CHAPTER III
THE YOUNG OTTOMANS – THE BEGINNING
Each reform effort in the history of Ottoman Empire had provoked opposition. So was the case with the Tanzimat reforms. One consequence of the two royal decrees was that Ottoman reforms no more remained an internal affair of the Empire; by responding to outside pressures, the process of reform was now brought to international stage and was opened up to foreign monitoring. For example, the Treaty of Paris 1856 made copious references to the Tanzimat Edict of 1856, and dwelt at length with the position of non-Muslims in Ottoman Empire. This had to happen as the Edicts were promulgated under pressures from foreign powers and the purpose was to placate them and also to gain the loyalty of Ottoman Christians. Once the Tanzimat decrees were promulgated, there were strong pressures for their quick implementation, but this was not an easy task. Lack of qualified and trained personnel to implement reforms, the difficulty in grafting Christian European values on to the Ottoman Islamic culture, an attitude of resistance and a sort of inertia towards any change dictated from above, a virtually bankrupt state exchequer, an underdeveloped infrastructure, a largely illiterate population all these and other factors led to a slow and halting implementation of the Tanzimat reforms. The Ottoman Muslims felt neglected and the reforms widened the gap between them and the Christians.

The promise of equality for all Ottomans before the law could not be so easily assimilated by the Ottoman society. For example, the payment of poll-tax by non-Muslims and their conscription in military were criticized by Ottoman Christians and their European champions as contrary to the Tanzimat
promise of equality. The European press highlighted the unsatisfactory nature of Ottoman tax system, publicized other defects in the Tanzimat system and brought out defects in its application. The poll-tax was an important source of state revenue and was a principle coming down from earlier times. The problem was diffused: provision had been made for particular cases in which individual non-Muslims were permitted to send a substitute in their place; the 1856 Edict specifically admitted substitution as a general principle, and provided for the purchase of exemption. Thus the poll-tax abolished by the Gülhane Edict continued to be collected but under a new name, as an exemption which relieved eligible non-Muslims of the duty of military service. The principle of equality of all before the law created problems relating to conversion and apostasy. One result of the 1856 Edict was that Christian missionaries became more active in the Empire and they started converting Muslims as well. However, in cases where individuals left Islam for Christianity, they could be arrested and punished and here the government did not care for foreign intervention.

Mustafa Rasheed Pasha who had an important role in the Gülhane Edict himself became apprehensive of the reform movement when within less than two decades the 1856 Edict was brought out. With the best will in the world, there was no way the multi-confessional, geographically incoherent and economically backward Ottoman Empire, whose institutions and legal framework had evolved to accommodate the demands of its own particular
culture and concerns, could hope to implement within a short space of time promises exacted by foreign powers under conditions of extreme pressure.²

During the Tanzimat period, Sultan Abdul Aziz (1861-1876) succeeded Sultan Abdul Majid. He proved to be a weak and inept ruler and was eventually deposed. His successor, Murad V (1876) was insane and deposed after three months. It was during the reign of Sultan Abdul Aziz that a movement called “the Young Ottoman Movement,” spearheaded by some Western-oriented intellectuals, emerged. With increasing exposure to Europe, a sort of environment of literary renaissance was developing which found expression through the privately owned press during the last two decades of Tanzimat. The views of these intellectuals, mostly bureaucrats, advocating a strong centralized government, an elected parliament, a written constitution and loyalty to “Ottomanism.” were presented through journalism. They sought to bring about a synthesis of the new institutions of Tanzimat and the Ottoman and Islamic traditions. As the inspiration for Tanzimat came from the bureaucrats some of their top policy-makers became too dominating which these intellectuals did not like, as they did not like the autocratic rule of the sultans. These European-oriented intellectuals felt that the success of Europe was not only in their technological superiority but also in their political organisation. They favoured a constitutional parliamentary system, rule of law and not rule of man. They wanted reform but without eroding Islamic traditions and Ottoman patriotism. In their view the hasty adoption of Western
institutions had not brought any efficiency in the government and had eroded Islamic values.

The Ottomans needed Western technology to meet the challenges of the West, but technology is not given without economic and political strings. For example, foreign investors built railway in some parts of Ottoman Empire, but their main purpose was to bring cash crops from interior to sea ports for shipment overseas. As interaction with European powers increased, they found ready markets for their factory manufactured mass products which were cheaper and so priced out the locally made goods. Further, heavy expenditure was incurred in buying weapons and warships to modernize the army and navy. Sultan Abdul Aziz wanted to strengthen the Ottoman fleet and to bring it at par with that of France and Britain. (Towards the end of his rule, the fleet comprised 20 battleships, 4 ships of the line, 5 frigates, 7 corvettes and 43 cargo ships) Without augmenting revenue, the Ottoman Empire had to take out loans on the European money markets to meet their budget deficits. Within two decades since the Crimean War, foreign debts had run so high as to throw the government into great financial crisis. Starting with the first loan of 3.3 million Ottoman lire taken in 1854 during the Crimean War, additional loans amounting to 200 million lire (about 180 million pound sterling) were taken within the next two decades. The result was that 60% of the state’s total expenditure had gone to servicing these debts which the Ottomans were unable to pay. In this situation of bankruptcy, protection of European creditors was secured by appointing the Ottoman Public Debt Administration which reserved
certain state revenue to service the debts. This was a surrender of Ottoman financial independence to European interests.

Economic progress, on the whole, was negligible during the Tanzimat period and so was the case with agriculture. However, as discussed earlier, developments in the field of law and education were significant. Those educated in schools established during the Tanzimat period included Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and other progressive leaders and thinkers of the Republic of Turkey. The introduction of the western concept of private property with the enactment of land law of 1858 resulted in Muslims losing their land to Christians and others who had the money to buy. Incidentally land reform, specially the change in land ownership structure, enabled Russian Jews to buy land in Palestine, signalling the beginning of Zionism.

As already observed in the previous chapter, during the Tanzimat period from 1839 to 1877, the Ottoman reformers no doubt attempted serious reforms on the basis of western model but within the Ottoman framework, “a mixture of east and west”. Thus process of change was initiated. But, it continued along with the old system which created an institutional duality in the Ottoman society. This process of change lacked originality and realism primarily because the Tanzimatists were more idealistic than experimental an orientation. Under the direct and indirect impact of the processes of democratization and wider political and economic consequences of the contact with the West, the Tanzimatists failed to pursue their programme of modernization systematically according to their ideological expectations. This
resulted in the cultural initiation, material opportunism and ideological inconsistency among them. Although the Tanzimat reforms proved only partially successful due to the religious opposition, peasant conservatism, and failure to understand the roots of European social reforms and scientific technology, yet these reforms built solid bases for future modernization. The attempts of modernization resulted in two major groups which were:

i) A new group of intellectuals called the ‘Young Ottomans’ emerged from the newly created educational institutions and represented the liberal socio-political ideas;

ii) A group of ‘fundamentalists’. They gradually acquired different meanings for different people.

The ‘Young Ottoman ideology’ was the manifestation of a serious reaction to, and deep protest against, the traditional as well as the western extremes. The intellectuals were the first ideologues in the Empire in the sense that they tried to make the western ideas of enlightenment as part of the Turkish reading public and to work out a synthesis between these ideas and Islam. They tried to maintain the ‘balance’ by observing that while the extreme conservative ideas or orders were detrimental to the progress of the existing Ottoman society, the Tanzimat reformers ignored the richness of traditional culture. The major components of the ideology of the ‘Young Ottomans’ were patriotism, constitutionalism, nationalism, (with Islamic orientation), liberalism, freedom and separation of state from religion.
The ‘Young Ottomans’ represented a form of political protest for which there had been no rule in the Ottoman Empire. For the first time, an organized group of the Turkish ‘intelligentsia’ (the body of educated persons qualified to form public opinion) was making use of the mass communication to voice extremely separate criticisms of the government of the Empire.\textsuperscript{12}

**The Young Ottomans:**

The most important opponents of the Tanzimat were the ‘Young Ottomans’ they wanted to transform the Ottoman government into a constitutional monarchy and revitalize Islam. They stand distinguished from the Tanzimat people.

Most of these young men were familiar with the European ideas; some of them were influenced by such Western thinkers as Montesquieu and Rousseau and the French Revolution. They had accepted the principles of nationalism as well as of democracy. They set out to weld its constituent elements into a nation. It was quite natural that they should choose Islam as a spiritual – ideological base for their nationalism, but they also knew that they would not attract the non-Muslim population of the Empire. They however hoped to gain the support of the non Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire on the basis of pan - Ottomanism. They believed in a limited form of pan-Islamism that would be welded together by the power of the Ottoman Empire. “Ottomanism” was the subject which was frequently discussed in their gatherings, and they based their ideas almost entirely on the Qur’ân. They wanted to put forward the theory of “Ottomanism”. On the whole, the Young
Ottomans became suspects in the eyes of the Sultan Abdul Hamid II. By the order of the Sultan some of the Young Ottomans were banished from the Empire. (Interestingly, the seeds of the movement were sown by six young men at a picnic party in the forests of Belgrade in the summer of 1865.)

The Patriotic Alliance:

The above group was the origin of a secret society called the "Patriotic Alliance" (İttifak-i Hamiyet), a small but influential group of dissenters. It was formed along the lines of similar groups prevalent in Europe at that time. They were not satisfied with modernising the machinery of the state, but wanted to establish a constitutional monarchy within Islamic framework. In Europe they were known as Jeunes Turcs.

According to the oral information gathered by one of the students of the movement, Midhat Jamal Kuntay, from the niece (daughter of a brother or sister) of Mehmet Bey, the Patriotic Alliance was founded by the following persons: Mustafa Fazil Paşa brother of Khedive Ismail of Egypt), Mehmet Bey, Namik Kemal Bey (poet and journalist) Nuru Bey, Ayatullah Bey, Resat Bey, Agah Efendi, Refik Bey, Ziya Bey Paşa (poet) Ibrahim Sinasi and Pazarkoylu Ahmed Agah whose task was to spread the ideas of the Alliance throughout the countryside.

According to Ebuzziyah, the chief but not always reliable source of information, the society was originally formed by five or six persons as a
“revolutionary society” that would take measures “to change the absolutistic regime to a constitutional regime”.18

Ali Paşa and Fuad Paşa had worked in the offices of the Grand Vizierate and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. They also held in their grip the formulation of the policies of the Porte (Ottoman Government). They were accused of personal rule, of producing wrong policies sitting in an ivory tower, and of building an exclusive class of sycophants.

Almost all members present at the picnic had been working in the Translation Bureau of the Porte, and most of them had been given the opportunity to inform themselves with European political systems as well as with the way the foreign policy of the Empire was being conducted. Their targets were the policies of Ali and Fuad.

There is no doubt, however, that the founding members of the Patriotic Alliance followed the political lead of Europe, but their intense patriotism made them think that it was a reform for Ottomans by Ottomans along Islamic lines.

In 1866 a man who was to become the patron of the founding members of the Patriotic Alliance, Mustafa Fazil Paşa, set the king of Italy as an example for the Sultan. All of his life was spent at the Porte. Most of his education was received at the bureaus of the Porte, where at the age of sixteen he had started his governmental career, being first appointed to the Bureau of the Grand Vizier. He had been appointed to the following posts:
Minister of Education in 1862

Minister of Finance in 1864

Chairman of the Council of the Treasury; when this body was established in October 1865.

After few months Mustafa Fazil was dismissed from his post in February 7, 1866, because he criticised Fuad's financial policy and presented to the Sultan a memorandum accusing the Porte of its incompetence in financial matters. Then he was asked to leave the capital within twenty-four hours on April 4, 1866. Thus Mustafa Fazil Paşa was now out of picture, leaving the Sultan to have his way in dealing with the Egyptian succession, where his brother (Ismail Paşa) was Khedive (“hereditary governor”) of Egypt.

After his exile, Mustafa Fazil continued his interest in Patriotic Alliance, and wrote a lengthy letter addressed to the ruler, Sultan Abdul Aziz in 1867. It is doubtful that the letter ever reached Abdul Aziz. It was thereafter published in the daily Liberté (on March 24, 1867). Namık Kemal and his friends had obtained the text of the letter and undertook to translate it for distribution.

The task of translation was assigned to Namık Kemal’s friend, Sadullah Bey. After the translation, 50,000 copies were printed in the shop of the French printer Cayol and distributed in the capital. There is no doubt that the ideas of the letter created a sensation in the capital. The idea was that this may pressurize the Sultan to take the lead in the constitutional – representative movement.
Mustafa Fazil Paşa’s financial support of the Young Ottomans provides one of the important keys to the subsequent history of the Hurriyet. He had deposited 2,50,000 Franc’s in Ziya’s name in a bank in Paris or London.20

Namık Kemal (d. 1887) was the most important intellectual, theoretician, and writer of the Young Ottomans. He was an effective critic of Tanzimat. All his life he tried to blend Islam and the ideas of Enlightenment. He wrote extensively in the newspaper Hurriyet, which was the organ of Young Ottomans and which approached problems from the Islamic point of view. He also talked about the importance of the Shari‘ah and the observance of the basic principles of Islam. He was credited with having used the words “fatherland”, and millet, “nation”, in their modern sense.21

_Tasvir - i - Efkar_ (newspaper) edited by Kemal, at the time of the crisis, had become the first Turkish newspaper to carry sophisticated analyses of foreign affairs and to go into such matters as the impact of new methods of warfare on the European balance of power. It also took up more controversial matters, such as the mixing of foreign elites in Ottoman diplomatic affairs, but was as yet aggressive in its treatment of the subject.

_Tasvir - i - Efkar_ was closed by the order of Ali Paşa because of the controversial matters and articles by Namık Kemal criticising foreign intervention in the affairs.

Mehmed Bey was a leading person of the Young Ottomans. He had received his education at the Ottoman school in Paris, and had returned well permeated with the ideas of constitutionalism and popular representation.
Mehmed Bey and his two younger friends, Nur'u Bey and Resad Bey were employed in the Translation Bureau of the Mejlis - i - Vala, the first modern consultative governmental machinery established in 1837 by Mustafa Rasheed Paşa.

Another member of the young Ottoman’s group was Ayetullah Bey. He was the product of a household but quite knowledgeable. He had full opportunity to acquire a solid understanding of western as well as eastern cultures. His admiration and attitude for the achievements of Napoleon (in the sense of Restoration of France) made him join the ranks of the political opposition.

Ali Suavi (d. 1878), who is considered the ‘real’ representative of the Young Ottomans, expressed the hostility of the middle – lower sections of the society towards the type of westernization which had only fringe benefits for them. He promoted a new ideological trend among the lower classes, which was the result of the introduction of westernization in the Empire.

Ziya Paşa, who was a man of the palace, was primarily antagonistic to the ministers of the Porte. His ideological contribution to the Young Ottomans was less significant.

Nine of the Young Ottomans within Turkey succeeded in escaping to Paris during April and May 1867. Their closest associates were Leon Cahur and Arminius Vambery; both were interested in Turkey or in the Turks. They found in addition other Muslim and non-Muslim Ottoman subjects already in France and connected with the Young Ottomans.
Under pressure from both the governments (French and Ottoman), the Young Ottomans were forced to move to London where they established their headquarters and papers. They quickly split into rival groups and then into rival individuals. This dissolution as a group was due to the difficulties arising from Mustafa Fazil’s reconciliation with the Turkish government resulting in his withdrawal of financial support, and to the differences in the views of the members.

The Young Ottomans were in full agreement in demanding a “constitutional” government. They wanted to put an end to the absolutism of the Padishah since they believed that it was not possible to retain the absolute rights of the ruler while reforming the laws of the state.

The views expressed in the principal organs *Hurriyet* (Liberty) and *Muhbir* (Messenger), they emphasized the need for a *nizam-i-serbestane* (liberal regime), for the establishment of a *kanun-u-esasi* (fundamental law), and for a *sura-yi-ummet* (national assembly). They pressed strongly on three points:

i) the economic crises of the Muslim peoples,

ii) the increasing dependence of Turkey upon the rivalries of the great powers, and increasing interference of these powers in the internal affairs of Turkey, which intensified the bitterness between the Muslim and Christian peoples of the Empire, and
iii) the irresponsible policies of the government and the financial foolishness of the rulers.

The Young Ottomans were confused over the matter of achieving their aims. Their intellectual confusion revolved around the question of how the desired constitutional regime, implying the sovereignty of the people, could be reconciled with the historic tradition of the Ottoman political system. The latter stage they always identified as Islamic, and based upon the Shari'ah. They accused the Tanzimatists that their reforms were nothing but an appeasement of the European powers. They also charged that the Tanzimatists had opened the gates to European economic and political intervention by failing to introduce genuine measures, on their own initiative. They believed that the rulers were not seriously interested in the recovery of the Muslim nation. The Young Ottomans were deeply irritated by the anti-Muslim prejudices growing in the West and held the Tanzimat policies largely responsible. They thought that the Tanzimat proved to the Europeans that the Muslims were incapable of reform and that Islam was an obstacle to progress.

Young Ottomans were neither revolutionaries nor revolutionists. Perhaps this was because they did not belong to any class or potential power. Their education separated them from the impoverished peasants and artisans, and there was as yet no middle of professional class in Turkey. The intellectuals could not live except as servants of the government or with the financial support of relatives.
The following quotation from Nuru Bey shows the ideological confusion as well as the desperation among the Young Ottomans about the feasibility of a constitutional revolution emanating from the people;

“Nuru Bey: I had fallen into much doubt as to the possibility of realising the aims for which we were working when I began to consider the fact that a country would not easily change due to the wishes of a few men. Realising that without education the finding of truth would be impossible; I began to consider myself a student who should take this opportunity of going to Paris to study”.

“Mehmed Bey believed that the true establishment of freedom in our country would only be possible with the support of a national movement”.

“Ziya Paşa believed that the realization of our aims would depend upon gaining power by reconciliation with the Sultan”.

“Agah Efendi thought that in order to arrive at key positions in the furtherance of our aims, we should try to reach reconciliation with the government”.

“Namık Kemal convinced that ‘the Ottoman nation was loyal to its Ottoman rulers; with us nothing was done unless the Padisah really wanted it’ and therefore he was of the opinion that there was no means other than bringing to the throne a Padisah determined to enforce the desired reforms”.
“Rifat Bey stated that any attempt should be carried out according to law; He did not consider any ideas except his own to be reasonable.

“Resad Bey was conscious of the fact that we were in an insolvable dilemma, and without making any recommendation, found the most useful course of action in the enrichment of his knowledge through as much study as possible”.

“Ali Suavi’s craziness, his moral faults, to all of us, and one of our concerns was to treat him tactfully to prevent him from any kind of action that would create bad impressions against all of us.24

The practical impasse to which the members of the society of the Young Ottomans were led was perhaps the primary cause of disunity in the group and the ultimate reason for the dissolution of the society in exile.

Young Ottoman Society:

A group composed of Mustafa Fazil, Rifat Bey and the above eight persons met on August 10, 1867. Rifat Bey was a newcomer into the ranks of the reformers. They decided that a new organization would be created which would adopt as its programme the principles of reforms mentioned in Mustafa Fazil’s letter to the Sultan. Ziya Bey was appointed head of this new group, known as New or Young Ottoman Society. Ali Suavi was to proceed immediately to revive the Muhbir which had to be published in London instead of Paris, because of the strict press regulation of France. First issue of the new Muhbir (messenger) published in London and appeared on August 31, 1867.
The Muhbir criticised the principle of Supreme Court and pointed out that none of the resources of the *Shari’ah* had been tapped in efforts at modernization.

Mustafa Fazil not satisfied of this criticism; he wanted a more tactful opposition to the government. After some time Ziya Paşa sent two letters on this subject, which were widely publicised. Mustafa Fazil replied by condemning Ziya Paşa but still complaining of the “blundering” of the Muhbir.

That problem created confusion in the minds of the Young Ottomans. Kemal tried his best to handle this situation. Sometime later definite orders came from Mustafa Fazil for Kemal to start another newspaper. Finally *Hurriyet* (Liberty) was started by Kemal on June 29, 1868.

Mustafa Fazil was no more satisfied with the *Hurriyet* than the Muhbir. This, in turn, would have meant stopping the publication of the *Hurriyet* from the group of anti-Fazil.

In 1869, Ziya Paşa ordered to Sakakini that the printing press of the *Hurriyet*, established in the name of the Young Ottoman, Agah Effendi, would continue to serve the purpose of the Young Ottoman Society. After having overseen the printing of a series of three articles which he had written, Kemal handed over the administration of the press to Agah Efendi on September 6, 1869.

After Namik Kemal’s resignation from the *Hurriyet*, he still lived in London, and supervising a printing of the *Qur’ân*, in which Mustafa Fazil also had engaged. Namık Kemal left London and returned to the capital Istanbul on
November 25, 1870, and he had promised Ali Paşa that he would not resume his journalistic writings. This was the end of the first phase of the Young Ottomans.\textsuperscript{25}

**Emergence of Istiklal:**

Ali Paşa died in September 1871, Mehmed Bey’s uncle, Mahmud Nadin Paşa, was made Grand Vizier. From this time on the Young Ottoman members were more active than before, and the Young Ottoman movement was associated with the activities of Namık Kemal. Under Mahmud Nadin Paşa’s rule, Kemal started a newspaper which was known as Istiklal (independence). But since it had been closed, the existing press law did not allow him to own a newspaper. At that point, the Young Ottomans decided to rent the name of a newspaper which was appearing under the name of Ibret.

The publication of the Ibret had been made possible, by the generosity of Mustafa Fazil Paşa. The printing plant of the Tasvir - i - Efkar was purchased by the prince, just after a week of Ali Paşa’s death. Mustafa Fazil Paşa appointed two Young Ottomans for the supervision of the press. One of these was Kemal; the other was Ebuzziya Tevfik, the author of the only extant history of the Young Ottoman movement. Ebuzziya was a former colleague of Kemal from the days of the Patriotic Alliance.

Namık Kemal had a second clash with bureaucrats, and the price he had to pay was to leave Istanbul for having criticised the government. Kemal had come under the influence of a Halveti mystic group, whose founder was
Ibrahim Kusadali. He was to act as a prayer leader. When Ebuzziya and some of his friends failed to appear at prayer time they were dismissed.

Ebuzziya thus decided to make a living by publishing books. This first of these publications was a drama entitled “Ecel ve Kaza” (Fate and Fatality), a patriotic piece which Ebuzziya claimed to be the first work of its kind in Turkey. During these days, the idea of a renaissance of the Muslims was in the air. Later he worked more on the theory of the political unification of Muslims.

It is important that the Young Ottomans had been appointed to administrative posts in various parts of the Empire. They thought that as administrators they could try to improve the country from a position of personal strength.²⁶

Proclamation of Dastur:

The floods, drought and famine occurred in rural Anatolia resulting in the collapse of agricultural economy and to compensate that, taxation in other areas had to be increased which led to uprisings. These together with the criticism of the government policy of appeasement towards foreign powers caused general dissatisfaction amongst Ottoman Muslims. In March 1876, a pamphlet entitled “Manifesto for Muslim Patriots”, calling for a representative consultative assembly, gained wide circulation in Istanbul. It was thought that Midhat Pasha who was in the forefront for reforms was behind this.²⁷ The theological students, influenced by the young patriots, held street demonstrations and organized meetings in mosques demanding the removal of
the pro-Russian grand vizier and Sheikul Islam and the palace acceded to their demands. Now, several important officials conspired to remove Sultana Abdul Aziz. A favourable ruling from the new Sheikul Islam was obtained and the Sultan was deposed in a bloodless coup d'etat in 1876. The Sultan’s successor, Sultan Murad V, had a nervous breakdown and within three months was deposed and replaced by his brother Sultan Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909). The new Sultan appointed Midhat Paşa as grand vizier, and proclaimed the constitution (Dastur) that was drawn up by the Young Ottomans on December 3, 1876. The Sultan also promised to appoint Namık Kemal as his personal secretary.

A year after promulgating the constitution, the Sultan suspended it under his emergency powers, on the pretext of crisis created by the Russo-Turkish war 1877-78, and exiled Midhat Paşa and Namık Kemal. Soon he suspended the assembly, and one by one the rest of the leaders were jailed or sent into exile.

Midhat Paşa was dismissed and sent outside Turkey on February 5, 1877, under the article 113 of the constitution. Soon after few days Namık Kemal was imprisoned and put on trial for attempting to dethrone the Sultan. The court, presided over by Kemal’s former patron Abdullatif Subhi Paşa, enumerated Kemal, but he still remained in jail. Finally he was exiled to Midilli (Mytilene). Later Kemal was placed at the head of the administration of the island. Then he was transferred to Rhodes and to Sakiz (Chios), each time in an administrative capacity. He died in Sakiz on December 2, 1888.
Ziya Paşa was placed out of the way by being appointed to the governorship of Syria. He was harassed by the enemies and thereafter he died in 1881.

Agah Efendi was also exiled at Ankara in 1877. This was due to Abdulhamid’s conviction that he had a hand in organising the protest of the softas in 1876. This issue does not fit in at all with what we know about Agah’s character. The issue is still unsolved. Agah was pardoned and sent as minister to Athens, where he died in 1886.

Nuru Bey had been appointed to a governmental post in 1876. He had also good relations with Sultan Abdulhamid. He remained in government service till the time of death in 1906.

Resad Paşa died in 1910. Mustafa Fazil had broken relations with the Young Ottomans in 1873 or 1874, and he died shortly thereafter in December 1875.

Ali Suavi had remained in Europe up to October of 1876. On his return he was made the director of the newly established Association of Galatasaray, but he was dismissed from his post. He had organised a coup, during this period, he died in 1878. Soon after Ali Sauvi’s death, Murad Paşa returned back to the royal seat of the state.

By 1878, the Young Ottoman movement had came to an end.
The Constitutional Change:

The Young Ottomans and their ideas represented an important stage in the Ottoman society, when ideology and ideological conflict started crystallising. The Young Ottoman ideology represented the Ottomans response to the various social, political and economic problems which had emerged as a result of the interaction between internal and external forces. These ideas may be considered to be the result of the institutional change and the intellectual diffusion. So, this ideology led to multidimensional changes in the Empire, like the promulgation of the constitution of 1878 which granted certain basic rights to the citizens of the Empire and established a new parliament. Though, the constitution of 1876 was a positive step towards political modernization, in the sense that the Sultan himself came under the limitations of certain rules and regulations. In this way, they newly promulgated constitution encouraged wider political participation in the Ottoman society. The Young Ottoman theoreticians could not maintain the same ideas due to the impossibility of taking over the best of European political institutions and placing them in the Islamic framework.\textsuperscript{31}

Even though the Young Ottomans failed to graft western ideologies to the body politic of Islam, but they were successful in introducing new values to the Turks. Towards the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the Young Ottomans used the formula. They wrote, “No security without freedom, no endeavour without security, no prosperity without endeavour, no happiness without prosperity”.\textsuperscript{32}
In the late nineteenth century, the governing elite in the Ottoman Empire had expanded beyond the dimensions of a family circle and included new elements like the educated elite, officers, lawyer's civil servants, and journalist. This change reflected in the sharper conflicts in the political ground and the ideological polarization between the competing groups. Sultan Abdulhamid II adopted the processes of westernization through the replacement of the symbols of the western civilization by that of the Arab civilization. The absolute rule of the Sultan led to the strengthening of the opposition groups which finally resulted in the “Young Turk” revolution, in 1908.
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