the new entrepreneurs of Adana industry. 1924-1925 Turkish Trade Yearbook and 1927 Yearbook of Turkey confirm that there was no non-Muslim merchant in Kayseri after the deportation and exchange of populations with Greece. 1924-1925 Turkish Trade Yearbook also lists the factories and their owners in Kayseri as follows: pharmaceutical plant (*müstahzarat*) owned by Nisarizade

Mustafa, flour mill owned by Seyitzade Mustafa, flour mill owned by Muhaddiszade Alim, flour mill owned by Taşçı Çingilizadeler, textile (*yerli dokuma*) mill owned by Feyzizade Sait and partners, carpet factory owned by Dirazzade and Mahdumları, carpet factory owned by Katipzade Nuh Naci, carpet factory owned by Taşçızade and partners and carpet factory owned by Göbelekzade and partners. Some of them participated in the formation of *Kayseri Milli İktisad Anonim Şirketi* and some were described as the leading men of the national resistance period.⁶⁸⁶ In other words, the Armenian deportation paved the way for the rise of a new bourgeoisie and thus a new upper class in the district.

The analysis of the process in Kayseri became important since it illustrates how the local actors were articulated in the policies of the central government and benefited from them to maximize their interests. The analysis of different implementations in the localities is significant to understand the socio-economic transformation of them.

Upon the decision for the return of the deportees in October 1918, Armenian deportees began to return. I could not find any data regarding the number of returnees in Kayseri sanjak, but it is claimed that the total number of Armenian returnees within the empire was about 300,000-350,000. The return process was not problem-free and raised some issues; such as the delivery of Armenian women and children to their community, the rise of insecurity resulting in the flight of the Armenian population from the sanjak, and the restitution of the abandoned properties. The last subject that emerged as the most controversial issue for the Armenian population was that their properties had been liquidated and most of the deportees lost their lives during the deportation.

The analysis of the restoration process in Kayseri demonstrates that this topic has to be examined considering variations in different localities. The attitude of the local authorities, security issues and the number of refugees and immigrants who had settled in the properties that had been abandoned by

⁶⁸⁶ Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, pp. 231-234, 263-269; Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, pp. 149-151.

Armenians all had definitive impacts on the restitution. Even though an overall picture of the process cannot be drawn, it seems that the Ottoman government of the Armistice period favored the restoration of the abandoned properties reversing the former policies of the CUP. This rupture in the government policy regarding the deportees and their properties would not last long since the Istanbul government was no longer the sole authority in the Ottoman lands by the middle of 1919. The rise of national movement and the establishment of national resistance organizations directly influenced the process as the appointed officials lost their control in the localities. This situation gave an impetus to the flight of the Armenians from the interior cities to coastal areas. The period of post 1920 has to be evaluated in the context of the rising national movement. Even though it is beyond the scope of this work, it has to be stated that the national forces did not favor the restitution of the Armenian properties.

As an important contribution of this study, the analysis of the return process shows that the case of Kayseri does not confirm certain arguments of the related literature. First of all, it is seen that the Ministry of Interior did not order the implementation of the principle of “*isbad-ı vücut*” to the returnees; instead, the Ministry wanted the restitution of the properties to the heirs of the deceased deportees. Even though we do not know if the local authorities implemented the central government orders regarding the restitution of such properties in the Kayseri district, it is evident that there was a complete reversal of the former policies at the central government level. It is also a general argument of the literature that serious problems emerged between the returnees and the immigrants/refugees who had settled in the abandoned properties. It is probable that only a small number of Armenian deportees could return to the sanjak. Since the number of the immigrants and refugees also highly decreased in Kayseri by the return of the deportees, there was no serious problem among them in the sanjak.

The fact that many of the deportees could not return to Kayseri at the end of the war means that only a small percentage of the abandoned properties were restored to their owners. Most of the abandoned properties stayed in the hands of their appropriators. Furthermore, the rise of Ankara government and

the changed attitude towards non-Muslims led to many returnees leaving the countryside and going to central cities. Therefore, the process had deep implications over the formation of the property rights and relations in Kayseri. Besides, 1927 population census illustrates that the flight of the non-Muslim population highly affected the demographic composition of the sanjak since at the time of the census there were only 3,230 Christian non-Muslims remaining in Kayseri.

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

Archival Sources*

Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi/Prime Ministry Republican Archive in Ankara (BCA), Ankara, Turkey

Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi/Prime Ministry Ottoman Archive in Istanbul (BOA), Istanbul, Turkey.

Library of Congress, The Papers of Henry Morgenthau, Washington DC, United States of America.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), Harvard University, Houghton Library, Boston, United States of America.

The US National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, MD, United States of America.

Published Documents and Memoirs

“Turkish Atrocities”: *Statements of American Missionaries on the Destruction of Christian Communities in Ottoman Turkey, 1915-1917*, compiled by James L. Barton, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Gomidas Institute, 1998.

28 *Teşrinievvel 1927, Umumi Nüfus Tahriri, Fasikül III*, Ankara, Başvekalet Müdevvenat Matbaası, 1929.

28 *Teşrinievvel 1927, Umumi Nüfus Tahriri, Fasikül II*, Ankara, Hüsnütabiat Matbaası, 1929.

Ankara Vilayeti Salnamesi 1325 (1907), ed. by Kudret Emiroğlu, Ahmet Yüksel, Ömer Türkoğlu, Ethem Coşkun, Ankara, Ankara Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1995.

Arşiv Belgeleri ile Ermeni Faaliyetleri 1914-1918, Vol. I, Ankara, Genel Kurmay Basımevi, 2005.

Arşiv Belgeleriyle Ermeni Faaliyetleri 1914-1918, Vol. VIII, Ankara, Genelkurmay Basımevi, 2008.

* Individual documents are cited in the relevant pages of the dissertation.

Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi, no: 81 (December 1982).

Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi, no: 83 (March 1983).

Bardakçı, Murat, *Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi, Sadrazam Talat Paşa'nın Özel Arşivinde Bulunan Ermeni Tehciri Konusundaki Belgeler ve Hususi Yazışmalar*, İstanbul, Everest, 2008.

British Documents on Ottoman Armenians, Vol. I (1856-1880), ed. by Bilal N. Şimşir, Ankara, TTK, 1982.

Cemal Paşa, *Hatıralar, İttihat ve Terakki, I. Dünya Savaşı Anıları*, ed. by Alpay Kabacalı, İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Düstur, II. Tertip, vol. 11, İstanbul, Evkaf Matbaası, 1928.

Düstur, III. Tertip, vol. 3, İstanbul, Milliyet Matbaası, 1929.

Düstur, Tertib-i Sani, Dersaadet, Matbaa-i Amire, 1336 (1920).

Ermeni Komitelerinin Amal ve Hareket-i İhtilaliyyesi İlan-ı Meşrutiyetten Evvel ve Sonra, İstanbul, Matbaa-i Amire, 1332 (1916).

İngiliz Belgelerinde Atatürk (1919-1938), Vol. 1 (April 1919-March 1920), ed. by Bilal Şimşir, Ankara, TTK, 1992.

Knapp, Grace Higley, *The Mission at Van, in Turkey in War Time*, 1916.

Kocabaşoğlu, Uygur and Murat Uluğtekin eds., *Salnamelerde Kayseri, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası Yayınları*, 1998.

Kurtuluş Savaşında Adalet Bakanı Ahmet Rifat Çalika'nın Anıları, ed. by Hurşit Çalika, İstanbul, 1992.

Meclis-i Ayan Zabıt Ceridesi, Devre.3, Cilt.2, İçtima Senesi.4, 41. İnikad (24 Mart 1334/24 March 1918)

Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 11. İnikad, (4 Teşrinisani 1334/4 November 1918)

Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 21. İnikad (5 Kanunuevvel 1334/5 December 1918)

Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 22. İnikad (7 Kanunuevvel 1334/7 December 1918)

- Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 24. İnikad (11 Kanunuevvel 1334/11 December 1918)
- Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.3, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.5, 25. İnikad (12 Kanunuevvel 1334/12 December 1918)
- Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.4, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.1, 10. İnikad (16 Şubat 1336/16 February 1920)
- Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.4, Cilt.1, İçtima Senesi.1, 17. İnikad (1 Mart 1336/1 March 1920)
- Miscellaneous no. 31 (1916), The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915-16, Documents presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs by Viscount Bryce*, London, 1916.
- Morgenthau, Henry, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, Detroit, Michigan, Wayne State University, 2003.
- Osmanlı Belgelerinde 1909 Adana Olayları, Vol. II*, Ankara, Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2010.
- Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler (1915-1920)*, Ankara, Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 1995.
- Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, Ankara, Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2007.
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.1, Cilt.28, İçtima Senesi.4, 14. İçtima (31 March 1923)
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre.2, Cilt.9, İçtima Senesi.2, 48. İçtima (27 October 1924)
- The Imperial Ottoman Penal Code, A Translation from the Turkish Text*, by John A. Strachery Bucknill and Haig Apisoghom S. Utidjian, London, Oxford University Press, 1913.
- Türk-Ermeni İhtilafı Belgeler (Turkish-Armenian Conflict Documents)*, eds. by Hikmet Özdemir and Yusuf Sarımay, Ankara, TBMM Kültür Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, 2007.
- Turkey, No.10 (1879), Correspondence Respecting the Condition of the Population in Asia Minor and Syria*, London, Harrison and Sons, 1879.

Turkey, No.2 (1896), Correspondence Relative to the Armenian Question and Reports from Her Majesty's Consular Officers in Asiatic Turkey, London, Harrison and Sons, 1896.

Turkey, No.6 (1881), Further Correspondence Respecting the Condition of the Populations in Asia Minor and Syria, London, Harrison and Sons, 1881.

Turkey, No.8 (1896), Further Correspondence Relating to the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey, [In Continuation of "Turkey No.2 (1896)"], London, Harrison and Sons, 1896.

United States Official Documents on the Armenian Genocide, Volume I: The Lower Euphrates, compiled and introduced by Ara Sarafian, Watertown, the Armenian Review, 1993.

Periodicals

İleri, no: 745, 3 February 1920.

STUDIES

"A potted history of the Aliotti family in the Levant" (Retrieved 20 April 2013, from, <http://www.levantineheritage.com/testi77.htm>)

1909 Adana Olayları Makaleler, The Adana Incidents of 1909 Revisited, edited by Kemal Çiçek, Ankara, TTK, 2011.

Adanır, Fikret and Hilmar Kaiser, "Göç, Sürgün ve Ulusun İnşası: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Örneği", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 186 (June 2009), pp. 18-27.

Ahmad, Feroz, *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, Istanbul, Kaynak Yayınları, 1999.

Ainsworth, William Francis, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Armenia, Vol. II*, London, John W. Parker, 1842.

Akçam, Taner, 'Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur', *Osmanlı Belgelerine Göre Savaş Yıllarında Ermenilere Yönelik Politikalar*, Istanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2008.

—, "Uğur Ümit Üngör ve Mehmet Polatel: El Koyma ve Yıkım, Genç Türklerin Ermeni Mallarını Gasp Etmesi Kitabı Üzerine", *Tarih ve Toplum, Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no. 14 (Summer 2012), pp. 95-119.

- , *The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Akçam, Taner, and Ümit Kurt, *Kanunların Ruhü, Emval-i Metruke Kanunlarında Soykırımın İzini Sürmek*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2012.
- Akkaya, Bülent, “H. 1330/M. 1912 Tarihli Erciyes Gazetesinin 14-21’inci Sayıları (Transkripsiyon ve Değerlendirme)”, unpublished MA Thesis, Erciyes University, 2006.
- Aktar, Ayhan and Abdülhamit Kırmızı, “Diyarbakır, 1915”, in *Diyarbakır Tebliğleri, Diyarbakır ve Çevresi Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Konferansı*, İstanbul, Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları, 2013, pp. 289-323.
- Alboyacıyan, Arşak, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria, Vol. II* (in Armenian), Cairo, 1937.
- Artinian, Vartan, *Osmanlı Devleti’nde Ermeni Anayasası’nın Doğuşu (1839-1863)*, İstanbul, Aras, 2004.
- Astourian, Stephan, “Testing World-System Theory, Cilicia (1830s-1890s): Armenian-Turkish Polarization and the Ideology of Modern Ottoman Historiography”, Dissertation, Los Angeles, University of California, 1996.
- Atnur, İbrahim Ethem, *Türkiye’de Ermeni Kadınları ve Çocukları Meselesi (1915-1923)*, Ankara, Babil Yayıncılık, 2005.
- Avagyan, Arsen and Gaidz F. Minassian, *Ermeniler ve İttihat ve Terakki İşbirliğinden Çatışmaya*, İstanbul, Aras Yayıncılık, 2005.
- Balakian, Grigoris, *Armenian Golgotha, A Memoir of the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1918*, trans. by Peter Balakian, New York, Vintage Books, 2009.
- Barker, William Burkhardt, *Lares and Penates; or, Cilicia and its Governors*, London, Ingram, Cooke and Co., 1853.
- Barsoumian, Hagop, “The Dual Role of the Armenian *Amira* Class within the Ottoman Government and the Armenian *Millet* (1750-1850)”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire, Vol. I*, eds. by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, New York, Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982, pp. 171-184.
- Bliss, Rev. Edwin Munsell, *Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities*, London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1896.

- Bloxham, Donald, *The Great Game of Genocide, Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Bruinessen, Martin van, *Ağa, Şeyh, Devlet*, İstanbul, İletişim, 2004.
- Calouste Sarkis Gulbenkian, The Man and His Work*, Lisbon, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2010.
- Charter, Melville, “East of Constantinople, Glimpses of Village Life in Anatolia, the Battleground of East and West, Where the Turks Reorganized Their Forces After the World War”, *The National Geographic Magazine*, vol. 43, no. 5 (May 1923), pp. 509-534.
- Chochiev, Georgi, “XIX. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Kuzey Kafkas Göçmenlerinin Toplumsal Uyarlanmasına Dair Bazı Görüşler”, *Kebikeç*, no. 23 (2007), pp. 407-456.
- Chochiev, Georgi and Bekir Koç, “Migrants from the North Caucasus in Eastern Anatolia: Some Notes on Their Settlement and Adaptation (Second Half of the 19th Century-Beginning of the 20th Century)”, *Journal of Asian History*, ed. by Denis Sinor, 40 (2006), pp. 80-103.
- Clark, Edward, “The Emergence of Textile Manufacturing Entrepreneurs in Turkey, 1804-1968”, Diss., Princeton University, 1969.
- Çelik, Kemal, *Milli Mücadele’de Adana ve Havalisi (1918-1922)*, Ankara, TTK, 1999.
- Çetinoğlu, Sait, “Diyarbakır’da Ermeni Mallarını Kim Aldı?”, in *Diyarbakır Tebliğleri, Diyarbakır ve Çevresi Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Konferansı*, İstanbul, Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları, 2013, pp. 368-406.
- , “Soykırımı Laboratuvarında İncelemek: Mardin 1915”, in Yves Ternon, *Mardin 1915 Bir Yıkımın Patolojik Anatomisi*, İstanbul, Belge, 2013, pp. 9-75.
- Çiçek, M. Talha, *War and State Formation in Syria, Cemal Pasha’s Governorate during World War I, 1914-17*, London, Routledge, 2014.
- Çomu, Aslı Emine, “The Impact of the Exchange of Populations on the Economic and Social Life of the City of Adana (1875-1927)”, MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2005.

- Dadayan, Kahaçadur ed., *XV. Yüzyıldan 1915'e Günümüz Türkiye'sinde Ermenilerin Ticari-Ekonomik Faaliyeti Toplu Belgeler*, translated by Mariam Arpi and Nairi Arek, Yerevan, Gasprint, 2012.
- Dadrian, Vahakn N., "The Agency of "Triggering Mechanisms" as a Factor in the Organization of the Genocide against the Armenians of Kayseri District", *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, vol. 1, no. 2 (September 2006), pp. 107-126.
- , *The History of the Armenian Genocide Ethnic Conflict from the Balkans to Anatolia to the Caucasus*, New York, Berghahn Books, 2003.
- Davison, Roderic H., "Nationalism as an Ottoman Problem and the Ottoman Response", in *Nationalism in a non-National State*, William W. Haddad and William Ochsenwald (eds.), Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1977, pp. 25-56.
- , "The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire, Vol. I*, eds. by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, New York, Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982, pp. 319-337.
- , *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform, 1856-1876*, Istanbul, Agora, 2005.
- Der Matossian, Bedross, "Ottoman Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri in the Nineteenth Century", in *Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri and Cappadocia*, ed. by Richard G. Hovannisian, California, Mazda Publishers, 2013, pp. 187-230.
- , "The Armenian Commercial Houses and Merchant Networks in the 19th Century Ottoman Empire", *TURCICA*, no. 39 (Fall 2007), pp. 147-174.
- Deringil, Selim, "'The Armenian Question is Finally Closed': Mass Conversions of Armenians in Anatolia during the Hamidian Massacres of 1895-1897", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 51, no. 2 (2009), pp. 344-371.
- Duguid, Stephen, "The Politics of Unity: Hamidian Policy in Eastern Anatolia", *Middle Eastern Studies*, 9 (1973), pp. 139-155.
- Duman, Önder, "Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Osmanlı Devleti ile Müttefikleri Arasında Bir Diplomatik Kriz: Ermeni Emval-i Metrukesi ve Borçları", *Ermeni Araştırmaları*, no. 22 (Summer 2006), pp. 117-163.
- Dündar, Fuat, "Aktar ve Kırmızı'nın Eleştirisi Vesilesiyle: Algılama ve Ölçüyü Tutturma Sorunu", *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 9 (Fall 2009), pp. 227-246.

- , *Crime of Numbers, The Role of Statistics in the Armenian Question (1878-1918)*, New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers, 2010.
- , *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası (1913-1918)*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2001.
- , *Kahir Ekseriyet Ermeni Nüfus Meselesi (1878-1923)*, İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı, 2013.
- , *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi, İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2008.
- Efiloğlu, Ahmet, “Fuat Dünder’in “Tehcire Gereken ve Hak Ettiği Anlamı Veren Kitabı”: Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi”, *Yücel Dağlı Anısına “geldi Yücel, gitti Yücel. Bir nefes gibi...”*, ed. by Evangelia Balta et al., İstanbul, Turkuaz Yayınları, 2011, pp. 177-200.
- Efiloğlu, Ahmet, “Fuat Dünder’in Osmanlı Belgelerinde Kaybolan “Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi””, *Bellekten*, no. 270 (August 2010), pp. 531-570.
- Efiloğlu, Ahmet and Raif İvecan, “Rum Emval-i Metrukesinin İdaresi,” *History Studies*, vol. 2/3 (2010), pp. 129-150.
- Ekmekçioğlu, Lerna, “A Climate for Abduction, a Climate for Redemption: the Politics of Inclusion during and after the Armenian Genocide”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 55, no. 3 (2012), pp. 522-553.
- Eldem, Edhem, “26 Ağustos 1896 “Banka Vakası” ve 1896 “Ermeni Olayları””, in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri Bilimsel Sorumluluk ve Demokrasi Sorunları*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011, pp. 125-152.
- Eldem, Vedat, *Harp ve Mütareke Yıllarında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomisi*, Ankara, TTK, 1994.
- , *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun İktisadi Şartları Hakkında Bir Tetkik*, Ankara, TTK, 1994.
- Fırat, M. Şerif, *Doğu İlleri ve Varto Tarihi*, Ankara, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1983.
- Georgelin, Hervé, “Armenians in Late Ottoman Rural Kesaria/Kayseri”, in *Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri and Cappadocia*, ed. by Richard G. Hovannisian, California, Mazda Publishers, 2013, pp. 231-249.

- Georgeon, François, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*, Ankara, Yurt Yayınları, 1996.
- Günaydın, Adem, “The Return and Resettlement of the Relocated Armenians (1918-1920)”, MA thesis, METU, 2007.
- Güran, Tevfik, *19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Tarımı Üzerine Araştırmalar*, İstanbul, Eren, 1998.
- Gürbüz, S. Aslıhan, “Hamidian Policy in Eastern Anatolia (1878-1890)”, MA thesis, Bilkent University, 2008.
- Gürün, Kamuran, *Ermeni Dosyası*, Ankara, 1985.
- Halaçoğlu, Ahmet, *Balkan Harbi Sırasında Rumeli’den Türk Göçleri (1912-1913)*, Ankara, TTK, 1995.
- Hanioglu, M. Şükrü, “Turkism and the Young Turks, 1889-1908”, in *Turkey beyond Nationalism: towards Post-Nationalist Identities*, ed. by Hans-Lukas Kieser, London, I.B. Tauris, 2006, pp. 3-19.
- http://www.oia.net/news/articles/2003_06_21_News_13_31_29.html (accessed 17 November 2011)
- Hülagü, M. Metin, “Kayseri ve Çevresinde Kuzugüdenli Aşireti ve Eşkiyalık Olayları”, *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 15 (2003/2), pp. 37-44.
- , “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Güherçile Üretimi ve Kayseri Güherçile Fabrikası”, *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 11 (2001), pp. 73-93.
- İpek, Nedim, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler*, Trabzon, Serander, 2006.
- İslamoğlu-İnan, Huri (ed.), *The Ottoman Empire and the World-Economy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Issawi, Charles, *The Economic History of Turkey, 1800-1914*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Kaiser, Hilmar, “Armenian Property, Ottoman Law and Nationality Policies during the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1916”, in *The First World War as Remembered in the Countries of the Eastern Mediterranean*, edited by Olaf Farschid et al., Beirut, Orient-Institut, 2006, pp. 49-71. (In Turkish, “1915-1916 Ermeni Soykırımı Sırasında Ermeni Mülkleri, Osmanlı Hukuku ve Milliyet Politikaları”, in *İmparatorluktan Cumhuriyete*

Türkiye’de Etnik Çatışma, ed. by Erik Jan Zürcher, İstanbul, İletişim, 2005, pp. 123-157)

——, “Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies: Ahmed Djemal Pasha, the Governors of Aleppo, and Armenian deportees in the Spring and Summer 1915”, *Journal of Genocide Research*, vol. 12, nos. 3-4 (September-December 2010), pp. 173-218.

——, *Imperialism, Racism, and Development Theories, The Construction of a Dominant Paradigm on Ottoman Armenians*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Gomidas Institute, 1998.

——, *The Extermination of Armenians in the Diyarbekir Region*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2014.

Kalaç, Ahmet Hilmi, *Kayseri’yi Bilmek İster misiniz? Yahut Kayseri’nin Ekonomik Durumu 1911*, Kayseri, Mazaka Yayıncılık, 2007.

——, *Kendi Kitabım*, Yeni Matbaa, 1960.

Kalfaian, Aris, *Chomaklou, The History of an Armenian Village*, New York, Chomaklou Compatriotic Society, 1982.

Kaligian, Dikran M., “Agrarian Land Reform and the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire”, *Armenian Review*, vol. 48, nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 2003), pp. 24-45.

——, “The Armenian Revolutionary Federation under Ottoman Constitutional Rule, 1908-1914”, Dissertation, Boston College, 2003.

——, *Armenian Organization and Ideology under Ottoman Rule: 1908-1914*, New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers, 2009.

Kalkan, Emir, “Kayseri’ye Yerleşen Türk Toplulukları”, *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no. 17 (April 1982), pp. 86-102.

Karaömerlioğlu, M. Asım, “Helphand-Parvus and his Impact on Turkish Intellectual Life”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 40, no. 6 (Nov. 2004), pp. 145-165.

Kardeş, Salahaddin, *Tehcir ve Emval-i Metruke Mevzuatı*, Ankara, Maliye Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, 2008.

Karpat, Kemal H., “Pan-İslamizm ve İkinci Abdülhamid: Yanlış Bir Görüşün Düzeltilmesi”, *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no: 48 (1987), pp. 13-37.

- , “The Ottoman Emigration to America, 1860-1914”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol.17, no.2 (May, 1985), pp. 175-209.
- , *Ottoman Population 1830-1914, Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
- Kars, Zübeyir, *Milli Mücadelede Kayseri*, Ankara, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1993.
- Kasaba, Reşad, “A Time and a Place for the Nonstate: Social Change in the Ottoman Empire during the ‘Long Nineteenth Century’”, in *State Power and Social Forces, Domination and Transformation in the Third World*, ed. by Joel S. Migdal-A. Kohli-V. Shue, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 206-230.
- Keskin, Mustafa, “Kayseri Yöresindeki Aşiretlerin İskanı Hakkında”, *Geçmişteki İzleriyle Kayseri*, Kayseri, 2006, pp. 80-94.
- Kevorkian, Raymond, *The Armenian Genocide, A Complete History*, New York, I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Kevorkian, Raymond H., and Paul B. Paboudjian, *1915 Öncesinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Ermeniler*, İstanbul, Aras, 2012.
- Keyder, Çağlar, *Memalik-i Osmaniye’den Avrupa Birliği’ne*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2003.
- , *State and Class in Turkey*, London, Verso, 1987.
- Kinneir, John Macdonald, *Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia, and Koordistan, in the Years 1813 and 1814, with Remarks on the Marches of Alexander, and Retreat of the Ten Thousand*, London, John Murray, 1818.
- Klein, Janet, “Power in the Periphery: The Hamidiye Light Cavalry and the Struggle over Ottoman Kurdistan, 1890-1914”, Dissertation, Princeton University, 2002.
- Kodaman, Bayram, “Hamidiye Hafif Süvari Alayları, II. Abdülhamit ve Doğu-Anadolu Aşiretleri”, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, no. 32 (1979), pp. 427-480.
- Koptaş, Rober, “Zohrab, Papazyan ve Pastırmacıyan’ın Kalemlerinden, 1914 Ermeni Reformu ile İttihadçı-Taşnak Müzakereleri”, in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri Bilimsel Sorumluluk ve Demokrasi Sorunları*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011, pp. 175-191.

- Kushner, David, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu*, İstanbul, Ay Köprüsü Yayınları, 2004.
- Landau, Jacob M., *Tekinalp, Turkish Patriot 1883-1961*, Leiden, Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituutte İstanbul, 1984.
- Matossian, Mary Kilbourne and Susie Hoogasian Villa, *Anlatılar ve Fotoğraflarla 1914 Öncesi Ermeni Köy Hayatı*, trans. by Altuğ Yılmaz, İstanbul, Aras Yayıncılık, 2006.
- McCarthy, Justin, *Death and Exile, The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims 1821-1922*, Princeton, The Darwin Press, 1999.
- , *Muslims and Minorities, The Population of Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Empire*, New York, New York University Press, 1983.
- , *Ölüm ve Sürgün*, trans. by Bilge Umar, İstanbul, İnkılap, 1998.
- , *The Ottoman Peoples and the End of Empire*, London, Arnold Publishers, 2001.
- McCarthy, Justin and Esat Arslan, Cemalettin Taşkiran, Ömer Turan, *The Armenian Rebellion at Van*, Salt Lake City, The University of Utah Press, 2006.
- McDowall, David, *A Modern History of the Kurds*, London, I. B. Tauris, 1996.
- Melson, Robert, “A Theoretical Inquiry into the Armenian Massacres of 1894-1896”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 24, No. 3 (Jul. 1982), pp. 481-509.
- Migdal, Joel, “The State in Society: an Approach to Struggles for Domination”, in *State Power and Social Forces Domination and Transformation in the Third World*, edited by Joel S. Migdal et al., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. 7-34.
- Nalbandian, Louise, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement, The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1963.
- Nazif, Ahmet, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, Kayseri, Kayseri İl Özel İdare Müdürlüğü ve Kayseri Belediyesi Birliği Yayınları, 1987.
- Nuri, Hıfzı, *Kayseri Sancağı, 1922*, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası, 1995.

- , *Türkiye'nin Sıhhi İçtimai Coğrafyası, Kayseri Sancağı*, Ankara, Öğüd Matbaası, 1922.
- Onaran, Nevzat, *Cumhuriyet'te Ermeni ve Rum Mallarının Türkleştirilmesi (1920-1930), Emval-i Metrukenin Tasfiyesi-II*, İstanbul, Evrensel, 2013.
- , *Emval-i Metruke Olayı, Osmanlı'da ve Cumhuriyette Ermeni ve Rum Mallarının Türkleştirilmesi*, İstanbul, Belge Yayınları, 2010.
- , *Osmanlı'da Ermeni ve Rum Mallarının Türkleştirilmesi (1914-1919), Emval-i Metrukenin Tasfiyesi-I*, İstanbul, Evrensel, 2013.
- Öğün, Tuncay, *Unutulmuş Bir Göç Trajedisi, Vilayat-ı Şarkıye Mültecileri (1915-1923)*, Ankara, Babil Yayıncılık, 2004.
- Ökçün, A. Gündüz, “1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Anonim Şirket Olarak Kurulan Bankalar”, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri, Metinler/Tartışmalar, 8-10 Haziran 1973*, ed. by Osman Okyar, Ankara, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1975, pp. 409-484.
- , *1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'de Bankacılık Alanında Kurulan Anonim Şirketler, İktisat Eğitim ve Araştırma Projesi Seminer Çalışmaları*, Ankara, 1973.
- Özbyay, Hasan, “XIX. Yüzyılda Talas ve Talas'ın Amerikalılar Tarafından Mısyon Merkezi Olarak Seçilmesinin Sebepleri”, *I. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri (11-12 April 1996)*, Kayseri, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 1997, pp. 255-260.
- Özdemir, Hikmet, et al., *Ermeniler: Sürgün ve Göç*, Ankara, TTK, 2004.
- Özel, Oktay, “Muhacirler, Yerliler ve Gayrimüslimler: Osmanlı'nın Son Devrinde Orta Karadeniz'de Toplumsal Uyumun Sınırları Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler”, in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri Bilimsel Sorumluluk ve Demokrasi Sorunları*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011, pp. 107-123.
- Özoğlu, Hakan, *Osmanlı Devleti ve Kürt Milliyetçiliği*, İstanbul, Kitap Yayınevi, 2005.
- Pamuk, Şevket, *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme 1820-1913*, İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı, 2005.
- Pamukciyan, Kevork, *Ermeni Kaynaklarından Tarihe Katkılar, cilt III, Zamanlar, Mekanlar, İnsanlar*, ed. by Osman Köker, İstanbul, Aras Yayıncılık, 2003.

- Papazian, K. S., *Merchants from Ararat, a Brief Survey of Trade through the Ages*, edited and revised by P. M. Manuelian, New York, Ararat Press, 1979.
- Parla, Taha, *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye’de Korporatizm*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 1989.
- Parmaksız, Esmâ İğüs, “Ermeni Tarihçi Arşag Alboyacıyan’ın Kayseri Ermenileri Tarihi Adlı Eserine Göre Kayseri’de XIX. Yüzyıl ile XX. Yüzyıl Başlarında Faaliyet Gösteren Ermeni Okulları”, in *Hoşgörü Toplumunda Ermeniler, Vol. II*, Kayseri, Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007, pp. 137-159.
- Percy, Henry Algernon George, *Highlands of Asiatic Turkey*, London, E. Arnold, 1901.
- Polatel, Mehmet, “Diyarbakır’ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Dönüşümünde Ermeni Mallarının Rolü”, in *Diyarbakır Tebliğleri, Diyarbakır ve Çevresi Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Konferansı*, İstanbul, Hrant Dink Vakfı Yayınları, 2013, pp. 407-420.
- , “Turkish State Formation and the Distribution of the Armenian Abandoned Properties from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey (1915-1930)”, MA Thesis, Koç University, 2009.
- Quataert, Donald, *Manufacturing and Technology Transfer in the Ottoman Empire 1800-1914*, İstanbul, The Isis Press, 1992.
- , *Ottoman Manufacturing in the Age of the Industrial Revolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Sahara, Tetsuya, *What Happened in Adana in April 1909? Conflicting Armenian and Turkish Views*, İstanbul, ISIS, 2014.
- Sarafian, Ara, *Talaat Pasha’s Report on the Armenian Genocide*, London, Gomidas Institute, 2011.
- Seyahatnamelerde Kayseri*, ed. by Osman Eravşar, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası Yayınları, 2000.
- Shaw, Stanford J. and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Volume II: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Süme, Mehmet, “Turkish-Armenian Relations in Develi According to the Sharia Court Records”, *Armenians in the Ottoman Society, Vol. II*, ed. by

Metin Hülagü, Gülbadi Alan, Şakir Batmaz, Erciyes University Press, pp. 49-59.

Sunar, Mehmet M., “Tribes and State: Ottoman Centralization in Eastern Anatolia, 1876-1914”, Master thesis, Bilkent University, 1999.

Sussnitzki, Alphons J., “Zur Gliederung wirtschaftlicher Arbeit nach Nationalitäten in der Türkei”, *Archiv für Wirtschaftsforschung im Orient*, 2 (1917), pp. 382-407.

Svajian, Stephen G., *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, New York, Green Hill Publishing Ltd., 1983.

Şeker, Nesim, “Demographic Engineering in the late Ottoman Empire and the Armenians”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 43, no. 3 (May 2007), pp. 461-474.

Tekeli, İlhan, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndan Günümüze Nüfusun Zorunlu Yer Değiştirmesi ve İskan Sorunu”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 50 (1990), pp. 49-71.

Ter Minassian, Anahide, , “Van 1915”, in *Armenian Van/Vasporakan*, ed. by Richard G. Hovannisian, California, Mazda Publishers, 2000, pp. 209-244.

—, “The Role of the Armenian Community in the Foundation and Development of the Socialist Movement in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1876-1923”, in *Socialism and Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1923*, eds. by Mete Tunçay and Erik Jan Zürcher, New York, British Academic Press, 1994, pp. 109-156.

Toksöz, Meltem, “Adana Ermenileri ve 1909 “İğtişaşı””, in *İmparatorluğun Çöküş Döneminde Osmanlı Ermenileri Bilimsel Sorumluluk ve Demokrasi Sorunları*, Istanbul, Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011, pp. 153-162.

Toprak, Zafer, *İttihat Terakki ve Cihan Harbi*, Istanbul, Homer Kitabevi, 2003.

—, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, Ankara, Yurt Yayınları, 1982.

Tuzcu, Ali, “19. Yüzyılın Başlarından 20. Yüzyılın İlk Çeyreğine Seyyahların Gözüyle ve Konsolosluk Raporlarında Kayseri’nin İktisadi Yapısı”, in *III. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri (06-07 Nisan 2000)*, Kayseri, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2000, pp. 527-552.

- Ülker, Erol, “Contextualizing ‘Turkification’: Nation-Building in the late Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918”, *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 11, no. 4 (2005), pp. 613-636.
- Üngör, Uğur Ümit, “‘A Reign of Terror’, CUP Rule in Diyarbakir Province, 1913-1923”, Master thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2005.
- , “Seeing like a nation-state: Young Turk Social Engineering in Eastern Turkey, 1913-50”, *Journal of Genocide Research*, vol. 10, no. 1 (March 2008), pp. 15-39.
- Üngör, Uğur Ümit, and Mehmet Polatel, “Taner Akçam’ın Eleştirilerine Dair”, *Tarih ve Toplum, Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no. 14 (Summer 2012), pp. 121-136.
- , *Confiscation and Destruction, The Young Turk Seizure of Armenian Property*, London, Continuum, 2011.
- Yıldırım, Onur, *Türk-Yunan Mübadelesinin Öteki Yüzü: Diplomasi ve Göç*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006.
- Zürcher, Erik Jan, “The Late Ottoman Empire as Laboratory of Demographic Engineering”, paper presented at the conference “Le Regioni Multilingui Come Faglia e Motore Della Storia Europe Nel XIX-XX Secolo”, Napoli, 2008. Retrieved January 29, 2013 from http://www.sissco.it/fileadmin/user_upload/Attivita/Convegna/regioni_multilingue/zurcher.pdf
- , “The Young Turks-Children of the Borderlands?”, *Turkology Update Leiden Working Papers Archive*. Retrieved January 29, 2013 from, http://edoc.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/HALCoRe_derivate_00003227/youngturks_borderlands.pdf
- , “Young Turks, Ottoman Muslims and Turkish Nationalists: Identity Politics 1908-1938”, in *Ottoman Past and Today’s Turkey*, ed. by Kemal H. Karpat, Leiden, Brill, 2000, pp. 150-179.
- , *Modernleşen Türkiye’nin Tarihi*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

The Population of Kayseri *Kaza*

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Kayseri Merkez Kazası Mahallatı	7,592	16,763	18,176	589	1,375	1,616	2,605	7,623	265	554	633	347	635	756	
Germir Karyesi	287	805	899	621		1,465	336	660							
Tavlusun Karyesi	385	805	891	136		288	97	167							
Talas Karyesi	808	1,695	1,848	1,100		2,645	1,026	2,305	8	17	24	5	8	11	
Derevenk Karyesi							98	217							
Hisarcık Karyesi	338	903	990												
Gesi Karyesi	262	642	692	39	88	99	5	12							
Kıranardı Karyesi	174	528	570												
Endürlük Karyesi	47	99	100	524	937	989									
İstefana Karyesi	182	478	493	83	152	160			10	26	34				
Salkuma Karyesi	133	370	390												
İspile Karyesi	165	388	456												
Kiçi Bürüngüz Karyesi	69	161	179												
Cırlavuk Karyesi	263	869	896												
Kuru Köprü Karyesi	119	342	369												
Efkere Karyesi	83	168	183				443	1,069							
Belegesı Karyesi							197	478							
Akçakaya Karyesi	324	748	793												

Source: BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükur	hane	inas	zükur	hane	inas	zükur	hane	inas	zükur	hane	inas	zükur
Zincidere Karyesi	76	175	188	467	1,363	1,274				38	87	75			
Dimitre (?) Karyesi	228	629	679												
Ağırmas Karyesi	269	676	760	86	218	219									
Üskübi Karyesi	78	190	196	64	154	168									
Vekse Karyesi	56	135	141	35	68	85									
Mancusun Karyesi	86	445	477				137	303	332						
İsbidin Karyesi	125	290	304												
Cırkalan Karyesi	93	241	252												
Dadasun Karyesi	51	90	110												
Kumarlı Karyesi	25	41	44												
Argınelik Karyesi	114	251	272												
Nirze Karyesi	74	154	178				46	415	428						
Darsiyak Karyesi	139	399	424	98	201	196	11	21	22						
Salur Karyesi	63	126	141												
Karahöyük Karyesi	58	79	114												
Gömeç Karyesi	103	223	243												
Barsıma Karyesi	94	220	239												
Horsana Karyesi	43	73	86												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Erkilet Karyesi	649	1,565	1,597	147	244	266							10	19	18
Alagöz Karyesi	27	47	51												
Ak İn Karyesi	102	262	279												
Kızık Karyesi	172	387	392												
Muncusun Karyesi	139	279	282							259	524	559	32	69	76
Molu Karyesi	365	847	887												
Mahzemin Karyesi	164	355	385												
Kemer (?) Karyesi	101	231	256												
Dadağı Karyesi	81	165	197												
Ebic Karyesi	103	196	256												
Bey Değirmeni Karyesi	30	49	49												
Bey Değirmeni Çiftliği	6	9	14												
Yemliha Karyesi	206	476	506												
Eski Ömerler Karyesi	78	163	195												
Karakimse Karyesi	73	156	186												
Yukarı Hasınlı Karyesi	34	76	102												
Aşağı Hasınlı Karyesi	87	234	234												
Saraycık Karyesi	63	188	194												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Ziruh Karyesi	60	196	231												
Yazır Karyesi	78	167	199												
Hasan Arpa Karyesi	22	42	46												
Emmiler Karyesi	114	297	324												
Taşhan Karyesi	84	192	205												
Çivril (?) Karyesi	153	316	329												
Boyacı Karyesi	94	183	186												
Kuşçu Karyesi	232	632	647												
Molla Hacı Karyesi	100	227	230												
Höbek Karyesi	157	368	378												
Yüreğil Karyesi	54	104	130												
Ayım Karyesi	144	343	355												
Döğer Karyesi	119	247	269												
Kalkancı Karyesi	59	114	125												
Himmetdede Karyesi	100	217	225												
Sarı Danişment Karyesi	48	122	116												
Fehimlü Karyesi	74	158	165												
Taf-1 Sagır Karyesi	57	159	178												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Taf-ı Kebir Karyesi	78	192	207												
Kersen/Gersen Karyesi	16	43	42												
Kuşçağaz Karyesi	69	174	187												
Obruk Karyesi	98	244	257												
İmaret Karyesi	135	359	369												
Germelik Karyesi	119	230	241												
Kilise Karyesi	155	383	399												
Horan Karyesi	179	436	453												
Horan Muhaciri (?) Karyesi	7	9	20												
Yazı Çebni Karyesi	89	217	229												
Belviran Karyesi	47	90	109				91	212	242						
Menteşe Karyesi	62	135	150												
Hırka Karyesi	151	397	411												
Çukur Karyesi	198	525	535	123	321	356									
Silahdar Karyesi	128	298	323												
Taşlık Karyesi				76	198	241									
Vartan Karyesi	39	84	98												
Hacılar Karyesi	845	2,362	2,497												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Yuvalı Karyesi	185	449	463												
Oymaağaç Karyesi	101	217	242												
Kaş Karyesi	57	158	177												
Bayram Hacı Karyesi	99	225	247												
Anbar Karyesi	39	43	59												
Keykubat Karyesi	8	17	19												
Yekun*	20,139	47,257	50,907	4,188	9,482	10,067	5,439	14,139	14,249	353	753	842	377	693	824

* The totals in the document are different from my calculations. I used my calculations at this table. In the original document the totals are as follows; Muslim households: 20,216, Muslim women: 47,217, Muslim men: 50,707, Greek households: 4,188, Greek women: 9,482, Greek men: 10,067, Armenian households: 5,539, Armenian women: 14,139, Armenian men: 14,249, Protestant households: 353, Protestant women: 753, Protestant men: 832, Catholic households: 377, Catholic women: 693, Catholic men: 824.

APPENDIX 2

The Population of Develi *Kaza*

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Develi Kaza Merkezi Everek Kasabası (?) Mahallatı		4,358	4,673		329	337		3,157	3,696		82	98			
Ebce Sultan Karyesi		180	191												
Ayvaz Hacı Karyesi		298	292												
İncesu Karyesi		94	128					417	495						
Eşelik Karyesi		34	37												
Öksüd Karyesi		301	299												
Ardıç Karyesi		121	124												
Pungu (?) Karyesi		118	124												
Böke Karyesi		143	165												
Bektaş Karyesi		32	35												
Pusatlı Karyesi		379	372												
Çomaklı Karyesi		37	55					598	666		95	95			
Cebir Karyesi		125	153												
Çilmeze Karyesi		86	87												
Çöreken Karyesi		46	52												
Çöten Karyesi		268	270												
Cüctün Karyesi		22	26					282	328		7	5			
Çömlekçi Karyesi		161	169												

Source: BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Hasanlı (?) Karyesi		95	120												
Hacıpaşa Karyesi		136	127												
Diğir (?) Karyesi		119	129												
Sendelhöyük Karyesi		691	700												
Sendiremeki Karyesi		104	100												
Zile Karyesi		619	662		134	144									
Süleyman Fakılı Karyesi		55	54												
Sögüdü Karyesi								167	164						
Sazak Karyesi								73	155						
Süleymanlı Karyesi		176	314												
Şih Barak Karyesi		247	263												
Şahmelik Karyesi		250	252												
Soysallı Karyesi		301	316												
Sarıca Karyesi		153	189												
Susun Karyesi		189	215												
Sar Mah mudlu Karyesi		124	137												
Sakal Tutan Karyesi		142	205												
Tombak Karyesi		160	176												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Taşhan Karyesi									206						
Tomarza Nahiyeye Merkezi		129	161						1,718						
Tıraşın Karyesi		300	313												
Gazi Karyesi		276	308												
Faraşa Karyesi		16	12			356	527								
Fırakdın Karyesi		244	296												
Karaca Viran Karyesi					95	113			150						187
Kazlıgömedi Karyesi									87						82
Kabaklı Karyesi		172	204												
Koçcağız Karyesi		124	116												
Kala Karyesi		114	118												
Kanber Karyesi		270	287												
Gilgin Karyesi		433	472												
Giregit Karyesi		247	251												
Kepez Karyesi		258	273												
Kömür (?) Karyesi		67	119												
Göbü Karyesi		49	55												
Gömedi Karyesi		82	80												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Madazı Karyesi		192	200												
Meyillidere Karyesi		54	67												
Melenki Karyesi		14	21												
Mardin Karyesi		144	145												
Maraçak Karyesi		124	125												
Virancık Karyesi		118	117												
Vengicek Karyesi		141	148												
Yağdıbaran Karyesi								78	89						
Yamaçlı Karyesi		129	125												
Yenice Karyesi		24	35					159	175						
Yekun*		14,085	15,259		914	1,121		7,092	7,960		184	198			

* The totals in the document are different from my calculations. I used my calculations at this table. In the original document the totals are as follows; Muslim women: 14,189, Muslim men:15,239, Greek women: 914, Greek men: 1,121, Armenian women: 7,092, Armenian men:7,960, Protestant women: 184, Protestant men: 198.

APPENDIX 3

The Population of İncesu Kaza

Esami	İslam		Rum		Ermeni		Protestan		Katolik	
	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas
İncesu Kazası Merkez Kaza Mahallatı		2,565		1,384		1,324				
Kara Höyük Karyesi		105								
Hamurcu Karyesi		275								
Viranşehir Karyesi		86								
Saraycık Karyesi		66								
Karahisar Nahiye Merkezi Mahallatı		2,226				2,360				
Kala Karyesi		258				286				
Keşlik Karyesi		206				204				
Erdemesin Karyesi		220				229				
Kesteliç Karyesi		228				224				
Kavak Karyesi		69				68				
Mavrican Karyesi		214				229				
Ortaköy Karyesi							366	328		
Başköy Karyesi		176				168				
Til Karyesi		83				86				142
Buket (?) Karyesi		37				35				130
Kuşçu Karyesi		45				57				
Gördelis Karyesi		93				94				

Source: BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Şeyh Şaban Karyesi		261	268												
Yekun		7,213	7,577		1,892	1,782									

APPENDIX 4

The Population of Bünyan *Kaza*

Esami	İslam		Rum		Ermeni		Protestan		Katolik	
	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas
Bünyan Kazası Merkezi Mahallatı		1,470		423		233				
Gıgi Karyesi						80				
Karaca Viran Karyesi				240						
Gergeme Karyesi		368		35		40				
Bürüngüz Karyesi		725								
Ermin Karyesi		89								
Emir Viran Karyesi		52								
Güllüce Karyesi		140								
Süksün Karyesi		260								
Karacafenk Karyesi		125								
Hazarşah Karyesi		215								
Dizgeme Karyesi		48								
İğdecik Karyesi		177								
Kahveci Karyesi		89								
Pir Ahmed Karyesi		61								
Köse Hacı Karyesi		97								
Musa Şeyh Karyesi		69								
Sultan Hamı Karyesi		90								

Source: BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 73/40

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Tuzhisar-ı Kebir Karyesi		490	520												
İlbaşı Karyesi		424	464												
Karadağ (?) Karyesi		420	452												
Zek Karyesi		129	136												
Zerezek Karyesi		322	325												
Kölete Karyesi		200	198												
Kuşçagız Karyesi		145	160												
Girveli Karyesi		123	126												
Taçın Karyesi		210	245												
Gül Viran Karyesi		227	250												
Persek (?) Karyesi		267	279												
Köpekli Karyesi		88	90												
Alayınli Karyesi		228	259												
Çulluk (?) Karyesi		47	56												
Harsa Karyesi		151	159												
Samağır Karyesi		220	250												
Kızılviran Karyesi		146	164												
Şiraz Karyesi		136	130												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Karaviran Karyesi		34	38												
Akçalı Karyesi		120	125												
Sıvgın Karyesi								317							
Ekrek Karyesi								686							
Sarıoğlan Karyesi		589	692					130							
Tatlı Karyesi		210	240												
Palas Karyesi		639	663												
Kara Kaya Karyesi		599	660												
Çiftlik Karyesi		504	569												
Yağmur Beyli Karyesi		61	72												
Burhaniye (?) Karyesi		39	41												
Kara Hıdırlı Karyesi		83	73												
Cavlak Karyesi		25	38												
Ömer Hacılı Karyesi		103	114												
Yüzerlik (?) Karyesi		135	158												
Yıldırım Karyesi		195	200												
Göme Viran (?) Karyesi		76	78												
Burun Viran Karyesi		91	94												

Esami	İslam			Rum			Ermeni			Protestan			Katolik		
	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür	hane	inas	zükür
Yelli Burun Karyesi		63	85												
Kör Kuyu Karyesi		64	59												
Kızıl Pınar Karyesi		64	70												
Küpelî Karyesi		264	442												
Turan (Nevran ?) Karyesi		92	94												
Akışla Karyesi		723	773												
Koyun Abdal Karyesi		323	387												
Girinci Karyesi		108	132												
Managuz Karyesi		91	103												
Kululu (?) Karyesi		246	306												
Gömürgen (?) Karyesi		494	565												
Ulu Kışla Karyesi		67	61												
Düzencik Karyesi		39	45												
Muradbeyli Karyesi		107	142												
Keklik oğlu Karyesi		47	56												
Sofu Mahmud Karyesi		47	64												
Gani Şeyh Karyesi		95	116												
Ortaköy Karyesi		190	218												

Esami	İslam		Rum		Ermeni		Protestan		Katolik	
	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas	hane	inas
Yeni köy Karyesi		230								
Tuz Hisar-ı Sagır Karyesi		86								
Seyid Ali (?) Karyesi		142								
Kara Erkek Karyesi		56								
Kilise Karyesi		40								
Örenlik (?) Karyesi		31								
Baş Pınar Karyesi		23								
Üç Ağıl Karyesi		45								
Müdürris (?) Karyesi		112								
Çiçekoğlu Karyesi		66								
Kocaoğlu Karyesi		77								
Sarıççek Karyesi		71								
Delvin (?) Karyesi		139								
Hacı Yusuf Karyesi		60								
Ağın (?) Karyesi		180								
Sarı Kaya Karyesi		43								
Kırıklı Hacı (?) Karyesi		79								
Yekun*		16,155		698		605		1,446		1,577

* The totals in the document are different from my calculations. I used my calculations at this table. In the original document the totals are as follows; Muslim women: 17,527, Muslim men:19,318, Greek women: 698, Greek men: 615, Armenian women: 1,446, Armenian men:1,577.

APPENDIX 5

Map of Kayseri Sanjak



Source: HRT.h, 496 (29 November 1913)

APPENDIX 6
CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Gözel Durmaz, Oya
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 20 December 1981, İstanbul
Phone: +90 312 210 31 37
Fax: +90 312 210 79 22
email: oyagozel@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MA	METU	2007
BS	Istanbul University	2003

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2004-Present	METU, Department of History	Research Assistant

APPENDIX 7

TURKISH SUMMARY

Balkan Savaşları ve ardından yaşanan süreçte bugünkü Türkiye topraklarında yaşayan nüfusun yapısında çok ciddi değişimler meydana gelmiştir. 1906 Osmanlı nüfus sayımına göre 15 milyon civarında nüfusa sahip olan bugünkü Türkiye topraklarında, 1927 yılına gelindiğinde 13.6 milyonluk bir nüfus kalmıştır. Bu sayısal değişime ek olarak nüfus kompozisyonunda da çok belirgin bir değişim vardır. 1906'da nüfusun % 20 kadarını gayrimüslimler oluştururken, 1927'de bu oran %2.6'ya düşmüştür. Balkan Savaşları ile başlayıp Kurtuluş Savaşı ile son bulan savaşlar dizisi boyunca yaşanan ölümler, kaybedilen Osmanlı topraklarından Anadolu'ya Müslüman muhacirlerin akını, Ermeni tehciri ve ardından Yunanistan ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti arasında gerçekleştirilen nüfus mübadelesi nüfusun yapısında meydana gelen bu radikal değişimin başlıca nedenleriydi.⁶⁸⁷ Nüfus kompozisyonunda yaşanan bu köklü dönüşüm siyasi açıdan Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun yıkıldığı ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kurulduğu çok önemli bir döneme denk geliyordu. Dolayısıyla yaşanan demografik değişim, yeni kurulan cumhuriyetin sosyo-ekonomik temelleri üzerinde de çok önemli etkilerde bulunmuştur.

Nüfus yapısında yaşanan bu değişim Türk tarih yazımının da son yıllarda üzerinde durduğu bir konu olmuş; nüfusun Türkleştirilmesi, homojenleştirilmesi, etnisite mühendisliği veya demografi mühendisliği gibi kavramlar üzerinden bu süreç analiz edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Ancak demografideki değişimin özellikle yerelliklerdeki sosyo-ekonomik etkileri literatürde çok daha az çalışılan bir konu olarak kalmıştır. Literatürün bu yönde

⁶⁸⁷ 28 *Teşrinievvel 1927, Umumi Nüfus Tahriri, Usuller Kanun ve Talimatnameler, Neticelerin Tahlili, Fasikül III*, Ankara, Başvekalet Müdevvenat Matbaası, 1929, ss. 8, 30; Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914, Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985, ss. 168-169; Çağlar Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey*, London, Verso, 1987, ss. 67-69, and 79-81; Erik Jan Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2007, ss. 239-241.

şekillenmesinde kaynakların sınırlılığı başlıca etkenlerden biri olmuştur. Birinci Dünya Savaşı ve İttihat ve Terakki konulu çalışmaların çoğu merkezden yerellere gönderilen emirler üzerine şekillenmiş ve bu kaynaklar çerçevesinde yapılan çalışmalar İttihat ve Terakki yönetiminin politikalarını anlamlandırmamıza katkıda bulunmuştur. Ancak bu sürecin yerelerde ne şekilde deneyimlendiği noktasında literatürde ciddi bir boşluk göze çarpmaktadır. Büyük ölçüde yerelden merkeze gönderilen yazışmaların son yıllara kadar Osmanlı Arşivi'nde araştırmacıların kullanımına açılmamış olmasından kaynaklanan bu eksiklik Osmanlı Arşivi'nde özellikle Dahiliye Nezareti tasnifinde yeni belge gruplarının araştırmacıların kullanımına açılması ile doldurulmaya başlanmıştır. Bu yeni belgeler, “Birinci Dünya Savaşı süresince yerelerde neler yaşandı?” sorusuna yanıt getirebilmemiz açısından araştırmacılara büyük bir olanak sağlamıştır.

Bu çalışma tam da bu noktadan hareketle, Birinci Dünya Savaşı süresince yaşanan demografik değişim yerelde sosyo-ekonomik yapı üzerinde ne gibi dönüştürücü etkilerde bulunmuştur sorusuna cevap vermeye çalışmıştır. Ancak şu da belirtilmelidir ki “Emval-i Metruke Defterleri”nin hala araştırmacıların kullanımına açılmamış olmasından kaynaklı olarak, araştırmacıların yaşanan süreci tam olarak analiz edebilme şansı bulunmamaktadır. Kullanıma açılan belgeler resmin tamamını ayrıntılarıyla ortaya koymaya yetmese de, “yerelde neler yaşandı?” ve “merkezi devlet politikalarının yaşananlar üzerindeki etkileri nelerdi?” sorularına ışık tutacak niteliktedir. Bu çalışmada, sözkonusu yeni belgeler kullanılarak, Kayseri’de Ermeni tehciri sonrası demografik yapının değişimi ile bu değişimden kaynaklanan sosyo-ekonomik dönüşüm, emval-i metruke meselesi ve Ermenilerin geri dönüş süreci değerlendirilmiştir.

Kayseri Birinci Dünya Savaşı süresince doğrudan savaş alanı olmadığı ve ardından da herhangi bir işgal ile karşılaşmadığı için şehirde toplumsal ve iktisadi yapıyı etkileyen başlıca olay Ermeni Tehciri olmuştur. Bu çerçevede tezde Kayseri sancağındaki Ermenilerin gerek savaş öncesi demografik yapısı gerekse de iktisadi konumları verilmiş ve ardından da tehcirin bu alanlardaki etkisinin analizine geçilmiştir. Tarih aralığı olarak da tehcirin başlangıç tarihi

olan 1915 ve Anadolu’da Osmanlı merkezinin artık tek güç odağı olma durumunun sona erdiği 1920 yılları seçilmiştir.

İlk olarak, tehcirin Kayseri’de uygulanması ve savaş sırasında nüfusta yaşanan değişim ayrıntılı bir şekilde incelenmiş ve Kayseri’deki durumun özgünlük teşkil edip etmediği değerlendirilmiştir. Demografik etkilerini ortaya koymaya çalıştığım bu sürecin, Kayseri açısından sonuçlarına baktığımızda, “ihtida” meselesi oldukça ciddi bir özgünlük olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. İhtida meselesini tartışmak, Kayseri özelinde, “merkezin talimatları ve politikalarının ötesinde yerelde ne yaşandı?” sorusuna anlamlı bir yanıt getirebilmek açısından çok önemli olmuştur.

1914 Osmanlı nüfus sayımı verilerine göre, Kayseri Sancağı’nın toplam nüfusu 263,074 kişiydi. Nüfus içinde çoğunluğu 184,292 kişi ile Müslümanlar oluştururken, 26,590 Rum Ortodoks ve 48,659 Ermeni bulunmaktaydı. Bunlara ek olarak, 1,515 Katolik ve 2,018 Protestan vardı.⁶⁸⁸ Diğer bir ifade ile gayri-Müslim nüfus toplam Kayseri nüfusunun %30’unu oluşturuyordu. Bu nüfus yapısında Ermeni tehciri ile ciddi bir değişim yaşanmıştır.

Kayseri’de tehcir uygulamaları Haziran 1915’te başlamıştır. Hükümetin tehcir kararının ardından 1 Haziran 1915’te Kayseri Mutasarrıflığı’na da gönderilen bir şifreli telgraf ile tehcirin Ermeni komite liderleri ile zararlı olabilecek Ermenilere uygulanması istenmiş⁶⁸⁹ ve bu şifrenin ardından Kayseri Ermenilerinin sevkine Haziran başında Everek’in Küçük İncesu karyesi ahalisinin sevki ile başlanmıştır.⁶⁹⁰ Kayseri Ermenilerinin sevki ile ilgili daha genel bir emir 5 Ağustos 1915’te Kayseri’ye gönderilmiş, ilgili şifrede Katolik Ermeniler istisna olmak üzere liva dahilinde bulunan bütün Ermenilerin tayin olunan mevkilere sevki emredilmiştir.⁶⁹¹ 15 Ağustos’ta gönderilen üç ayrı şifre ile Ermeni sevkياتında istisnaların sayısı arttırılmış: ilk olarak asker, zabitan

⁶⁸⁸ Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914, Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985, ss. 186-187.

⁶⁸⁹ BOA, DH. ŞFR, 53/201 (*Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, s. 158.)

⁶⁹⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 53/246

⁶⁹¹ BOA, DH. ŞFR, 54-A/276

ve sıhhiye zabitlerinin aileleri, ermeni mebusları ve onların aileleri ile henüz sevk edilmemiş Protestanlar sevkten muaf tutulmuştur.⁶⁹² Ancak Ermeni tehcirine getirilen bu istisnalar çok geç gelmiş; pek çok Katolik ve Protestan Ermeni ile asker aileleri bu emirler öncesinde Kayseri Sancağı'ndan sevk edilmiştir.⁶⁹³

Kayseri Mutasarrıflığı'nın Ermeni sevkıyatı konusunda Dahiliye Nezareti'ne gönderdiği bilgilere göre, sevkıyat öncesi şehirde 49,947 Ermeni bulunmaktaydı. Bunların 46,463'ü Ortodoks, 1,517'si Katolik ve 1,967'si Protestan'dı. Tehcir kararı ile birlikte, Kayseri Sancağı'ndan 16,487 Ortodoks Ermeni, 116 Katolik Ermeni ve 587 Protestan Ermeni sevk olunmuştu. 26 Ağustos 1915 itibariyle, Kayseri kaza merkezi ve Develi'deki Ermenilerin sevkine başlanmamış olmasına rağmen, Mutasarrıflık on beş gün içinde Ermeni sevkıyatını tamamlamayı öngörmekteydi. Böylece Kayseri'de ihtida etmiş Ermeniler dışında Ermeni kalmayacaktı. Sevkıyat ile birlikte, Katolik nüfus livadaki Müslüman nüfusun ancak binde biri oranına, Protestan nüfus ise binde beşi oranına inmişti.⁶⁹⁴ 1915 yılının Eylül ayı ortalarına gelindiğinde Kayseri'de Ermeni sevkıyatı tamamlanmıştır. 49,947 Ermeni'nin, 44,271'i Halep, Musul ve Suriye'ye sevk edilmiş ve Kayseri'de 4,911 Ermeni kalmıştır. Asker aileleri ile az sayıda Protestan ve Katolik'ten oluşan bu 4,911 Ermeni ise

⁶⁹² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/18; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/19; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/20 (*Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, ss. 214-215). Ermeni sevkıyatı sırasında Kayseri-Talas'ta bulunan Amerikan misyonerlerinin raporları da Protestanlar, Katolikler ve asker ailelerinin tehcirden muaf tutulduklarını teyit etmektedir. "NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807", "*Turkish Atrocities*": *Statements of American Missionaries on the Destruction of Christian Communities in Ottoman Turkey, 1915-1917*, s. 123; NARA, RG 256, 867B.00/31.

⁶⁹³ The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), Harvard University, reel. 629. Daha önce de belirtildiği gibi Osmanlı nüfus sayımına göre Kayseri'de tehcir öncesi, 2.018 Protestan ve 1.515 Katolik bulunmaktaydı. Tehcir sonrası ise liva dahilindeki Katoliklerin sayısı 634'e inerken, Protestanlar 507 kişi kalmıştır. Dolayısıyla, hükümetin Katolikler ve Protestanların sevkten muaf tutulmalarına dair gönderdiği emirlere rağmen veya bu emirlerden önce Katolik ve Protestanların Kayseri'den sevk edilmiştir. BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 74/28; Karpata, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914*, ss.186-187.

⁶⁹⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 485/90 (26 Ağustos 1915)

%5 oranında köylere dağıtılmıştır.⁶⁹⁵ Sevk işlemleri, 15 Mart 1916 tarihi itibarıyla Dahiliye Nezareti'nden gönderilen bir emirle, tatil edilmiş; bundan sonra Ermenilerin ihraç olunmaması tebliğ edilmiştir.⁶⁹⁶

Bahsi geçen sevkîyatın Kayseri nüfusu üzerindeki etkileri, Osmanlı Arşiv belgeleri ile Dahiliye Nezareti'nden elde edilmiş verilere dayanan ve Talat Paşa için hazırlanmış özel bir doküman olan “Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi” kitabına dayanılarak gösterilecektir.⁶⁹⁷ Kayseri özelinde birazdan değineceğimiz belgeler de “Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi”nde verilen rakamların Osmanlı arşiv belgeleri ile uyduğuna göstermektedir.

“Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi”nde tehcir edilen toplam Ermeni sayısı 924,158 olarak verilirken, Kayseri'den sevk olunan Ermenilerin miktarı ise 47,617'dir.⁶⁹⁸ Tehcire dair bu sayıları veren kitap, bizler açısından çok daha önemli bir başka bilgi daha içermektedir ki bu da muhtemelen 1916 sonu veya 1917 yılı başı itibarıyla Ermeni nüfusunun imparatorluk dahilinde dağılımına ilişkindir. Pek çok vilayet için hem vilayetteki yerli Ermenilerin hem de aslında başka vilayette doğup o tarih itibarıyla vilayette bulunan Ermenilerin sayısı verilmiştir. Tehcir sonrasındaki Ermeni nüfusunun genel hesabı için bu veriler çok önemlidir.⁶⁹⁹ “Talat Paşa'nın Evrak-ı Metrukesi”ne göre, Kayseri'de toplam 6,761 Ermeni kalmıştır (6,650 Kayserili Ermeni ve 111 Kayserili olmayan Ermeni). Bu sayıya Osmanlı belgelerinde de rastlamaktayız. Bu

⁶⁹⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 489/63 (17 Eylül 1915); BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/75 (18 Eylül 1915) (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, s. 260.)

⁶⁹⁶ BOA, DH. ŞFR, 62/21(*Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, s. 357.): “Görülen lüzum ve icab-ı idari ve askeriye binaen badema Ermeni sevkîyatının tatili takarrur ettiğinden şimdiye kadar çıkarılanlardan başka artık hiçbir sebep ve vesile ile Ermeni ihraç olunmaması tamamen tebliğ olunur.”

⁶⁹⁷ Murat Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Emval-i Metrukesi*, İstanbul, Everest, 2009.

⁶⁹⁸ Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Emval-i Metrukesi*, s. 77.

⁶⁹⁹ Bardakçı, *Talat Paşa'nın Emval-i Metrukesi*, s. 109. Kitapta ayrıca şöyle bir not bulunmaktadır: “1330 icmalinde Ermeni Gregoryen nüfus-ı umumisi 1,187,818 ve Ermeni Katolikler'in miktarı 63,967 ki, her ikisinin mecmuu 1,256,403'den ibaret olarak gösterilmiştir. Nüfus-ı mevcude tamamen muharrer olmadığından, mikdar-ı hakiki 1,500,000 kadar olacağı gibi, bugün mevcut olarak balada görülen yerli ve yabancılardan 284,157 miktarına da ihtiyaten %30 kadar ilave eylemek iktiza eder ki bu takdirde mevcut-ı hakiki 350,000 ile 400,000 arasında bulunmuş olur.”

kaynağa göre, Kayseri dışında olan Kayserili Ermenilerin sayısı ise 6,979'dur.⁷⁰⁰

Kayseri Sancağı'ndan Dahiliye Nezareti'ne gönderilen bir belgede sancakta Ekim 1916 itibariyle toplam 6,761 Ermeni kaldığı ve kalanların hepsinin ihtida etmiş oldukları, dolayısıyla da Kayseri'de Ermeni, Protestan ve Katolik mezhebine mensup kimsenin kalmamış olduğu belirtilir. Oldukça ayrıntılı olan bu belge, sancakta bırakılmış olan mühtedi Ermenileri: Protestan, Katolik, Ermeni (Gregoryen), asker ailesi olanlar, yerli olmayan Ermeniler ve özel izinle bırakılmış olanlar olarak tasnif etmiştir. Bu belgeye göre ihtida etmiş olan bu Ermenilerden 634'ü Katolik Ermeni, 507'si Protestan Ermeni, 3,430'u yerli Ermeni, 2,060'ı asker ailesi, 15'i yabancı yani Kayserili olmayan Ermeni ve 115'i de özel izinle bırakılmış olan Ermenilerdir.⁷⁰¹

Bu tabloyu analiz edebilmek için, önce merkezi hükümetin ihtida ile ilgili emirlerine değinmek gerekir. Bu konuda vilayetlere ilk olarak 22 Haziran 1915'te (Van, Trabzon, Erzurum, Bitlis, Mamuretülaziz, Diyarbakır ve Canik'e) bir emir gönderilmiş ve bireysel olarak veya toplu şekilde ihtida edenlerin alıkonulması ve eğer bu kişiler toplu halde bulunuyorlarsa vilayet/liva dahilinde dağıtılmaları bildirilmişti.⁷⁰² Gerek Alman gerekse Amerikan belgeleri de bu süreçte pek çok Ermeni'nin din değiştirerek yerlerinde kalmaya devam ettiğini teyit etmektedir. Ayrıca, bireysel din değiştirmelerin yanında toplu din değiştirmelerin olduğu da not edilmelidir. Özellikle Karadeniz bölgesinde bazı Ermeni köyleri toplu olarak din değiştirmişlerdir.⁷⁰³

⁷⁰⁰ Ara Sarafian, *Talaat Pasha's Report on the Armenian Genocide*, London, Gomidas Institute, 2011, ss. 37, 43. Kayserili olmayan 111 Ermeni'nin 3'ü İstanbul Ermeni'si, 87'si Ankara Ermeni'si ve 21'i Sivas Ermeni'sidir.

⁷⁰¹ BOA, DH. EUM. 2. Şb, 74/28 (22 Ekim 1916)

⁷⁰² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/100

⁷⁰³ Taner Akçam, *The Young Turk's Crime Against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2012, ss. 292-295.

Ancak 22 Haziran 1915 tarihli telgraftan kısa bir süre sonra, Dahiliye Nezareti'nin, muhtemelen bu toplu ihtidaların etkisi ile, tavır değişikliğine gittiği görülmektedir. 1 Temmuz 1915'de, pek çok vilayet ve mutasarrıflığa, bu gibi ihtida taleplerinin sırf memlekette kalma amacıyla yapıldığı, bundan dolayı bu taleplere itimat edilemeyeceği belirtilerek, Ermeniler ihtida bile etse sevke devam edilmesi gerektiği bildirilmiştir.⁷⁰⁴

Bu çerçevede, Kayseri'de karşımıza çıkan ilk mesele de, sevk edilmek istenen Ermenilerin ihtida talep etmeleri üzerine yaşanmıştır. Bu ihtida talebi karşısında yerel yöneticiler mühtedilerin sevk edilip edilmeyeceği konusunda tereddüt yaşamışlardır. Sevklerine karar verilen Derevenk karyesi ahalisinin ihtida talebi ile başvurusunun ardından, 12 Temmuz 1915'te Dahiliye Nezareti'ne müracaat eden Mutasarrıflık, bu talep karşısında gönderilmeleri kararlaştırılan Derevenk karyesi ahalisine ne şekilde muamele olunması gerektiğini sormuştur.⁷⁰⁵ Bunun üzerine Dahiliye Nezareti, sözü geçen kişilerin sırf kendi menfaatlerini sağlamak için ihtida talep ettikleri kanaatine vararak, ilgili kişilerin sevklerine devam edilmesini bildirmiştir.⁷⁰⁶

Nezaretin din değiştirmeleri bir taktik olarak değerlendiren yaklaşımına ve ihtida edilse bile Ermenilerin sevkine devam edilmesi şeklindeki kararına rağmen, pek çok bölgede din değiştirmelerin devam etmesi, Dahiliye Nezareti'nin 20 Temmuz 1915'de aynı konu ile alakalı yeni bir emir göndermesine neden olmuştur. Sözü geçen emirde, sevk edilmesi gereken Ermenilerden bazılarının ihtida etmeleri nedeniyle yerlerinde bırakıldıklarının ve bazı memurların da bunlara aracılık ettiklerinin anlaşıldığı belirtilmiştir. Bu gibi ihtidalara kıymet verilmemesi gerektiği konusundaki eski emri hatırlatan Nezaret, din değiştiren Ermenilere bu tarz istisnai muameleler yapılmamasını bildirmiştir.⁷⁰⁷

⁷⁰⁴ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/254

⁷⁰⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 479/100 (12 Temmuz 1915)

⁷⁰⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54/427: "Ermenilerin ihtidası sırf ilca-yı menfaat ile olduğu için ihtidaları üzerine tebidleri tehir edilmeyecektir."

⁷⁰⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/49

Kayseri’de, ihtida konusunda ortaya çıkan ikinci mesele Ermeni askerleri ile ailelerinin ihtida talepleri sonucu yaşanmıştır. Ermeni asker, zabitan ve sıhhiye zabitlerinin aileleri 15 Ağustos 1915 itibariyle sevkten muaf tutulmuştu.⁷⁰⁸ Ancak söz konusu karardan önce, 9 ve 10 Ağustos 1915’te, Kayseri Mutasarrıflığı’ndan Dahiliye Nezareti’ne gönderilen şifreli telgraflarda Ermeni askerler ile ailelerinin sevk edilip edilmeyeceği gündeme gelmiş; Kayseri Mutasarrıflığı, Nezarete başvurarak askeriyede hizmet eden Ermeni doktor ve eczacıların ailelerinin de sevk edilecekler arasında yer aldığını, bunlara ne şekilde muamele olunması gerektiğini sormuştur.⁷⁰⁹ Buna cevaben Dahiliye Nezareti, bu kişilere uygulanacak muameleye Başkumandanlığın karar vereceğini bildirmiştir.⁷¹⁰

10 Ağustos 1915’te, bu konuda Nezarete iki yeni şifre ile tekrar başvuran Mutasarrıflığa göre, amele taburlarındaki Ermenilerin sevklerini ertelemek için Askeriyeye kendilerine vesika verilmiş⁷¹¹ ve amele taburlarında bulunan birtakım kişiler, kumandanlara müracaat ederek aileleri ile birlikte ihtida etmek istediklerini bildirmişlerdi. Bunun üzerine, Mutasarrıf tekrar, bu kişilerin sevklerinin ertelenip ertelenmeyeceğini sormuştur.⁷¹² 15 Ağustos’ta ise Ermeni asker ailelerinin sevkini durdurulduğu haberi gelmiştir. Ancak Nezaret sevki durdurmasına rağmen, ihtida talepleri konusunda yumuşamamış, 18 Ağustos 1915’te Kayseri Mutasarrıflığı’nın Ermeni asker ve ailelerinin ihtida talepleri konusunda gönderdiği yazıya cevaben ihtidanın kabul edilmemesini emretmiştir.⁷¹³ Kayseri Mutasarrıflığı, askerlerin ihtida talepleri hususunda Emval-i Metruke Komisyonu Başkanı’nı da uyarmayı ihmal etmemiş ve Ermenilere dair işlemlerin ancak mülki idarelerce görülebileceğini, dolayısıyla

⁷⁰⁸ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/18

⁷⁰⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 483/42 (9 Ağustos 1915)

⁷¹⁰ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/360

⁷¹¹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 483/70

⁷¹² BOA, DH.ŞFR, 483/71

⁷¹³ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 55/94 (18 Ağustos 1915)

askerlerin ihtida taleplerinin mülki idareye yönlendirilmesi gerektiğini bildirmiştir.⁷¹⁴ Bu yazışmalar, Emeni asker ve ailelerinin din değiştirmeleri hususunda mülki idare ile askeri otoriteler arasında bir yetki alanı mücadelesi yaşandığının göstergesi olarak okunabilir.

Kalan aileler ile ilgili bir diğer önemli karar ise Ermenilerin buldukları yerlerdeki toplam nüfusun yüzde beşini geçmeleri durumunda, söz konusu oranı geçmeyecek şekilde Müslüman köylerine dağıtılmalarını öngören karardır.⁷¹⁵ Bu karar uyarınca sevkten muaf tutulan aileler, %5 oranında Kayseri'deki Müslüman köylerine dağıtılmışlardır.⁷¹⁶ Ailesinin ihtida etmesi sonucu savaş süresince Kayseri'de kalan Ermeni ailelerinden birine mensup olan Stephen Svajian da anılarında kalan Ermenilerin Müslüman köylerine dağıtıldığını aktarır.⁷¹⁷ Yine Amerikan misyonerlerinin raporları da kalan Ermenilerin Türk köylerine dağıtıldığını teyit etmektedir.⁷¹⁸

Sevkten muaf tutulan Ermenilerin ihtida talepleri hususunda Dahiliye Nezareti'nin olumsuz tavrı zaman içerisinde değişmiş, 4 Kasım 1915'te vilayet ve mutasarrıflıklara gönderilen şifreli telgrafla, sevk edilmeyip öteden beri ikamet ettikleri yerlerde bırakılanların ve sevk esnasında sevkten muaf tutulacakları tebliğ olunanların ister ikamet ettikleri yere dönmüş olsunlar isterse de başka yerde kalmış olsunlar ihtidalarının kabul edileceğini bildirmiştir.⁷¹⁹ Bu emir Kayseri'de farklı yorumlanmış ve livada kalan tüm

⁷¹⁴ Aris Kalfaian, *Chomaklou, The History of an Armenian Village*, New York, Chomaklou Compatriotic Society, 1982, s. 163.

⁷¹⁵ BOA, DH.EUM.VRK, 15/49 (16 Ağustos 1915)

⁷¹⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 489/63; BOA, DH.EUM.2.Şb, 68/75 (in *Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı*, s. 260.); BOA, DH.ŞFR, 490/15.

⁷¹⁷ Stephen G. Svajian, *A Trip through Historic Armenia*, Green Hill Publishing Ltd., New York, 1983, s. 369.

⁷¹⁸ The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), Harvard University, reel. 629; "NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807", "*Turkish Atrocities*": *Statements of American Missionaries on the Destruction of Christian Communities in Ottoman Turkey, 1915-1917*, compiled by James L. Barton, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Gomidas Institute, 1998, s. 125.

⁷¹⁹ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 57/281 (4 Kasım 1915)

Ermenilere din deęiřtirmeleri gerektięi yoksa Halep'e sũrũlecekleri sũylenmiř ve Ermeniler sevk edilmemek iin din deęiřtirmek zorunda kalmiřlardır.⁷²⁰

Her kũye beř kiřiyi ařmayacak řekilde hatta oęu durumda ũer dũrder kiři olarak daęıtılan Ermenilerin bu kũylerde yařadıkları sıkıntılar (ekonomik ve toplumsal) da din deęiřtirmede olduka etkili olmuřtur. Pek ok Ermeni, Kayseri řehir merkezi ve Talas'a dũnebilmek iin din deęiřtirmeyi kabul etmiřtir. Amerikan misyoner raporları, 5,000 kadar Ermeni'nin bu řekilde din deęiřtirdięini ve Kayseri řehir merkezi ile Talas'a dũndũęũnũ yazmaktadır.⁷²¹ Bu toplu din deęiřtirme sonrası, Kayseri Mutasarrıflıęı 22 Aralık 1915'te Dahiliye Nezareti'ne livada artık hi Ermeni kalmadıęını bildirilmiřtir.⁷²²

Bu sũre sonunda Kayseri sancaęında bir kısım yerel yũneticilerin desteęi, kayırması, muhtemel ki rũřvet almaları karřılıęı ve de zanaatkar ihtiyacı gibi nedenlerle, dięer pek ok vilayet ve sancak ile karřılařtırmalı olarak baktıęımızda, olduka fazla sayıda Ermeni'nin (6 bin kũsur) tehcir edilmeyip sancakta yařamaya devam ettięi gũrũlmektedir. Merkezden ihtida konusunda gũnderilen emirlerin ierięine bakıldıęında, ihtida etseler bile sevkten muaf gruplar iinde yer almayan Ermenilerin tehcirine devam edilmesinin defaatle bildirildięi gũrũlmektedir. Kayseri uezinde gerekleřen bu durum, merkezin emirleri ve yerelin uygulamaları arasında aı farkı olduęunu gũsteren bir rnek olarak deęerlendirilebilir. Dolayısıyla, uygulamayı inceledięimizde yerelin dinamiklerini dikkate almak durumunda olduęumuzu ve merkezden gelen keskin emirlerin, birtakım dinamikler nedeniyle yerelde aynen uygulanmadıęını sũyleyebiliriz. Bu řekilde bir incelemenin dięer bũlgeler iin de yapılması, hem de Ermeni tehciri uygulamalarının daha derinlikli bir analizinin yapılabilmesi iin gereklidir.

⁷²⁰ "NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 824", *"Turkish Atrocities": Statements of American Missionaries on the Destruction of Christian Communities in Ottoman Turkey, 1915-1917*, s. 137; The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), Harvard University, reel. 629.

⁷²¹ "NARA, RG 256, Special Reports and Studies, Inquiry Document 807", *"Turkish Atrocities": Statements of American Missionaries on the Destruction of Christian Communities in Ottoman Turkey, 1915-1917*, ss. 124-127.

⁷²² BOA, DH.řFR, 502/30

Bu anlamda, yakın zamana kadar, yerelin uygulamada sadece pasif bir şekilde değerlendirildiği hakim paradigmanın da revize edilmesi gerekir. Ki elimizde çok az sayıda bu tarz çalışma bulunmakla birlikte var olan farklı yerelliklere odaklanan kitap ve makalelerin birbirinden oldukça farklı hikayeler içerdiği görülmektedir. Talha Çiçek'in Suriye kitabı, Kaiser'in Halep makalesi ile Diyarbakır kitabı ve de Üngör'ün Diyarbakır üzerine tezinde de görüldüğü üzere yöneticilerin niteliği, İstanbul ile kurulan ilişkinin niteliği ve otonomlaşıma pratikleri gibi faktörler üzerinden birbirinden oldukça farklı tehcir süreçlerinin yaşandığı ve farklı sonuçların ortaya çıkmaktadır.⁷²³

Tehcirin Kayseri sancağı üzerindeki sosyo-ekonomik etkileriyle ilgili olarak, Kayseri'nin tehcir öncesi durumuna göz atmak ve Kayseri Ermenilerinin iktisadi durumlarından kısaca bahsetmek gerekir.

Kayseri tarihsel olarak önemli bir ticaret merkezi olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Toprağın verimsizliği ile dağlık yapısı ve tarımın eski tekniklerle yapılıyor olması dolayısıyla Kayseri'de tarım temel uğraş alanı olmamıştır. Salnameler de dahil pek çok kaynakta bu duruma değinilmiş ve Kayseri'deki tarımsal üretimin şehrin ihtiyacını karşılayamadığı şehrin zahire ihtiyacının çevre vilayetlerden karşılandığı belirtilmiştir. Tarımsal üretim geleneksel tarım ürünleri üzerine yoğunlaşmış ve yetersiz olmakla birlikte sebze-meyve yetiştiriciliği gelişmiştir.⁷²⁴

⁷²³ Hilmar Kaiser, "Regional Resistance to Central Government Policies: Ahmed Djemal Pasha, the Governors of Aleppo, and Armenian deportees in the Spring and Summer 1915", *Journal of Genocide Research*, vol. 12, nos. 3-4 (September-December 2010), pp. 173-218; Hilmar Kaiser, *The Extermination of Armenians in the Diyarbekir Region*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2014; M. Talha Çiçek, *War and State Formation in Syria, Cemal Pasha's Governorate During World War I, 1914-17*, London, Routledge, 2014; Uğur Ü. Üngör, "A Reign of Terror", CUP Rule in Diyarbekir Province, 1913-1923", unpublished Master thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2005.

⁷²⁴ Ahmet Hilmi Kalaç, *Kendi Kitabım*, Yeni Matbaa, 1960, s. 57; Ahmet Nazif Efendi, *Mirat-ı Kayseriyye*, Kayseri, Kayseri İl Özel İdare Müdürlüğü ve Kayseri Belediyesi Birliği Yayınları, 1987, s. 13; Hıfzı Nuri, *Kayseri Sancağı, 1922*, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası, 1995, s. 7; "General Report by Lieutenant Bennet on the Sandjak of Kaisarieh", *Turkey, No.6 (1881)*, *Further Correspondence Respecting the Condition of the Populations in Asia Minor and Syria*, London, Harrison and Sons, 1881, s. 271; Uygur Kocabaşoğlu ve Murat Uluğtekin., *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, Kayseri, Kayseri Ticaret Odası Yayınları, 1998, ss. 138, 166, 197, 235-236.

Kayseri dediğimiz gibi esas olarak bir ticaret şehri olarak değerlendirilmektedir ve Kayserinin bu konuma gelmesinde özellikle Adana ile kurulmuş ekonomik ilişkiler belirleyici olmuştur. 19. yüzyılda Kayserili tüccarlar Adana pamuğunun başlıca müşterisiydi ve Anadolu içlerine pamuğun dağıtımını bu tüccarlarca yapıyordu. Adana ile kurulmuş olan bu ticari bağ, Kayseri’de dokumacılık ve halıcılığın gelişmesinde de etkili olmuştur.⁷²⁵

Kısaca ve çok genel olarak ifade edilen bu iktisadi yapıda Ermenilerin tuttıkları yer iki başlık altında değerlendirilebilir. İlk olarak Ermeni köy hayatına değinilmelidir çünkü tehcir öncesi Kayseri merkezi civarındaki köylerde ve özellikle Develi’de ciddi bir Ermeni nüfusu vardı. Bu açıdan elimizdeki en önemli kaynak Arşak Alboyacıyan’ın “*Hye Gesaria*” ve Aris Kalfaian’ın “*Chomaklou*” kitaplarıdır. Köy hayatını da anlatan bu iki eser, tarımın Kayseri Ermeni köylerinde temel ekonomik aktivite olmadığını belirtir. Toprağın verimsizliği, köylüleri geçimlerini sağlamak için başka faaliyetlere özellikle tarımsal faaliyetin yanında bir zanaat sahibi olmaya yönlendirmiştir. Kırsal hayatın zorlukları ve tarımın köylülerin geçimini sağlayamamasının bir diğer sonucu Kayseri Ermeni nüfusunda erkeklerin önemli bir kısmının sezonluk işçi olarak büyük şehirlere 1800’lerin sonundan itibaren de Amerika’ya daimi işçi olarak gitmesi olmuştur. Özellikle Amerika’ya göç Ermeni köylerinin iktisadi seviyesi üzerinde çok büyük etkilerde bulunmuş, bu Ermenilerin köylerine düzenli olarak gönderdikleri paralar Ermeni köylerinin refahını yükseltmiştir. Halı yapımı 1800’lerin sonundan itibaren köylü kadınlar için yeni bir faaliyet alanı olmuş ve kadınlar bu şekilde ailelerinin geçimine katkıda bulunmuşlardır.⁷²⁶

Kayseri’nin tarihsel olarak ticaret yolları üzerinde bir merkez olması ve gelişkin ticari faaliyet pek çok Ermeni tüccarını bu ticari aktivitelerde önemli roller oynamaya itmiştir. Ermeni tüccarlar başta İstanbul, İzmir gibi ülke

⁷²⁵ William Burkhardt Barker, *Lares and Penates; or, Cilicia and its Governors*, London, Ingram, Cooke and Co., 1853, ss. 372-377.

⁷²⁶ Ayrıntılı bilgi için bakınız: Arşak Alboyacıyan, *Badmootiun Hye Gesaria, Vol. II*, (Ermenice), Cairo, 1937; Aris Kalfaian, *Chomaklou, The History of an Armenian Village*, New York, Chomaklou Compatriotic Society, 1982.

içindeki önemli merkezlerle daha sonra ise yurt dışındaki ticaret şehirleri ile özellikle Manchester ve Londra ile bağlar kurup oralarda ticari temsilcilikler açmış, Avrupa mamul maddelerinin Türkiye'deki dağıtıcıları olmaya başlamışlardır. Kayseri'den Gülbenkyan, Manukyan, Seliyan, Gümüşyan, Frengiyan aileleri gibi büyük tüccar aileleri çıkmıştır. Kayserili Ermeni tüccarlar bir taraftan yerel ürünleri ihraç ederken, diğer taraftan da özellikle manifatura ticareti ile uğraşmış ve Türkiye pazarında bu ürünlerin temel ithalatçısı ve dağıtıcısı olmuşlardır. Kayserili Ermeniler sınai üretim faaliyetlerinde de yer almışlardır.⁷²⁷ 1882-83 Ankara Salnamesi'nde Kayseri için devlete ait olan Güherçile Fabrikası'nın yanı sıra sekiz adet fabrika sayılmaktadır: Gözübüyükzade Fabrikası, Kalpakçıyan Fabrikası, Kundakçıyan Fabrikası, Karakaşyan Fabrikası, Tabanyan Avadis Fabrikası, Tabanyan Ohannes Fabrikası, Ağabaşyan Fabrikası, Kökliyan Saragan Ağa Fabrikası.⁷²⁸ Fabrikaların üretim alanına yahut sahiplerine dair herhangi bir açıklama olmasa da; fabrikaların isimlerinden Gözübüyükzade Fabrikası hariç diğerlerinin gayrimüslimlere ait olduğu ortadadır. Yani şehirdeki üretim faaliyetlerinde gayrimüslimler önemli pay sahibiydi.

Yukarıda genel özellikleri verilen iktisadi yapının Ermeni tehciri sonrasında uğradığı değişiklikler söz konusu olduğunda, Ermeni emval-i metrukesi en önemli kaynak olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır.

Ermeni mallarının ne şekilde kullanıldığı konusuna geldiğimizde bunu bazı başlıklar altında toplayabiliriz: askeriyenin ihtiyaçları, halkın çeşitli ihtiyaçları, muhacir ve mültecilerin yerleştirilmesi ve Müslüman girişimcilerin desteklenmesi gibi. Bu çerçevede Müslümanların şirket kurması da teşvik edilmiştir. Örneğin 6 Ocak 1916'da vilayet ve mutasarrıflıklara çekilen telgraf ile Ermenilerden kalan menkul malların Müslümanlardan oluşacak İslam şirketlerinin arttırılması için kullanılması bildirilmiş ve bu amaçla şirketin

⁷²⁷ K. S. Papazian, *Merchants from Ararat, a Brief Survey of Trade through the Ages*, ed. and revised by P. M. Manuelian, New York, Ararat Press, 1979; Bedross Der Matossian, "The Armenian Commercial Houses and Merchant Networks in the 19th Century Ottoman Empire", *TURCICA*, no. 39 (Fall 2007), ss. 147-174.

⁷²⁸ Kocabaşoğlu-Uluğtekin, *Salnamelerde Kayseri*, ss. 71-73.

kurucu, idareci ve temsilcilerinin iktidar sahibi ve namuslu kişilerden seçilmesi istenmiştir. Hem esnaf hem de çiftçilerin bu oluşumlarda hissedar olabilmesi için de yarım veya bir liralık senetler hazırlanması ve bu senetlerin kişilerin adına olması emredilmiş ve bu sayede senetlerin yabancıların eline geçmesi engellenmek istenmiştir. Bu uygulamalar ile amacın Müslüman ahali arasında ticaret hayatının arttırılması olduğuna dikkat çekilmiş ve bu yöndeki gelişmeler hakkında Nezarete sürekli bilgi verilmesi talep edilmiştir.⁷²⁹ Daha sonra gönderilen başka şifreli telgraflar ile bu emir tekrar edilip Ermeni emval-i metrukesinin atıl bırakılmayarak İslam şirketlerine uygun şartlar altında transfer edilmesi ve bu şirketlere gerekli yardımların yapılması gerektiği de ifade edilmiştir.⁷³⁰

Bu emirlerden de anlaşılacağı üzere, Müslüman girişimcilerin şirket kurmasını teşvik için emval-i metrukenin kullanılması Osmanlı hükümetince desteklenmiştir. 1908 yılında İttihat ve Terakki'nin iktidara gelmesine kadar imparatorlukta 86 anonim şirket varken 1908-1918 yılları arasında 10 yılda 236 şirket kurulmuştur. Bahsi geçen şirketlerin 123'ü savaş yıllarında kurulmuştur ve daha önce kurulan şirketlerde yabancı yatırımı önemli bir oranda pay sahibiyken, savaş yıllarında kurulan 123 şirketin çoğunun Müslüman-Türklerce kurulduğu görülmektedir.⁷³¹ Bu politika ve destekler Kayseri'de de meyvesini vermiş ve savaş öncesi Kayseri'de hiç anonim şirket yokken 1916 yılında iki anonim şirket birden kurulmuştur: "Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi" ve "Köy İktisat Bankası". Bu iki şirketin kurucuları kimdi diye baktığımızda doğrudan İttihat ve Terakki kadrolarının şirketlerin kuruluşuna ön ayak olduğu görülmektedir. Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi'nin 7 kurucusundan 4'ü İttihat ve Terakki üyesiyken, Köy İktisat Bankası'nın bütün kurucuları İttihat

⁷²⁹ BOA, DH. ŞFR, 59/239

⁷³⁰ BOA, DH. ŞFR, 64/39; DH. ŞFR, 60/95

⁷³¹ Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, Ankara, Yurt Yayınları, 1982, ss. 57-58.

ve Terakki üyesiydi. Bunların dışında yerel eşraf, tüccar ve toprak sahipleri de bu oluşumların içinde yer almıştır.⁷³²

Bu şirketleri inceleyen Feroz Ahmet de bu duruma vurgu yapmış ve şöyle bir tespitte bulunmuştur:

Bu milli ekonomi ve milli burjuvazi yaratma politikasından en fazla kazanç sağlayanlar esas olarak ticaret ve sanayiye yatıracak parası olan kimselerdi. Bunlar artık hükümetin himayesi altında çalışabiliyorlardı. Önde gelen İttihatçılar küçük servetler yapmak için mevkilerini kullandı ve bu durum savaş yılları boyunca devam etti. Taşrada ise bu politikadan en fazla yarar sağlayanlar yerel tüccar ve eşraftı.⁷³³

Gerçekten de bu iki şirket savaş yılları içinde büyük karlar elde etmiştir. Örneğin Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketi iki yıl içinde sermayesini 46,000 liradan 200,000 liraya çıkarırken; 10,000 lira sermaye ile kurulan Köy İktisat Bankası sermayesini 1917’de 50,000 liraya çıkarmıştı. Bu iki şirket de savaş sonrası etkinliklerini kaybetmiş ve kısa süre sonra kendilerini feshetmişlerdir.⁷³⁴

O dönemde kurulan şirketlerin ve bunlara verilen desteklerin konu edildiği Osmanlı belgelerinden anlaşılacağı üzere; emval-i metruke bu şirketlerin kuruluşunda ve büyük karlar elde etmesinde etkili olmuştur. Merkezden gönderilen emirler bir taraftan taşrada şirket kurulmasının önemine değinirken diğer taraftan da bu şirketler üzerinden haksız kazançlar elde edilmesini ve vurgunculuk yapılmasını eleştirmekte ve yerel yöneticileri bu gibi olayların engellenmesi konusunda uyarmaktadır. Bu uyarıların hedefinde özellikle bu şirketlerin emval-i metrukeyi çok ucuza satın alıp sonra kısa sürede birkaç katı fiyata elden çıkarmaları ve böylece bir anda fahiş karlar elde etmeleri bulunmaktadır. Şirketlerin desteklenmesindeki amacın bu mallar

⁷³² A. Gündüz Ökçün, “1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Anonim Şirket Olarak Kurulan Bankalar”, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri, Metinler/Tartışmalar, 8-10 Haziran 1973*, ed. by Osman Okyar, Ankara, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1975.

⁷³³ Feroz Ahmad, “Doğmakta Olan Bir Burjuvazinin Öncüsü: Genç Türkler’in Sosyal ve Ekonomik Politikası, 1908-1918”, *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, pp. 53-55.

⁷³⁴ Ökçün, , “1909-1930 Yılları Arasında Anonim Şirket Olarak Kurulan Bankalar”; ve Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat*.

üzerinden vurgunculuk yapılmasını teşvik etmek olmadığı, bu malların Müslümanlar arasında ticaretin geliştirilmesi ve Müslüman şirketlerinin kurulması amacıyla kullanılması gerektiği ifade edilmiştir.⁷³⁵ Bu duruma bir örnek vermek gerekirse, 8 Şubat 1916 tarihli bir belgeye göre Kayseri’de alelacele oluşturulan bir İslam şirketi Ermenilerden kalan bir mağazanın mallarını 2,000 liraya kapatma suretiyle aldıktan sadece iki gün sonra 10,000 liraya satmıştır. Dahiliye Nezareti bu uygulamayı eleştirmektedir: “İslam şirketleri tesisinden maksat Müslümanları ticaret ve sanata alıştırmaya ve memleketimizdeki İslam müesseselerinin arttırılması ve ticaretinin geliştirilmesi olduğu cihetle şirketlere elden geldiği kadar yardım yapılmalıdır ancak emval-i metruke toptan ve kapatma suretiyle verilmemeli müzayedeye konularak başkalarının da katılımı sağlanarak kanun ve mevzuata uygun bir şekilde satış gerçekleştirilmelidir”.⁷³⁶

Merkezden bu tarz uygulamaların engellenmesine dair emirler gelmeye devam etmiştir. Bu durum emval-i metrukenin dağıtımında özellikle Müslüman şirketlerin malları çok ucuza kapatıp, kısa sürede emval-i metrukeyi aldıkları fiyatın en az birkaç katına satarak kestirmeden zengin olduklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Merkezden bunun engellenmesi için emirlerin gönderilmeye devam etmesi sorunun da devam ettiğinin göstergesidir.⁷³⁷

Savaş döneminde Kayseri Belediye Başkanı olan Ahmet Rıfat Çalika da emval-i metrukenin ele geçirilmesi mücadelesinde çeşitli yolsuzluklar yapıldığından bahseder. Çalika’nın savaş suçları ile ilgili eklediği tabloda emval-i metruke kapsamında işlenen suçlar da yer almaktadır. Biri Kayseri’nin en büyük mensucat malları satan Yazıcıyan Mağazası ile ilgilidir. Bu mağaza, eşraf, tüccar ve polis işbirliği ile açılmış ve içerisindeki mallar alınmıştır. Bir diğer şikayet ise, bazı bürokratlar ve eşrafın emval-i metruke müzayedesinde hileli yollarla malların fiyatını düşürmeleri ile ilgilidir. Bu kişilerin aynı zamanda Kayseri Milli İktisat Anonim Şirketinin kurucuları arasında olması ve

⁷³⁵ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 54-A/383; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/275; BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/37

⁷³⁶ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 60/275 (8 Şubat 1916)

⁷³⁷ BOA, DH.ŞFR, 61/37; BOA, DH.ŞFR 61/31

bir kısmının da İttihat ve Terakki üyesi olması emval-i metruke üzerinden kurulan ilişkilerin niteliğini bir kez daha ortaya koymaktadır. Son olarak Emval-i Metruke Komisyonu başkanı da dahil olmak üzere Ermeni mallarını korumakla görevli kişilerin de bu sürecin bir parçası oldukları görülmektedir.⁷³⁸

Sonuç olarak gerek arşiv belgelerinden gerekse de anılardan hareketle, Ermeni tehcirinin Kayseri'nin iktisadi hayatını köklü bir değişikliğe uğrattığı söylenebilir. Ermenilerin şehirden gönderilmesi ile birlikte ciddi bir iktisadi boşluk ortaya çıkmış ancak bu boşluk kısa sürede Müslüman girişimcilerce doldurulmuştur. Ermeni dükkanları ve içlerindeki mallar bu yeni girişimci sınıfa çok ucuz fiyatlar karşılığında satılmıştır. Bu süreç bir yandan da bir iç mücadele yaratmıştır ki emval-i metrukenin ucuza satılması, müzayedeye konulmaması gibi nedenlerle pek çok şikayet merkeze yönlendirilmiş; İstanbul'dan ise bu hususta özen gösterilmesi ve suiistimallere engel olunması yönünde emirler Kayseri Sancağı'na gönderilmiştir. Kayseri'den harp zenginlerini şikayet eden pek çok telgrafın Dahiliye Nezaretine gönderilmiş olması şehrin eşrafı, memurlar ve askeri kadrolar arasında emval-i metrukeye kimin sahip olacağı üzerinden çatışmalı bir durum yaşandığının göstergesidir. Bu süreçteki zenginleşmelerden, ortaya çıkan bu yeni kaynağı edinemeyenlerin rahatsızlık duyduğu ortadadır.

Emval-i metruke meselesinde, bu çalışma literatüre önemli bir katkı sağlamıştır. Bu konuda yerelden gönderilen belgeler esas alınmış, sürecin taşrada ne şekilde yaşandığı ayrıntılı olarak ortaya konmuş, emval-i metruke çerçevesinde ortaya çıkan mücadeleler, ittifaklar ve problemler incelenmiştir. Emval-i metruke konusunda bugüne kadar yapılan pek çok çalışmadan farklı olarak hukuki mevzuat temel alınmamış ve esas olarak uygulamaya odaklanılmıştır.

Yapılan inceleme emval-i metrukenin tasfiyesinin aslında merkezin “resmi sermaye transferi” yaklaşımının ötesinde, yerelde yaşanan güç mücadelesi ekseninde şekillendiğini göstermiştir. Bu anlamda da hem yerel

⁷³⁸ *Kurtuluş Savaşında Adalet Bakanı Ahmet Rifat Çalika'nın Anıları*, ed. by Hurşit Çalika, İstanbul, 1992, ss. 34-35.

yöneticilerden hem de bu tasfiyelerden pay alamayanlar tarafından merkeze gönderilen şikayetlere özellikle dikkat çekilmiş, ortaya çıkan bu muazzam kaynağın yerelde nasıl bir bölüşüm kavgasını tetiklediği analiz edilmiştir. Ortaya şöyle bir tablo çıkmıştır: net sermaye transferinin gerçekleştiği, Ermeni mallarının resmi olarak tasfiye edildiği ve Müslüman girişimcilerin zenginleşmesinin hedeflendiği bu dönemde, asıl karşı çıkılan Ermeni mallarının tasfiyesi değil, bu tasfiyenin resmi otoritelerin kontrolü dışında gerçekleşmesidir. Şirketleşme pratikleri de bu sürecin bir diğer halkasıdır. Bizzat yerel yöneticiler, İttihat ve Terakki kadroları ve taşradaki Müslüman girişimciler eliyle Kayseri’de kurulan şirketler kalıcı kuruluşlar olarak ortaya çıkmasalar da, şirket ortaklarının birden zenginleştiğini, sonuç itibarıyla, gayrimüslimlerden sermaye transfer edildiğini ve nihayet Müslüman girişimcilerin desteklenmesi meselelerinde “milli iktisat” politikasının başarıya ulaştığını görüyoruz.

Söz konusu zenginleşmeyi pekiştiren bir başka faktör de savaş sonu geriye dönebilen Ermeni sayısının azlığı olmuştur. Bu süreç sonucu anlaşılmaktadır ki Kayseri’de yeni bir girişimci sınıf ortaya çıkmış ve bu kişilerin çoğu milli mücadelenin de en etkin isimleri arasında yer almıştır. Kayserili bu yeni girişimci sınıfın mensupları Cumhuriyet döneminde özellikle var olan tarihsel ticari bağın da etkisiyle Adana’ya yerleşmiş ve Adana’nın önemli tüccarları arasında yerlerini almışlardır.⁷³⁹

Tezin bir diğer önemli bölümü Ermenilerin geri dönüşü süreci üzerine odaklanmış ve Kayseri’de bu sürecin yansımalarını, ortaya çıkan sorunları ve yaşanan gelişmeleri incelemiştir. Yapılan inceleme, konu ile ilgili literatürde yer alan birtakım genellemelerin Kayseri özelinde bir karşılığının olmadığını göstermiştir. İlk olarak Ermenilerin geri dönüşü ile birlikte el konulan emval-i metrukenin “isbad-ı vücud” gibi bir ilke getirilerek -yani tasfiye edilen Ermeni mallarının ancak tapuda isimleri kayıtlı Ermenilerin geriye dönmesi ile- iade edileceği, gerçek kişi yoksa mirasçılara verilmeyeceği, dolayısıyla pek çok

⁷³⁹ Aslı Emine Çomu, “The Impact of the Exchange of Populations on the Economic and Social Life of the City of Adana (1875-1927)”, MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2005, ss. 96-97.

Ermeni'nin ailesinin mallarını geri alamadıkları şeklindeki argümanın Kayseri Sancağı'na gönderilen emirlerde yer almadığı aksine malların mirasçılara iade edilmesi yönünde emirler verildiği anlaşılmaktadır. İlgili literatürden 1920 sonrası uygulandığını anladığımız “isbad-ı vücud” ilkesinin, Ermenilerin asıl geri dönüş hareketinin yaşandığı mütareke dönemi için de geçerliymiş gibi okunması ise aslında İttihat ve Terakki sonrası gelen Mütareke Hükümetinin uyguladığı farklı politikanın göz ardı edilmesi sonucunu doğurmaktadır.

Ayrıca, muhacirler ve geri dönen Ermeniler arasında ciddi sorunlar çıktığı şeklinde sıklıkla vurgulanan bir argümanın da Kayseri'de geri dönüş döneminde bir yansıması olmamıştır. Öncelikle Ermenilerin geriye dönüş tarihleri itibariyle Kayseri Sancağı'nda kalan muhacir ve mülteci sayısı oldukça azalmıştır. Tehcir edilen Ermenilerin çoğunluğunun geri dönemediği de belirtilmelidir. Sonuç itibariyle, Ermeni emval-i metrukesine yerleştirilen muhacir ve mülteciler ile geriye dönebilen Ermeniler arasında çıkan bir soruna belgelerde rastlanmamıştır.

Bu çalışma, her yerelliğin nüfus kompozisyonu, toplumsal aktörler, merkezi otoritenin etkinliği ve aynı zamanda yerel yöneticilerin karakterine göre kendine has dinamikler sergileyebileceğini ve uygulamanın da bu özellikler çerçevesinde şekillendiğini göstermektedir. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışmada Kayseri özelinde ortaya çıkan sonuçların başka bölgeler için de geçerli olduğu iddia edilmemekte; tam aksine, diğer bölgeler için de benzeri çalışmaların yapılıp sürecin ayrıntılandırılması gereğinin altı çizilmektedir. Sonuç itibariyle bu çalışma, Osmanlı Devleti'nin merkezi politikalarına değil, o politikaların yereldeki uygulanma biçimlerine eğilmesi ve politika ile uygulama arasındaki farklılıklara dikkat çekmiş olması itibariyle, tehcir dönemi Kayserisiyle ilgili literatürde kendine bir yer edinmeye çalışmıştır.

APPENDIX 8

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Gözel Durmaz

Adı : Oya

Bölümü : Tarih

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce): A City Transformed: War, Demographic Change and Profiteering in Kayseri (1915-1920)

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: