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ABSTRACT

During its last century, the Ottoman Empire witnessed dramatic changes in settlement patterns due to migration, sedentarization, and the ascendance of commercial agriculture. Out of this process emerged new relationships between people and the environment, ecological questions of disease, land, and water management, and novel forms of social interaction. This dissertation examines that frontier ecology in Cilicia, a borderlands region of the Eastern Mediterranean situated at the historical juncture of Anatolia and Syria.

Centered on the city of Adana, the Çukurova delta plain was home to small urban and village communities along with transhumant pastoralists who used the plain for winter pasture at the mid-19th century. The people of Cilicia migrated to the mountains during the summer to beat the heat, graze their flocks, and avoid the risk of malaria in the marshy lowlands. Following the Crimean War, this ecology of transhumance began to change through the expansion of cotton cultivation, the arrival of tens of thousands of Muslims migrants, and the forced settlement of pastoralists. Wheat, cotton, and sesame took over the former swamps and pastures. Settlers grappled with epidemic malaria as they sought to make a living on a sparse, fertile, and uneven plain. The seasonal migrations of pastoralists slowly gave way to the seasonal migration of agricultural laborers. And the region’s center of gravity drifted from the mountains to the plain.

This process has been narrated through the various lenses of modernization, nationalism, imperialism, and global economic transformation, but this study approaches the remaking of Cilicia from the vantage point of vital issues in the quotidian life of its inhabitants from the late Ottoman period onward. This is the story of the people of Cilicia and their ever-changing relationship with the environment over the course of a century. It uncovers the activities of Muslim and Christian villagers and merchants, the journeys of immigrants from the Caucasus, the Balkans, and Crete, the labors of Arab, Kurdish, Armenian and Assyrian seasonal workers, and the enduring movements of pastoralists and their flocks. It studies how state and society confronted unique ecological questions like malaria that arose out of settlement. It explores a world born of rapid agrarian change, which became the stage for tales of economic triumph, physical struggle, and communal contention over access to land and resources. This study follows these themes through the tumultuous years of WWI and into the Republic of Turkey, tracing the shifts and continuities between the late Ottoman period and the post-WWII mechanization of agriculture and transport and the near elimination of malaria.

In order to achieve a multivocal narrative, this dissertation draws on a wide source base from different state and non-state archives in Turkey, France, the US, the UK, and Lebanon as well as periodicals and published sources in a number of languages, especially Ottoman/Modern Turkish and Armenian. Perspectives from literature and folklore add further texture to this picture of agrarian change in a region of the modern Middle East.
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This dissertation is a social and environmental history of an area of the Eastern Mediterranean historically known as Cilicia during the 19th and 20th centuries. For most English-language readers, this name and the place to which it refers may not be familiar. Centered on the city of Adana in the former Ottoman Empire, a region of the Turkish Republic known as Çukurova today, historical Cilicia occupies more than 40,000 km² in Southern Anatolia and Northern Syria. If it were an independent country, Cilicia would be roughly as large as Switzerland. If you prefer a US state, Ohio. Yet, to encapsulate Cilicia’s position, geography, and all the historiographical baggage that it carries, a fine analogy might be the Mezzogiorno, a region that encompasses the southern portion of Italy that includes the great island of Sicily. Cilicia’s population today is around 6 million and contains eight cities with over 100,000 residents, making it similar in size and population to its Levantine neighbors of Israel, Palestine, Lebanon, or Jordan, more populous than Denmark, Finland, or the Republic of Congo. As a region, it accounted for 6.5% of Turkey’s nearly $800 billion economy in 2008, meaning that historical Cilicia’s economy today is larger than the GDP of over 100 different countries, including Tunisia, Serbia, and Bahrain.

The more qualitative comparisons made by commentators of the late 19th century offer other means of understanding Cilicia’s relative place on the planet during the period in question. The most common comparison, made by European capitalists and Ottoman statesmen alike, was to Egypt. For these observers, the giant plain of Cilicia crosscut by raging rivers had all the economic potential of the Nile Delta. Late Ottoman intellectual and physician Abdullah Cevdet opined in one article that the region was “the Egypt of tomorrow.”

1 Abdullah Cevdet, “Adana Ferdann Mısırıdır [Adana is the Egypt of Tomorrow],” Ictihaa, no. 24 (1 Haziran 1327 [14 June 1911]).
nostalgia for France’s brief bid at ruling Cilicia following the First World War, one French author even referred to the region as “Egypt with the Alps,” alluding to the stunning contrast of a lush plain basking in the shadow of the towering Taurus Mountains.²

Other comparisons of the period, while less grand, were perhaps more precise. When state hegemony faltered in the Amanus Mountains of Cilicia or the region known as Gavurdağı during the 1860s, it was referred to as “the Montenegro of Syria.”³ This was a Eurocentric comparison, but the analogy was not lost on the Ottomans, who used an army with recent fighting experience in Montenegro to reassert their authority. Not far from Gavurdağı was Alexandretta or henceforth İskenderun, the largest port of the Cilicia region at the outset of the 19th century, once referred to as “the Sierra Leone of the Eastern Mediterranean.”⁴ This was an allusion to it being a port insalubrious enough to ward off invaders.

As Cilicia changed, so too did the comparisons, which frequently harkened to regions of colonial expansion. The explosion of agriculture in the lowlands of Cilicia from the 1860s onward conjured images of other frontier spaces for outside visitors such as the missionaries who declared that “we are confident that no prairie in Illinois could present a better display of wheat than we there saw.”⁵ These American comparisons appealed to Turkish agronomists as well, who when seeking to improve cotton cultivation in Cilicia during the interwar period, looked to parts of the American South such as Georgia and Texas, even daring to visit these states to learn more about the agricultural potential of the Çukurova plain.⁶ And while the malarial milieu of Cilicia was sometimes uncharitably likened to the sub-tropical climate of the Indian subcontinent,

³ NARA, RG 84, Diplomatic Posts (Turkey) 231, Beirut Vol. 6 (1856-1865), Johnson to Morris, Alexandretta (26 July 1862).
⁵ "The Physical Geography of Turkey," The New Englander 31, no. 120 (July 1872).
⁶ BOA, HR-İM 95/62 (23 January 1924).
echoes of more salubrious imperial ecologies were acknowledged where they were found. The town of Mersin, Cilicia’s Mediterranean port that sprung up seemingly overnight during the late 19th century, gave one British traveler the eerie sensation of strolling through an Australian town, mainly due to the proliferation of eucalyptus introduced with the intention of improving the local air.7

One of the contentions of this work is that there is a little bit of everywhere to be found in the story of Cilicia’s ecological transformation. The region’s historical geography and demography will no doubt offer a rich scenery and diverse cast of characters ideal for staging human dramas of the more universal variety. The more challenging demand that this study makes is to ask the reader to seriously entertain the notion that Cilicia is the center of a universe. This is essentially a prerequisite of suspending disbelief long enough to endure over six-hundred pages of narrative about an ultimately brief period in the history of a relatively small place. But I also ask the reader to put this region at the center because I genuinely argue through this work that while not quite the center of the universe, is much more central than has ever been recognized.

Imagine the world as a portrait of the human body, each brushstroke representing a tiny but crucial piece of our known historiography. The face of history has long been Europe. That is where the most attention to detail has been concentrated. As for Cilicia, when we look at the portrait, we find that it is merely an appendage hanging from an appendage: the earlobe of Europe. This analogy is inspired by a creative collection of essays by Carlo Ginzburg, which has affirmed the importance of earlobes. In a discussion of the subject of clues, he described the innovative method for identifying the authorship of paintings pioneered by 19th-century Italian art critic Giovanni Morelli. His method had been controversial not only because it overturned

many assumptions and beliefs about authorship established by art historians past but also because it argued that a painter was best identified not by his or her motifs, colors, or medium but rather through inconsequential details such as the form of hands and ears. According to this Morellian method, the mundane and undeliberate aspects of the artist’s work were what truly betrayed his or her identity. Authorship was not revealed by artists’ acts of self-expression, but rather in the way that the brush moves when no one — not even the artist — is looking.  

This “Morellian” view provides a very good argument for studying the would-be margins of historical processes, places like Cilicia where many were not looking, even when these regions were so clearly close to the center of world events. During the 19th century, Cilicia was in the very middle of an empire — the Ottoman Empire — which in turn was at the heart of many processes that contributed to the making of the modern world, so central at times that it was taken for granted. The specifics of these processes and that story will be revealed in time, but for now, the point is merely to ask that the reader pay attention to this earlobe. It just might have some surprising things to say about the authorship of the complex picture of the world we know.

For a good five years now, Cilicia has in some way been the center of my own world. While I have only spent a few months there physically, my pursuit of its history has taken me to archives and libraries in Turkey and elsewhere across the globe, consuming the better part of my time and resources and arousing some of the most intense feelings of excitement, anxiety, and satisfaction that I have experienced during my doctoral education. Throughout my work on this project, my reading of numerous good and lesser works, and my conversations with innumerable brilliant students and scholars in Turkey and elsewhere, I have increasingly questioned what

---

right I have to narrate this story. After all, not everyone has the opportunity to conduct funded research about someone else’s earlobe. Maybe I have succeeded in convincing others of its importance. Yet I am not the first to see it, and long before I came there have been many people for whom Cilicia was already the center of the universe. For many, it was their home, and they lived by it, sometimes fighting and dying for it, even because of it. They knew its significance well before I did. It is my privilege to tell their stories, which have been transmitted not only through their words but through their actions as well, and though I cannot take each story at face value, I hope that I have succeeded at times in doing justice to the complexity of their experiences.

Chris Gratien
Syracuse, NY (14 May 2015)
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INTRODUCTION

The road between Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin is lined with factories and warehouses. Beyond these buildings lay acre upon acre of neatly cultivated land. Cotton and various produce thrive on rich soil, irrigated by machines, nourished by fertilizers, and protected by pesticides. The railway that has connected the rest of the Çukurova plain to the port of Mersin since the late Ottoman period runs parallel to this important thoroughfare. This landscape is a product of the radical transformation in human relationships with the land and water of the Adana region over the past two centuries, and the process that shaped it has been nothing if not thorough. However, in tiny patches of grass between the rails, highways, warehouses, and tidy fields that surround them today, you will find the few remaining representatives of a group that once dominated the plain. Small herds of sheep and goats are tended by families that eke out their living on the tiny margins of Çukurova’s industrial economy. For most of the Ottoman period, the Adana region was theirs, serving as annual winter pasture for hundreds of thousands of animals that migrated down from the Taurus Mountains following the warm months of the summer and early fall. What follows is a study of how their pasture became a sprawling planation and how the small communities of pastoralists that once rested on the back of this ungulate proletariat were settled uncomfortably on the margins.
This is not a history from below in the usual sense, although typically subaltern actors — from shepherds and cotton-pickers to immigrants and ethnic minorities — will indeed play a large role in what follows. The history I will narrate reaches even further below, beneath the hooves of herds, inside the soil of fertile fields, and between the reeds of the deep, dark swamps where mosquitoes lurk. Archaeologists and climatologists alike will attest to the historical richness of the many-layered sediment of time beneath city streets, silent meadows, and even the ocean floor. The layer that concerns this modest study is thin and close to the surface of the Çukurova plain, shallow enough to be excavated with garden tools or for those who prefer not to get their hands dirty, basic mastery of Ottoman Turkish. It corresponds to a century of ecological change that began following the Crimean War in the 1850s.

Over this century, a steady flow of settlers and the gradual expansion of cultivation made farms out of the Adana region’s swamps and grasslands. These settlers grappled with disease, uncertainty, and each other as waves of political and economic change swept through the region. The ecological dynamics established during the initial period of settlement endured across generations and indeed even after the Ottoman Empire itself ceased to be. Most importantly, the impact of malaria, which was unkind to settlers, became a pervasive feature of society in Çukurova thereafter. This would not change in a fundamental way until after the Second World War, when the introduction of insecticides that could kill mosquitoes and many other organisms opened a new chapter of the region’s agrarian tale. During this century-long process, countless individuals endured sickness, poverty, and political marginalization as many others made their fortunes on the fertile frontier.
In the Lowlands: the Ecological Transformation of Ottoman Cilicia

This study is concerned with ecological transformation, that is, the history of change in relationships between different organisms, geography, and climate. It considers concepts such as “environment” and “nature” inseparable from the realm of the social, cultural, or human under John McNeill’s broad definition of environmental history as the study of humans and “the rest of nature.” Much has been written on various political and socioeconomic developments during the late Ottoman period and thereafter, but these processes have not commonly been narrated from an ecological perspective that situates human societies in their lived environments. This an old theme in environmental historiography writ large, but within the historiography of the Middle East, the proposition of studying “the rest of nature” might at first glance seem even offensive. Ecological perspectives that place emphasis on the realm of the “non-human” may be received as environmentally-deterministic, naively empiricist, or contrary to the vital imperative of focusing on human stories within a field constantly fighting against the systematic misrepresentation and

dehumanization of Muslims in Western societies. This study aims to highlight the ways in which environmental perspectives can be deeply human, as they require us to understand the complex and intimate relationships of past peoples with their environments. As relationships with the environment changed, so too did matters of political economy, gender and family structures, and the various ways in which people saw the world around them.

Alan Mikhail notes in his introduction to Water on Sand that earlier studies on geography and ecology in the Middle East had tended towards static representations or deterministic explanations, often falling short of recognizing “the dialectical relationships between human beings and environments.” It is necessary to view environment and society as mutually constituted in the realm of culture. Environmental history is in this way essentially a form of cultural history, in that the human relationship to the rest of nature comprises one of the most important components of human culture. Different practices governing the use of land and water, patterns of migration, methods of cultivation, and diet are all ultimately cultural, and they are arguably more widely relevant to studying past human experiences than many of the conventional subjects treated by cultural history. As I will illustrate, understanding past ecologies can help us to better examine the lives of historical actors who left behind little documentation. Fundamental ecological questions regarding climate, water, soil, disease, and

---

3 Mikhail, Water on Sand : Environmental Histories of the Middle East and North Africa, 5.
5 Here I refer to the fact that cultural history is often the study of cultural products or literature and the arts as broadly defined, i.e. written texts, songs, or artifacts that serve as human forms of expression.
animals that are distant from present conceptions of quotidian life were central to people of the past and matters of life and death.\textsuperscript{6}

This study also highlights the ways in which some of the most important events and processes in the history of the Middle East possess unexplored ecological components. From changes in land tenure regimes and the expansion of commercial agriculture to migration and urbanization, every process that has shaped the late Ottoman and post-Ottoman world has occurred in an ecological context and borne environmental effects.\textsuperscript{7} Some of the most studied and debated topics in the political historiography of the Middle East — from colonialism and rebellion to war and even genocide — have ecological dimensions concerning issues such as climate and disease.

Located at the historical juncture between Greater Syria and Anatolia, Cilicia is just one small region of the former Ottoman Empire, but as I alluded to in the preface, its history is relevant to the study of many other parts of the Middle East today. This is the first study to

\textsuperscript{6} My view of ecology here is similar to Michel de Certeau’s emphasis that everyday practices are not the backdrop of human history but rather at the very center. Michel de Certeau, \textit{The Practice of Everyday Life}, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

\textsuperscript{7} While the relatively few works mentioned above comprise a narrowly defined field of environmental history, historians of the Ottoman Empire have been asking ecological questions for a very long time. As Onur İnal’s unpublished paper entitled “Environmental History as an Emerging Field in Ottoman Studies” (available on academia.edu as of 14 May 2015) suggests, historians that have examined aspects of agrarian life, land, agriculture, local history, and disease have often studied subjects that may be viewed as environmental without explicitly defining them as such. For Cilicia, more below. For Anatolia, see Donald Quataert, \textit{Miners and the state in the Ottoman Empire: the Zonguldak coalfield, 1822-1920} (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006); Donald Quataert, \textit{Workers, peasants, and economic change in the Ottoman Empire, 1730-1914} (Beylerbeyi, Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993); Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, \textit{State and peasant in the Ottoman Empire: agrarian power relations and regional economic development in Ottoman Anatolia during the sixteenth century} (Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1994). For Arab provinces Kenneth M. Cuno, \textit{The Pasha's peasants: land, society, and economy in Lower Egypt, 1740-1858} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Judith E. Tucker, \textit{Women in nineteenth-century Egypt}, Cambridge Middle East library (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Beshara Doumani, \textit{Rediscovering Palestine merchants and peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700-1900} (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1995); Dina Rizk Khoury, \textit{State and provincial society in the Ottoman Empire: Mosul, 1540-1834}, Cambridge studies in Islamic civilization (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997); Martha Mundy and Richard Saumarez Smith, \textit{Governing Property: law, administration, and production in Ottoman Syria} (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007). For disease, see Birsen Bulmuş, \textit{Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire} (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012); Nükhet Varlık, \textit{Plague and Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean World: the Ottoman experience, 1347-1600} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
explicitly deal with the history of late 19th and early 20th century transformations in Cilicia as a subject of environmental history. But it is no accident that this region should be one of the first parts of the former Ottoman world to enter the environmental historiography. There is something about the region’s metamorphosis over the last two centuries that beckons historians to ask ecological questions. Like many parts of the Mediterranean that so inspired Braudel and those who have followed, the differentiated Cilician geography has offered the space for an array of lifestyles and economic activities as well as historical continuity and transoceanic contact. Geography may have a hand in shaping human activity, but the history of Cilicia is a testament to the extent to which human beings develop a wide variety of interactions with their environments.

The conventional narrative regarding the history of the Cilicia region is that the lowlands — namely the plain called Çukurova — have been radically transformed from an expanse of swamps to become one of the densest regions of population and cultivation in the Mediterranean. As a result, some of the works that have been written about Cilicia, while not explicitly touted as environmental history, have dealt with compelling questions regarding the nature of that fundamentally ecological transformation. To this effect, many have repeated the words of


Çukurova means “lowlands” or “hollow plain” or literally “pit-plain”. An interesting indication of the meaning conveyed by this name can be found in the case of a playbill for the Turkish translation of the German opera *Tiefland*, which itself was based on the Catalan play entitled *Terra Baixa*, both names referring to “lowlands.” The Turkish translator, an opera actress named Saadet (Alp) İksesus rendered the title as “Çukurova.” AK, ME_Evr_010292 “Çukurova operası rol dağılımı” (1951).
Mübeccel Kiray that Çukurova amounted to “no more than a badly drained, fever-ridden, thinly populated country” at the beginning of the 19th century.\(^{10}\) I do not contest this statement but merely emphasize that contrary to the general view supported by modernization theory, which has weighed upon the historiography of Turkey in an unusually heavy manner, there is nothing that makes cotton fields inherently better than swamps or dense population preferable to sparse population. Moreover, the presence of fever, which here refers to malaria, resides not in a particular kind of geography per se but rather the ways in which human beings interact with that geography.

In the case of Çukurova, the inhabitants of the plain, most of whom were pastoralists in the early 19th century, did not reside in the plain during the summer in part because of the perceived ill-effects of the season, which is the part of the year when mosquitoes (the vector of malaria) proliferate. For these reasons, the different inhabitants of Cilicia spent their summers in the mountains, and for those who had sheep and goats, this type of seasonal migration called vertical transhumance (more in Chapter 1) offered the additional benefit of expanded pasturage.

In the 19th century, the equation began to change. The residents of Çukurova, who rose in number steadily until the First World War, expanded their cultivation of cotton, grain, and sesame, impelled in part by the growing demand of the world market. This process began to transform the plain. With time, agriculture came to dominate every aspect of life in Çukurova. However, the creation of that agricultural wealth was only a small part of the story. The transformation that came with cotton entailed a fair amount of destruction. The first form of

---

destruction occurred when the Ottoman government used military might to forcibly settle the pastoralist tribes that wintered in Çukurova during the 1860s. That military campaign killed a sizeable portion of those populations and led to their political and economic marginalization (more in Chapters 3 and 4).

One of the early attempts at studying Çukurova’s transformation, Andrew Gordon Gould’s dissertation entitled Pashas and Brigands, dealt with the history of forced settlement in Cilicia and its legacy. That study was somewhat ahead of its time, which accounts for its best insights and certain shortcomings. Carried out during the early 1970s, Gould’s dissertation was situated in a field for which Ottoman history was largely the history of the Ottoman state and the study of the 19th century was in essence a study of the Tanzimat reforms and Ottoman attempts at modernization. As a result, his narrative was heavily state-centered and framed by the successive administrations of different governors in Adana and the implementation of specific policies. On the other hand, in his treatment of settlement’s impacts, Gould highlighted what I regard as the ecological nature of the conflict between the Ottoman administration and Cilicia’s pastoralists and why the settlement campaigns were so destructive and ineffectual. Seasonal migration was more than just an economic activity or a means of evading state control; it was

---

11 Gould’s research built in part on the work of a number of Turkish scholars who researched various facets of Çukurova’s history during the Ottoman period. The foremost among those scholars was Taha Toros, who wrote about the history of the Adana region beginning in the 1920s and continuing until his recent passing in 2012. Another important early work in Turkish on aspects of Gould’s is Kasm Ener, Tarih boyunca Adana ovasına bir bakış (Adana: Bugün Matbaası, 1958).
part and parcel of local understandings of health, which were affirmed by the ways in which settlement led to high mortality among the forcibly settled tribes. By recognizing these facts at a time when environmental history was in its infancy and even the social history of the Ottoman Empire was scarcely studied, Gould can be credited with an important insight.

Gould’s dissertation was never published as a book, but other authors have taken his work as a point of departure in studying the broader transformation of Cilicia. The most complete and well-rounded study regarding the transformation of late Ottoman Cilicia is *Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton* by Meltem Toksöz. In her monograph, Toksöz devotes considerable space to the emergence of Cilicia’s cotton economy and the rise of commercial agriculture around Adana and the port of Mersin.\(^\text{14}\) She situates the ecological transformation I will discuss here within the context of a changing world economy. One of the strengths of this study is that it balances the factor of state-driven administrative reforms and settlement policy with the commercial activities of extra-state actors such as bankers, merchants, and most importantly rich and poor migrants in facilitating the making of a new Çukurova.\(^\text{15}\) By disaggregating the different state and non-state actors participating in Çukurova’s agricultural expansion, Toksöz complicates a simplistic narrative of modernization that portrays economic growth in an uncritically positive light and does not concern itself with differential outcomes and experiences of historical processes.

Stephan Astourian is another scholar who has studied the economic transformation of late Ottoman Cilicia from a similar angle by employing a world-systems approach. His insights on the political polarization of Muslims and Christians in the region during that period have been


\(^{15}\) Another important work on the subject of settlement in Çukurova is the research of Mustafa Soysal, published in German during the 1970s. Mustafa Soysal, "Die Siedlungs- und Landschaftsentwicklung der Çukurova : mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Yüregir-Ebene" (Fränkische Geographische Gesellschaft, 1976).
especially valuable. In connecting that polarization to the differential outcomes of economic processes, changes in land tenure, and the effects of economic competition, Astourian has encouraged us to think about political changes in Ottoman society within the context of concrete transformations in local relationships with the land occurring in part through broader changes in the global economy.\textsuperscript{16} Though not expressly framing their studies as such, each of these authors are among those who have provided valuable insight regarding ecological questions in the history of Cilicia, and they will serve as important points of reference throughout this dissertation.

I build on these works in a few significant ways. This dissertation covers a more extended time period, the century between 1856 and 1956, thereby bridging the Ottoman and post-Ottoman eras and studying the continuities and ruptures between the two. This includes a detailed examination of the World War I period in Cilicia and its aftermath. In doing so, I aim to study the long-term impacts of processes initiated during the late Ottoman period. I highlight many periods of distinct transformation as opposed to focusing on the teleological aspects of this process by examining the layers of ecological transformation visible in the palimpsest of the Cilician landscape. Rather than emphasizing activity in urban regions such as the port of Mersin and the provincial capital of Adana, my narrative centers on the margins of the expanding settlements in the Çukurova plain and changes in former regions of importance such as the villages and pastures of the Taurus Mountains. Although the processes associated with the economic transformations of the past two centuries were arguably less visible in such regions, I

emphasize that the way those processes played out on the margins provides a very different perspective on the nature and outcome of historical change during this period.

In addition to undertaking an ecological rereading\textsuperscript{17} of previously studied sources, this work also incorporates many new pieces of source material that has never been used to study the history of Cilicia, documents from not only the oft cited Ottoman and Turkish Republican archives but also materials from state archives in the US, UK, and France and other materials in Ottoman/Turkish and Armenian from non-state archives and libraries.\textsuperscript{18} By incorporating sources in a number of languages and non-archival materials such as newspapers, literature, and memory books written by descendants of Ottoman Cilicia’s inhabitants, this study presents a multivocal narrative of Cilicia’s past that I hope contains some of the special texture that is found in the

\textsuperscript{17} This entails reading the sources with an eye to what they provide about details regarding environment and climate as well as how ecological factors may impinge upon the contents of the historical documentation. In addition, I read the sources to derive conclusions about how individuals interacted with the environment and reconstruct their understandings of health and ecology. I look for clues regarding the environment such as information about agriculture and natural events like floods. Lastly, I have read my sources with an eye to the types of themes and events that are typical of particular months of the year and namely the different between summer and winter.

\textsuperscript{18} The most exhaustive research for this project was carried out at the Ottoman archives, where I believe I have located the majority of the sources most critical to the relevant periods in this study over the course of more than two years working in Turkey. My use of the Turkish Republican archives is less systematic and based on what has been digitized and catalogued for those archives. In terms of what is available and catalogued, the Republican archives are not on par with the Ottoman archives. I have also made very extensive use of local newspapers from the Adana region available at libraries in Istanbul. My research in Paris and Nantes that amounts to about two months of work has enabled me to additionally conduct a thorough perusal of the relevant archival and published materials in French, although I have not been able to systematically include everything that I have collected from that massive source base. A similarly good coverage can be found in my use of English-language sources based on research at The National Archives in Kew, UK and the US National Archives and Records Administration in College Park, MD. My use of Armenian sources has been less systematic, as they are for the most part published sources accessed through different libraries in my places of research. The Armenian materials found here are comparatively speaking only a sampling of what is available. Arabic was a major minority language in Ottoman Cilicia and as a result there are occasional references to relevant Arabic sources strewn about this dissertation, but due to constrained access and a relative paucity of those sources, they are not numerous, though one could potentially find more than I have used here. Gisela Prochazka-Eisl and Stephan Prochazka have carried out field research in Cilicia regarding the life of the Arab Nusayri community there that may be helpful, although their study reflects a similar unavailability of printed Arabic sources. Gisela Procházka-Eisl and Stephan Prochízka, The Plain of Saints and Prophets : the Nusayri-Alawi community of Cilicia (Southern Turkey) and its sacred places (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010). There is a very great wealth of documentation in German that I was unable to access due to insufficient knowledge of German, but where I have located absolutely critical materials, I have tried to make use of them (see Chapter 9). General access to published sources in English, French, Ottoman, and Armenian has been greatly enhanced by the growing availability of digital resources over the past few years, including among Turkish libraries. See bibliography for a complete listing of other libraries and archives consulted in Turkey, France, UK, US, and Lebanon.
folklore and many great agrarian novels written about the region. In doing so, I highlight the multiplicity of historical actors and attempt to disaggregate certain groups of actors such as “the state” and provincial society.

I also seek to do something that is categorically different from what has been written about the history of Cilicia and indeed most of the Middle East. This entire study is framed by the defining feature of ecology in Cilicia prior to the mid-19th century: seasonal migration (henceforth transhumance) as a response to malaria-prone disease environments. Although malaria, swamps, and seasonal migration barely earn mention in most works dealing with the late Ottoman countryside, there is no more salient theme in the numerous sources I have consulted in developing this study than the intolerability of Çukurova summers and ever-looming threat of malaria. I argue that malaria is not just an ignored factor in the history of Cilicia and many parts of the Ottoman world, but that when it comes to studying the important changes in settlement during the past centuries, malaria is the defining question in that experience.

As the reader will discover throughout this study, seasonal risk of malaria played a fundamental role in nearly every major aspect of Cilicia’s history. When people were forced to spend the summer in Çukurova, there was a high chance that they would contract malaria, and for much of the period in question, that was a truly deadly proposition. Thus, malaria encouraged people to stay out of the plain during the summer, and when they began to settle, malaria

---

The dozens of writings of Yaşar Kemal have been singularly influential on parts of this dissertation, although I have not had time to consult the author’s entire oeuvre. For every chapter of this dissertation, there is probably an entire Yaşar Kemal novel. Works of special relevance include Yaşar Kemal, Binboğalar Efanesi : Roman (Istanbul: YKY, 1971; 2004); Yaşar Kemal, Memed, My Hawk (New York: Pantheon Books, 1961); Yaşar Kemal, Kimsecik (Istanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1980); Kemal Yaşar, Üç Anadolu Efanesi : Köroğlunun meydana çıkışı, Karacaoglan, Alageyik (Istanbul: Ararat Yayınevi, 1967); Yaşar Kemal, Çukurova Yana Yana (Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları, 1955); Yaşar Kemal and Abidin Dino, Ağıtlar : Folklor derlemesi (Istanbul: YKY, 2004). The novels of Orhan Kemal and Hanna Mina have also been instructive. Songs and poems come from a variety of published sources. I have also used a number of books from the Armenian “memory book (մենամենամե” genre. These works are usually composed as village histories published in the diaspora and for each region of Anatolia where Armenians were present there is usually one or more such works. For more on this genre, see the Houshamadyan project edited by Vahé Tachjian: houshamadyan.org.
epidemics were rampant. They wiped out vast swaths of settler populations, especially Muslim immigrants from the Caucasus and the Balkans, and malaria was the most common disease cause of death in Çukurova up until the period of the First World War. During the war, malaria achieved a new level of virulence, despite the development of medical solutions and forms of prophylaxis. The Turkish Republic inherited a Cilician geography in which the majority of people suffered from malaria annually. Anti-malaria campaigns became part of the nation-making process. Even as certain factors discussed below reduced malaria mortality, the disease was a fundamental aspect of life in the Cilician countryside well into the 1950s.

Placing the omnipresence of malaria at the center of Cilicia’s story restores the quotidian experience of the periods in question and gives new meaning to the history of settlement, migration, and displacement in this corner of the Mediterranean. Malaria has long been a feature of the Mediterranean lowlands, but the changes in settlement patterns that began in Cilicia during the mid-19th century augmented the role of malaria particularly within the rural sphere. As has often been the case in history, malaria disproportionately affect marginalized groups such as the inhabitants of remote villages, migrants, and agricultural laborers in Cilicia. The issue of malaria is especially relevant for regions such as Cilicia where significant changes in settlement patterns linked local ecologies to a global phenomenon of frontier settlement.

---

21 For good comparisons, see Margaret Humphreys, *Malaria : poverty, race, and public health in the United States* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2001); Arabinda Samanta, *Malarial Fever in Colonial Bengal, 1820-1939 : social history of an epidemic* (Kolkata: Firma KLM, 2002).
The Settler Revolution and the Ottoman Empire

Everything about human history is rooted in the earth.22

Edward Said, Culture and Imperialism

In addition to the approach to the social and environmental history of Cilicia outlined above, this study addresses a very important global context of frontier settlement in such regions. One of the central themes in this study of Ottoman Cilicia and its ecological remaking is the phenomenon of settlement. By this I mean not only changes in settlement patterns, but the specific subject of human beings forming new settlements on land that was previously not used for the purposes of settled agrarian cultivation. The expansion of settlement and agriculture, the use of violence to achieve state settlement goals, the implantation of new state institutions, and indeed, the confrontation with an emerging issue of malaria in settlement space were all fundamental aspects of broader historical experiences in colonial settings and the frontiers of expanding early modern and modern settler states.23 However, this phenomenon was much broader than the Columbian exchange of the early modern period or the rapid expansion of settlement in Anglophone territories during the 19th century.24 In fact, While Frederick Jackson Turner’s frontier thesis of US history has lost favor for some of the specific claims it makes about American exceptionalism and the foundations of American democracy, colonial frontiers are increasingly seen as important sites of socioeconomic and institutional transformation within

23 This is even true for regions of the world not typically associated with issues such as malaria. For example, David Blackbourn’s research on Germany illustrates the extent to which the relationship between malaria, settlement, and water was at the heart of Germany’s history from the early modern period into the twentieth century. David Blackbourn, The Conquest of Nature : water, landscape, and the making of modern Germany (New York: Norton, 2006).
the historiography of European states and their successors. James Belich has referred to this impact in the Anglo-world as a “settler revolution.”

Although the historiography on this phenomenon has become increasingly global in its thinking, it has yet to embrace the Ottoman context as a significant area of focus. John Richards’s *The Unending Frontier* was in many ways a breakthrough for the comparative study of the global settlement phenomenon. Richards used examples from outside Europe and the Americas, namely China, Japan, and Mughal South Asia, in order to study the simultaneous expansion of numerous early modern agrarian empires and their impacts on different

---

25 As James Belich argues in *Replenishing the Earth*, the settlement frontiers of the Anglo-world created what he dubs a “settler revolution” on the global scale and have played an enormous role in the transformations associated with industrialization and the making of the modern world. The implications of this argument are that the radical changes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were made in the frontiers, colonies, and provinces, not in imperial metropoles. The cases in Belich’s study by and large represents instances in which colonization has become a permanent and incontrovertible reality. In other words, the settler revolution resulted in the permanent installation of settler communities in the frontiers of the Anglo-empire such as the United States, South Africa, and Australia. Belich may be somewhat over-occupied by culture, leading him to ignore important agrarian transformations that occurred under British rule in South Asia which may be seen as having contributed to the settler revolution. While he is keen to note where Indians migrated elsewhere or participated in British military institutions, developments in South Asia do not earn much treatment in his narrative of the Anglo-world. See James Belich, *Replenishing the earth : the settler revolution and the rise of the Anglo-world, 1783-1939* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 127. Belich’s argument is reminiscent of a similar strain of thought within postcolonial studies, which increasingly draws attention to the ways in which former colonies were instrumental in shaping modern nation-states. This historiographical trend may be especially strong among historians of the relationship between French and Algeria, who seek to uncover silences about how colonial practices returned to the metropole and Muslim Algerians have shaped modern France. See Todd Shepard, *The invention of decolonization : the Algerian War and the remaking of France* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006); Jim House and Neil MacMaster, *Paris 1961: Algerians, state terror, and memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Osama Abi-Mershed, *Apostles of modernity : Saint-Simonians and the civilizing mission in Algeria* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010). The doctoral dissertation of Tom Hill, for example, has studied the relationship between French policies towards mobile populations in both France and Algeria during the nineteenth century, focusing on how the problematic poor became part of France’s failed scheme to settle the Algerian countryside and integrate tribal communities into a colonial utopia. Tom M. Hill, “Imperial nomads : settling paupers, proletariats, and pastoralists in colonial France and Algeria, 1830-1863” (University of Chicago, 2006). Some of this work is in the vein of Aimé Césaire’s *Discourse on Colonialism*, which in the wake of the horrors of fascism during the Second World War, reminded Europe that the barbarism of the war represented the very form of violence that European states long used in the colonies. Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Robin D. G. Kelley (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000). For the early work of William McNeill on Eurasian frontiers, see William Hardy McNeill, *Europe's Steppe Frontier, 1500-1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

26 Alan Mikhail makes note of this “telling” absence in his overview of the MENA environmental history field, referring to the environmental history of the Middle East as the “fallow between two fields” of the historiography. Mikhail, *Water on Sand : Environmental Histories of the Middle East and North Africa*, 17.
environments. He illustrated how (perhaps with the exception of Japan\textsuperscript{27}) this political expansion fueled settler movements and in turn facilitated an extraordinary harvest of natural resources that has left an indelible ecological legacy. Richards’s work expanded the conventional view of this process beyond the maritime empires that maintained some kind of geographical and administrative distinction between the colony and the metropole to include Russian territorial expansion and the intensification of agriculture in China.\textsuperscript{28} However, a notable absence in \textit{The Unending Frontier} and most of the similar global historiography of the making of the modern world is the general omission of the Ottoman Empire or any part of the modern Middle East. The Ottoman Empire was, after all, an empire. How did that geography fit into a world where seemingly everyone was either colonizing or being colonized, and human beings harvested natural resources at an exponentially increasing rate?

It merits mention that before the period of early modern frontier expansion by European states, various Islamic states and their institutions were clearly in a state of expansion that had socioeconomic and cultural impacts on various frontier regions. Richard Eaton’s work on the successive expansion of Islamic empires in South Asia, research on the spread of Islam in West Africa during the early modern period, and indeed, the well-documented rise of the Ottoman Empire in Eastern Europe and Anatolia followed by a further expansion into the Arab world point to a more or less shared trajectory between Islamic empires and other large empires into at least the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{29} Similarly, while it is not necessarily a dominant paradigm within

\textsuperscript{27} This exception does not apply to the case of nineteenth-century Japan post-Meiji Restoration, during which the rise of scientific agriculture has been identified as the cause of certain forms of ecological change such as the extinction of species like the Hokkaido wolf. Brett L. Walker, "Meiji Modernization, Scientific Agriculture, and the Destruction of Japan's Hokkaido Wolf," \textit{Environmental History} 9, no. 2 (2004).

\textsuperscript{28} John F. Richards, \textit{The Unending Frontier: an environmental history of the early modern world} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

the field of Ottoman studies, a number of scholars have examined the ways in which regions of
the Ottoman Empire have functioned as frontier spaces, borderlands, or zones of contact.30

The ambiguity regarding the Ottoman Empire and the “settler revolution” arises from its
history from the seventeenth century onward, which by contrast, has been draped in the discourse
of Ottoman decline. That simplistic notion of decline has been thoroughly critiqued from various
angles, but the history of the Ottoman Empire before the 19th century is in some ways still an
open question with regard to many subjects, especially those relevant to notions of
“expansion.”31 In broad terms, Reşat Kasaba has sketched the contours of how the Ottoman
Empire was situated in the larger context of the settler revolution during the early modern period.
His work entitled A Moveable Empire suggests a marked difference between other European
empires of the early modern period in the presence of large nomadic populations living within
the empire’s borders.32 Along with the work of Sam White and Faruk Tabak, who have studied
the ecological context of comparatively lower population growth in the Ottoman Empire and the

---

30 See Kemal H. Karpat and Robert W. Zens, Ottoman Borderlands: issues, personalities, and political changes
(Madison, WI: Center of Turkish Studies, University of Wisconsin, 2003). Special thanks to Linda Darling, who has
shared her yet unpublished essay on approaches to borderlands and frontiers and their relevance and impact within
the field of Ottoman studies. Darling’s essay highlights the different historiographical approaches to “contact
zones,” “borderlands,” and “frontiers” and the ways in which all concepts might be applicable to the study of the
Ottoman Empire. Linda Darling, "Ottoman Borderlands, Frontiers, and Contact Zones," in The Early Modern
Ottoman Empire as a Contact Zone (Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton NJ, 2010).

31 It is possible to critique the very notion of Ottoman decline and how it has been deployed within historiography
on numerous grounds. For one of the best critical overviews of the question, see Cemal Kafadar, "The Question of

32 Peter Perdue has studied a broadly similar phenomenon in China for the case of Qing policy towards nomads
during the early modern period, but unlike in the Ottoman Empire, the Qing state was able to achieve a greater
degree of hegemony over nomads and induce settlement during the early modern period. Peter C. Perdue, China
marches west: the Qing conquest of Central Eurasia (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University
Press, 2005).
Mediterranean, Kasaba’s work suggests that the Ottoman Empire was not to be considered among the early modern states involved in the settlement of John Richards’s unending frontier for most of the 17th and 18th centuries. For example, although at times Ottoman governments made some attempts at inducing settlement, according to Kasaba, the Ottomans generally accommodated nomadic practices and even enlisted tribal communities for military and administrative purposes, incorporating their mobility into the administrative practices of the Ottoman state. Sam White has shown that the ecological conditions of the Little Ice Age actually favored an ascendance of extensive pastoralism as opposed to the creation of agricultural settlements in Ottoman Anatolia during the early modern period. This is not to say that Ottoman statesmen and peasants were dissimilar from their counterparts within other early modern empires, only that the types of frontier expansion that occurred in other parts of the world were not as visible in most parts of the Ottoman Empire.

Regarding the place of the Ottoman Empire within the historiography of high imperialism and the heyday of settler colonial states during the 19th century, there has been some consideration of the notion that the Ottoman Empire and the Khedival state in Egypt resembled other 19th-century empires. The Ottoman and Egyptian states wielded civilizational discourses and in some cases deployed the same kinds of hierarchies that typified colonial states. Yet this

36 See Eve Troutt Powell, *A Different Shade of Colonialism: Egypt, Great Britain, and the mastery of the Sudan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003). Ussama Makdisi, “Rethinking Ottoman Imperialism: Modernity, Violence and the Cultural Logic of Ottoman Reform,” in *The Empire in the City: Arab Provincial Cities in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Jens Hanssen and Thomas Philipp (Würzburg: Ergon in Kommission, 2002); Selim Deringil, "They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery: The Late Ottoman Empire and the Post-Colonial Debate," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45, no. 2 (2003). Recent work on Ottoman Yemen by Thomas Kuehn and Eugene Rogan’s pioneering work on Transjordan examine in different ways how the Ottoman Empire was part of the era of high imperialism during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Mostafa Minawi’s dissertation also
phenomenon is essentially envisioned as the product of an attempt by Ottoman and Egyptian governors to strengthen their position on the global stage, and even as the Ottoman and Egyptian state institutions expanded, military and economic vulnerability, constant contestation of sovereignty, and economic penetration by foreign interests give the impression that these states were as much the colonized as they could have been the colonizer. Such vocabularies may be inadequate for discussing Ottoman history. But this ambiguity may be a factor in why some global reflections on this period, Bayly’s *The Birth of the Modern World*, give such sparse and unsatisfactory treatment to the Ottoman case, which appears as peripheral to the entire process.

In contrast with this relative absence, Reşat Kasaba’s work strongly suggests the need for inclusion of the Ottoman Empire within the discussion of the settler revolutions of the 19th century identified by the global historiography. During the last century of the Ottoman period, frontier settlement became intertwined with efforts at expanding the reach of the state, resulting in more concentrated forms of involvement in the lives of subjects that impinged upon their lifestyles in a variety of new ways. The Ottoman government adopted a more hostile stance towards migratory lifestyles, and with a large and sustained influx of Muslim immigrants, made settlement and the promotion of agrarian village life an important goal in the countryside. Kasaba cites Gould’s work on tribal settlement in Cilicia as an example of how the Ottoman Empire, like other states of the period, sought to effect a sedentarized and more agriculturally


37 Frederick Cooper argues that one of the problems of scholarship seeking to analyze the history of colonialism is that of abstraction; historians try to deal with poorly defined concepts such as “modernity” and give overwhelming focus to slippery issues such as identity. He also notes that empires such as the Ottomans and the Russians—much like their counterparts in Western Europe—“began to act more colonial in the late nineteenth century,” pointing to a problem of classification. Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in question theory, knowledge, history* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 28.
productive populace.\textsuperscript{38} In other words, the Ottoman Empire may not have been an active settlement frontier during the early modern period, but by the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, it was in terms of policy and practice on the ground home to many regions of frontier settlement due to specific military and economic goals and the need to settle mobile populations.

There is a growing body of literature covering the last century of the Ottoman period that emphasizes, contrary to prior focus on the role of intellectual bureaucrats in Istanbul, the role of provincial settings in the remaking of the Ottoman state during the Tanzimat period and beyond. From the Danube to the Euphrates, ambitious attempts at provincial restructuring became part and parcel of the Ottoman state’s overhaul, and while it is possible to see these measures as attempts at reform or “modernization” emanating from the center, it must also be noted that these provincial reforms were fundamental to the economic growth and indeed survival of the Ottoman state.\textsuperscript{39} As Eugene Rogan has put it in his work on Transjordan, “while the frontier might not have needed the state, by the second half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century the state needed the frontier.”\textsuperscript{40} In keeping with much of the abovementioned scholarship on European imperialism and the global settlement phenomenon, I argue that these provincial frontier settings must not only be studied as mere objects of the Ottoman state but rather as the very locations where that state was made and redefined. As I will show in this dissertation, the “frontier experience” shaped subsequent policies and broader imperial outcomes.

\textsuperscript{38} Kasaba, A Moveable Empire, 103-16. See also Yasemin Avci, "The application of Tanzimat in the desert: The Bedouins and the creation of a new town in Southern Palestine (1860-1914)," Middle East. Stud. Middle Eastern Studies 45, no. 6 (2009); Yonca Köksal, "Coercion and mediation: Centralization and sedentarization of tribes in the Ottoman empire," Middle Eastern Studies 42, no. 3 (2006).
\textsuperscript{39} For some recent examples, see Milen V. Petrov, "Tanzimat for the countryside : Midhat Pasa and the Vilayet of Danube, 1864-1868" (Princeton University, 2006); Ebubekir Ceylan, The Ottoman Origins of Modern Iraq : political reform, modernization and development in the nineteenth century Middle East (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2010).
\textsuperscript{40} Rogan, Frontiers of the State, 9.
Ottoman Settlement Frontiers

Before I explain the ways in which certain geographies of the Ottoman Empire were subject to processes typical of frontier settlement regions of the world during the 19th and 20th centuries, I would like to emphasize the ways in which the Ottoman frontier experience was distinct. Among European empires that were growing as states during the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire was the only to suffer severe territorial contraction. Put differently, although the Ottoman Empire was losing territory, its involvement in the daily lives of its subjects was nonetheless expanding, and the administrative and economic activities that sustained it were increasing. The creation of new agricultural settlements and the deployment of migrants and other Ottoman subjects towards achieving this goal was part and parcel of that growth. But because the Ottoman Empire was territorially contracting, frontier expansion, which involved millions of people over the empire’s last half century or so, occurred within the borders of the Ottoman Empire in pockets of sparse population that were targeted for settlement. Even if this also occurred in other nation states of the period, the relative lack of a colonial frontier is a key difference between the Ottoman Empire and most other empires of the period. Overseas colonies or far frontiers served as a population release valve within the imperial states that were also able to expel indigenous populations from lands as they moved an export the urban poor and displaced villagers.41 Territorially speaking, this was not possible in the Ottoman context, and so settlement occurred right inside the empire.42

41 For discussion of emigration as a “safety valve”, see Bayly, The Birth of the Modern World, 132-34.
42 The Ottoman Empire did experience significant emigration of Christians for economic and political reasons in regions such as Mount Lebanon as well as in Anatolia after the period of the Hamidian massacres in the 1890s. However, these migrations were relatively small in comparison with Muslim migration, and Muslim immigrants were not settled in great numbers in the precise regions whence most of these Christian emigrants came. Out-migration from the Ottoman Empire flowed overwhelmingly from mountain regions. In addition, many Christian migrants returned to the Ottoman Empire after spending some years working in the Americas, Europe, or Africa. See Akram Fouad Khater, Inventing home : emigration, gender, and the middle class in Lebanon, 1870-1920 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Andrew Arsan, Interlopers of empire : the Lebanese diaspora in
For the purposes of this study, a settlement frontier is a space where new people, organisms, ecological practices, and institutions enter unsettled or uninhabited spaces or as has almost always been the case, supplant or build upon old ones. Examples of frontier settlement occurred under the auspices of governments in a state of territorial expansion such as the United States, the Russian Empire in Central Asia and the Caucasus, the French Empire in Algeria, or the settler state in South Africa. However, alongside these examples are other types of spaces where similar processes played out in less recognizable forms. The spaces I am defining as settlement frontiers are in many ways the places where nations and empires were made. The institutions associated with those polities took shape in frontier contexts, and primary conceptions of identity were forged in these zones of contact.

Fundamental to this definition of frontier settlement in this context is biological transfer or ecological exchange. Many regions of the Ottoman Empire experienced a large influx of people, plants, and other organisms from the 19th century onward. The fact that the Ottoman Empire welcomed millions of immigrants during its last century has been mostly ignored by the broader scholarship on global migration. The Ottoman Empire received a large number of


43 These are mere examples. Others large settler states of the classical variety include Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Kenya, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

44 For example, the transformation of regions of British South Asia such as the Bengal Delta entailed changes in settlement, economy, and ecology radical enough to be counted among frontier spaces. See Iftekhar Iqbal, The Bengal Delta : ecology, state and social change, 1840-1943 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). The Italian conquest of the Mezzogiorno, which did not entail all aspects of frontier settlement but sought to displace local political organization and property regimes, may arguably be seen as a form of frontier expansion. After all, how might we explain the birth of the spaghetti western genre in Italy or for that matter, its popular offshoot in Turkey, the poster boy of which was incidentally Marxist filmmaker and Çukurova native Yılmaz Güney. Giovanni Scognamillo and Metin Demirhan, Fantastik Türk sineması (Istanbul: Kabalci Yaynevi, 1999). See Lucy Riall, Sicily and the unification of Italy : liberal policy and local power, 1859-1866 (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1998).

45 Understanding the total number of migrants who entered the Ottoman Empire and what percentage of them survived or stayed long enough to have a significant demographic impact is challenging, but Faruk Tabak cites a figure stating that 4 million immigrants entered the Ottoman Empire from the Crimean War onward. Tabak, The Waning of the Mediterranean, 293-94.
people from outside its borders and former Ottoman provinces that became part of the Russian sphere or new states in the Balkans. These migrants were referred to within the Ottoman vocabulary as *muhacirs*[^46], and they settled in government-designated areas of almost every province of the empire, sometimes relocating more than once.[^47] Like immigrants who went to other major frontiers of the period, some eventually returned to their original countries. However, in general, the Muslim immigrants who came to the Ottoman Empire were envisioned as an agriculturalist vanguard that would increase the economic production of more sparsely populated provinces and serve as a loyal peasantry in regions where Ottoman hegemony was sometimes contested. For this reason, most were not initially allowed to settle in major towns or cities.[^48]

Immigrants were not the only group of migrants involved in the settlement of the Ottoman countryside from the 19th century onward. Economic opportunities fueled internal migration from the more crowded mountainous hinterlands of the empire to move towards the coast where ports created new potential for commerce and commercial agriculture was on the rise. But in other cases, these groups settled in the towns and villages of the Ottoman Empire where new forms of business were taking place. This population growth was accompanied by a rise in land under cultivation as well as total agriculture output, and in turn, the emergence of new forms of agriculture introduced many novel plants in local ecologies.[^49] The phenomenon of

[^46]: More in Chapter 1.
[^48]: These immigrants may be compared with the homesteaders that settled frontiers of the Anglo-world such as the American Midwest during the 1860s, with the caveat that in contrast with the solitary homestead model, these communities were settled into a small villages usually made up of families from their home regions. This model was more or less a reflection of the social organization of Ottoman society.
[^49]: These plants include the expanding cash crops such as cotton, tobacco, sesame, sugar, rice and the like as well as largely novel food crops of the Columbian exchange like maize and potatoes. For an overview of Ottoman
biological transfer in the Ottoman Empire was not limited to people and plants. The work animal population likely grew as well as a result of expanding agriculture.50 As for other biota, the frontier settlement process was also accompanied by the spread of new agents and vectors of disease.51 Qualitatively and quantitatively speaking, the biological material of the Ottoman Empire was much different in 1914 than in 1856 and radically different by the 1950s.

In addition to these ecological transfers, cultural, and institutional transfers played a particularly important role in 19th century settler contexts. Much of the literature on colonialism has focused on the ways in which colonial states sought to supplant not only the institutions of local societies but also their very cultures or civilization through the rhetoric of a civilizing mission. It is important to not take the rhetoric of colonial cultures at face value. Even if the French administration used the language of a civilizing mission extensively in Algeria, in practice, the state may not have done much to instill its cultural institutions among local communities, although that did not preclude destroying indigenous institutions.52 Rather than focusing on the cultural component of civilizing missions, i.e. the culturally specific aspects of those missions, which is only a subset of settler identity discussed below, in frontier settlement contexts, it may be more practical to look at the structural aspects of institutions. In frontier agriculture and economy during this period, see Donald Quataert, The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922 (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 111-41.

50 As Faruk Tabak suggests, the population of non-domesticated animals, especially megafauna, likely declined. Tabak, The Waning of the Mediterranean, 289.

51 The rise in malaria, which comprises a few species of blood parasite spread by the anopheles mosquito, was one of the principal ecological impacts of frontier settlement, especially in Cilicia. Cholera first spread into Cilicia and other parts of the Ottoman Empire during the between the 1830s and 1860s, and outbreaks occurred periodically for the rest of the Ottoman period. Evidence also strongly suggests that syphilis rose in prevalence during the nineteenth century, following growing numbers of migrants, workers, and soldiers. New forms of pests such as phylloxera, which ravaged the world’s grapes during the late nineteenth century, also entered the Ottoman Empire during this time.

52 See for example Abi-Mershed, Apostles of modernity : Saint-Simonians and the civilizing mission in Algeria.
settlement spaces, states and settler societies act upon certain institutional realms. Eugene Rogan makes reference to this phenomenon in Ottoman Transjordan as the frontier of the state.\textsuperscript{53}

After the military and other institutions of governance employed to maintain hegemony in frontier regions, the most important institutional realm associated with frontier settlement is law, specifically law regarding property and land tenure. New land tenure regimes allowed settlers to lay claim to land, and in turn, the implantation of settlers served the purpose of extending state hegemony into new regions and increasing revenues through those land tenure regimes. In the decade following the Crimean War, particularly important changes to land tenure that implanted new legal structures that were generally steps towards increasing the presence of private land ownership in different frontier spaces.\textsuperscript{54} In the Ottoman context, a significant shift in land tenure came with the 1858 Land Law, which mandated the registration of land and the granting of title deeds (\textit{tapu}) that were subsequently transferrable. Over the following decades, most of the land in the empire was registered either voluntarily or by registration commissions sent to different parts of the empire, as Martha Mundy and Richard Saumarez Smith have shown, at different times.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{53} Rogan, \textit{Frontiers of the State}.
The land law was one of the most important iterations of the great expansion of state apparatuses that included police, gendarmerie, courts, schools, prisons, mosques, hospitals, and a wide variety of institutions aimed at facilitating taxation, conscription, and economic production. All such institutions were expanded in frontier regions like Adana and well into historically peripheral regions such as Greater Syria and Iraq that were culturally very different from the imperial center. Such cases have been cited as evidence of an “Ottoman civilizing mission.”

From the late eighteenth century onward, it seems that a new notion of civilization took root in Ottoman society. It referred in part to universal components of civilization (such as sedentary life, economic growth, education, medicine) as well as cultural components of specific civilization (Islamic/Western law, Turkish language, morality). Through government policies, including the settlement policies dealt with in this dissertation, Ottoman administrators sought to expand this civilization, which was in turn used as rhetorical effect to justify a wide range of interventions. By the end of the Ottoman period, the discourse of civilization was no longer the privilege of the state and could be evoked by a wide range of social groups, especially the middle class.

One of the pervasive impacts of the rapid ecological, socioeconomic, and legal transformation that occurred in these frontier spaces was the various forms of administrative and
economic unevenness that typify areas of dense capitalist activity.\textsuperscript{59} Manu Goswami’s \textit{Producing India}, which focused on unevenness as the “immanent contradiction” of colonial rule, has beautifully illustrated the means by which the processes associated with what I refer to in this study as frontiers result in socioeconomic inequality as well as “spatiotemporal unevenness.”\textsuperscript{60} What this meant is that the frontier experience facilitated economic stratification, distorted the experience of space and time, and created regions of profound difference linked by relative geographical proximity. In the Cilicia region, this unevenness can be observed in the contrast between life in the bustling port of Mersin and the malarial doldrums of the Upper the Çukurova plain, which were separated by less than 100 km (more in Chapter 5). However, due to the internal and especially fragmentary nature of the Ottoman frontier, researchers may identify even smaller pockets of frontier settlement strewn throughout the empire creating microcosms of unevenness on the very local level.

Another important point of clarification regards the various post-Ottoman states, which in the case of Cilicia has been the Republic of Turkey. The First World War disrupted the ecological changes associated with frontier settlement in a fundamental way, but after the war, many of those processes resumed in the successor states of the Middle East. In fact the postwar transformation of in the case of Çukurova almost mirrored the process of agrarian transformation that began during the 1860s. These processes continued until the 1950s, at which point the rapid increase in agriculture, the use of new technocratic approaches to the environment, and the relative elimination of malaria created radically new ecological conditions in the Cilician countryside. Therefore, I argue that the century stretching from the 1850s to the 1950s comprises

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{60} Manu Goswami, \textit{Producing India: from colonial economy to national space} (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 9.
\end{footnotesize}
a discrete period of ecological change during which the intersection of agricultural settlement, migration, and questions of disease such as malaria dominated life of Ottoman frontiers such as the Çukurova plain.\textsuperscript{61}

The final critical point for understanding the social history of frontiers is that the zones of cultural contact created by frontier settlement tend to create two conflicting processes. On one hand, migration and settlement lead to the cohabitation of multiple societies. Settler societies are often heterogeneous due to diverse origins of migrants and the frequent presence of multiple distinct indigenous communities. But simultaneously, settler societies often construct boundaries between the settler and the indigenous, the latter of whom becomes slated for elimination. The tension between hybridity and homogenization, which is rooted in contention over property and access to land and resources, drives conflict over racial, ethnolinguistic, or religious identities in frontier contexts.

In the Ottoman context, the question of settler identity was particularly complex. There was no one specified ethnic or cultural definition for settlers. The immigrants who came to the Ottoman Empire, except in specific instances\textsuperscript{62}, were predominantly Muslims from a variety of different regions surrounding the incrementally contracting Ottoman border. However, at the same time, large numbers of local villagers and townsfolk were involved in frontier settlement through acquisition of land, investment in agriculture, and migration towards regions of growing economic activity. This process, which was in many ways equally aided by government policies

\textsuperscript{61} Writing from the perspective of changes in the Ottoman and Turkish states, Zurcher refers to the period of 1908-1950 as a discrete “Young Turk era” of modern Turkey’s history. From the vantage point of the local history of Cilicia, the first distinction between the pre and post-Young Turk era may be relatively minor for questions of ecology and agrarian change, but nevertheless, Zurcher’s narrative is one example of how the processes that shaped the first decades of Republican Turkey emerged during the late Ottoman period. Erik Jan Zürcher, \textit{The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk’s Turkey} (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010).

\textsuperscript{62} For example, Jewish settlers given land in Ottoman Palestine were also referred to in official documentation as \textit{muhacir} presumably because they became permanent resident Ottomans subjects, even though this term usually referred to Muslim migrants. BOA, DH-MKT 2422/104 (19 \c{e}s\i rini\c{e}vel 1316 [1 November 1900]).
that sought to encourage cultivation, included non-Muslims as well. As a result, different aspects of Ottoman policy were simultaneously backing the settlement of a number of Muslim groups as well as Christians in newly emerging agricultural spaces such as Cilicia. This state of affairs made frontier cities such as Adana and Mersin incredibly cosmopolitan. It also created competition over the land in the countryside that sometimes broke down along communal boundaries (more in Chapter 7). But in a manner quite distinct from other global settlement spaces, during the half-century before the First World War, Cilicia had been a dynamic borderlands region, which — even when not devoid of violence and communal strife — possessed an enduring hybrid quality in the absence of a clear settler identity.

However, throughout the Ottoman frontier experience, there were punctuated moments of either state sanctioned or communal violence targeting specific groups that arose out the confluence of political developments in the empire with factors of agrarian change. In some cases, nomads were pitted against the state; in other cases Muslims against Christians. In the Turkish Republic, other ethnoreligious markers would become relevant in instances of state violence against local populations. These categories marking the victims and perpetrators of such violence were not consistent across time or space, just as the frontier experience affected communities in different regions differently. Yet given that many such instances of violence in the Ottoman Empire seem to be linked to the structural changes occurring within local political economies, it is necessary to understand the relationship between frontier settlement and movement and the sometimes violent outcomes of frontier processes as embedded in changing local ecologies.

---

63 For example, Stephan Astourian argues that agrarian policy during the late Ottoman period favored the dispossession of Armenians in parts of Eastern Anatolia while giving the Armenian community an opportunity to prosper in the Cilicia region. Astourian, "The Silence of the Land: Agrarian Relations, Ethnicity, and Power."
**Movement, Settlement, and the Question of Violence**

In addition to the ecology of regions of frontier settlement, this study is concerned with the theme of movement. I examine how forms of movement have been integral to human habitation of and interaction with different geographies. Cilicia as a region naturally lends itself to this unit of analysis due to the way that various forms of movement have shaped its recent history. This study highlights three different aspects of movement and their relationship to ecological change. The two main categories of movement are cyclical movements such as seasonal migration for health purposes or labor and economic activity and permanent migration such as that of various forms of immigrants or settlers in the Cilicia region. Both of these types of movement were fundamental to understanding the ecological changes that occurred in the Çukurova plain.64

Alongside these two types of movement, there is a third aspect of movement that merits attention for its distinct placement within a political context. This category is diverse and overlaps with both cyclical and permanent migration but is typified by the feature of coercion and specifically numerous forms of violence. This violence is not merely the violence that accompanies acts such as forced migration or forced settlement but also the byproduct of limitations on movement. This motion-violence is the same as other forms of violence, which are ultimately all physical.65 As Benjamin Brower notes in his study of French conquest of the

---

64 Meltem Toksöz alludes to the centrality of such movements in the title of her monograph “Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton.”

65 Here Catherine Malabou’s commentary on the subject of trauma is of value. She highlights the ultimate similarity of all bodily traumas from physical lesions or “organic trauma” to the sociopolitical injuries of oppression, which are unified by their ultimate manifestation in “the cerebral sites that conduct emotion.” She advocates the grouping of “all damage caused by extreme relational violence.” In addition to categorically unifying all forms of violence, Malabou’s discussion highlights the fact that facilitating recovery from these sorts of sociopolitical trauma necessitates the collective acknowledgement of these types of injuries as the consequence of ultimately physical forms of violence. Catherine Malabou, *The New Wounded: from neurosis to brain damage* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2012), 10.
Sahara that “violence is not a singular phenomenon and assumes many forms.” Conventional understandings of violence generally extend beyond the physical application of violent force to encompass a wide range of uses of power to inflict harm. The threat of violence itself can be considered a form of violence. But more than that, diffuse and indirect forms of violence, when meted out across a large area and time frame, can have the same types of effects as more conventionally-defined forms of physical violence. For example, systematic dispossession and marginalization may create poverty that when resulting in famine, kills through the mechanisms of what Michael Watts calls “silent violence.”

This motion-violence is experienced and meted out kinesthetically; in other words, through action upon a body’s state of motion. Various forms of limitation on movement from forced settlement to forced migration comprise a subset of this silent violence. Expulsion and captivity are types of violence that have always existed, but I argue that these motion-based forms of violence became ascendant or prevalent in certain historical contexts, such as the period and places examined in this dissertation. From the early modern period onward, human societies engaged in new forms of movement that were integral to global frontier settlement. Significant transformation in maritime navigation enabled radically different forms of mobility that facilitated larger scale migration during the early modern period, and then during the 19th century, dramatic changes in transport introduced by the steamship and the railway greatly

---

67 Michael Watts, *Silent Violence: food, famine, & peasantry in northern Nigeria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983). In his study of medicine in French Algeria, William Gallois establishes the conceptual link between this more invisible form of violence such as violence and disease inflicted through impoverishment and massacres as traditionally understood, arguing that “in the case of both the violence of indifference which we find in famines and in the planned killing of genocide, eliminationist literatures played a crucial enabling role in forming a broad culture of attitudes towards death and the value of life in the colony.” William Gallois, *The Administration of Sickness: medicine and ethics in nineteenth-century Algeria* (Basingstoke [England]; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 95. See also, Mike Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño famines and the making of the third world* (London; New York: Verso, 2001).
expanded the capacity for long distance travel. While this was a period of increased mobility and transregional migration, novel forms of control on mobility and the creation of more firmly bounded geographies through the hardening of political borders and the restructuring of property relations made people vulnerable to new types of violence that arose from the conditions under which certain communities were not welcome in certain places.

I do not focus here on the extent to which this new violence was culturally-specific or tied to certain technologies but instead will build outward from the Ottoman case to highlight some examples of how this motion-violence was experienced from the 19th century onward. The Ottoman Empire is only one of many places throughout the world where new forms of displacement had violent effects. During the late Ottoman period, the Ottoman government increasingly pursued a policy of iskân or settlement that resembled settlement policies in many of the empires discussed above. As Reşat Kasaba has illustrated, settlement policies had been an intermittent aspiration within the Ottoman government, but the 19th century brought a greater ability to act upon those aspirations. While not carrying inherent connotations of physical force, iskân often took the form of violence. The word iskân, which means “to (make someone) settle,” was used to describe acts of not only forced settlement but also forced motion. In some cases, it simply involved settling voluntary immigrants in a particular area. But in general, especially when applied to nomadic populations, it referred to compulsory sedentarization or settlement backed up by military force. In other cases, the policy of iskân has appeared in the history of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey as a synonym for forced migration or expulsion, similar to the sometimes euphemistic concept of “resettlement” of problematic populations from one region to another or the slightly less euphemistic US policy of “removal” employed against American
Indians. Whether a command to stay or to go, iskân was a policy that acted upon a group’s freedom of movement, and in this regard, created the potential for harmful impacts.⁶⁸

There are many senses in which the exile and confinement that resulted from resettlement can be understood as violence. But it is important to recognize that under ecological conditions of the 19th century, forced movement or settlement could have a very deadly impact. Being compelled to inhabit a particular geography whether through forced migration or forced settlement could not only lead to disease or other hardship, but as this study argues, both agents and subjects of these types of compulsion were usually more conscious of these impacts that has been previously assumed.

This violent byproduct of settlement defined as iskân in the Ottoman-Turkish context was a salient feature of Cilicia’s political landscape from the 1860s onward. For example, when the Ottoman government forced pastoralists in Cilicia to settle and prevented their seasonal migrations, the violence at play was not only the military force used to crush tribal uprisings but rather the suffering incurred by those populations due to their being prevented from carrying out a customary movement. In the case of many of these people, the harm they endured as a result of this violence took the form of malaria epidemics that ravaged families and wiped out a major segment of the population. During the period of the First World War, an Ottoman writer named Ahmet Besim Atalay, whom I will discuss at further length throughout this text, penned a history of that region of settlement and its effects on the communities it targeted. Atalay very poignantly

⁶⁸ See Ilhan Tekeli, "Involuntary Displacement and the Problem of Resettlement in Turkey from the Ottoman Empire to the Present," Center for Migration Studies 11, no. 4 (1994).
equated settlement or iskân with elimination or imhâ, saying that the Ottoman government had “killed and buried” the tribes of Cilicia by forcing them to settle.\(^6^9\)

Another well-known example of the type of motion-violence that will be discussed in this dissertation, which occurred in the midst of Atalay’s own writing, is the deportations of Armenian civilians from Anatolia during the First World War. These deportations were part of a policy of forced expulsion and massacre of Armenians known as the Armenian genocide carried out by the CUP government.\(^7^0\) This policy — like the tribal settlement campaigns discussed above — was sometimes framed as iskân as in relocation or resettlement, although in practice it was an order to go rather than to stay.\(^7^1\) Deportations were in many parts of the empire accompanied by executions, massacres, and horrific abuses, but the violence of deportation was also to be found in the fact that Armenians were sent off with inadequate food and supplies to desert regions of Northern Syria where they were very likely to die of starvation or disease (see Chapter 8 and 9).

This dissertation links these clear-cut instances of violent expulsion and violent confinement to other examples that present slightly more complex equations. Muslim migrants who arrived to the Ottoman Empire after being expelled or fleeing from surrounding areas of Russian expansion or sites of national conflicts became subject to the policy of iskân or

---

\(^6^9\) Ahmed Besim’s commentary was certainly not without political context, something that will be dealt with in Chapters 4 and 10. Besim Atalay, *Maraş Tarihi ve Coğrafyası* (Istanbul: Matbaa-yi Âmire, 1332 [1916], 1339 [1923]), 71-72.


\(^7^1\) For example, see Yusuf Sarinay and Recep Karacakaya, *Osmanlı belgelerinde Ermenilerin sevk ve iskân (1878-1920)* ( Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2007).
settlement when they arrived to Anatolia. In Cilicia, they would meet fates similar to those of pastoralists forced to sedentarize, and in many parts of Anatolia, the first generation of these migrant communities was devastated by epidemics, particularly disease such as malaria that arose from certain types of interaction with the local geography. The violence carried out by the Russian army manifested not only in dispossession and the hardship of the journey but also the suffering that these migrants endured due to their dislocation once they arrived in the Ottoman Empire. But here the Ottoman government shared some responsibility as well in mandating certain settlement areas for these migrants. In the case of Muslim migrants, the government recognized this form of violence and therefore began to entertain requests for resettlement in a more salubrious location in implicit acknowledgement of the right to freedom of movement for the purposes of wellbeing once the effects of and dissatisfaction with settlement policy became more apparent (see Chapters 1 and 6).

There are many other examples wherein we may examine aspects of violence embedded in various phenomena from population exchanges and conscription to property relations and migrant labor regimes that will emerge throughout the course of this study. Although any individual can be guilty of such violence, this particular form of violence is common to states and other institutions that possess concentrations of physical power significant enough to act upon individuals and groups without deployment of that physical power. I argue that motion-violence has a special place in our understanding of the 19th century. This was the time period when many states were able to wield power over subjects through more rigid enforcement of boundaries, surveillance of movement, and compulsion of labor, settlement, and migration. Resistance to these forms of power, however they may or may not be justified, must be understood as resistance to a potential form of violence in the fullest sense. This point is crucial
for understanding the legacy of nineteenth century imperialism in our present day. While their capacity to carry out unwarranted acts of physical violence unimpeached has arguably waned over the last century, governments and other large institutions have meanwhile claimed an extraordinary degree of power of the movement of bodies that knows no precedent.

**Summary of the Chapters**

In the span of a few hundred pages, this study attempts to examine processes that unfolded over more than a hundred years. Thus, while this work is a very simplified version of the events it discusses, I know that it will prove longer than readers might have preferred. To facilitate easier reading, each chapter is framed by self-contained arguments that build toward the larger points in this dissertation on the expectation that readers may not wish to read the entire work. As a result, the meticulous reader may detect some repetition or excessive cross-referencing with regard to certain crucial points throughout the manuscript. The scope of the work has also introduced the additional complication of sacrificing detail in certain areas, forcing me to excise what might have even been entire chapters. In other cases, I have adhered to the examination of ecological themes and the development of new perspectives on the processes in question at the expense of potentially useful background information that can be found in the works of other authors. What has remained is comprised of sections most pertinent to the study of four themes and bring together the four parts of this dissertation: contention over geography and space, ecological transformation, violence and displacement, and ecological continuities.

Part 1 highlights the issue of contention over geography. It centers on the making of an agrarian frontier in Ottoman Cilicia in the post-Crimean War context, covering just over two decades from 1856 to 1878. It examines how Ottoman administrators, faced with a variety of political, economic, and social questions, sought to impose a new institutional order on Cilicia through the forced settlement of seasonally-migratory pastoralists and the introduction of large
numbers of Muslim migrants who fled the Russian sphere. Chapter 1 traces the development of what I refer to as a political ecology of transhumance in Ottoman Cilicia and outlines the reasons why state and commercial actors sought to alter this political ecology in the post-Crimean War context. The seasonal migration of most of the region’s inhabitants for health purposes also fed local autonomy, and by the middle of the 19th century, local dynasties that were able to govern the predominantly pastoralist population of the countryside dominated politics in the Adana province. With rise of cotton agriculture during the US Civil War (1861-65) and the influx of large numbers of Muslim migrants from Crimea and the Caucasus, the Ottoman government had greater incentive to clamp down on local autonomy and assert more direct governance in order to better collect taxes and enforce conscription. In this regard, some form of confrontation between the Ottoman administration and the local pastoralist communities was overdetermined by the historical factors in play.

However, the timing and nature of forced settlement campaigns in Cilicia was not solely an outcome as these factors. As I explain in Chapter 2, a crisis of legitimacy emerged in the region as the result of the assassination of an American missionary and an inability of the Ottoman authorities to identify and punish the would-be culprits. The pursuit of those culprits manifested in the form of various obstacles presented by a contentious political geography. Although most Ottoman officials were reluctant to take any dramatic measures that would upset the tenuous hold on sovereignty in Cilicia region, the urgings of American diplomats to pursue justice bolstered the argument for more aggressive intervention into the political affairs of the countryside. The pursuit of the culprits ultimately led to the undoing of the political order in Ottoman Cilicia. In the restoration of order, a more ambitious vision of reform won out. It
favored a military reassertion of hegemony, the forced settlement of tribes, and an attempt to spread “civilization (medeniyet)” in the countryside.

Chapter 3 studies the phenomenon of a military campaign aimed at forced settlement called the Reform Division or Firka-i İslahiye. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, an Ottoman statesman and scholar whose historical writings had furthered a notion of civilization based on a reading of Ibn Khaldun, became the commissioner of this large army charged with establishing Ottoman hegemony in Cilicia. The goals of the Reform Division, which arrived to Cilicia in 1865, were to break the power of the local dynasties, put an end to the practice of seasonal migration among the region’s pastoralists, and turn those communities into settled agriculturalists. For Cevdet, the Reform Division represented a force of change that would transform the nature of a rebellious geography into a zone of civilization. This chapter details the discursive aspects of a civilizing mission as articulated by Ahmed Cevdet that were underlying these efforts and examines what this mission meant in practice.

Chapter 4 studies the immediate consequences of Ottoman settlement policy during decade following the Reform Division’s activities in Cilicia. Contention over geography did not end with the military reassertion of hegemony in Cilicia during the 1860s. Although the army had succeeded in curtailing the power of the local dynasties, settlement resulted in catastrophic rates of malaria, mortality, and loss of livestock among pastoralist populations. When financial constraints caused Ottoman commitment to settlement to waver, those populations rebelled against the new order and returned to a migratory way of life. By 1878, the provincial government had compromised on some of its settlement orders, allowing local communities to migrate for the purposes of avoiding malaria. Yet although the theory behind settlement policy in
Cilicia reverted into a looser practice of accommodation, the trajectories and processes established by the Reform Division would endure.

Part 2 of this study examines the impacts of this new trajectory through the intense socioeconomic and ecological transformation in Cilicia during the last decades of the Ottoman period (1878-1914). It considers how this transformation brought novel forms of life and struggle to Cilicia and how it effected a profound political and economic unevenness in the countryside. Chapter 5 details the emergence of a thriving cotton industry in the well-watered Çukurova plain. Because of the low population density in this region, the vast estates of large landholders were worked by migrant laborers from Northern Syria and Eastern Anatolia. The population of Adana would fluctuate with the arrival and departure of laborers, and over the course of a few decades, the Adana-Mersin region emerged as an area of intense demographic and economic growth. Pastoralists had been pushed to the margins, but a new form of migration now dominated life in Cilicia. Urban areas grew at a rate that exceeded overall population growth in the province. However, the eastern portion of the Çukurova plain, which was the area settled by pastoralists and migrants, was less affected by these developments. The Adana province was dominated by unevenness in terms of economy and governance, and as a result, the late Ottoman experience in the rural periphery of Cilicia differed from the urban setting.

Chapter 6 explores these themes further by highlighting the ways in which the Ottoman administration sought to address the issue of malaria in the Cilicia region in the wake of frontier settlement policy, which tolerated but did not fully endorse mobility as a reaction to malaria. During the last decades of the Ottoman period, understandings of malaria transformed continually, and the approaches adopted by the Ottoman administration and medical establishment reflected these changing understandings. Swamp drainage gave way to medical
approaches with the discovery of the malaria parasite in 1880, and by the end of the Ottoman period, anti-mosquito campaigns were also part of these approaches. While Ottoman anti-malaria activities yielded some results, ecological interventions often had unintended consequences in the countryside, and logistical and financial constraints dictated the Ottoman confrontation with malaria in Cilicia would not change human relations with the disease in a fundamental way. In fact, the intransigence of malaria in the face of these efforts in some cases affirmed the importance of transhumance in terms of public health. But the erosion of the economic power of transhumance for pastoralist populations meant that the mountains were no longer solely theirs.

Chapter 7 considers how frontier settlement produced different forms of contention over space between communities that inhabited the Cilicia region. Due to the visibility of the Adana massacres 1909 and further violence during the First World War, Ottoman Cilicia has been conventionally remembered as a powder keg of communal tension and anti-Armenian hostility. I argue that such a view overshadows the way that Muslims and Christians did live together even during a time of considerable flux. However, certain aspects of agrarian transformation in Cilicia introduced a continuous factor of competition and conflict over land and sometimes fostered political rifts between Muslims and Christians. Meanwhile, the region’s position as a frontier space made it susceptible to the impacts of political issues elsewhere in the empire that moved with migrant workers. This chapter examines the different factors identified by historians that have written about the Adana massacres of 1909, and considers the extent to which aspects of Ottoman settlement policy and the resultant ecology contributed to forces of unrest.

These questions come to bear on Part 3 of the dissertation, which studies the experience of the Cilicia region during a period of displacements and disruptions. These chapters deal with the history of Cilicia during the World War I (1914-1918) and the French Mandate period that
immediately followed (1918-1922). They add to an emerging body of scholarship that seeks to study the social history of the First World War throughout the world. Chapter 8 examines the ways in which mobilization for war in the Ottoman Empire along with the expulsion of Armenians caused a dramatic drop in the agricultural output of the Adana region. The cotton ecology of the Cilicia region did not hold up to the economic and material conditions of the war. As a result, agricultural production faltered and scarcity spread throughout the Cilicia region. The Ottoman government adopted some measures to address these issues that ultimate did not offset the effect of the war but may have established important trajectories for understanding the post-Ottoman period.

As various forms of displacement continued throughout the war, further ecological reverberations occurred. Chapter 9 studies the different forms of displacement that occurred in the Cilicia region, such as the deportation of Armenians, the arrival of Muslim refugees, and the movement of soldiers in the empire. The disruptions that were felt within the empire converged on the Adana region in the form of a bizarre malaria epidemic that reached improbably into the mountains. This chapter examines that epidemic, which was studied but not fully explained by German doctors, in order to illustrate the interconnectedness of different ecological issues in the wartime context.

Chapter 10 traces these developments into the history of the French Mandate of Cilicia, which promised a restored agrarian economy and a future of commercial progress, but ultimately engendered upheaval that prolonged the effects of the First World War. By the end of the war, tens of thousands of people had moved in and out of the Cilicia region one or more times, and large amounts of land had changed hands. Cilicia’s longstanding indigenous Christian
population, which was thriving before the war, was almost entirely expelled. The agrarian world they left behind was in shambles.

Part 4 of this study addresses the issue of ecological continuity between the Ottoman and early Republican periods. The First World War was a major rupture in the history of the Middle East that resulted in tremendous demographic change in the Cilicia region as well as the creation of a new state in the form of the Turkish Republic. However, in the realm of economy, ecology, and agrarian policies, the early Republican period reflects many parallels with the trends and processes witness during the last decades of Ottoman rule. By following the themes of agrarian transformation, ecology, and disease into the first decades of the Republican period from 1924 to 1956, this study highlights the endurance of many themes in the history of Cilicia.

Chapter 11 studies the reorganization of the Cilician countryside in the wake of the First World War. During the interwar period, agrarian transformation in Cilicia was in many ways the story of substituting one peasantry for another. The population exchanges between Turkey and Greece were one literal manifestation of this phenomenon, as Muslims arrived to replace the Christians that had been eliminated from the Cilicia landscape. But moreover, the Republic government increasingly sought to augment and transform village life in the making of a new nation-state. Lingering economic issues and the numerous complications of such as a massive overhaul of the countryside meant that change would not be immediate, and the agrarian economy of Cilicia did not resume its prewar vitality until the eve of the Second World War. But while the last decades of the Ottoman period had led to greater urbanization in Cilicia, village populations grew at a faster rate than urban populations in the decades following the First World War. Meanwhile, new approaches to agriculture heralded not only quantitative shifts in the arena of economic production but qualitative ones as well. These developments point to an acceleration
of the process of frontier settlement in the Anatolian countryside during the early Republican period.

Chapter 12 examines the role that malaria played in the remaking of agrarian Cilicia. The Turkish Republic inherited a geography where malaria was an enduring feature of rural life, and during the 1920s, declared war on the disease. The Adana region in particular became one of the leading sites of malaria research in the Mediterranean, and a diverse set of ecological and medical approaches were accompanied by public health propaganda in Turkey’s fight with malaria. These public health programs fostered new kinds of interactions between state and society that were mediated through medical institutions. Meanwhile, by the mid-1930s, ideas about ecology had changed so that many advocated a new war on nature aimed at controlling and harnessing natural forces for the benefit of the nation and civilization. But the nature targeted as enemy was in fact the product of human activity, a countryside shaped by commercial agriculture in which malaria proliferated.

Chapter 13 considers how agrarian change in Cilicia impacted the way people viewed their relationship with the lived geography through the most enduring feature of the region’s landscape: the summer plateau or yayla. Socioeconomic change in the Adana region along with new methods of transportation completed the transformation of the yayla from an economic space to a space of leisure for the urban middle class. This was part and parcel of a broader romanticization of nature that was playing out within the contours of a nationalist discourse. With the subsequent romanticization of the Turkish pastoralist, this discourse completed a full circle of transformation regarding the relationship between the local pastoralist population that had been forcibly settled during the 1860s and their putative descendants in the people of modern
Turkey. However, by the Second World War, their pastoralist way of life had been pushed to the tiniest margins of the Cilician landscape.

Chapter 14 rounds out an exploration of over 100 years of ecological change with an overview of some of the momentous events that the post-WWII brought to the countryside of the Adana region. The Second World War was a period of economic tribulations in the Cilicia region, and these troubles intensified commitments to the technocratic overhaul of the countryside and the harnessing of nature. Following the war, a government wielding increased funds and technology aided in part by the US Marshall Plan embarked on new war on nature in the countryside in the form of an aggressive pesticides-based campaign against mosquitoes and malaria. With increased investment, mechanization of agriculture, the introduction of fertilizers and pesticides, the rise in irrigation, and the construction of a hydro-electric dam on the Seyhan River in 1956, it appeared to some that victory in the war with nature was near. But the ecology of Cilicia would prove more enduring, as malaria and many of the ecological conditions associated with frontier settlement lingered for decades to come.
Aşık Veli was a bard who like his father Aşık Musa used the nom de plume of Dadaloğlu to compose songs about the life and events of his community: the Afşars.¹ They were comprised of a few thousands tents of transhumant pastoralists and tens of thousands of animals that migrated between the plateaus of the Taurus Mountains and the Çukurova plain on an annual basis.² As of the 1860s, they were the largest of a number of similar confederations in the Cilicia region. Like any bard, Dadaloğlu mused on love, lamentation, and nomadic life in the lyrical styles of Central Anatolia and the Turkic dialect of its pastoralist inhabitants.³ When the Ottoman army invaded the mountains and told them to come down to the plain in 1865, Dadaloğlu made songs of defiance as local leaders led small attempts at resistance. His poetry issued a cry to battle that offered an elegant rebuttal to Ottoman claims on the Cilician geography with the line, “They say the state made a decree about us. The decree is the Sultan’s, but the mountains are ours.”⁴

¹ One may also find the spellings of “Avşar” or “Avshar.” For an early study on the Afşars and other Turkmen communities in Anatolia carried out by German researchers and translated into Ottoman by the Tribes and Immigrants Commission during the First World War, see Dr. Freilich and Raulich, Türkmen Aşiretleri (Istanbul: Sevda, 1916). For an overview of sources on the Afşars, see İlhan Şahin, Osmanlı dönemde konar-göçerler : incelemeler, araştırmalar (Istanbul: Eren, 2006), 27-34.
⁴ “Hakkımızda devlet etmiş fermarı / Ferman padişahın, dağlar bizimdir” in ibid., 81. Some versions may differ slightly, as the songs of Dadaloğlu were transmitted orally and not written down for several decades. One of the earliest mentions of a Dadaloğlu song appears to have been written by Ahmed Besim Atalay, who interviewed peasants in the Çukurova region around the time of the First World War. In Maraş Tarihi, he recorded the lyrics of a song that resembles those of Dadaloğlu, although there is no attribution. Atalay, Maraş Tarihi ve Coğrafyası, 70-71.
The Afşars were defeated, and as the other pastoralists of the area, were made to settle in new villages. But resistance had not been all in vain. Many of the Afşars were allowed to settle in mountain villages near Sarız and Pınarbaşı. It was a small victory but an important one, as it gave them better access to the cherished mountain spaces. Their leader, Hacı Bey, who negotiated the settlement, was commemorated among the Afşars for his role in the establishment of their villages. But settlement was not easy for Hacı Bey, who died soon after. And for most of those settled by the Ottoman government in the Çukurova plain, even harder years were ahead. Settlement would be remembered as the great tragedy of their communities. In a subsequent song, Dadalogloblu would call it “the end of the world (kiyamet).”

Nonetheless, the songs of resistance and suffering survived among the remnants of the communities that had been settled. Patriarchs of the small lineages that once controlled the Cilicia region — figures like Küçükalioğlu Mistık Pasha and Kozanoğlu — became heroes memorialized by local folklore. When historians and folklorists began to document the songs from the early twentieth century onward, they were known throughout the region. Sociologist Wolfram Eberhard even found the songs among Armenians living in California during his research in the 1950s.


6 Ibid., 303.
8 Eberhard, "Nomads and Farmers in Southeastern Turkey: Problems of Settlement.”; Eberhard, Minstrel tales from Southeastern Turkey.
The immortal struggle of the Afşars was the product of a formative period in the history of modern states. They had been attacked in a moment of structural expansion carried out by the Ottoman Empire. Settlement was used as a means of subjugating mobile communities that did not cooperate with the new order of the Tanzimat period. The forced settlement of pastoralists in Cilicia occurred during a time when almost every military empire in the world waged battles against local communities and the geographies they inhabited. From the US frontier expansion to the Italian Risorgimento, these battles became defining moments in the histories of those states. However, this period of contention and territorial consolidation for those empires would leave a long legacy of destruction among the communities they touched.

Among those regions was the North Caucasus, a predominantly Muslim area colonized by the Russian Empire during the 1860s. Russian military commanders referred to the Caucasus as “our Algeria,” and the Russian administration sought to install a loyal Christian peasantry in the region.9 Like the pastoralists of Cilicia, the inhabitants of the Caucasus had put up a fight. Imam Shamil led a decades-long resistance in Dagestan that created its own legends of heroism.10 But as resistance was broken, local populations were faced with the choice to flee or Russify, and in the end, most took refuge in the Ottoman Empire. Tens of thousands of such migrants, referred to as muhacirs, were sent to the Cilicia region alone. Many were settled into villages not far from the pastoralists subjugated by the Ottoman military, and like their neighbors, they would perish in huge numbers.11 It was a long way to travel in order to die of malaria on the banks of the Ceyhan River. These were the stories and conflicts that defined the experience of the Ottoman frontier.

9 Sunderland, Taming the Wild Field: colonization and empire on the Russian steppe, 151-55.
10 For a translation of Qarahi’s history of Shamil and his rebellion, see Thomas Sanders et al., Russian-Muslim confrontation in the Caucasus: alternative visions of the conflict between Imam Shamil and the Russians, 1830-1859 (London; New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004).
11 See Chapters 1 and 4.
Part 1 of this dissertation studies the struggle over geography in Cilicia over two decades following the Crimean War, and considers the ecological consequences of the region becoming an area of frontier settlement. Seasonal rhythms of migration or *transhumance* dominated the socioeconomic life of Cilicia before the settlement campaigns. This constant movement posed many long-term challenges to Ottoman administrative and economic visions for the region, as well as more proximate issues regarding the maintenance of law and order. It was when an international scandal involving a murdered missionary laid bare the troubles of the transhumant political ecology that the Ottoman government moved to forcibly settle the pastoralists of Cilicia. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, a historian and statesman, oversaw the pacification campaigns and the negotiations that followed. For him, settlement was sure to bring “civilization (*medeniyet*)” to a region endowed with fertile soil and access to growing Eastern Mediterranean ports. But Cevdet had underestimated the difficulties of forcibly settling populations in Çukurova, and by the 1870s, they had already begun to shirk settlement orders after growing unable to tolerate the malaria epidemics that buried their relatives, friends, and children.

Although this story was remembered on the popular level, it was largely erased from the dominant historiography of the Tanzimat period and the history of the making of modern Turkey, which grew to be narrated from the vantage point of statesmen, bureaucrats, and diplomats.\(^\text{12}\) Only gradually was the violence that occurred in Cilicia during the 1860s restored by authors during the Republican period, primarily local Turkish historians who recognized the events as a formative moment in the making of their region.\(^\text{13}\) By then, nationalism had changed


much about how the period was remembered, and ecological change had done much to alienate people from environments of the past. What follows is a reconstruction of the confrontation between local pastoralists and the Ottoman state in Cilicia before the nation and before the ecology of the Çukurova plain was forever remade.

---

CHAPTER 1
THE POLITICAL ECOLOGY OF OTTOMAN CILICIA

Cilicia is a historical region bound together by sharp contrasts in elevation. The impressive peaks and plateaus of the Taurus and Amanus ranges surround the vast and fertile plain of Çukurova, which is crosscut by the Seyhan and Ceyhan rivers and their tributaries. Runoff from the mountains feeds those rivers and endows this delta plain with a rich and well-watered soil, leading to the formation of wetlands and swamps throughout the lowest areas. In turn, moisture from the sea and plains, which becomes fog, rain, and snow as it meets with mountains, waters the slopes of the Taurus and Amanus ranges, nurturing large swaths of pine and cedar almost unrivaled among Anatolian forests.

The climatic effects of this contrast in elevation have far-reaching consequences for human life in Cilicia. During the summer, the plain is muggy and oppressively hot. By the measures of Turkish studies from the 1970s, the region of the Çukurova plain in the immediate
vicinity of Adana has on average 195 summer days (high of 25°C/77°F or greater) and over 136 tropical days (high of 30°C/86°F or greater) per year.\textsuperscript{3} Average high temperatures from June until the end of September are above 31°C/87.8°F. In August, they regularly exceed 37°C, the temperature of blood in the human body. Adana’s latitude is also 37° north of the equator, roughly parallel with Mediterranean cities like Athens, Lisbon, and Tunis, but its annual temperature is somewhat warmer than all of those. The intense heat of the summer was the most remarkable feature of the Cilician climate for outsiders. A late nineteenth-century source from Russian Armenia characterized the summer heat as “unbearable (անտանելի),”\textsuperscript{4} and in fact, one British consul griped in 1898 that summer in Adana was “tropical and far more trying than in India.”\textsuperscript{5} Though most parts of India are a good bit hotter than Adana during the summer, this region came to be classified among the tropical or “warm countries (bilad-i harre)” of the Ottoman Empire alongside Greater Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and North Africa.\textsuperscript{6} Ottoman agronomists sometimes placed Adana in its own clime (iklim) called the Adana or “Taurus (Toros)” region, distinct from that of Syria or other parts of Anatolia.\textsuperscript{7} One remarked in an 1888 publication that summers in the Çukurova region were “warmer than the summers of the coasts of the Alexandria and Egypt (İskenderiye ve Mısır) climes.”\textsuperscript{8}

Just a few days-walk from Adana, Tarsus, and the mere handful of towns that dotted the plain surrounding the Gulf of Iskenderun before the nineteenth century, a radically different

\textsuperscript{3} The neighboring provinces of İçel and Hatay (Antakya) by contrast experience 61.5 and 89.5 tropical days per year respectively. Çukurova Bölgesi: bölgesel gelisme, şehirleşme ve yerlesme düzeni, (Ankara: Bölge Planlama Dairesi, 1970), 15-16.

\textsuperscript{4} Kilikia : p’ordz ashkharagrut’ean ardi Kilikıyo, Matenadaran Arak`si (Peterburg: Tparan I. Libermani, 1894), 35.

\textsuperscript{5} TNA, FO 78/4938, Barnham to Salisbury, Aleppo (6 June 1898).

\textsuperscript{6} See BOA, A-MKT-MHM 523/51, Mehmed Necib to Sadaret, Adana (9 Şaban 1321 / 16 Teşrinievvel 1319 [29 October 1903]).

\textsuperscript{7} I have compared a few late Ottoman works on agriculture and geography, which while not necessarily consistent in their geographical divisions of the empire, tend to place Adana in a distinct geographical category that sometimes encompasses the Antalya region immediately to the west of the Adana province. See Hüseyin, Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin Ziraat Coğrafyası (İstanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 1303 [1888]), Part 2, 14; "Ziraat-i Umumiye," in Yazma Bağışlar (İstanbul: Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi), 8-9.

\textsuperscript{8} Hüseyin, Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin Ziraat Coğrafyası, Part 2, 15.
climate prevails. Ottoman writers put that region in the same climatic zone as parts of inner Anatolia like Sivas and Ankara and sometimes referred to it as the “yayla (summer plateau)” clime. The highlands of the Taurus Mountains in the north and the Amanus Mountains of the eastern part of the plain are known for their cool summer temperatures and fresh breezes. The average high in the mountains during the summer hovers around 22°C/71.6°F. The average annual temperature in Taurus Mountains towns of the Adana region is comparable to that of Budapest, meaning that in order to experience the climatic difference between the mountains and the plains of Cilicia in strictly latitudinal terms, one would have to traverse the northern half of the Ottoman Empire at its absolute territorial peak.

Temperature variation alone goes a long way towards explaining why the Cilicia region has historically been dominated by the rhythms of seasonal migration. The practice of transhumance, annual movement between winter and summer quarters, is one that has developed throughout the world in response to mountainous geographies and is well-suited to the needs of pastoralist societies that depend on year-round availability of pasture to feed their flocks. In the Middle Eastern context, vertical transhumance (migration between different elevations) is often represented as a practice of nomadic pastoralists who move between a yaylak or summer pasture (henceforth yayla) and a winter pasture or kışlak. While it is true that pastoralist communities

---

11 Jean Boyazoglu and Jean-Claude Flamant, "Mediterranean Systems of Animal Production," in The World of pastoralism: herding systems in comparative perspective, ed. John G. Galaty and Douglas L. Johnson (New York: Guilford Press; Belhaven Press, 1990), 353-93. Also see J. Malcolm Wagstaff, The Evolution of Middle Eastern Landscapes: an outline to A.D. 1840 (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1985). This form of transhumance is visible not only throughout the former Ottoman Empire but also in Iran, where the Turkish names for summer and winter pastures, i.e. yaylak and kışlak, tend to be used even in Persian. Arash Khazeni, Tribes and empire on the margins of nineteenth-century Iran (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2010), 4. For general discussion of pastoralism in Ottoman Anatolia, see White, The Climate of Rebellion.
were most dependent on transhumance for survival, a more careful view of the Adana region during the Ottoman period reveals that settled villagers, townsfolk, and nomadic pastoralists alike all spent their summers at a yayla of some kind.\textsuperscript{12} The yayla was a sort of temporal space, a region used for a shared purpose at a specific time by Cilicia’s inhabitants, irrespective of their diverse socioeconomic lives.

During the 1850s, the Adana province was home to a few hundred thousand people, and for most of them, some form of transhumance was the norm or at the very least the ideal (see Figure 2 \textit{Forms of Transhumance in Ottoman Cilicia, circa 1850 below}).\textsuperscript{13} They included the townsfolk of Adana and Tarsus, who spent their summers in the breezier orchards on the outskirts of town or at summer homes in the mountains (see Figure 1).\textsuperscript{14} That was equally true for the region’s large Armenian minority, which was concentrated in the towns as well as the villages of

\textsuperscript{12} For general remarks on transhumance in the Taurus Mountains, see Suavi Aydın, "Toroslarda Yaylacılık ve Çukurova'nın Önemi [Transhumance in the Taurus Mountains and the Importance of Çukurova]," \textit{Kebikeç}, no. 21 (2006).

\textsuperscript{13} Langlois cites figures of around 150,000 for the period, although this does seem like a low number. Langlois, \textit{Voyage dans la Cilicie}, 18.

\textsuperscript{14} Throughout this chapter you will see hand-drawn map of Çukurova, prepared by an Ottoman engineer during the 1870s. For clarity, I have removed the Ottoman writing of the various towns and village in the area from the map but maintained the dots that point to small settlements. This map of Çukurova (see Figure 1 \textit{Section of Ottoman map with Adana at center, gardens and orchards marked with purple and green (Source: BOA, HRT-h 486 (1287 [1870/1]).)}) above from the 1870s shows the extent to which the towns of Adana and Tarsus were surrounded by kilometers of orchards and gardens. BOA, HRT-h 486 (1287 [1870/1]). See also Yusuf Ziya, \textit{Tabsıra yahut Adana Temaşası} (Adana: Adana Vilayet Matbaası, 1314 [1898]), 13-14; Hagop Terzian, \textit{Atanayi keank'ě} \textit{[The Life of Adana]} (Istanbul: Z.N. Perperean, 1909), 12.
the Taurus Mountains. Urban Armenians could find respite in the mountain towns and villages of their coreligionists, and just like their Muslim neighbors, cherished the yayla as a salubrious summer space.\textsuperscript{15} The yayla was most central for pastoralist communities whose sheep, goats, and other animals depended on the expansive pastures of the Cilicia region made possible by differentiated elevation. Some of these pastoralists, particularly those in the western part of the Çukurova plain, were settled villagers; others, particularly in the east, resided in tents or temporary huts.\textsuperscript{16} All moved with their animals between summer and winter pastures, and for such communities, the yayla was synonymous with a concept of home or sûla. The season of migration was an auspicious time accompanied by springtime celebrations and marked by certain activities and rituals.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} The use of yaylas as a summer retreat is attested in the pre-Ottoman period of the Rubenian dynasty of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia during the thirteenth century. Krikor Koudoulian, Hay leṙē : karmir druagner Kiliğiöy aghēēn [Armenian Mountain: Bloody Episodes from the Cilician Catastrophe] (Constantinople: T. Toghramachian Press, 1912), 14; Léon M. Alishan, Sissouan, ou l’Arméno-Cilicie : description géographique et historique, avec cartes et illustrations (Venise: S. Lazare, 1899). The folk songs of Armenian communities in the area, which were entirely settled, often make mention of the yayla. Misak Keleshean, Sis-Madean : Patmakan, banasirakan, telekagrakan, azgagrakan ev yarakic paraganer (Beirut: Hay Jemaran, 1949), 529.

\textsuperscript{16} Langlois, Voyage dans la Cilicie, 18-23. More on this below.

\textsuperscript{17} Yaşar Kemal’s Binboğalar Efsanesi depicts the festivities surrounding the yayla season and the celebration of Hıdırêlez. Kemal, Binboğalar Efsanesi : Roman. Departure for the yayla was typically associated with many special behaviors particular to the season ranging from dietary restrictions to the production and wear of certain clothing items. Kemal Özbayri and Hatice Gonnet, Tahtacılar ve Yöruks = Tahtadjis et Yörucks : matériaux pour l'étude des nomades du Taurus (Paris: Dépositaire, A. Maisonneuve, 1972), 30-31.
A view of seasonal migration that emphasizes its importance for communities of nomadic pastoralists, while not wholly unfounded, obscures a very crucial aspect of transhumance in regions like Cilicia that bound nomads and townsfolk alike in their movements. The inhabitants of Cilicia found the summer of the plain not only unbearably hot but also extremely unhealthy, and this fact influenced their transhumant habits. In 1835, a Scottish clergyman named Vere Monro passed through Çukurova and described his experience in a work entitled *A Summer Ramble through Syria*. His account reveals among many things that Çukurova was nowhere to ramble through during the summer, much less inhabit. “The heat, untempered by a breath of air, was very oppressive; and the flies, which swarmed about us like bees, made it more

---

18 In 1853, American missionaries noted that the governor of Adana would spend the summers in Marash, which was somewhat cooler and closer to the mountains. "Intelligence from the Missions," *The Missionary Herald* 49, no. 1 (January 1853): 19.
“insupportable,” he wrote.\textsuperscript{19} Not even the locals could bear the climate; most had left for the summer, and those who did remain in Adana were “reduced to the inertness of vegetable existence.”\textsuperscript{20}

Monro had violated the rhythms of seasonal migration, and in doing so, subjected himself not only to the sweltering heat of the muggy plains but also to the mortal risk of contracting malaria, a disease that he would later experience in Beirut.\textsuperscript{21} Vere Monro, who came from a long line of important physicians, understood the causes of malaria to be “pestilential vapours” that emanated from stagnant water. This miasmic understanding of disease was largely shared throughout Europe and the Ottoman Empire. Swamps and “dirty,” uncultivated land where organic matter rotted in wet soil were recognized as producers of “bad” or “heavy” air that caused the particular variety of fever and trembling associated with malaria.\textsuperscript{22} A preoccupation with Cilicia’s “unhealthy” climate caused by swamps is a common feature of most works written about the region before the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{23}

Few geographies in the Ottoman Empire exhibited this experiential link between climate and disease more than Cilicia’s most malarial port city, Iskenderun (or Alexandretta). Iskenderun is located at the southeastern edge of the Çukurova plain. During the Ottoman period, it was synonymous with the vast wetlands that surrounded the town (see Figure 4 below), which was

\textsuperscript{19} Vere Monro, \textit{A Summer Ramble in Syria, with a Tartar trip from Aleppo to Stamboul} (London: R. Bentley, 1835), 158-59.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 178.
\textsuperscript{21} Vere Monro, \textit{A summer ramble in Syria, with a Tartar trip from Aleppo to Stamboul}, vol. 2 (London: R. Bentley, 1835), 202-3.
\textsuperscript{22} Later, symptoms would be understood as the result of the infection of a parasite transmitted between humans by some species of the anopheles mosquito, which does thrive in warm, wet regions. Even then, the indelible link between geography and disease has remained part of the malarial matrix as experienced. For a short overview of historical understandings of malaria, see James L. A. Webb, \textit{Humanity’s Burden : a global history of malaria} (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 8-16. Shifts in understandings of malaria as a disease over the latter half of the nineteenth century are discussed at greater length in Chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{23} See \textit{Kilikia : p’ordz ashkharkogr’ean ardi Kilikioy}, 34.
used mainly as a Mediterranean outlet for goods traveling to and from Aleppo. Early modern travelers, who visited the port unanimously associated Iskenderun with the swamps and the disease they caused. Gabriel Brémond, for example, noticed that foreigners were particularly sensitive to the disease environment, falling ill “no matter how short they dwelled during the summertime.” Ottoman observers understood the geography in much the same way. In a late eighteenth-century account of the hajj pilgrimage, which followed a land route from Istanbul through Anatolia and Syria to the Arabian Peninsula, Mehmed Edib described the air of the port of Payas, just a few kilometers from Iskenderun, as “very heavy.” But within this context, Edib

24 Even after Ottoman rule, Iskenderun’s swampy reputation endured. Hanna Minah, the acclaimed Syrian author, spent much of his childhood in this area, which was part of the French mandate during the interwar period. He poetically and pessimistically described this milieu in an autobiographical novel appropriately entitled The Swamp (Al-Mustanqa’). Hanna Minah, al-Mustanqa’ (Beirut, Lebanon: Dar al-Ádab, 1986).

25 For Henry Teonge, a British Navy Chaplain who visited the area in 1675, Iskenderun was an “especially sickly place” during the summer because of “an innumerable company of frogs [sic], of a great bignes [sic], which cry almost like ducks” that would find their way to the town and “for want of water dye there, and infect the ayre very much.” But of course it was the mosquitoes that the frogs eat—not the frogs themselves—which spread malaria in the port. Henry Teonge, The diary of Henry Teonge : Chaplain on board H.M’s ships assistance, Bristol and Royal Oak 1675-1679 (London: Routledge, 2005), 112. Mid-sixteenth century French traveler Gabriel Brémond attributed Iskenderun’s quality as a “bad village” with “awful (pessima) air” to the stagnant water, “which occurs in almost all the low-lying maritime places of the Levant.” Brémond’s account comes to us through a publication of its Italian translation. Gabriel Brémond and Giuseppe de Corvo, Viaggi fatti nell’Egitto superiore et inferiore : Nel Monte Sinay, e luoghi piu cosmici di quella Regione; in Gerusalemme, Giudea, Galilea, Sammario, Palestina, Fenicia, Monte Libano, et altre Provincie di Siria; quello della Meka, e del Sepolcro di Mahometto (Roma: Paolo Moneta, 1679), 269. In 1610, Spanish traveler Pedro Teixeira had described the region in approximately the same way, saying that it was “for the most part swampy (paludoso) and therefore very unhealthy (muy enfermo).” Pedro Teixeira, Relaciones de Pedro Texeiro d’el origen descendencia y svcession de los reyes de Persia, y de Harmuz, : y de vn viage hecho por el mismo avtor dende la India Oriental hasta Italia por tierra (En Amoberes: en casa de Hieronymo Verdussen, 1610), 194.

26 Brémond and de Corvo, Viaggi fatti nell’Egitto superiore et inferiore : Nel Monte Sinay, e luoghi piu cosmici di quella Regione; in Gerusalemme, Giudea, Galilea, Sammario, Palestina, Fenicia, Monte Libano, et altre Provincie di Siria; quello della Meka, e del Sepolcro di Mahometto, 269. Another account by Andrew Paton from 1844 gives the following description: “One would expect to see some movement at a place where twenty-five British vessels alone cleared out annually; but nothing can be more desolate or ruinous. The climate paralyzes every thing. Our consul had about fifty attacks of fever before he became acclimated; and the rest of the population has the sepulchral complexion of the specters that glide about the roadside inns in the Pontine marshes between Velletri and Terracinn.” Paton, The Modern Syrians, 215.

27 The French translation of Mehmed Edib’s account by Bianchi indicates that it is a seventeenth-century source, but the work of Jan Schmidt refers to it as a late eighteenth-century account with some evidence to corroborate this date. Thanks to Nir Shafir for help with question. Jan Schmidt, The joys of philology : studies in Ottoman literature, history and orientalism, 1500-1923, vol. 2 (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2002), 269-77.

28 Here I am quoting from a French translation of Edib’s work made during the nineteenth century. The word “heavy” in reference to air is easily recognizable as the “vahim” or “sakil”, words frequently used to describe the quality of insalubrious air in Turkish. In one example from a Turkish version of the manuscript at the National
mentioned another more salubrious space nearby rarely noted in European accounts of the period. Payas possessed magnificent yaylas, green plateaus where one could seek respite from the oppressive air of the coast during the summer months.\textsuperscript{29}

Transhumance was in part a response to what was perceived as an insalubrious environment. Seasonal migration did not ward off malaria because the cool, light mountain air sweeps away the heavy, pestilential vapors of the lowlands, though some may have understood it that way. Retreat to the yayla comprised an effective response to malaria because the anopheles mosquito, which generally proliferates during the warm months of year in temperate climates and in the case of Cilicia during summer and early fall, does not thrive at high elevations due to climatic conditions and a general lack of sitting water at those heights. Moving upland during the spring as mosquitoes began to spread was a way of ensuring a return to the plains in the late fall having spent a malaria-free summer at the yayla. This approach to malaria, which can be classified as avoidance, remained the most effective means of preventing the disease long after medicines such as quinine sulfate developed during the nineteenth century offered alternative solutions.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 8.

\textsuperscript{30} For global discussion of transhumance as avoidance, see Webb, \textit{Humanity’s Burden: a global history of malaria}, 14-15.
Although the mosquito’s role in spreading malaria between humans was a mystery until the 1890s, it is clear that seasonal migration was practiced by local populations of Cilicia with the conscious intent of avoiding malaria.\(^{31}\) In most cases, this is evidenced by the perceived oppressiveness or discomfort of the air in the lowlands. The aforementioned Mehmed Edib makes this link in his description of Adana, saying that “since its air is heavy (sakil), most of the inhabitants go to the yayla during the summer.”\(^{32}\) Halil Kamil, a governor of Adana during the 1850s, requested permission to spend the summer in the mountain village of Namrun, saying “most of the population both rich and poor (bay ve gedâ) needs to spend three or four months at the yayla, as Adana’s well-known heaviness of air (vahâmet-i hava) is unbearable during the

---

\(^{31}\) Evliya Çelebi, a contemporary of the other seventeenth-century travelers mentioned above, explained local beliefs about the wondrous plateaus of Payas, one of which specifically was free of malaria (isıma) and the population of which was “very healthy (gayet tendürüst).” Hafiz Mehmet Zilla Evliya Çelebi, Evliya Çelebi seyahatnamesi. 3. kitap, Topkapi Sarayı Bagdat 305 yazmasının transkripsiyonu, dizini (Istanbul: Yapi kredi, 1999), 32.

warm seasons.” The malarial geography of Cilicia, known at the time through its inhospitable airs, was pervasive and played an important role in shaping life in the Adana region. This will be especially clear in Chapters 3 and 4, as I explain why the local population of Cilicia, both pastoralists and townsfolk alike, so fiercely resisted limitations on their movements that would increase with the assertion of new forms of governance in the region during the last decades of Ottoman rule.

33 BOA, MVL 310/45, Halil Kamil to Meclis-i Vala, Adana (9 Şevval 1273 [2 June 1857]). This matches the observations of William Burckhardt Barker, a British orientalist who also spent some time in Tarsus as a diplomat during the mid-nineteenth century; he said that “the poor man will sell any thing he may possess rather than fail to take his family to the mountain during the summer months.” William Burckhardt Barker and William Ainsworth, Cilicia, its former history and present state (London: R. Griffin, 1862), 115. See also, Kilikia : p’ordz ashkharhagrut’can ardi Kilikiyo, 34. Also, BOA, İ-MVL 472/21365, no. 5/2; MVL 643/6, no.1; 776/2. When American travel writer Bayard Taylor visited Adana during a summer during the 1850s, he estimated its population at just 15,000. Taylor is not a terribly credible observer, but this is still an interesting clue as to the seasonal impacts on the population of Adana given the context provided above. Bayard Taylor, The lands of the Saracen; or, Pictures of Palestine, Asia Minor, Sicily, and Spain (New York: G.P. Putnam & Co., 1855).

34 During the warmer months, caravans in the Cilicia region were only able to travel at night. Another detail worth mention is that particularly when the weather was warm, the roofs of houses in the towns of Cilicia became important spaces of leisure and a place to sleep during the night. Bayard Taylor unintentionally linked malaria and mosquitoes in the region, noting that in both Adana and Tarsus there was “a high wooden frame on the top of every house, raised a few steps above the roof, and covered with light muslin, like a portable bathing-house. Here the people put up their beds in the evening, sleep, and come down to the roofs in the morning—an excellent plan for getting better air in these malarious plains and escaping from fleas and mosquitoes.” Taylor, The lands of the Saracen; or, Pictures of Palestine, Asia Minor, Sicily, and Spain, 233.
Figure 4 Map of swamps around Iskenderun, circa 1852 (Source: BOA, I-DH 244/14880, No. 1)
Transhumant Pastoralism in Ottoman Cilicia

Endemic malaria was a natural consequence of Cilicia’s geography and climate that gave great impetus to the various forms of transhumance outlined above. Yet the factors that determined the relative habitability of the region over time were not static, nor were the patterns of land use and settlement in the Cilicia region. During the nineteenth century, Western and Ottoman observers alike became preoccupied with what appeared to be conspicuously sparse settlement in comparison with geographies of the past. Ruined cities of the Çukurova plain such as Anavarza and towns apparently much reduced from their medieval populations such as Antakya gave the impression that the region had been depopulated.\(^3\) The factors that made these locations more or less habitable in the long durée were complex, but by the nineteenth century, the presence of large nomadic populations of pastoralists was cited as the chief obstacle to restoring settlements in the region (more in Chapter 3).

Table 1 Population Estimates of Adana Province\(^3\), circa 1850

(Data Source: Langlois, Voyage en Cilicie, pg. 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslims (Turks)(^3)</td>
<td>38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks (^3)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs / Gypsies / Africans (^3)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmens / Kurds</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Europeans / Persians</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>147,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^3\) This does not include certain parts of historical Cilicia, such as the region around Marash and other areas of Northern Syria that were part of the Aleppo and Aintab provinces. These numbers are probably somewhat low or reflect only the male population, as more comprehensive censuses of later decades would put the estimated population at more than twice these figures. More in Chapter 5.

\(^3\) Langlois refers to this segment of the population as Turks, which generally means that they were Muslims, who, in the case of Adana, spoke predominantly Turkish.

\(^3\) This refers to Greek Orthodox Christians or Rum as they were commonly known in Turkish, not necessarily speakers of Greek.

\(^3\) The largest segment of this population, who Langlois designates as “Arabs,” were Egyptian peasants that came during the 1830s as well as Nusayri (Alawite) peasants that lived mainly along the littoral and mountains of Northern Syria.
The demographic and political predominance of nomadic pastoralists in the Cilicia region as of the nineteenth century is difficult to quantify and vulnerable to exaggeration. If the only comprehensive figures available, the estimates of a French orientalist named Victor Langlois, are reliable, about 70% of the tribal households in the Adana province, which accounted for a little over half of the population, were “nomadic.” This means that roughly 38% of the Adana province’s population was classified by Langlois as nomads. While most of the population of the region engaged in some form of vertical transhumance regardless of their economic livelihood, what separated these nomadic pastoralists from the rest of these communities was the distance of their migrations, their lack of fixed villages, and the relative absence of agriculture in the regions they dominated. While villagers, townsfolk, and pastoralists in the western half of the province migrated to relatively nearby yaylas during the summer, communities such as the Afşars, who according to Langlois comprised roughly 3,000 households or “tents,” traveled between Çukurova in the winter to Uzunyayla (more below) in the Taurus Mountains some 300 km away during the summer. This meant that communities such as the Afşars, which were much larger than most of the villages in the area, would cross into other provinces during the course of their migrations, bringing with them some 40,000 sheep and many other animals.

---

40 For example, Kasaba states in A Moveable Empire that the Adana province held 56,955 nomads versus 5,000 settled peasants. This appears to be a slight misinterpretation of the data presented in Gould’s study of settlement. Kasaba, A Moveable Empire, 86.

41 Langlois counted these populations in terms of houses and tents depending on if they were settled or nomadic, which was the common way of counting such populations for the Ottoman government. This would suggest roughly 20,000 households among a population estimated at 80,000, meaning that Langlois’s definition of household size was rather small.

42 Langlois, Voyage dans la Cilicie, 18-23.

43 By the measures of the time, this was 70 hours, meaning several days of travel. BOA, l-MVL 586/26367, no. 1. See the dissertation of Andrew Gordon Gould for a cartographic representation of routes of pastoral transhumance. Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 31.
Table 2 Estimates of tribal households and number of livestock, circa 1850
(Data Source: Langlois, *Voyage en Cilicie*, pg. 21-23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe Name</th>
<th>Tents</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Goats</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Camels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Menemenci (Melemindji)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekeli</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sortan and Kucuoğlu (Kudjuoglou)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakayalı (Karakailu)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toroğlu (Thor-oglu)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahşiş and Hacı Hasanoğlu</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatekelı</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puran and Mustafa Bey</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalaunlu (Kalaounlu)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karahacilı (Kara-hadjelu)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundarlı (Daoundarlı)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerid (Djerid)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sırkıntılı (Sarkanteli-oglu)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerimoğlu</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmıtılı (Karitinlu)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozanoğlu (Khozan-oglu)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozdoğan (Bousdagan)</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecirli (Tadjerlu)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsak</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karalar 48</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lek</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afsar (Afchar)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karsıntılı (Karsanteli)</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,880</strong></td>
<td><strong>467,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>215,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 I have provided the Turkish spellings (most of which are corroborated by Ottoman sources) as well as the original French spellings by Langlois in parentheses where there was any significant difference. These differences, in addition to being the result of imprecision, reflect local pronunciation variations during the late Ottoman period when compared with modern spellings.

45 John Reader argues that the decline of cattle populations and the rise of goat populations indicates economic impoverishment of pastoralists in modern Africa. John Reader, *Africa: a biography of the continent* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1998). Generally speaking, goats can exploit rough mountain vegetation that is usually out of reach for cattle, and therefore, communities with more goats may be generally judged to command poorer land.

46 These cattle may also refer to domesticated water buffalo, which are common to the Çukurova region. Langlois wrote “boeufs et vaches.”

47 Camels were the chief means of transporting goods in the Cilicia region circa 1850 and thus large numbers of camels should be considered an indicator of relative material wealth for a given community. Horses, donkeys, and mules, which were used for transportation, were not counted by Langlois.

48 Langlois listed these final four tribes as “Kurds.” Because the boundary between Turkmen and Kurd was fuzzy during this period, and because the Afsars, for example, are typically held up as a quintessential Turkmen community, I see no valid reason to impose the ethnic breakdown employed by Langlois.
Available data regarding the shifts in balance between these pastoralist communities and the other population of the Cilicia region and the Çukurova plain is conflicting, especially when it comes to the question of the relative predominance of “settled” communities. Mustafa Soysal’s study of settlement in Çukurova indicates that tribal communities in the Cilicia region were generally larger and more numerous than villages during the sixteenth century, which was more or less true in the nineteenth century as well.\(^4^9\) It is difficult to ascertain the precise extent to which those tribes, usually recorded as \(\text{aşiret or cemaat}\) in Ottoman documents, would have been classified by Langlois as nomads. In fact, given the diverse types of migration carried out by local populations of the Cilicia region and given the complexity of their economies and communal relations, it would be unwise to attempt to make any statements about a shift between nomadism and settled life in Cilicia in strict terms. As Meltem Toksöz aptly stated in *Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton*, “the nomadic inhabitants of the Çukurova had developed such complex life-styles that no linear evolution from nomadism to semi-nomadism and then to sedentarization could be discerned.”\(^5^0\) Nomadic pastoralism and settled village agriculture existed on two ends of a continuum representing the possibilities of rural subsistence in Ottoman Anatolia, and the historical relationship between nomadism and settlement was much more dialectical than linear.

This is a key point because, as will be shown, Ottoman and foreign observers alike tended to adopt the opinion that nomadism was a reflection of a primitive stage of social development in Cilicia. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, a historian and statesman who will play an important role in this first part of the dissertation, wrote in his early Tanzimat-era history that “tent-dwelling (\(\text{himenesin}\)”) tribes were of the “lowest order” of all human societies, as far from


\(^5^0\) Toksöz, *Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton*, 20.
the social development of settled villagers as those villagers were from city people. Yet the type of sedentary life often assumed to be the default of human settlement in the modern context or favored by past agrarian empires such as the Ottoman state was not applicable in the context of early modern Cilicia. Here, I will not focus so much on the notion that one way of life can be more primitive than another but rather call into question the idea that villagers spread throughout the empire would share more bonds than would villagers of a region such as Cilicia and their nomadic neighbors. As Albert Hourani has warned, this assumed grouping is questionable, as “pastors and cultivators may be the same people, or belong to the same community, or live in some kind of symbiosis with each other.”

In the Cilician context, I argue that geography more than any firm social boundaries distinguished villagers from nomads, and the boundary that separated these two spheres was continually muddied by seasonal flooding and annual fluctuations in the local environmental conditions. Certain aspects of Cilicia’s geography and climate seem to have constrained the complex livelihoods of the people there. For example, most of the tribes in the western portion of the Adana province, such as the Menemencizâdes, were recorded by Langlois as settled in the 1850s, while those who inhabited the eastern portion, where very few villages were to be found, were overwhelming nomadic. This distinction must arise as a consequence of the hydrography of the region. The area in that eastern portion around the Ceyhan River, which frequently flooded and even sometimes met with the Seyhan River in the Çukurova plain, was extremely marshy. A French traveler who visited Çukurova during the 1870s referred to its terrain as a “large

53 A late nineteenth-century Armenian source from the Russian Empire indicated that the rivers of Cilicia were too unpredictable in their course for significant navigation or the establishment of ports in the delta. *Kilikia : p’ordz ashkharhagrut’eăn ardi Kilikiyo*, 91.
It is clear from remains of the Çukurova plain such as Anavarza that large settlements in the area required complex drainage and irrigation systems. In the absence of such structures, villagers could carry out small scale maintenance of their lands, but in an area as swampy and flood prone as Çukurova, it is easy to see why communities would favor more replaceable structures such as tents or reed huts. In the western portion of the Çukurova plain, where the skirts of the Taurus Mountains were better drained, settled village life, even among pastoralist tribes, was more conducive.

Figure 5 Winter Quarters of Certain Tribes in Çukurova circa 1850, my rough estimates based largely on subsequent areas of settlement. In practice, most of the Çukurova plain would have been used as winter pastures by some groups, and so this map is merely a represented of certain examples.

A similar differentiation can be observed in the Gavurdağ region, the strip of the Amanus Mountains running parallel to the Eastern Mediterranean coast along the historical border between Anatolia and Syria. The towns along the coast of this region such as Payas and

---

Iskenderun have already been well-attested above for their insalubrious reputation during the nineteenth century and before. Yet as will be shown in a little more detail during Chapter 3, the transhumant populations of Gavurdağlı did not fit the nomadic mold of the Afşars and other communities that migrated between eastern Çukurova and the Taurus Mountains. The contrast between the mountain and the plain in Gavurdağlı is very sharp. As a result, many of the people of Gavurdağlı were able to practice agriculture by descending to their fields for planting, harvesting, and maintenance. At mid-nineteenth century, Gavurdağlı had a large population of Muslim and Armenian villagers.

The subtle differences in geography that influence habitation patterns were even readily visible in the nineteenth-century form of the city of Adana. As all sources and maps attest, the city was built up almost entirely along the west bank of the Seyhan River, which was considerably elevated in comparison with the “the other side (karşıyaka)” as it is known, which was low, swampy, and flood prone (more in Chapter 12). The topography has a gentle slope westward towards Tarsus (see Figure 6), which was generally swampier and viewed as less salubrious than Adana. Add to these factors the fact that inhabitants of Adana built up vast gardens and orchards surrounding the west side of the city, and it becomes easier to understand how a town like Adana became a small, relatively-habitable enclave in the center of an otherwise unwelcoming plains environment.

Figure 6 Tarsus and its immediate vicinity circa 1870
Recently, scholars have looked to climatic factors in explaining the apparent shifts in habitation throughout the Mediterranean and in regions such as Cilicia in particular. An era of reduced global temperatures referred to as the Little Ice Age, which was most acute from roughly 1550 to 1850, overlaps roughly with a period of Ottoman history during which agrarian crisis abounded. These crises precipitated a relative shift from lowland to highland settlements throughout the Mediterranean during the early modern period. Faruk Tabak argues that the climatic effects of the Little Ice Age made for more severe rain and increased occurrence of flooding, which may have rendered regions of low elevation such as Çukurova more unfit for year-round habitation. Furthermore, the agrarian reverberations of more frequent famine created instability in the countryside, which Sam White argues was significant enough to lead to village abandonment and the frequent rebellions that occurred during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. White argues that this “climate of rebellion” favored nomadic pastoralist communities that were less vulnerable to changing climatic conditions than their settled counterparts. The breakdown of economic life and security in the countryside further encouraged Ottoman populations to take refuge in the mountains.

55 The Little Ice Age is one of the best understood historical climate anomalies studied by historians. For an overview of this period and its cultural history in Europe, see Behringer, A cultural history of climate, 85-167.
57 See White, The Climate of Rebellion. There is some evidence of how this change may have impacted agricultural settlements of the Eastern Mediterranean. A British doctor in Aleppo, for example, observed that while Aleppo was once known for supporting fine citrus, by the mid-eighteenth century, oranges and lemons could no longer be grown around Aleppo due to winter temperatures that caused their zone of cultivation had shifted towards the coast. Alex Russel and P. Russell, Natural History of Aleppo (London: G.G. and J. Robinson, 1794), 89. If we define drought as those instances of particularly dry weather that invoked some sort of intervention from the Ottoman state, we can say that the Aleppo province experienced significant drought in the years 1715, 1734, 1758, 1765, 1785, 1792, and 1825. Abd al-Hamid Mishlih, al-Mintaqah al-gharbiyyah li-Wilayar Halab : Idlib fi al-qarn al-thamin `ashtar, 1700-1800 : dirasah ijtim`i`iyah i`tisadiyyah-tarikhiyyah (Dimashq: Wizarat al-Thaqafah, 2006), 100-02; Abd al-Hamid Mishlih, Idlib wa-mintaqatuha fi al-`ahd al-`Uthmani fi al-qarn (13 H/19 M) : dirasah ijtim`i`iyah i`tisadiyyah idariyyah (Dimashq: Dar `Ikramah, 2004), 142-43.
58 Accounts of the Celali rebellions indicate that settled populations were vulnerable to acts of violent. In 1608, an Armenian named Simeon set out from the city of Lviv, a region of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in modern-day Ukraine, in order to visit important sites of pilgrimage in Constantinople, Jerusalem, and elsewhere in the Ottoman domains. During his years in the Ottoman Empire, he crisscrossed Anatolia and Syria and wrote an account of his travels. He visited many small Armenian communities in the cities and small towns and villages tucked away
The arguments of both White and Tabak are sound and the general shift they refer to is attested by the historical record. But without solid statistics regarding precise shifts in settlement inside the Cilicia region, it is very difficult to weigh the extent to which nomadic populations expanded their territorial coverage over the course of the Little Ice Age crisis described by White and others. What is clear, however, is that in general, the habitation of mountain spaces and the predominance of mobile populations posed powerful obstacles to direct Ottoman governance. Figures like Ahmed Cevdet were preoccupied with the practice of nomadism precisely because it impeded new policies that sought to create an undifferentiated system of rule during the nineteenth-century period of administrative centralization. In this way, intimate interaction with the geography and environment of Cilicia gave rise to a particular political ecology, one that favored autonomy that in turn guarded the practice of transhumance and the ways of the local population.

in the mountainous heart of Eastern Anatolia. The account scarcely mentions the plains of Çukurova in Cilicia. In his lone five-sentence description of the area pertaining to the town of Sis, “there are many large fleas and mosquitos” was among his few observations. However, Simeon did visit many of the towns and villages of the Taurus Mountains, all of which he found to be in a state of disarray as a result of the Celali rebellions that had swept across Anatolia. He reported that in towns such as Zeytun, once massive Armenian communities had been reduced to clusters of a few dozen households, with populations having fled the chaos created by Celalis and the depredations of settled communities. Simeon and George A. Bournoutian, The travel accounts of Simeon of Poland (Costa Mesa, Calif: Mazda Publishers, 2007), 271-73.
The Political Ecology of Transhumance

Nomads and pastoralists (such as Berbers and Bedouins), hunter-gatherers, Gypsies, vagrants, homeless people, itinerants, runaway slaves, and serfs have always been a thorn in the side of states. Efforts to permanently settle these mobile peoples (sedentarization) seemed to be a perennial state project—perennial, in part, because it so seldom succeeded.59

James C. Scott, Seeing Like a State (1998)

The mountains had long been the true seat of political power in Cilicia.60 Communities that inhabited the mountains of Cilicia used their geographical advantage to bend Ottoman administrative practices. The Armenian communities of the Taurus Mountains in Cilicia, and particularly in the town of Zeytun north of Marash, were often able to escape taxation altogether, as collection required the Ottomans to send officials with military support into mountain stronghold known as “the eagles’ nest (ազատախմբ).”61 The same was equally true for transhumant pastoralist communities. They could easily resist being counted and taxed by retreating into the mountains. These facts may give the impression that the mountain peoples of the Mediterranean, be they nomads or villagers, were in a position of almost constant hostility and rebellion towards the central government. However, this perspective is oversimplified, as it does not account for the ways in which the Ottoman state was able to sometimes collect taxes and govern in mountain regions. It certainly does not explain how and why the Ottoman Empire, throughout its many phases of transformation, was able to maintain a centuries-long hegemony

60 The medieval Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia was based at the foot of the Taurus Mountains in Sis and Armenian towns such as Hadjin and Zeytun were centers of authority that remained predominantly Armenian into the twentieth century. The Armenian Kingdom was defeated during the fourteenth century by the Ramazanoğlus, Turkmen allies of the Mamluks. That lineage continued to dominate the politics of the Adana region, serving as hereditary governors under the Ottomans into the seventeenth century. Further east towards Marash, the mountains were controlled by the Dulkadiroğlus, a lineage that intermarried with the early Ottomans and served as their allies.
— whatever that hegemony might have meant — in Anatolia and similar regions of the Middle East.

![Sketch of Zeytun circa 1895, from Aghassi and Tchobanian, Zeïtoun: Depuis les origines jusqu’à l’insurrection de 1895 (1897)](image)

Figure 7 Sketch of Zeytun circa 1895, from Aghassi and Tchobanian, Zeïtoun: Depuis les origines jusqu’à l’insurrection de 1895 (1897)

Rather than mere hostility, Reşat Kasaba characterizes the relationship between nomadic communities and the Ottoman state as one of “symbiosis.”62 This symbiosis was defined by a situation in which tribal communities played an important role in maintaining Ottoman hegemony in peripheral regions and often supplied the state with important assets of pastoralist society such as meat and cavalry. Kasaba also argues that nomads and their caravans in addition to serving as conveyors of goods throughout the empire, could be employed towards moving grain during times of scarcity and carrying out other important military and labor functions.63 For example, the Adana region provided a major source of camels for the military during the early

---

63 Ibid., 33.
nineteenth century. Kasaba’s revision is important, particularly for the ways in which it illustrates how mobility facilitated the integration of different regions of the empire.

On the other hand, it is also clear that Ottoman policy vis-à-vis nomadic communities was not consistent across time. While it was to a very great extent characterized by accommodation of mobility, there were also many state-initiated attempts at sedentarization in Anatolia prior to the Tamzimat period (1839-1878). One such attempt that targeted the communities of the Cilicia region in the late seventeenth century, highlights some of the challenges of forcing or even encouraging nomads to settle in an early modern context. Enforcing settlement orders without the use of overwhelming military force was impossible, and settled communities invariably found their new locations unsuitable or desired to continue migratory practices. As Kasaba notes, “the sedentarization policies that the Ottomans adopted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries did not produce a permanently settled society.” In fact, it would seem that the communities of Cilicia targeted by these settlement campaigns suffered significant demographic loss as a result.

The persistence of migratory lifestyles and general autonomy in the mountains had clear implications for the administration of regions like Cilicia, creating a political ecology of transhumance. Most importantly, this political ecology allowed a class of hereditary governors to consolidate local legitimacy and establish semi-autonomous governments in the hinterland of the

---

64 BOA, C-AS 872/37389 (27 Zilkade 1225). This is hardly surprising given that according to the estimates of Langlois, the tribes of Cilicia possessed over 20,000 camels as of 1853, with nomadic communities holding the largest camel concentrations. According to Langlois the Afsars alone had 9000 camels. Langlois, *Voyage dans la Cilicie*, 21-23. Likewise, pastoralists performed important economic functions by providing meat and milk to settled communities in the empire, especially at feast times where large numbers of animals were sacrificed and distributed by the Ottoman state. For a quantification of the sources of Ottoman Istanbul’s meat at feast time, see Chris Gratien, “Istanbul’s Moveable Feast,” *Tozsuz Evrak* (14 October 2013) http://www.docblog.ottomanhistorypodcast.com/2013/10/sheep-sacrifice-bayram-ottoman-empire-istanbul.html.


66 Kasaba, *A Moveable Empire*, 86.
Adana province. These governors, known throughout Anatolia as derebeys or “lords of the valley,” were somewhat akin to feudal lords. In exchange for providing security as well as sometime military support and an amount of tax revenue, they were allowed to govern with relatively little direct interference. 68 These derebeys, who are among the local hereditary figures often referred to as ayans, peaked in influence around the turn of the eighteenth century, and would become some of the main targets of the Ottoman government as decades of reform and centralization followed. 69

While the Ottoman government relied on the derebeys in part to maintain order in the mountainous hinterland of Anatolia, the relationship between these local dynasties and banditry sometimes ran contrary to this logic. One derebey known as Küçük Alioğlu Halil, who gained control of Gavurdağı and exercised power over Payas and İskenderun beginning in 1787, maintained his position by showing a penchant for disruption. 70 In his Tarih, Ahmed Cevdet Pasha refers to this derebey’s rebellious activities and in particular, his disruption of the road between Anatolia and Syria that was a primary route for hajj pilgrims. 71 Halil earned notoriety among Europeans for many attacks upon travelers and on one occasion holding the Dutch Consul of Aleppo prisoner for eight months. As British Consul of Aleppo John Barker related in 1800, Halil had worked his way up from a simple bandit exploiting the mountain geography to gain power in Payas, gradually earning tribute from the people of the town and gathering a large band of brigands around his person. Later, he began to use political acts of organized brigandage to

68 The influence of the derebeys on the decentralization of the Ottoman Empire during the eighteenth century has been much discussed. For the Cilicia case, an article by Andrew Gordon Gould provides the best discussion of these lineages and their transformation during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Gould, “Lords or Bandits? The Derebeys of Cilicia.”

69 For the most updated study of the politics of this period in Ottoman Anatolia, see Ali Yaycıoğlu, Partners of the Empire: the crisis of the Ottoman order in the Age of Revolutions (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2016).


secure titles and pardons from the Ottoman government.\textsuperscript{72} The archival record shows Küçük Alioğlu Halil deliberately disrupting the Payas road connecting the Adana and Aleppo provinces in order to extort positions from the state.\textsuperscript{73} Yet, when the local government in Adana was unable to curtail the activities of his bandits, Halil earned begrudging recognition from the Ottoman government, and his children eventually inherited his political position in the region surrounding Payas.\textsuperscript{74}

If the rise of Küçük Alioğlu Halil diverges from the abstract image of the “local notable” sometimes evoked in Ottoman historiography, a road to nobility paved with acts of brigandage is not tremendously remarkable within the history of early modern Europe. In fact, more than bandit leaders or tribal heads, the derebeys lived the lives of lords and aspired to do so. For example, one Cilician derebey of the mid-nineteenth century named Menemencizade (or Menemencioğlu) Ahmed Bey appears not as a nomadic warrior but rather a provincial aristocrat. The Menemencizades were a lineage of landed tribal elite who dominated the political landscape of western Çukurova in Tarsus and Karaisalı for decades. Though this clan is usually mentioned in discussion of the tribes and nomadic pastoralists in Cilicia, they bore little resemblance to this prototype. Their wealth was in livestock, 80,000 sheep, 20,000 goats, and 18,000 cattle spread across 3,000 households according to mid-nineteenth century estimates, but they were by and large a sedentary community in the sense that they lived in villages, though certainly engaging in seasonal migration when necessary. The patriarch Menemencizade Ahmed, who had played an


\textsuperscript{73} He had already been granted the title of mirliva in order to secure his allegiance, but in a subsequent letter was found once again disrupting the pilgrimage in demand of the title of mirmiran (equivalent to beylerbeyi). BOA, HAT 14/552 (ca. 1202 [1787/8]).

\textsuperscript{74} BOA, HAT 267/15524 (ca. 1204 [1789/90]). For a full overview of Küçük Alioğlu Halil and his successors in Payas, see Mahmut Şakiroğlu, “Çukurova Tarihinden Sayfalar 1: Payas Ayanı Küçük Ali Oğulları,” \textit{Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi} 15, no. 26 (1991).
important political role as Ibrahim Pasha’s ally during the Egyptian occupation of Cilicia in the 1830s, resided in an eight-room brick mansion in Karaisali that would come to be used by Ottoman officials as the government building in the district following his departure. He was also exceptional in that he authored a history of his own life and lineage, much of which is narrated through the various events and encounters that occurred in the geography and on the yaylas of Cilicia. More than the nomad warrior prototype, the story of Ahmed Bey is reminiscent of his aristocratic contemporaries in Sicily memorialized by works such as Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa’s Il Gattopardo (The Leopard).

Just as the entire region of Sicily became synonymous with brigandage during the period of Italian unification, Cilicia’s elite became known for their banditry and nomadic ways during the Tanzimat period. Scholarship that deals with the history of tribal communities in Ottoman Anatolia tends to present these groups as monolithic and undifferentiated wholes headed by a particular chief or notable that more or less becomes a stand-in for the entire tribe. However, it is important to note that pastoralist communities, just like settled communities, contained internal hierarchies and various forms of stratification. While some lineages could be traced to a

---

75 BOA, A-MKT-MHM 437/34, no. 2 (19 Zilkade 1285 [3 March 1869]). Yılmaz Kurt has published a number of primary sources regarding the Menemencizâde family, including collections of Ottoman archival documents pertaining to their history. See, for example Yılmaz Kurt, "Menemencioğulları ile ilgili Arşiv Belgeleri I," Belgeler 21, no. 25 (2000).

76 This work originally written in Ottoman has been transcribed into the modern Turkish alphabet by Yılmaz Kurt. Menemencioğlu Ahmed and Yılmaz Kurt, Menemencioğulları Tarihi (Ankara: Akçağ, 1997).

77 Lampedusa, offers a portrait of the old Sicilian elite on the eve of the Risorgimento. Much of the novel takes place within the confines of the mansion of Don Fabrizio, the patriarch of a noble family on the verge of being displaced by the new order. Don Fabrizio, an elegant, stoic prince but ultimately a passive observer to the political events of his day, watches as Sicily and with it his family are engulfed in a civil war that ultimately results in the incorporation of Italy’s southern Mezzogiorno region into the Italian Republic. Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa, Il gattopardo (Milano: Feltrinelli, 2002).

78 For a discussion of this period, see Riall, Sicily and the unification of Italy: liberal policy and local power, 1859-1866.

79 Here I should also echo the words of John Tutino in his study of development and the state’s attack on patriarchy in the Mexican highlands that “social organizations that proclaim unity of purpose—families, communities, even nations—are structured internally by power, inequality, even exploitation.” John Tutino, "From Involution to Revolution in Mexico: Liberal Development, Patriarchy, and Social Violence in the Central Highlands, 1870-1915," History Compass 6, no. 3 (2008): 798.
particular mountaineer or bandit who usurped Ottoman rule, their eventual power and wealth made these figures landed elite whose socioeconomic condition was alienated from the vast majority of the tribal populations they presided over.

One case of this phenomenon is that of the Kozanoğlu family, a lineage that counted some 500 households at mid-nineteenth century centered on the Taurus Mountains towns of Feke and Hadjin. The power base of the Kozanoğlus was formed in part by transhumant pastoralists who passed through the district, but the Kozanoğlus were sedentary leaders who derived their livelihood from their position. The Kozanoğlus allied with political leaders in Armenian towns such as Hadjin. This bond was strong enough that the Kozanoğlus could rely on their connections with the Armenian Catholics in Sis to maintain hegemony in the region while resisting Ottoman interference.\textsuperscript{80}

In the 1830s, an Egyptian army led by İbrahim Pasha, son of Mehmed Ali Pasha, invaded Syria and occupied Cilicia. During this occupation, tribal notables played a key role in politics, some as allies and others as opponents of the new Egyptian regime.\textsuperscript{81} This reflected the general fact that the \textit{derebeys} of Cilicia did not operate as a unified front but rather sometimes acted as

---

\textsuperscript{80} The Armenian notables of Hadjin and the Kozanoğulları maintained a longstanding alliance in Kozan. Langlois, \textit{Voyage dans la Cilicie}, 11, 19. In fact, in a section of the \textit{Complete History of Hadjin} published in Armenian in 1942, members of the Kozanoğlu lineage do not appear as such but are referred to instead as “Kozanyan,” unusually nativizing the Kozanoğlu family name in apparent adoption of the language of the nineteenth-century Armenian source the section was based on. Poghosean, \textit{Hachéni ēndhanur patmut'wne}, 146-50. Some popular historiography has presented the Kozanoğlu lineage as uncomplicatedly “Turkish.” An enlightening example of this phenomenon based on another derebey lineage might be Abdurrahman Münir Kozanoğlu’s short work entitled \textit{Kozanoğulları}. He introduces this work by establishing his family as a Turkish tribe that played an important role in the “Turkicization (Türkleşme)” of Anatolia over the years, linking the Kozanoğlus to the tribal notables that wrested power away from the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia during the fourteenth century. Abdurrahman Münir Kozanoğlu, \textit{Kozanoğulları} (Istanbul: Bakış Müessesesi, 1983). By contrast, the work of Armenian writer Aghasi about his native town of Zeytun composed in the 1890s, which was certainly not without its own biases, argues that many of the tribal lineages in Cilicia were descendent from the original Armenian inhabitants, had shared customs, and therefore close relations with Armenians in the Taurus Mountains. Aghasi and Chobanian, \textit{Zeïtoun: depuis les origines jusqu'à l'insurrection de 1895}, 60.

\textsuperscript{81} See Ahmed and Kurt, \textit{Menemencioğulları Tarihi}. 
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competitors against one another. However, their political role on both sides of the conflict strengthened their authority in their respective areas.

After the Ottomans resumed control of Cilicia in the 1840s, the provincial government of Aleppo made some attempts at inducing tribal populations to settle. The Reyhanlı confederation comprised of a few thousand households led by Mürselzade Ahmed Pasha agreed to partially settle the Amik Plain near Gavurdağ in 1844. According to Gould, over 1,000 households of pastoralists settled on a voluntary basis in the Pazarık plain near Marash in 1846. These communities were allowed to choose their settlement locale and continue seasonal migration. In both cases, disputes with neighboring communities became barriers to settlement. Though they remained loyal to the Ottoman state, the Reyhanlıs largely abandoned the goal of pursuing sedentarized agriculture. One document suggests that the “intolerable” swamps in the Amik Plain area undermined permanent settlement of the Reyhanlıs and their nearby rivals, the Hadidis. The two maps below, one made by the Ottoman military (date unclear, most like after settlement) and the other from the French consulate in Aleppo dating the 1860s, illustrate the ecological constraints on settlement in the Amik Plain. The vast swamps surrounding Lake Amik would have made for a most inhospitable place to spend the summer, and neither map shows Reyhanlı as having become a permanent settlement, although the Ottoman map does refer to the district of Reyhaniye (more on Amik in Chapter 14).

---

82 Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 38.
83 Ibid., 38.
84 BOA, A}–MKT-UM 385/69, no. 2 (22 Cemaziyelevvel 1276 [5 December 1859]).
The Amik Plain and Lake Amik

Figure 8 Section of Ottoman map of Amik Plain, swamps represented by blue squiggles. Reyhaniye district underlined. Original orientation of map, which places East at top has been preserved. (Source: BOA, HRT 2270)

Figure 9 Amik Plain circa 1867 (Source: CADN, 166PO D1, 93)
There are other examples of experimentation with tribal settlement in Cilicia in the years leading up to the Crimean War. All point to the fact that settlement was to occur according to the terms of local populations and through cooperation with local leaders. However, relations with these leaders, especially the major derebeys mentioned above, became more strained during the war. One of the terms of accommodation of these leaders and the transhumant practices of the societies they presided over was that they were expected to muster troops and cavalry when necessary. By the time of the Crimean War, the Ottoman Empire had a conscript army constituted by draft lotteries (kura-yi şeriye) held throughout the empire. Most of the local leaders in Cilicia such as Kozanoğlu refused to send men to fight in the Crimean War. This was no doubt a great service to their constituencies, as a huge percentage of the Ottoman soldiers who fought in the war perished, mainly due to disease.

There were some exceptions to this abstention. One leader among the Kerimoğlus, Asiye Hatun, known by her nickname of Kara Fatma or “The Cockroach,” led a unit of cavalry onto the battlefield, where she even left two of her own teeth. The Ottoman government recognized her exceptional status both as a woman and as a Cilician tribal notable, and awarded her a salary in compensation.

Matriarchal succession was an occasional feature of Turkmen and Kurdish tribal organizations in Cilicia, and prominent women played an important role in the political life of those communities (more in Chapter 3). But Asiye Hatun’s willingness to fight in the war along with her voluntary settlement in Çukurova a decade later suggests that allying with the Ottoman

---

86 Ibid., 41-45.
87 Hikmet Özdemir, Salgın hastalıklardan ölümler, 1914-1918 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2005), 51-54. For more on Ottoman involvement in the Crimean War, see Canand Badem, The Ottoman Crimean War, 1853-1856 (Boston: Brill, 2010).
88 The image of a female warrior named Kara Fatma recurs throughout the history of late Ottoman and early Republican Anatolia. See Zeynep Kutluata, "Geç Osmanlı ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönem'inde Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Savaş: Kara Fatma(lar)," Kültür ve Siyasette Feminist Yaklaşımlar, no. 2 (February 2007).
89 BOA, I-DH 308/19638 (5 Muharrem 1271 [28 September 1854]).

80
state was a means of ensuring her position among the different factions in her region. Either way, the fact that the only prominent tribal figure from Cilicia to cooperate with the war effort was also apparently the only female officer to fight on any side of the Crimean War sums up the extent to which political life in Cilicia was a flagrant exception to the Ottoman Tanzimat rule.

The Crimean War interval clearly illustrated that the derebeys and by extension the pastoralists over whom they presided did not answer to the Ottoman government on key matters regarding the obligation of Ottoman subjects. Controlling these communities would not be

---

90 Janet Klein argues that this phenomenon became a defining feature of Eastern Anatolia during the Hamidian period, during the Ottoman government armed certain tribal leaders who in turn used the opportunity to strengthen their local positions. Janet Klein, *The Margins of Empire: Kurdish militias in the Ottoman tribal zone* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), 63-64.

possible without dislodging them from the mountains and either coopting or removing the local political leaders of the Cilicia countryside. Yet geography had proven a very powerful logistical barrier to doing so. Even if pastoralist communities could be coaxed out of the mountains, the disease ecology of the Çukurova plain rendered their settlement unrealistic. This being said, Cilicia would witness a profound agrarian transformation following the Crimean War thanks to a rise of agriculture in the western portion of the plain and the arrival of immigrants who could serve as settlers in the countryside. These factors would further energize the settlement impulse within the Ottoman administration.

**Panting for the Plow, Yearning for the Yayla**

Leaving aside the pervasive issue of malaria described above and the intransigence of local autonomy in the Cilicia region, there were many reasons for the lowlands of Cilicia to become an area of new settlement during the nineteenth century. The alluvial soils of Çukurova are exquisitely rich. The famed venture capitalist Hacı Ömer Sabancı, founder of the Sabancı business empire, has been quoted as saying that “Adana soil is so fertile that if you tied up a donkey, it would turn into a mule right on the spot.”92 J.H. Skene, the British Consul in Aleppo during the 1860s, summarized the state of Adana’s natural bounty in terms dripping with capitalist fantasy, saying, “Stately forests rot on the mountains, and rich ores crop out unheeded from the rocks; fertile plains pant for the plough, and copious streams to irrigate them feed only pestilential marshes. Bedouins encroach on arable land to secure pasture for their increasing flocks, and villages are abandoned, the desert overlapping cultivation.”93

---

92 Quotation reported by Taha Toros. Sadun Tanju, Hacı Ömer (Istanbul: Apa Ofset Basimevi, 1983), 288.
93 "General Report by Mr. Consul J.H. Skene on North Syria under the New Organization of the Turkish Provinces," in Commercial Reports received at the Foreign office from Her Majesty's Consuls in 1868, ed. Great Britain Foreign Office (London: Harrison and Sons, 1868).
His words were indicative of an ascendant narrative about Cilicia’s geography wherein Çukurova came to be seen for its unrealized economic potential. European observers, many of whom passed through Cilicia in commercial or diplomatic capacities, consistently remarked upon the incredible agricultural prospects of the sparsely populated Çukurova plain. Crosscut by large rivers and endowed with rich soil, the region was a natural fit for large irrigation projects that would extend areas of cultivation for cash crops such as cotton, desiccating and reclaiming swamp land in the process. The well-watered and fertile soils produced by these rivers would earn Çukurova the nickname of the “Second Egypt.”

Indeed, for a brief period, Cilicia quite literally became the Second Egypt when Ibrahim Pasha occupied the region during the 1830s. For Mehmed Ali and Ibrahim Pasha, the natural

---

94. Another example is that of John Kinneir, who found Çukurova “fruitful, but deserted” and “surrounded on all sides by brown and arid hills.” He remarked that “the soil was a rich brown, and, although it was at the season of the year when the country is parched with drought, the weeds and grass grew with great luxuriance.” 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*, by John Macdonald Kinneir (London: J. Murray, 1818), 134.


97. Saint-Simonian intellectuals that served in the Egyptian government heralded the invasion as a momentous event in the history of the Middle East, saying “Syria, which under Ottoman rule had turned to the East, has turned back to the West by freeing itself from foreign oppression.” Edmond de Cadalvène and Emile Barrault, *Histoire de la guerre de Mehemed-Ali contre la Porte ottomane en Syrie et en Asie Mineure* (1831-1833) (Paris: Arthus Bertrand, 1837), 14. For a similar example of contemporary hagiography of Mehmed Ali by a British author see: Edward Churton, *The life of Mohammed Ali, Viceroy of Egypt : to which are appended, the quadruple treaty and the official memoranda of the English and French ministers* (London: Edward Churton, 1841).
wealth of Cilicia presented a great opportunity. Once establishing power in Cilicia, Ibrahim Pasha encouraged the settlement of Egyptian and Syrian peasants in Çukurova and introduced the planting of Egyptian cotton seeds. The Egyptian government presided over a growing agrarian regime. By 1840, Adana was counted as the largest cotton producing region in Northern Syria, though according to British sources, a good year would yield only around 5,000 bales. This figure may have been an understatement, but even so, production would subsequently be much higher.

Ibrahim Pasha’s short-lived government in Cilicia (1832-40) encouraged agriculture and other types of ecological interventions and attracted the attention of Western investors. The Adana-Tarsus economy began a slow but consistent growth. Yet, it was to be neither an Egyptian nor foreign government but rather the Ottomans themselves who would preside over the first genuine cotton boom in Çukurova some decades later. When the US Civil War

---

98 The forests of the Taurus and Amanus Mountains offered much-needed timber to the governors of a virtually treeless Egypt eager to expand their naval fleet. In the negotiations of the Peace of Kütahya with the Ottoman state in 1833, Ibrahim Pasha considered the Southern Anatolian coast among the most important acquisitions of the campaign, heeding his father’s advice to "give as much care to the matter of timber as you would to crippling the army of Constantinople. Khaled Fahmy, All the pasha’s men : Mehmed Ali, his army, and the making of modern Egypt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 50. In the nineteenth-century Mediterranean, abundant sources of timber were vital to maintaining a healthy naval fleet. Egypt was poor in forests; the Taurus and Amanus Mountains as well as the coasts had abundant supplies. Until the nineteenth century, the vast forests of Cilicia reached all the way to the outskirts of the city of Adana. Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey, 58.

99 Procházka-Eisl and Procházka, The Plain of Saints and Prophets, 40-41.

100 See: AUB, Asad Rustum Collection, Box 3 1/10, letter from Mehmed Arif regarding farm of Ahmed Pasha. The British report described the agricultural potential of the Adana region at the time as up to 20,000 cantars. The weight of the cantar and its equivalents varied from place to place around the world—as did the bale—but we can say as a rough estimate that 5 cantar would be equal to a bale. John Bowring, Report on the commercial statistics of Syria (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office (Foreign Office), 1840), 14.

101 Agrarian growth in Egyptian Cilicia spurred some attempts at increasing irrigation, one of which near Tarsus resulted in the contamination of the Cydnus River, leaving its waters unpotable. Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 47-50. Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey, 40. Ibrahim Pasha also ordered the planation of palm trees in Adana, which survived but did not yield edible fruit. Ibid., 57. In order to make important ports such as Iskenderun more livable, Ibrahim Pasha also commissioned the draining of the marshes around the city, a measure that had some temporary impacts but ultimately was negated with the Egyptian withdrawal and the reemergence of the swamps. Barker and Ainsworth, Cilicia, its former history and present state, 114. See also Songül Ulutaş, "Gelenekten Moderne Tarsusta Tarımsal Dönüşüm (1839-1856)," (2012). More in Chapter 6.

102 Meltem Toksöz offers additional treatment of the Egyptian occupation. Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton. There are a small number of documents pertaining to the Egyptian presence in Cilica available at American University in Beirut, but research in the Egyptian state archives would likely reveal a much greater number of
disrupted the slave labor cotton economy of the American South, a sudden global shortage offered an opportunity for cultivators in the Mediterranean to enter the cotton market. Izmir, Egypt, and Cilicia were some of the main beneficiary regions. The cotton craze was buttressed by articles in *Ceride-i Havadis*, a British-owned Ottoman newspaper that reported continuously on the US Civil War and the potential profitability of cotton cultivation. Over the first half of the 1860s, cotton exports from the Adana region increased rapidly. The tiny port of Mersin quickly began to grow as a center of commercial activity. The amount of land under cultivation in Cilicia doubled. The Ottoman government encouraged landowners in Adana and elsewhere to plant cotton by allowing them to import Egyptian seed duty free. Cotton gins were introduced to speed up the process, and workers from as far off as the Harput and Kurdistan provinces were encouraged to migrate to Adana every April to meet the sudden rise in demand for labor during the planting season. This instant agricultural prosperity inspired awe and optimism among local and foreign commercial circles.

sources, predominantly in Ottoman Turkish, for researchers interested in studying this very fascinating experiment of semi-colonialism by the Egyptian state in Southern Anatolia.


106 The French Consul of Aleppo reported 15,000 bales of cotton produced in 1861, 34,000 bales in 1862, and 63,500 bales in 1863. CADC, Correspondance commerciale et consulaire, 1793-1901, Alep 33 (1863-1866), pg. 61, Bertrand to de Lhuys (20 July 1864). By comparison, citing British records, Gould indicates a roughly six-fold increase in Çukurova cotton production from 1860-1865. Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 195.


108 BOA, A-MKT-MVL 144/58 (16 Şevval 1278 [16 April 1862]). There was some debate as to whether American or Egyptian seed would be best to plant, but in the end Egyptian was favored; however, local cultivators often preferred to use the local variety because it required less labor. More in Chapter 5. BOA, A-MKT-MHM 256/79 (4 Ramazan 1279 [23 February 1863]); 257/97 (27 Ramazan 1279 [18 March 1863]).

109 BOA, A-MKT-MHM 299/36 (26 Zilkade 1280 [3 May 1864]); 328/84, No. 1 (8 Mart 1281 [20 March 1865]).
In addition to the sudden rise in cotton agriculture in the Çukurova region, the Ottoman Empire faced a demographic crisis that accelerated the settlement imperative. In fact, Ottoman officials saw agriculture in Adana as a potential solution to this issue. Russian incursions into Crimea and the Caucasus initiated the first major exodus of what would become periodic waves of Muslim immigrants from the border regions of the contracting Ottoman Empire. These migrants were called *muhacirs*, a term that is somewhat ambiguous in that we can understand it to mean immigrant or refugee, both of which would suit the experience of these communities.\(^{110}\) Russian expansion following the abolishment of serfdom in 1861 was aggressive and involved the settlement of large numbers of Christian subjects in predominantly Muslim regions. The local Muslim inhabitants, who in many cases had long resisted Russian authority, were sometimes told to convert to Christianity and relocate to other parts of the Russian Empire or flee under the threat of violence.\(^{111}\)

In the first half of the 1860s alone, hundreds of thousands of Nogays, Circassians, Chechens, and other Muslim communities from the expanding Russian sphere chose the Ottoman Empire as their new home.\(^{112}\) The influx of these migrants, many of whom had been

\footnotesize
110 The term “muhacir” which is the noun form of the verb “muhaceret etmek” or “to emigrate” is used inconsistently throughout the Ottoman period, and there is not room for full discussion of the subject here. The key point that separates the notion of “muhacirs” or “immigrant/emigrant” for that of “mülteci,” which is clearly refugee, is that the muhacirs is not expected to return to their place of origin. In English and French sources from the Ottoman period it is common to see the term *muhacir* used as is in reference to Muslim migrants to the Ottoman Empire. I will use different translations interchangeably to suit the context throughout this dissertation and sometimes refer to *muhacirs* as a group where applicable.

111 Some authors contend that the policies pursued by the Russian military during the 1860s in the Caucasus amounted to ethnic cleansing or genocide, as they were consciously thorough in their removal of Muslim populations from certain problem areas. For discussion, see Sunderland, *Taming the Wild Field: colonization and empire on the Russian steppe*, 151-55; Sanders et al., *Russian-Muslim confrontation in the Caucasus: alternative visions of the conflict between Imam Shamil and the Russians*, 1830-1859, 154-57.

subjected to acts of violence or recently involved in an armed struggle in their former homeland, would change the demographic makeup of Anatolia fundamentally. The Ottoman government welcomed these post-Crimean War immigrants, although it had little choice in the matter. However, rather than allowing them to settle in towns or already crowded cities, Ottoman policy was to encourage muhacir settlement in would-be empty lands of the countryside. In 1860, a special commission called the Muhacirin Commission (Muhacirin Komisyonu) was formed to oversee the complicated process of settlement, which included providing transportation, money, provisions, and in many cases, constructing villages for the newcomers.\footnote{Cuthell, "The Muhacirin Komisyonu: an agent in the transformation of Ottoman Anatolia 1860-1866", 18-20.}

Çukurova was a prime region for migrant settlement in the post-Crimean War context. The high material and human demands of the war had provided incentive for an already expanding Ottoman state apparatus to adopt a new land code in 1858 that would serve as the basis for the registration of property and the distribution of deeds (tapu) to landholders, thereby increasing tax revenue.\footnote{Roderic H. Davison, Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1876 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963), 98-99.} Çukurova contained a great deal of land that would have been classified as “empty lands (arazi-yi haliye or mevat),” land that was “unused” or in practice exploited for pasture or other purposes by local inhabitants. The greatest concentration of empty land was in the section of the plain east of Adana. During the 1860s alone, tens of thousands of Muslim muhacirs, mostly identified as Nogays and Circassians, were settled in this area around

---

the Ceyhan River.115 According to settlement procedures, these communities were registered and land was divided up through cooperation with their leaders and those who “could follow directions (söz anlar).”116 These settlers were expected to integrate into the budding cotton economy. Muhacirs were settled into a number of villages on both sides of the Ceyhan River, an extremely fertile but marshy region east of Adana, and upon the recommendation of the governor of Adana, the settlers received free cotton seed in order to participate in this rapid growth.117

The post-Crimean War settlement process was a tragic debacle that claimed the lives of untold numbers of people. The migrants who fled the Caucasus arrived in Istanbul sick and starving, and from there, they boarded other ships bound for settlement regions. In the Cilicia region, waves of migrants comprising hundreds of families began arriving in Mersin in summer of 1859.118 Those who survived this long journey and were settled in Çukurova failed to thrive due to the hardships of settlement and most crucially, malaria. Muhacirs were settled onto empty lands in independent villages on terrain that was often unfit for immediate habitation by local standards. For example, of the fourteen Nogay and mixed villages profiled by Hakan Kırimlı in his fantastic overview of Tatar settlements in modern Turkey, thirteen were in modern-day Ceyhan and one in Karataş (see Figure 11).119 These areas were not only full of wetlands but highly prone to nearly annual flooding of the Ceyhan River. Among an already vulnerable population of settlers arriving to the semi-tropical Çukurova plain from the cooler climates of the North Caucasus, mosquitoes were well poised to finish the job started by the Russian military.

115 Compiling Ottoman sources, Hilmi Bayraktar indicates that just over 20,000 Nogays came to the Adana province between 1859 and 1861. Bayraktar, "Kırım Savaşı Sonrası Adana Eyaleti'ne Yapılan Nogay Göç ve İskânları (1859–1861) ".: 50. About two decades after the fact, Lieutenant Bennet, a British official appointed to observe the effects of settlement in Çukurova, indicated that around 15,000 Nogays had been settled in the area. BNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
116 Here this is presumably due to the fact that most immigrants would have had difficulty communicating in Ottoman Turkish. BOA, İ-MVL 439/19468 (17 Rebiulahir 1277 [2 November 1860]).
117 BOA, MVL 662/51 (11 Receb 1280 [22 December 1863]).
118 BOA, A-MKT-NZD 288/14, no. 2 (15 Muharrem 1276 [2 August 1859]).
119 Kırimlı, Türkiye'deki Kırım Tatar ve Nogay köy yerleşimleri, 46.
Figure 11 Ceyhan River and Approximate Placement of Nogay Settlements. The green patches are hills and small mountains.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ In constructing this map I have plotted the settlements mentioned in Hakan Kırmılı’s study of Nogay villages onto the Ottoman map of Çukurova from the 1870s (see above). While some of the villages were already indicated on that map, others had to be approximated using Google Maps and Kırmılı’s descriptions. Ibid., 46-67.
The Nogay immigrants perished in large numbers during the first years of settlement, and in summer 1861, they began to request transfer to “airy (havadar)” regions due to an inability to “adapt to the climate (abiühava ile imtîazaç)” of the areas where they had been settled.\textsuperscript{121} The same was true for a group of Circassians who came to the Muhacirin Commission in Adana with that exact complaint. They sought to be resettled in areas with climates more similar to that of the Caucasus in the Black Sea region such as Trabzon and Sinop.\textsuperscript{122} A continued influx of such complaints, the attempts of many immigrants to flee their place of settlement in Adana to elsewhere, and even some requests to return to the Caucasus aroused some concern among the Ottoman administration, which tried to keep the new settlers in their respective places.

In light of serious complaints about regions of settlement, the Muhacirin Commission was sometimes able to offer the alternative of settlement in regions of higher elevation in inner Anatolia where the climate would be more agreeable for new immigrants. However, unlike the expansive and largely unsettled plains of Anatolia, habitable mountain areas and the \textit{yaylas} of pastoralist communities in particular were precious spaces already used by local communities. The conflicts over land that would arise in the course of settlement in the coming decades immediately came to the fore when the Muhacirin Commission began settling large numbers of families in a plateau region of the Taurus Mountains in the Sivas province north of Adana. This region called Uzunyayla or “Long Yayla” sits at more than 1500 meters above sea level and possesses a cool mountain climate similar to that of the North Caucasus whence most of the \textit{muhacirs} had come. Officials estimated that up to 10,000 households could be settled into new villages in this empty space, and in preparation for settlement, thousands of families began to come to the regions surrounding Uzunyayla for temporary settlement until houses could be

\textsuperscript{121} Alternative regions suggested included Ramazanoğlu \textit{yayla} and the areas surrounding Marash. BOA, A-MKT-MHM 223/3 (14 Zilhicce 1277 [23 June 1861]).
\textsuperscript{122} BOA, MVL 621/27 (17 Cemaziulahir 1278 [20 December 1861]).
constructed. However, this space was also, as its name would suggest, an important summer pasture for a number of pastoral communities, most notably the Afşars. When they found houses being constructed on their yayla in summer of 1861, they attacked and scattered the muhacirs, destroying the structures that had been built. Although it was evident that military force would be needed to prevent such incidents from recurring, Ottoman officials were reluctant to send troops because the Afşars were too numerous and “savage” to be dealt with easily. If the conditions regarding land use and mobility in Cilicia were going to change in a fundamental way, it would require an extremely ambitious effort.

The Breaking Point

The settlement of nomads had long been seen as a potential goal by Ottoman administrators. The land code and other aspects of the Tanzimat reforms stipulated that the Ottoman state should make sure that transhumant pastoralists were registered on a piece of land, if only on paper. Incidents involving clashes between migrants and “brigands” of the Adana region’s various tribes created further incentive to use the empty lands in order to settle these semi-nomadic communities permanently. Likewise, as cotton agriculture expanded in Çukurova, impending disputes over land between pastoralists and cultivators loomed ahead. Meanwhile, the Ottoman government enjoyed increased military capabilities, a growing imperial budget, and access to foreign loans in the post-Crimean War, and with the arrival of muhacirs and the formation of a commission to deal with them, the Ottoman Empire was acquiring the

---

123 BOA, İ-MVL 586/26367 No. 11 (5 Safer 1277 [23 August 1860])
124 BOA, A-MKT-UM 492/93 (12 Safer 1278 [19 August 1861]).
125 Another motivation for inducing settlement I have seen in European sources but mentioned explicitly only once in Ottoman sources (and even then in the wake of forced settlement campaigns) was the possible construction of a railroad. A letter from the Adana Council mentions a report regarding the necessary types of settlement that should be carried out for a railroad plan. However, this occurred after the Reform Division had already begun its activities (see Chapter 3). BOA, MVL 1041/7 (26 July 1865). Work on the first railroad in Çukurova did not begin until the 1880s (see Chapter 5).
administrative structure and practical experience to create more generalized policies of "settlement" or iskan.

These new developments along with the long-term pressures described above and by Reşat Kasaba in *A Moveable Empire* explain in general terms why the Ottoman Empire might have been in a position to carry out forced settlement campaigns against nomads in various parts of Anatolia, Syria, and Iraq.\(^{126}\) They are the factors that overdetermined the forced sedentarization of nomads; given the historical conditions, settlement would inevitably emerge out of the confluence of these pressures. Yet given the historical failures of settlement orders and adding to them the political and logistical challenges involved in suddenly attempting to assert direct rule over tens of thousands of pastoralists, there was also powerful incentive not to forcibly settle nomads. In fact, for all the forced settlement that would occur in the Ottoman Empire during the last decades of its existence, many nomadic communities would never be targeted by military settlement campaigns and remain accommodated by state policies. In other words, the factors outlined above explain why the Ottoman Empire might forcibly settle tribes in Cilicia but certainly not why it happened where, when, and how it did.

When considering the reasons for forced settlement in Cilicia, we cannot take as given the more macrohistorical factors discussed in this chapter and followed the lead of previous scholars that took justifications articulated by statesmen such as banditry or "progress" at face value.\(^{127}\) Nor is a larger global context of post-Crimean War pacification campaigns that ranged from Russian expansion in the Caucasus and French colonization of the Sahara to the Italian Risorgimento and the US Civil War sufficient explanation (see Introduction). Even if “everyone

---
was doing it” and the Ottomans were too, clearly settlement occurred in certain places for certain reasons.

In fact, one could argue that Ottoman officials in Istanbul, rather than actively seeking to conquer and forcibly settle nomads, were doing everything in their power to avoid such a measure. This view must also be considered, as it is much more consistent with the very loose types of inducements pursued in the abortive settlement attempts in the Pazarcık and Amık plains during the 1840s. It also fits better with the primarily mediatory role adopted by the Ottoman administration in the disputes between the new immigrants and the Afşars over Uzunyayla. Moreover, if we examine the ways in which the Ottoman government used force in the provinces during the Tanzimat period, the most notable example being the military occupation of Syria and Mount Lebanon, we find that these types of measures were only pursued in the context of a major upheaval or political crisis and often involved an element of foreign diplomatic pressure.

In the decade following the Crimean War, Cilicia witnessed some tense political moments in the countryside such as the conflicts between the immigrants and the Afşars in Uzunyayla mentioned above. A few of these incidents centered on Marash and the efforts of the local notables to incite tribal populations against Armenians in the region. Gould discusses these various political incidents in his study of the Reform Division, pointing to the ways in which each of them contributed to a general desire on the part of Ottoman officials to reform the administration of the province.\(^{128}\) Throughout these various conflicts, one of the key figures in the local politics of the region was a local potentate of the Gavurdağ region, Küçük Alioğlu Mustafa Pasha, better known by his nickname Mistik.

---

\(^{128}\) Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 46-56.
Místik Pasha’s father was Küçük Alioğlu Halil, the same man whose bandits terrorized the hajj road and kidnapped the Dutch Consul of Aleppo. Vere Monro claimed that prior to the Egyptian invasion of Cilicia, Místik “had been the most ruthless robber in the country.” However, not all observers viewed Místik in this light. Andrew Archibald Paton, a British student who visited Místik’s domain in the 1840s said of him that “By the concurrent testimony of both Turks and Arabs, he is possessed of a most active and intelligent mind, and his little district is one of the securest and best governed in this part of Turkey.”

Although Místik had ostensibly gone on to continue his father’s bandit legacy, he would become the lynchpin of Ottoman rule in post-Crimean War Cilicia. The Ottoman government reinstated him as governor of Payas with hopes that he could maintain order in the area. Gould notes that it appears the presence of Místik prevented the Muslim notables of Marash from allying with tribal leaders against Armenians in 1856 and that he was applauded by foreign observers for preventing the 1860 massacres in Syria from spreading further north past Gavurdağı. Even though his presence as a hereditary governor undermined certain aspects of the Tanzimat order in Cilicia, Místik became viewed as a very valuable ally by some Ottoman officials along with important British diplomats.

Gould’s discussion of the various political intrigues of Cilicia, just as the long-term factors mentioned above, point to a series of pressures on a tenuous order in Cilicia that was about to crack. In Chapter 2, I will offer a detailed snapshot of life and politics in Cilicia at that moment of fracture. Of all the myriad entanglements that the Ottoman administration sought to sort out in its slow reform of Adana’s administration in the decade following the Crimean War,
one in particular placed Místik Pasha at odds with the wishes of both Ottoman officials and foreign diplomats. As I will show in Chapter 2, the questions surrounding a murdered American missionary would precipitate a crisis that ultimately pushed Místik out of power, leading the Ottoman government down a more radical course of policy with the Reform Division and the forced settlement of Cilicia’s pastoralist populations.
It is not enough to say that the Ottoman officials chose to forcibly settle the pastoralist communities of Cilicia because they wanted to and could. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, the statesman most involved with the campaign, tended towards descriptions of the perpetual rebelliousness of the region’s inhabitants and the ways in which nomadism was an obstacle to Ottoman reform (more in Chapter 3). These must be seen as justifications and not explanations of what occurred. In Chapter 1, I outlined some long-term factors that led up to the forced settlement campaigns and discussed some short-term political conflicts in Cilicia following the Crimean War that were mentioned by Gould in his study of settlement. One of those crises, I argue, was the true catalyst for the settlement campaigns, not because it related directly to the issues surrounding settlement per se, but because it produced a political conflict that the Ottoman government ultimately decided to resolve through the use of military force. Whether its relationship to the settlement campaigns was productive or pretextual, it merits our attention.

The crisis I am referring to revolved around the murder of an American missionary, which through a series of incidents and escalations, led to the removal of Küçük Alioğlu Mistik Pasha, a hereditary governor in the strategically important Gavurdağ region. In Ottoman sources, the removal of Mistik Pasha and its aftermath are cited as the most proximate reason for the dispatch of Ottoman troops to the Cilicia region. What these sources do not reveal is that Mistik Pasha was removed with great hesitation by the central government in Istanbul at the urging of a few local Ottoman officials and in particular, the US Consul in Beirut. In other
words, the symbolic removal of a powerful derebey, which led to the large-scale operations of the Reform Division, was the indirect result of an international diplomatic crisis that in turn arose from an unsolved crime and its investigation.¹

What follows is a rather lengthy narrative of a murder mystery involving a missionary couple, numerous foreign and Ottoman officials and diplomats, Armenian villagers, Cilician mountaineers, and a diverse cast of local actors and observers. I have narrated these events in full because they are complicated and because I think the multivocal qualities of the source base make it especially evocative. But I have also included this story in the study because I think it illustrates through the fine grain of narrative detail various aspects of local politics and life in Cilicia during the 1860s, when the region was on the cusp of yet unconceived changes. Most importantly, it demonstrates the extent to which the ecological questions that extend throughout this study influenced the actions and decisions of those who inhabited Cilicia in quotidian but very meaningful ways.

“White Already to Harvest”

“We had little to do except study the language; yet our progress was not what it would have been in our own country under the same circumstances, for we cannot do as much in this warm climate as we can at home. I especially found that I could not apply myself as I did in Oberlin for after studying an hour or so, my head would be all in confusion. Mr. Coffing suffered much with his bowels.”² This excerpt is from one of the first letters written by missionary Josephine Coffing to friends back home in 1858 about her experience at the Central Mission in Aintab of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). Coffing, her husband Jackson, and a few other missionaries had recently embarked on a new career of

¹ Gould uses a few missionary sources in this short section. The general outline of his description is accurate but it contains some errors regarding details of the case. Ibid., 55.
² ABC 76 (Personal Papers), Coffing, Josephine 1/1 no. 13 (1 July 1858) Coffing to Clark.
Christian service in Northern Syria, a region of the Ottoman Empire home to sizeable Christian minorities and a large Armenian community in particular. Josephine and Jackson Coffing were in the midst of a special romance shared by those selflessly devoted not only to each other but also to a particular cause, in this case spreading the word of the Bible and other types of knowledge taught in Protestant mission schools. She was a recent Oberlin graduate and he was also an Oberlin alumnus with extensive experience pioneering Bible schools in Ohio and Pennsylvania as well as New York City. They were among the most zealous of an extremely zealous organization of American missionaries that was active not only among American Indian communities but also many regions of Africa, Asia, and Europe.³

The Coffings had not anticipated the hardships that would accompany their voyage from the United States to the Ottoman Empire, during which most of the missionaries fell ill, with one even dying on the journey across the Eastern Mediterranean.⁴ The summer months in Aintab would bring perspiration, fever, headache, and diarrhea to missionaries struggling to adapt to the new disease environment and climate. Yet the Aintab mission was growing rapidly. Its efforts were focused on proselytizing and broader education mainly among the Armenian communities of the region. Jackson Coffing reported great personal satisfaction with the progress of the mission, which the ABCFM annual report of 1857 dubbed “the most remarkable of all

³ Other sources list Jackson Coffing’s place of birth as Mount Vernon, Ohio; however, a work of genealogy indicates that his family moved from Pennsylvania to Ohio when Jackson was five years old. Coffing was one of sixteen children. Charles Luther Popejoy, The Popejoy family in America, 1700-1976 : William Popejoy immigrant from England and his descendants (Juneau, Alaska 1976), 229-30. Benjamin Chidlaw, one of the early figures of the American Sunday School Union recalled the pioneering work of Coffing in rural Ohio in his memoirs. Benjamin W. Chidlaw, The Story of My Life (Philadelphia: W.H. Hirst, 1890), 146-49. Coffing earned notoriety among missionaries in New York City due to his work with “the Candy Girl,” a young orphan girl about whom a successful propaganda bulletin was made. James W. Alexander, Maria Cheeseman, or, The candy-girl (Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union, 1855). For more on ABCFM missions among the Cherokee and their opposition to the Indian Removal Act, see: John A. Andrew, From revivals to removal : Jeremiah Evarts, the Cherokee Nation, and the search for the soul of America (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992).

⁴ Disease also complicated their journey in that they were unable to spend the night in their port of arrival, Iskenderun, due to the high risk of malaria there. For more on malaria in Iskenderun, see Chapters 1 and 6. ABC 76 (Personal Papers), Coffing, Josephine 1/1 (March 14, 1858) Coffing to Hills.
missionary stations.” During their years in Aintab, Jackson and Josephine Coffing were involved in expanding the mission’s schools, which increased in number more than threefold during the second half of the 1850s. There were nine schools in Aintab alone educating over 500 pupils, in addition to the many adult women who received instruction in the home. Jackson remarked, “So far as I know, it is now one of the largest Sabbath schools in the world.” The endeavor must have seemed momentous to the eager missionaries who saw a spiritual frontier opening before their eyes, and the ABCFM mission structure was such that it facilitated expansion into more remote places by establishing “out-stations” mainly serviced by local clergy trained in mission schools.

The growth of the mission offered Jackson Coffing an elegant solution to the summertime sufferings in Aintab. In a letter to the ABCFM secretary, Jackson explained that with Mrs. Coffing’s lingering ill health in Aintab, they were eager to expand missionary activities elsewhere, proposing a journey west in fall of 1860 to the Taurus Mountains and the Çukurova plain. Not only would they help establish a mission in Adana, but that mission would be paired with a summer mission in the airy mountain town of Hadjin, as Adana was “intensely hot” during the summer and a “notoriously unhealthy town.” “In my opinion no missionary

---


7 Sabbath or Sunday schools aimed at providing religious instruction to children were spreading rapidly throughout the United States at this time. ABC 641/229, Coffing to Anderson from Aintab (20 October 1859).

8 ABC 641/232, Coffing to Anderson (7 June 1860).
from any northern part of the United States should attempt any direct labor here in the summer,”
Coffing would write in defense of this seasonal approach.\textsuperscript{9}

Practically speaking, a new Adana mission made eminent sense at the time, since although it was the region’s largest and fastest growing city, it was incongruously being served by the out-station of an ABCFM mission in the fairly distant and small town of Antakya.\textsuperscript{10} Likewise, as a predominantly Armenian area, Hadjin was home to as many needy souls as Adana itself, and at any rate, many of Adana’s inhabitants spent their summers in the mountains and vice versa. This summer mission would be fully attuned to the seasonal rhythms of transhumant life in Cilicia (see Chapter 1).

\textit{Figure 12} Jackson and Josephine Coffing (Source: Poghosean, \textit{Hachen Endhanur Patmut’iwne}, pg. 380-81)

\textsuperscript{9} ABC 641/235, Coffing to Pratt, Adana (3 November 1860).
\textsuperscript{10} Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions: presented at the meeting held of Cleveland, Ohio, October 1-3, 1861, 49.
The mountains, however, presented other challenges to missionary activity. Unlike the main towns of the Cilicia region, Hadjin was only nominally governed by Ottoman authorities, its local administration being entirely in the hands of Armenian notable families and the governor\(^\text{11}\) Kozanoğlu Yusuf Pasha and his kin. There was no guarantee that Kozanoğlu would uphold the pledges of the Porte to protect missionaries in the Ottoman Empire, which had recently been made as part of the 1856 Hatt-ı Hümayun that outlined the rights and duties of Ottoman subjects and religious minorities. Nonetheless, the biggest threat to Protestant missionary activities in the Taurus Mountains was not the governor himself but rather the local Armenian political structure. The Armenian notables or çorbacis\(^\text{12}\) that controlled the towns of Hadjin and Zeytun derived their legitimacy from their ties to the Church, namely the Catholicosate of Cilicia seated in the nearby town of Sis. They were especially unwelcoming to Protestantism, which they viewed as a threat to their hegemony. Coupled with recent political turmoil in Marash and an incident in which an Italian working for the English consulate was burned alive for calling a Muslim judge a pimp (pezevenk), American missionaries were acutely aware that any move towards mountains was a journey into contested space.\(^\text{13}\)

In fact, Jackson Coffing might have anticipated the result of his impending venture based on analogous experiences a few years prior in Mount Lebanon. There, American missionaries had sought to found a summer mission in Ehden, a predominantly Maronite village in the mountains used as a summer home by the residents of nearby town of Zgharta and the port of

\(^{11}\) Kozanoğlu held the title of kaymakam of Eastern Kozan, meaning that he was a governor of a district much smaller than a province level. I refer to him as a governor here for ease of comprehension.

\(^{12}\) Çorbaci is a term commonly used to refer to Christian notables in Ottoman Anatolia.

\(^{13}\) Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 52. Coffing called Marash “the most government ridden place in the empire.” ABC 641/235, Coffing to Pratt, Adana (3 November 1860).
Tripoli, two places – like Adana – widely regarded as insalubrious.\textsuperscript{14} They were promptly driven from Ehden once their intentions of proselytizing became clear.\textsuperscript{15} If these signs were insufficient for showing the hazards of mountain missions, Coffing had received the message in quite explicit terms; when he told a man in Marash that he was headed to Hadjin, the man’s response was simply that “they will kill you.”\textsuperscript{16}

Nonetheless, the Coffings and a small entourage set out from Marash into the heart of the breathtaking landscape of the Taurus range in order to investigate this potential field of missionary activity. Following this preliminary visit to Hadjin, Coffing described the road as “the most beautiful [he] had ever beheld” as they passed through yaylas and dense pine forests. As if intoxicated by the crisp mountain air, he marveled at the Cilician nature’s every offering: “When passing over one of the highest points, we had a cloud, and thunder and hail, and afterwards a magnificent rainbow. I thought I had never seen one so beautiful. It was so near to us, and so bright. There were two bows of red and in some places three under the main bow.”\textsuperscript{17}

The Taurus geography bore all the making of a fine summer home, but the town of Hadjin itself was decidedly less picturesque. Coffing described it as a densely crowded settlement situated in a deep mountain valley. From afar it “seemed all like one building under one roof but with innumerable doors and apartments.”\textsuperscript{18} He described the streets as “filthy” in comparison with other similar mountain villages in Anatolia, although it was certainly a rich

\textsuperscript{14} In a report about the sanitary situation in Tripoli circa 1880, Ottoman officials surmised that the Abu Ali river running through Tripoli was the source of the port’s disease issues. Y-PRK-UM 2/9, no. 1 (24 Ağustos 1296 [5 September 1880]). See also Edib and Bianchi, \textit{Itinéraire de Constantinople à la Mecque : extrait de l’ouvrage turc intitulé: Kitab menassik el-hadj} (livre des prières et des cérémonies relatives au pélerinage), 29.
\textsuperscript{15} Gregory M. Wortabet, \textit{Syria and the Syrians; or, Turkey in the dependencies} (London: J. Madden, 1856), 116-17; Charles William Meredith Van de Velde, \textit{Memoir to accompany the map of the Holy Land} (Gotha: Justus Perthes, 1858), 188.
\textsuperscript{16} ABC 641/236, Coffing to Anderson, Aintab (15 January 1861).
\textsuperscript{17} ABC 641/235, Coffing to Pratt, Adana (3 November 1860).
\textsuperscript{18} ABC 641/235, Coffing to Pratt, Adana (3 November 1860).
field for mission work from a demographic standpoint. The town itself was mostly Christian and comprised of about 1700 houses each containing multiple families. Though no proper census was possible there, Coffing and his associates estimated a population of 15,000 to 20,000.

Although they had been braced for ill-treatment by Hadjin’s notables, the general reaction to the Coffings in the town was one of curiosity and excitement. They carried with them an Armeno-Turkish translation of the Bible — the first to ever enter Hadjin — rendering the archaic and foreign language of the scripture immediately accessible to the local communities. Coffing, who was especially fond of music, entertained the local children with the hymns he taught at the Protestant mission in Aintab. Another admirer of this music was the governor Kozanoğlu, who welcomed the missionaries contrary to all expectations. Coffing and a deacon named Sarkis visited him at his mansion approximately two hours from Hadjin, where after initially seeming “a little frightened or confused,” he relaxed and spoke freely with them over coffee. As Coffing and Sarkis dined on delicious lamb kebab, bulgur, and köfte with Kozanoğlu and his men, they discussed their plans to found a mission in Hadjin.

The governor showed willingness to offer his protection should they incur any abuses from the local elite and agreed to sell them land to build the mission. Though Coffing was skeptical of how genuine Kozanoğlu’s enthusiasm truly was, he concluded that “he evidently

---

19 A later British visitor left with a similar impression, saying “I visited the place last summer and without exception it is the most disgustingly filthy town I have yet seen. The condition is indescribable. The only wonder is they do not have the plague.” TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1881 No. 11, Bennet to Goschen, Marash (11 May 1881).

20 Coffing noted the issue of underestimated population counts, which Ottoman administration referred to as withheld or mektum population: “As to the number of people in the place it is difficult to say exactly. The agha and Chorbadjies make the number less than it is. The people make it more. The accounts I got are about as satisfactory as this; I suggest to one a common Hadjinli that there must be 12,000 or 15,000 people in the place. He replied that “if you say 12,000 there are that many—if you say 20000 there are that many—if you wish to say 30,000 there are that many. There are as many as you please to say there are.” His idea being that there are a great many in the place.” ABC 641/235, Coffing to Pratt, Adana (3 November 1860).

21 Poghosean, Hachēni ēndhanur patmut’iwnē, 380-84.
fears us more than we fear him and would like to secure our friendship.” Later, when Coffing was back in town with Josephine, Kozanoğlu staged a theological debate between Sarkis, the Protestant deacon from Aintab, and the local Armenian çorbacıs, “often deciding against them that Sarkis had gained his points.” The hereditary Muslim governor of Kozan had given his endorsement to the new Protestant endeavors in the Taurus Mountains. As Coffing and his party continued on their journey to the mountain town of Niğde and later to Adana, the people of Hadjin bid them a warm farewell. Coffing’s optimistic report of this encounter generated a buzz among the missionary community, with excerpts published in its monthly period, The Missionary Herald. “The place is ‘white already to harvest,’” he exclaimed. “Who shall thrust in the sickle, and when?”

“Too Zealous for His Own Safety”

In March of 1862, Jackson Coffing was shot without warning by armed men lurking in a myrtle grove just past the town of Payas on his way from Adana to Aleppo for the annual mission meeting. His servant was killed, and a few other members of his party wounded. His armed guard had immediately fled upon the sound of gunfire. Coffing managed to continue riding for about forty-five minutes, but being too weak to go on, he sent his attendant to Iskenderun for help. The missionary was brought to the town only to succumb to his wounds later that night. Like the Westerners who had occasionally died before him in that malarial port town, he was buried in the cemetery of the city’s Greek Orthodox church at a funeral notably

---

22 ABC 641/235, Coffing to Pratt, Adana (3 November 1860).
23 ABC 641/235, Coffing to Pratt, Adana (3 November 1860).
24 “Letter from Mr. Coffing, January 15, 1861,” The Missionary Herald 57(1861): 171. The phrase “white already to harvest” appears in the New Testament in reference to evangelization (John 4:35). It was common within nineteenth-century missionary rhetoric to refer to communities that were potential sites of conversion as fertile fields waiting to be plowed. See: B.B. Edwards, "Obligations of the Eastern Churches to the Home Missionary enterprise," The Home Missionary 18, no. 8 (1845): 178.
25 NARA, RG 84, Diplomatic Posts (Turkey) 231, Beirut Vol. 6 (1856-1865), Johnson to Cabouli [Kabuli] Efendi, Beirut (5 April 1862).
attended by consular officials and a large crowd of curious townsfolk, though his wife Josephine
would not arrive in time. His grave was marked with a simple marble tombstone; some years
later, his wife and colleagues would replace it with the following: “Rev. Jackson Coffing, A.M.,
a citizen of the United States of America, and missionary of the American Board, resident at
Adana, died at Alexandretta (Iskenderun), March 26, 1862, from wounds received at the hands of
assassins; aged 37 years. ‘Fear not them which kill the body.’”

On a larger time scale, this incident has appeared rather inconsequential. It has scarcely
been mentioned in treatments of the Adana region’s history. And within the history of
American empire, it serves merely as a momentary conflict between the US Department of State
and the ABCFM. In the work of James A. Field, Coffing’s murder, which I argue was never truly
explained, appears as one of many commercial and missionary activities that pushed the US to
project its power in the Mediterranean arena. Within this narrative, the murder investigation
ended swiftly and without incident, standing as a small blemish on the record of Americans in
the Mediterranean during 1860s. Yet the historical implications of Coffing’s demise have gone
unnoticed. It has been typically viewed as nothing more than a characteristic act of banditry, the
kind one might expect in the Ottoman Empire and particularly in a notoriously lawless region
such as Adana. Even the local history of Hadjin composed by the town’s Armenian diaspora in

26 ABC 642/8, Morgan to Anderson, Alexandretta (31 March 1862).
27 Henry Day, A Lawyer Abroad: what to see and how to see (New York: R. Carter and Bros., 1874), 199.
28 Gould’s work is the only history of Adana that mentions Coffing’s killing in a broader discussion of various issues
regarding Ottoman hegemony in the Cilicia region during the Tanzimat period Gould, "Pashas and Brigands: Ottoman
provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 55.
29 James A. Field, From Gibraltar to the Middle East : America and the Mediterranean world, 1776-1882 (Chicago:
30 Ibid., 346.
California — authored by those usually privy to details about the politics there during the late Ottoman period — offers relatively little explanation for why Coffing was killed.\textsuperscript{31}

In contrast to these cursory treatments of the incident, a close examination of the historical record reveals that Coffing’s murder triggered a series of events of tremendous import for the Adana region. Most importantly, the aftermath of this murder and the hunt for the perpetrators upset the fragile political balance of Ottoman Cilicia and culminated in Ottoman military action against the region’s tribal communities. Triangulation of Ottoman, missionary, and US and other diplomatic sources clearly indicates that Jackson Coffing’s killing was a genuine assassination, an act of political violence either carried out or commissioned by influential players in local politics. The murder had been clearly linked to his activities in the Taurus Mountains, and in this way, his attempt to found a mission attuned to the geography and climate of the region initiated a larger contention over geography between the Ottoman administration and the inhabitants of the Cilicia region. Rather than being an isolated incident that was resolved with relative ease, it birthed a political crisis that lasted for over a decade.

The story of Coffing’s death persisted in the form of rumor in the Adana region. As one traveler who passed through Cilicia during the 1870s noted, “it is supposed that robbery was not the real reason for the murder—but Mr. Coffing was a most zealous missionary—too zealous for his own safety! and had made many enemies at Adana, who had determined to be rid of him.”\textsuperscript{32}

This reason for his assassination remained obscure in part because Jackson Coffing himself had long remained silent about the details of his experiences preceding the event, specifically the hostile and humiliating treatment he and Josephine had received when they set out to “thrust the

\textsuperscript{31} While this work mentions the political issues that Coffing encountered in the mountains, his murder, which according to this work was carried out by two Sırkıntı “Turks,” is not explicitly linked to any particular motive. Poghosean, \textit{Hachêni ēndhanur patmut‘ıvenê}, 382.

\textsuperscript{32} Davis, \textit{Life in Asiatic Turkey}, 10-11.
sickle” in the town of Hadjin in July of 1861. However, as his wife explained in a letter to her mission friends back home that October, the Coffings and their companions had been forcibly removed from Hadjin through an embarrassing and drawn-out spectacle.

At the outset, the Coffings had not been overly anxious about possible tensions in Hadjin. The general interest in their mission work and the permission of Kozanoğlu had somewhat assuaged their fears that they would not be welcome there. Thus, their subsequent departure from Aintab was a tear-filled goodbye colored not so much with a sense of impending doom but rather one of moving on. One of the members of the congregation prepared a farewell song, which the children performed for the Coffings before they left. “Our teacher is going / Let us weep / ‘Tis the Lord’s Doing / What can we say?” they sang as they offered a lament of separation, concluding (we assume without intention of foreshadowing) with the line “We will meet again in heaven / let us rejoice!” As they began their trip towards Marash, a group of over one hundred people accompanied them for the first day of their journey.33

On July 13, they arrived in Hadjin. The welcome they encountered was far more tepid than they had anticipated. They learned that a group of men from the nearby Armenian town of Zeytun had intended to cut them off on the road from Marash but had arrived too late. The çorbacıs who had opposed them before were now determined to prevent the Coffings from establishing a foothold in the mountain. The Bishop of Hadjin visited the town’s churches that day and warned the congregations that if anyone sold food or materials to or allowed their children to mingle with the missionaries, they would face a harsh penalty. When two men spoke against this order, they were promptly imprisoned and fined.34 Kozanoğlu had also sided with the Armenian notables, giving their threats the legitimate backing of an official figure. The Coffings

33 ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Clark, Hadjin (17 August 1861).
34 ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Clark, Hadjin (17 August 1861).
and their party were at this point camped in tents among a garden of mulberry trees just outside of town, where they were visited by the five head notables of Hadjin. They told the missionaries to leave immediately saying they had “no right to come into their town and make divisions among them.” They threatened to gather a drunken mob to pull down any structure that the missionaries aimed to build.\(^{35}\)

Nonetheless, the Coffings were able to purchase a plot of land from a brother of the governor, where they began to build their mission. When the çorbacıs drove away the workers that had been hired to dig, the Coffings wrote to the Marash mission to send builders. Almost two months after the missionaries arrived in Hadjin, construction finally began on September 9 in most unceremonious fashion. The notables had assembled a small mob to stage a protest, which they commanded from the rooftops of nearby houses. Yet, when work continued, they went to visit Kozanoğlu at his summer home some eight miles away to obtain expressed permission to expel the missionaries.\(^{36}\)

On September 11, a gathering of what Jackson Coffing described as “80-100 people, mostly relatives and dependents” of the local Armenian notables arrived at the building site with a group of muleteers to send the missionaries packing. Coffing immediately sent a messenger to Kozanoğlu, who declined to respond in writing but relayed the message that “the man in the hat (şapkali),” i.e. Jackson Coffing, must go.\(^{37}\) The mob commenced to attack the workers and chase them away, tearing down the structures that they had built. They also began to load the Coffings’ things onto mules in preparation for their departure. When Josephine’s sewing machine confounded them, they demanded that her Armenian companion from Aintab Avedis

---

\(^{35}\) ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Home Friends, Adana (22 October 1861).

\(^{36}\) ABC 641/236, Coffing to Anderson, Adana (13 March 1862).

\(^{37}\) Brimmed hats were immediate markers of foreignness in rural regions of Anatolia. Josephine Coffing also mentions the distinct references to Jackson as “the man in the hat.” More below.
disassemble it to be loaded onto the mules. Josephine writes, “He said he did not know how any more than they did, which was true, but they did not believe him and the club began to fall upon him. I sprang forward in front of Avedis, exclaiming that they should not strike him, that I had promised his father I would be a mother to him, and that if they must strike they should strike me.”

38 The sewing machine incident was a clear sign that while the çorbacıs were openly hostile to the missionaries and claimed to command a wild drunken mob, their movements were measured so as not to violate the missionaries personally and thereby warrant state intervention. This became especially clear when they began to beat Avedis with clubs. Jackson intervened and was accidentally struck. The moment his hat hit the ground, the attackers suddenly relented, fearful of harming Jackson Coffing or his wife. Coffing mocked them. He pointed at the club that struck him and said “Behold, the head-man’s (i.e. the çorbacı’s) Bible!”, and he began to sing.

As dusk approached, the mob gradually became more unruly and attracted a large crowd of confused onlookers. Children wailed as they absorbed the horrible scene. One of the çorbacıs headed towards a shanty on the missionaries’ lot, where Josephine had sought refuge from the barrage of insults that rained down upon them. He tore down the boards of the shanty, nearly injuring Josephine with the falling rubble, and when she crawled out, he kicked her hard in the side, leaving a bruise that would last “for several weeks.”

39 He had crossed the fine line that had hitherto been maintained. Josephine wrote, “In kicking me they had gone beyond the Governor’s instructions and the men were now so frightened that they tried to find a horse, and in a few minutes brought a young and beautiful horse and put my saddle on it. Mr. C. was afraid to have me mount it, but I feared the horse less than the men.”

40 The çorbacıs instructed the Coffings to go to Marash, but knowing this would take them near the village of Zeytun where they might

---

38 ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Home Friends, Adana (22 October 1861).
39 ABC 641/236, Coffing to Anderson, Adana (13 March 1862).
40 ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Home Friends, Adana (22 October 1861).
incur the wrath of a similar mob, they refused and headed towards the safer and easier road back to Adana.41

*Figure 13 Hadjin circa 1914 (Source: Father Krikoris Balakian, Armenian Golgotha, Vol. 1, 1922 via houshamadyan.org)*

This would not, however, be the end of their ordeal. As night fell, they stopped along the road to sleep. They were awoken by men from Hadjin imploring them to return to town and promising them that all the inhabitants, even those who had been in the mob, save the çorbacıs of course, had sided with the missionaries. While there may have been some truth to this, the Coffings correctly interpreted these men’s entreaties as intended to prevent them from reaching Adana where they might seek recourse from the Ottoman government. They continued on their journey during the day, when they were suddenly accosted by a small group of armed men on

---

41 ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Home Friends, Adana (22 October 1861).
foot. As Josephine related, Avedis, who had accompanied the Coffings on foot, told them to run. “We gave our horses the reins and the whip, and the men stood as if nailed to the ground for they had never seen a woman ride faster than a walk before.” After riding for about an hour they stopped to see if Avedis would be able to catch up. But instead, they were immediately met by the two men that had accosted them earlier, who were now intent on bringing the missionaries back by force. During this scuffle, Josephine whipped their hands as they attempted to take control of the bridle of their horses. Yet after some brief escapes and pursuits, the men succeeded in leading the Coffings back to Hadjin.

In the town, they found a crowd waiting for them. Their companion Avedis had been beaten badly. Some of their belongings, which had been packed up and placed on a bridge, had been knocked into a muddy creek. They were kept waiting in Hadjin for several days, sweating in a tent where they were visited by sympathizers. Coffing likened his agony there to that of Jesus Christ in Gethsemane. Finally, Kozanoğlu presented them with some papers to sign, which were intended as statements of voluntary departure from Hadjin and a promise to not seek retribution from the Ottoman government. Coffing felt a devilish satisfaction for an instant as he signed his name with the word “forced” written in English just before it.\(^{42}\) With this, the missionaries parted ways with Hadjin. According to Jackson, many townspeople gathered along the road to watch the spectacle and cursed the Hadjin notables as the Coffings passed by. During a hard and stressful journey past Sis and into the hot Adana plain, Jackson contracted what his wife called “ague,” fevers and trembling typically associated with the malaria that the Coffings had hoped to avoid by establishing a mission in Hadjin. He was sick for weeks as the couple remained in Adana into the winter.\(^{43}\)

\(^{42}\) NARA, RG84, Diplomatic Posts (Turkey) 231, Beirut Vol. 6, Johnson to Morris, Adana (16 August 1862).  
\(^{43}\) ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Home Friends, Adana (22 October 1861).
The altogether similar accounts of Jackson and Josephine Coffing portray a situation within which their efforts to bring the Protestant Gospel to a generally receptive population were undermined by the reactionary antipathy of the religious elite in Hadjin supported by a local governor concerned only with maintaining his position. While we might rightly be skeptical of the biases of missionary accounts known to sometimes contain hyperbole of biblical proportions, the description does seem accurate. After all, subsequent interrogations by Ottoman officials in a case regarding the damaged property of the Coffings reveal that while the aforementioned çorbacı refused to acknowledge any violence, the events had unfolded very much as the Coffings had described.44 Moreover, once Ottoman administration was more firmly established and local autonomy curtailed in Hadjin over the coming decades, missionaries were able to return to the town and work in peace.

What is also clear is that while the Hadjin incident faded in subsequent months in Adana, resistance to Protestant missionary activities in the Çukurova region did not. In addition to instances of hostility to converts in Tarsus, Coffing was assaulted by a group of Armenian men outside the door of the mission church in Adana. Even the governor of Adana had grown tired of the trouble caused by the ABCFM missionaries, menacingly reminding Coffing of what had happened to the Italian man burned in Marash some years earlier.45 Meanwhile, another incident involving hostility towards American missionaries by Armenian notables occurred in the mountain town of Ekbez (today Akbez) in Gavurdağı. It was amidst these lingering issues that Coffing finally took action through diplomatic channels, writing to the US Resident Minister in Istanbul Edward Joy Morris and the US Consul in Beirut J. Augustus Johnson, who was eager to offer his support. News of the incident soon spread to other officials and diplomats in the region

44 BOA, I-HR 218/12627, no. 5–6 (11 Ramazan 1282 [28 January 1866]).
45 ABC 641/236, Coffing to Anderson, Adana (13 March 1862).
such as British Consul of Aleppo J.H. Skene.\textsuperscript{46} In the letter where Jackson Coffing finally offered his account of what had taken place in Hadjin to the ABCFM administration in the US dated March 16, 1862, he mentioned these developments but assured the authorities that “abandoning the place [was] not to be thought of.” Envisioning himself as a martyr, much as he did on that hot day in Hadjin some months before, Coffing wrote, “St. Paul and Barnabus after being expelled from Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra — with severe treatment in the last named place — returned to them all again after not a very long time.” Noting that Josephine had gone to Aleppo due to her lingering health issues, Coffing closed the letter saying “in my next, I trust I may give you something more cheering.”\textsuperscript{47} Yet, this would be his final dispatch to the ABCFM leadership.

**Gunboat Diplomats**

After months of being out of touch, Josephine Coffing wrote a letter to her home friends saying, “You have no doubt ere this learned from the papers that I am a widow.” Her husband had died miserably of blood loss in the stuffy port of Iskenderun, she being far away in the city of Aleppo for her own health reasons. “You both know what a void is left in my heart and something of that longing to again clasp the dear one in my arms and again to look into those loving eyes,” she told her friends as she mourned their last days together. “Four days, Friday, Saturday, Sabbath, and Monday, my dear husband spent with me in Aleppo. Could I have known that these four days were the last that we were to spend together on earth, think you that most of them would have been spent in the society of friends?” They had rarely seen each other in the past weeks, but had exchanged their affections regularly via post. “With my good night I would send you a kiss, but kisses on paper are dry affairs,” Jackson said to close the last letter she

\textsuperscript{46} BNA, FO 78/1688, Skene to Bulwar (14 March 1862).
\textsuperscript{47} ABC 641/236, Coffing to Anderson, Adana (13 March 1862).
would receive from him. For Josephine and her now deceased husband, a tumultuous and ultimately tragic chapter was closing. “I know I shall see him again. I know that my Father would not have mixed so bitter a cup for me had there not been a ‘need be’ for it,” she wrote in determination.48 Perhaps the destiny she hinted at was eventually fulfilled when Josephine Coffing became one of the first members of an ABCFM women’s mission in Hadjin some decades later, where she remained in the words of one contemporary “usefully employed among her own sex” into the last decades of Ottoman rule there, returning to the US in 1905 after almost 50 years of service.49 However, the implications of her husband’s death would soon stretch beyond the bounds of their relationship to shake the entire Cilicia region.

The killing of this American missionary had occurred conspicuously close to his decision to name names and seek redress for his material losses and personal injury through diplomatic channels. His sudden death, which made Coffing the first martyr of an American Protestant mission that had largely operated in peace within the Ottoman domains over the prior decades, sent a shockwave through the ABCFM ranks and the sparse American diplomatic corps in the Ottoman Empire.50 The American ambassador and Consul in Beirut, representatives of a US Department of State that was by all measures smaller than the ABCFM itself, were faced with a major diplomatic crisis in the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, in an Adana region suddenly profiting from the cotton boom initiated by the US Civil War, the Ottoman state’s hegemony and ability to maintain order had been brought into question. Within this context, an investigation of Coffing’s murder and a relentless pursuit of the perpetrators unfolded.

48 ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Clark and Hills, Antioch (17 June 1862).
50 Not long after Coffing’s murder, a second American missionary named Meriem was killed in the Balkans. The records of the American Legation in Constantinople pertaining to this similar incident also contain some documentation regarding the Coffing investigation. NARA, RG84, Diplomatic Posts (Turkey) 312, Misc. Cases Vol. 3 M-O, “Murder and Robbery of W.W. Meriem.”
While it is impossible to reconstruct what happened exactly, in this section I will explore the intricacies of the case as they appear in the archival records of the American and Ottoman states. What can be said with certainty is that our inability to definitively answer the question of who killed Jackson Coffing is most basically the result of a desire at every level of administrative responsibility to have this episode resolved quickly. The local government in Adana was eager to have the incident pass without it escalating into an issue of religious freedom in the Ottoman Empire or involving military action. Meanwhile, the US Resident Minister Edward Joy Morris and Secretary of State William Seward were eager to appease the ABCFM, which the US diplomats often viewed as nagging, by finding a fast and firm resolution to this case.\(^{51}\) As this drama unfolded, Ottoman statesmen in Istanbul for their part appeared as hopeful as their representatives in Adana that the incident would not devolve into a confrontation between imperial and regional power. None of the aforementioned parties would emerge wholly satisfied with the outcome of this case.

The figure of J. Augustus Johnson — Augustus to those who knew him\(^{52}\) — the newly appointed Consul of Beirut who tirelessly followed the case and produced hundreds of pages of

\(^{51}\) The safety of American missionaries in the Ottoman Empire became one of the principal concerns of the ABCFM following this incident. The annual meeting of 1862 resulted in the following resolution: “That the Board respectfully and earnestly asks the Government of the United States to give such instructions to its representatives in Turkey, and elsewhere, — if not already given, — as will prevent all doubt and delay in interposing the national shield of protection, in the cases of emergency which are constantly liable to arise. And they would respectfully represent, that, at the present time, this is especially needful in Turkey, in consequence of the peculiar complexity in the relations of that Empire to foreign Governments, tending to alienate the different races from each other, and thus more or less to endanger and disquiet the foreign residents in all parts of the Empire.” ABCFM, "Annual Meeting of the Board." *The Missionary Herald* 58(1862): 336-42.

documentation related to its resolution, played a crucial role in pushing the Coffing case, which others were eager to forget, to an increasingly dramatic conclusion. Johnson was a new breed of devoted civil servants within the small American state department — at least that is how he presented himself in an autobiography entitled *The Life of a Citizen at Home and in Foreign Service*. It was he who had originally offered support to Coffing after gaining word of the abuses he faced in Hadjin, and it was he who would relentlessly pursue cases of major and minor offenses against American citizens in Greater Syria over the coming years. Throughout months of traveling back and forth between Beirut, Adana, and Aleppo, Johnson incurred significant costs and hardships in pursuit of a truth that was simply too stubborn to come to light. His correspondence and the pile of Ottoman documentation about these events reveal the complex network of local interests and powerbases governing the political culture of Adana on the eve of massive provincial reforms.

The notion of a formal investigation of crimes committed by any of the mountain inhabitants of Cilicia being conducted within an international diplomatic context was fairly novel. Historically speaking, there was relatively little that the Ottoman government could do in such instances. For example, Francis Beaufort, the Irish hydrographer who would go on to lend his name to the Beaufort scale of wind force during his service in the British navy, set out from Izmir on a journey to map the southern coast of Anatolia in 1811. His journey was cut short off the coast of Ayas, a small port on the southern edge of Çukurova. He and his crew were accosted there by a group of angry men, and though they quickly hurried to their ship and started to sail

---

53 Johnson’s correspondences are located in the files for the Beirut consulate at the US archives. NARA, RG84, Diplomatic Posts (Turkey) 231, Beirut Vol. 6.
54 Johnson conceived of the audience for an autobiography of a dutiful American civil servant such as himself as follows: “It has been suggested that sketches from the life of a plain man might be of interest to plain people whose sons, like the writer, had not the advantages of wealth or college training, as a fresh illustration that ours is a land of opportunity; and my children have long urged me to give them some account of my earlier years at home and abroad.” Johnson, *The Life of a Citizen at Home and in Foreign Service*. 
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away, Beaufort was shot near his groin in the process of fleeing, and another member of his crew was killed. The culprits, they later learned, were “mountaineers” known by the locals for their mischief and cruelty.\textsuperscript{55} Though the governor of Adana was notified of the incident, it is unclear that anything was done to apprehend the bandits, who were able to escape into mountain spaces where Ottoman authorities could scarcely tread.

In other words, crimes of this nature often ended without much resolution, and the investigators had little to begin with. A letter from missionary Henry Morgan to the ABCFM provides the most detailed account of the shooting itself. Morgan headed to Iskenderun immediately when news of the shooting began to spread. There, he learned that Coffing had set out from the Armenian village of Nacarlı the morning of the day that he was shot, a crucial detail for understanding the nature of the crime.\textsuperscript{56} They encountered some suspicious men crossing a stream beyond the town of Payas and were warned further down the road by two women that trouble lurked ahead.\textsuperscript{57} The attack itself was an ambush; the gunmen neither gave warning nor told the travelers to stop. Coffing, who began to lose blood rapidly from a ruptured artery in his left arm and wounds in his chest, continued as far as he could. Eventually, he and his remaining party met soldiers along the road and Coffing was tended to by the quarantine official of Iskenderun and brought to a house to rest. There, the bleeding was stopped but Coffing spent the night in agony, complaining of pain in his abdomen and barely managing to even sit up to drink tea. As his condition worsened, “They asked if he had any message for his wife, and he only answered in Turkish the name of God.” Later, he said that his pain had subsided, raised his one

\textsuperscript{55} Francis Beaufort, \textit{Karamania, or a Brief description of the South coast of Asia Minor and of the remains of antiquity... collected during a survey of that coast, under the orders of the lords commissioners of the admiralty, in the years 1811 and 1812 by Francis Beaufort} (London: R. Hunter, 1817), 304-05.
\textsuperscript{56} ABC 642/8, Morgan to Anderson, Alexandretta (31 March 1862).
\textsuperscript{57} ABC 76, Josephine Coffing – Personal Letters (Vol. 1), Coffing to Clark and Hills, Antioch (17 June 1862).
injured arm to pray in English, and then breathed his last breath at twenty minutes to 5AM on Wednesday, March 26.\textsuperscript{58}

The shooters had apparently intended to kill Coffing and not to rob him, since they fired suddenly and without warning. The murder had occurred shortly after he had sought recourse from the Ottoman government for the injustice he experienced in Hadjin. This evidence strongly suggested that the killing was in fact a retaliatory assassination. As the manhunt began, rumors spread throughout the area. The investigation quickly became an international affair involving various foreign diplomats, local and imperial Ottoman officials, and representatives of the ABCFM. Before long, authorities received word that two young men from a town in the mountains had been bragging to their friends about killing Coffing and having received a handsome bounty. Within a few weeks of the murder, the perpetrators had been identified but not yet apprehended. Meanwhile, some Armenian men from Çokmerzimen, a town near Payas with strong connections to Armenian communities in the Taurus Mountains, were brought into custody. They were alleged to have offered a 10,000 kuruş bounty for Coffing’s life.\textsuperscript{59} This conformed to initial suspicions of the members of the ABCFM. British Consul Skene reported that “a general impression now exists that it was an act of revenge on the part of some Armenians.”\textsuperscript{60}

These arrests sent the local Armenian community into an uproar. Spring of 1862 became as especially tumultuous time in the Cilicia region. The Armenian mountain town of Zeytun defied Ottoman attempts at reasserting authority in dramatic fashion, fending off a large military regiment sent to quell their rebellion. France and its King Napoleon III had suddenly emerged as

\textsuperscript{58} ABC 642/8, Morgan to Anderson, Alexandretta (31 March 1862).
\textsuperscript{59} NARA, RG 84, Diplomatic Posts (Turkey) 231, Beirut Vol. 6, Johnson to Morris, from aboard HSM Foxhound off Alexandretta (14 April 1862).
\textsuperscript{60} TNA, FO 78/1688, Skene to Bulwar (15 April 1862).
the protectors of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire and intervened successful to negotiate a political solution to this crisis.61 The French ship Mogador sent for this purpose and anchored off the Eastern Mediterranean coast. Its captain, who was sent to protect the Armenians of Cilicia, began pressuring for the release of the Armenian suspects implicated in Coffing’s assassination.62 Skene remarked with some concern about the possible consequences of this development that “to become the champion of those not unfairly supposed to be assassins and interpose between the Turkish Authorities and the Sultan’s subjects in a simple case of Detective Police is more than I thought possible in the present state of Treaty relations between Turkey and the European powers.”63

The ability of Western states to anchor their ships off the coast of Cilicia in order to exert political pressure would become a recurring theme in the history of this open littoral plain as war boats and steamships began to play a bigger role in maritime politics. They could not reach into the mountains, but British and American diplomats could make a great deal of noise on the coast. As a result, they began promoting some rather irregular strategies in the pursuit of the criminals. These irregularities are reflected not in official diplomatic correspondence but in the diary entries of J. Augustus Johnson’s wife, who it seems recorded details of their conversations regarding the case. These entries in turn made it into Johnson’s autobiography. For example, Johnson asked the British warship Foxhound, which was harbored off the coast of Payas, to conduct target practice in view of the mountain villages in order to scare the local population and officials.

61 Victor Langlois, whose study of the Cilicia region provides the most comprehensive information regarding the population of pastoralist communities in the area prior to settlement (see Chapter 1), was an outspoken advocate of the Armenian cause in Zeytun who wrote a polemical piece about impending sectarian violence directed at Armenians. Langlois’s study of Cilicia had been carried out “by order of the emperor” Napoleon III under the auspices of the Ministry of Public Education in France. Langlois, *Voyage dans la Cilicie*, iv. See also Victor Langlois, *Les Arméniens de la Turquie et les massacres du Taurus* (Paris: J. Claye, 1863).
62 NARA, RG 84, Diplomatic Posts (Turkey) 231, Beirut Vol. 6, Johnson to Morris, from aboard HSM Foxhound off Alexandretta (14 April 1862).
63 TNA, FO 78/1688, Skene to Bulwar (18 April 1862).
According to Mrs. Johnson, “the officials and people of the province of Adana had been stirred up like soup, and never had there been such a gathering of soldiers and ships because one man had been killed, and he merely a Christian.”

Nonetheless, the authorities were having difficulty apprehending the Muslim suspects, although they had been surprisingly easy to identify. This trouble arose from the lack of state influence in Gavurdağı. The crime had occurred in the district of Payas, which was under the government of Küçük Alioğlu Mıstık Paşa (see Chapter 1). Despite the infamy of his family, Mıstık had lately emerged as the lesser of many evils among the local notables of the region, having played a helpful role in a peaceful resolution to the protests in Marash some years earlier. During a meeting on a British warship, Mıstık told the diplomatic officials he met with that he thought he knew who the culprits were and had all of their near relatives detained. We learn again from Mrs. Johnson about the specifics: “until the criminals are brought in, their relatives are kept prisoners, eleven men sitting on the ground in a row with their feet protruding through holes in a split log which is padlocked at both ends. This seems to me needlessly cruel, but I am assured that it is the only method of securing the surrender of the outlaws by their own people… without a pitched battle and a great loss of life.”

The diplomats in question were making every effort to illustrate to the local population that Coffing’s was no ordinary murder and that killing an American would be treated no less severely than if he were French or English. Mıstık Pasha along with the British Vice Consul and a few Ottoman officials were charged with the task of extracting the assassins from their

64 Johnson, The Life of a Citizen at Home and in Foreign Service, 136.
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68 Ibid., 136.
hiding place, which was under the control of an uncooperative rival notable named Ali Bekiroğlu Ali Ağâ. Yet, after nearly a month without results, Johnson began to indicate that Mıstık and Ali Bekiroğlu were “trifling” with the Ottoman investigators, suggesting that the matter would not be resolved without a show of force. In the end, two battalions of the Arabistan army under the leadership of Ahmed Pasha, the Adana governor who had served as a commander in the Crimean War, were sent to accompany Mıstık Pasha in his visit to the mountain in order to apprehend the criminals, who were taken into custody.

Who Killed the Man in the Hat?

The alleged culprits were two young men named Ahmed and Halil. They were arrested and brought to Adana. However, the complications of administering justice immediately became clear when Halil was able to escape into the mountains, breaking his shackles while he, Ahmed, and his guard had stopped for ablutions by a stream. In the meantime, however, the authorities were able to interrogate Ahmed, a man approximately twenty-four years of age hailing from the village of Bülke. During his interrogation, Ahmed offered a detailed narrative of the events. According to Morgan, the American missionary who interrogated him, “In personal appearance he corresponds precisely with the description we have always received. He is not much over twenty years of age, short, full-faced, and speaks with a gentle, persuasive tone. There is nothing timid, sullen, nor hardened in his appearance.” Ahmed represented himself as a poor mountain boy drawn into a bewildering conspiracy by men who had seduced him with money and misled him into being the accomplice to the murder of a missionary. According to his account, he and
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his friends were bringing timber from the mountain to sell in the village of Çokmerzimen near the coast when he was accosted by three Armenians and propositioned to participate in a robbery that soon was revealed to be an assassination of some men who were spending the night in the nearby village of Nacarlı. Ahmed was a member of the notorious Ulaşlı community that owned the mountain landscape of Gavurdağ. The men had allegedly played upon his mountain pride as an Ulaşlı, shaming him for being afraid to undertake such a venture. They promised him a large sum of money and two shiny pistols each for himself and his friend Halil.

The authorities doubted Ahmed’s account, particularly his description of the murder, which occurred at a place called Sarıseki just past the town of Payas. According to Ahmed, the Armenians had shot Coffing and he and Halil had only been involved in hitting the other victims. He justified this using the argument that witnesses reported six gunshots and that, armed with only a rifle as he was, he could not have acted alone with Halil. There were simply too many bullets in the air for them to have acted alone. This account clashed with some of his previous statements, and the interrogator repeatedly accused him of lying, demanding that he set the story straight. To this he replied, “Since it was a matter of life and death and I was afraid, I hemmed and hawed (geveledim) a little at first, but now I got it straight.
These are the facts.” The interrogation document was certified by several tribal notables from local tribal communities such as the Cerids, Tecirlis, and others, including the notorious Ali Bekiroğlu Ali Agha.

This account conformed to suspicions that the event was an assassination somehow linked to what had occurred in Hadjin the prior year but seemed at odds with the expectations of officials on the ground. The Armenians Ahmed had implicated in the crime denied even knowing him and claimed that Mstik Pasha or someone else had instructed Ahmed to provide such a narrative in order to use the incident to take revenge on them in some way. Their testimonies, copies in Ottoman Turkish of which are preserved in the US archives, did not reveal a single iota of involvement with the crime, as they denied knowing the individuals involved. Ahmed, far from being the innocent lumberjack he claimed to be, had a reputation in the area for banditry. His account also contained inaccuracies, most notably that he claimed that the Armenians had shot Coffing from the right but his wounds indicated that fire came from the left. Coupled with previous alleged admissions of guilt, there was little reason to suspect that anyone but Ahmed and Halil had fired shots on Coffing.

Yet, there are many subtle indicators that Ahmed’s testimony was based on some version of reality linking the killing to the events in Hadjin the previous summer. The general geography and logistics of the killing conformed to other available evidence. He mentioned encountering Coffing’s party at a stream just before the killing, a fact confirmed by witnesses from Coffing’s party. Ahmed’s mention of the village of Nacarlı where Coffing had indeed spent the night strongly suggested premeditation as this indicated a genuine awareness of where Coffing had
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been. Involvement of some people from Çokmerzimen in the murder is further suggested by the fact that in the Armenian village history of Hadjin written many decades after the events and filled with small inaccuracies, the crime was erroneously identified as having taken place in Çokmerzimen even though it could have been more properly placed at Iskenderun or Payas.  

Yet the most compelling piece of evidence available, a clue not mentioned by any of the officials involved at the time, lies in the language Ahmed used to identify Coffing. Ahmed alleged that his would-be Armenian accomplices first proposed the crime and described Coffing and his party, saying “There are a few Ottoman-looking (Osmanlı gibi) strangers coming from Adana and among them is a man in a hat (şapkalı).” In other words, Ahmed claimed that he was not waiting for a foreigner or missionary per se but rather “a man in a hat,” the same hat that had so symbolically frozen Coffing’s aggressors in Hadjin during the heated moment when it had been accidentally knocked from his head. Of course, a brimmed hat would have been uncommon enough in Ottoman Anatolia at the time to be used as a reliable identifier. What is fascinating in this detail is that the term “man in the hat” or “şapkalı”, which Coffing noted as the way he was referred to in Hadjin and by Kozanoğlu in particular, is a phrasing that seems unconsciously mimicked from another genuine source irrespective of the relative veracity of Ahmed’s testimony.

Someone had told Ahmed to kill a man in a hat. Whether Muslim or Christian messengers from Hadjin or even Kozanoğlu himself had relayed the assassination orders, the clues are sufficient to link the assassination to Coffing’s expulsion from Hadjin and the region.
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governed by the Kozanoğlus and more specifically, his attempt to have offending parties punished. This is relevant because following Ahmed’s interrogation and its refutation by the Armenians he had implicated, the investigation changed course dramatically so that neither Armenian involvement nor any link to Kozanoğlu was pursued. This turn was in part the result of Ahmed’s second interrogation weeks later, in which he confessed to having lied about the role of Armenian accomplices in the shooting of Coffing, saying that it was Halil who had done it. When asked why he lied, he said that he was scared of those who were threatening him and that they had instructed him to pin the crime on the Armenians in order to be released. This new testimony did not shed much light onto who might have called for the assassination, as Ahmed cited his only motivation as money. However, it caused a dramatic but somewhat inexplicable shift in focus towards capturing Halil. Johnson, the US Resident Minister Morris, and the ABCFM were pushing for results as well as the punishment of Ahmed, who, subsequent accusations of Halil aside, had now satisfactorily confessed his involvement in the crime.

It is not totally possible to sort out the details based on the interrogations of Ahmed or the other individuals involved in this case, because all of them appear to be false. However, it is worth noting that even in a high stakes murder case, Ahmed, the alleged culprit would not normally have much to fear. Such cases were often settled with the payment of blood money by the culprit in the Ottoman context, and Johnson indicated that this was the outcome very much expected by Ahmed who appeared “only a little ashamed” at what he had done.82 However, the case had symbolic meaning that would only later become apparent to the local individuals involved. As a French diplomat noted in a letter to Johnson, the Coffing case was a matter of concern for “all civilized nations (toutes les nations civilisée).”83 Johnson and his European
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counterparts had been pushing for a capital sentence from the very beginning, and after a hasty trial, they succeeded in securing execution orders for Ahmed.

Yet just as Johnson’s efforts to have some form of justice served were beginning to bring results, tensions between competing political forces on the local levels began to undermine the investigation. The first blow came when Ahmed Pasha, the governor who had eagerly apprehended the assassins, was removed from his post and replaced by his rival Hurşid Pasha. This transfer came immediately on the heels of a showy return to Adana during which Ahmed Pasha led a procession of soldiers right through the town in accompaniment of his prisoner Ahmed. Whether his removal was in response to this conspicuous imperial display or the machination of local forces had conspired to have him replaced, his successor would prove to be less proactive; Johnson reported later that Hurşid Pasha had retired to Marash for the summer, spending his time lounging in cafes in the company of his wife and concubines. Meanwhile, Johnson wrote repeated letters to the Ottoman foreign ministry and Ambassador Edward Joy Morris complaining about Minan (or Abdülminan) Bey, a member of the Adana council (meclis), who he claimed was deliberately disrupting the investigation and had sought to prevent the arrest of the alleged perpetrators. Hurşid Pasha and Minan were allegedly friends. Johnson’s letters reveal a general distrust of all local political figures involved; he even suggested in one letter that Ahmed’s testimonies were perhaps inauthentic. In addition to being threatened by the Muslim notables of the mountain, Armenian men had also been possibly “tampering” with him during his time in the notoriously porous Adana jail. 84 By contrast, he placed great trust in Kabuli Pasha, the governor of Syria, and Faik Bey, a commissioner sent from Istanbul specifically for the purposes of resolving the case. These officials would become the leading proponents of dramatic political change in the Cilicia region as a crisis of legitimacy emerged.

84 BOA, İ-MVL 472/21365, no. 1, J.A. Johnson to E.J. Morris, Adana (16 June 1862).
Johnson and the Ottoman officials involved in the case began to doubt whether Mıstık Pasha would ever deliver Halil into the hands of Ottoman authorities, though he was seen as the key to the case. According to Ahmed’s testimony, Halil had managed to escape in part because “he was the son of the uncle of Andırınlıoğlu Ahmed the husband of [Mıstık’s] wife’s sister.”

This relation was not so close as to indicate direct involvement by Mıstık Pasha per se, but it would certainly discourage the official from exerting an honest effort in the pursuit of Halil. Mıstık had for better or worse been the crux of the investigation from the very beginning. With his unique ability to assert authority over the communities of Gavurdağ, only he could bring the assassins to justice. Yet he exhibited wavering interest in doing so. Mıstık was only willing to deliver the fugitive Halil on his own terms, and he used every moment of decisive action from the government as an opportunity to pursue his own political interests and vendettas among his fearful friends and eternal enemies in the mountains. From early on in the case, it was understood that Mıstık could be an obstacle, however, all involved were wary to cross him lest Syria erupt into what Johnson continually refers to as “civil war.” As it became increasingly clear that Halil would not be captured so long as direct Ottoman control could not be asserted over the mountain without the involvement of Mıstık Pasha, Johnson began to urge his Ottoman counterparts to act saying, “however the authorities of Payas might trifle with His Excellency, they could not be permitted to trifle with the Government of the United States.”

Geography was still another factor working against the pursuit of Halil and wearing the patience of Ottoman and foreign officials. Not only did the mountains offer refuge to those who
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wished to escape the clutches of the Ottoman state, but the plains also produced a miserable and malarial environment of operation. “Fevers lurk in every marsh and stagnant pool for hundreds of miles along the coast and on the plains which skirt the Taurus range and the Giaour Dagh (Gavurdaği),” wrote an exacerbated Consul Johnson in August of 1862 from Iskenderun with his wife and child very ill back in Beirut. All of Johnson’s personnel as well as Faik Bey had become stricken with malaria. “But I would willingly have the fever hard (his emphasis),” he wrote, “if I could catch Kaleel, see the two assassins executed and then return to my family.”

Within a few weeks, Johnson had the fever and the execution order he hoped for, but no Halil. He wrote a hurried dispatch to Morris saying, “fever, fatigue and loss of sleep for a week do not enable one to wield a satisfactory pen.”

Johnson remained too ill to attend the eagerly awaited execution of Ahmed that he had so ardently insisted upon; he sent in his place a local man from Tarsus named Abdullah Debbas who served as the American Vice Consul of the region. Afterwards, American missionary publications reported that justice had been served as Ahmed, the man who had murdered one of their own, had been tried and hanged in Adana. Both American and Ottoman archival sources indicate that indeed Ahmed was executed in the fall of 1862, a sentence not always carried out in the Ottoman justice system, but the manner of his execution was not nearly as neat as reported. Debbas’s account portended an inauspicious and messy ending to the story of Jackson Coffing:

The Firman was presented and publicly read after which the sound of trumpet was heard, and the prisoner appeared in chains followed by one hundred regular troops. H.E. Khoorshid Pasha and his suite, the European Consular agents and merchants and myself followed in great and solemn procession to the bridge. H.E. the Pasha stopped at the police station just opposite the bridge, whereas all the rest including myself proceeded across the bridge to the other side of the river, the place of the execution.
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After the criminal had been surrounded by the armed soldiers, the chains were taken from his neck and feet, a jug of water was given him to drink and he was allowed to perform his ablutions and prayers which lasted for about half an hour.

Afterwards they made him kneel in the center having bound his eyes with a white handkerchief and in the presence of a great multitude of people, about 5000 spectators, at 30 minutes to 12 o'clock, was struck from behind by a bad hand and a bad knife which did only cut the skin of his neck. The criminal having received the first sword blow loudly exclaimed ‘La ilah ill’ Allah’ (there is no God but God) and fell on the ground on his face. But the executioners got over his shoulders and placed another man over his feet and with his clumsy knife in seven minutes was able in the most barbarous and most horrible way to carve his head off his body.

All the numerous spectators, mostly Christians, trembled at the sight thereof, although great tranquility and calmness seized throughout the country and I did not hear a single word uttered by any man against the execution, but I heard most of the people curse the executioner for his horrid manner of cutting off the head, and many people saying “Padishah sag olsoun,” i.e. May the Sultan live!

The murderer’s head was then placed by his side near his arm and the people were dispersed.  

Pulling Back the Veil

“The greatest suffering at the death of a friend does not occur immediately upon the event. It comes when the world have forgotten that you have cause to weep,” wrote Josephine Coffing in September of 1864 from the ABCFM mountain summer home at Kessab in Northern Syria. More than two years after the death of her husband Jackson, the second killer identified in the murder had yet to be captured, and although the authorities still pursued the case, they had in many ways forgotten Coffing’s cause to weep. Following Ahmed’s execution on the banks of the Seyhan River, the sole direction of the case had become apprehending his accomplice Halil. There was no further consideration of motivation for the assassination or who had ordered the hit. Halil had escaped to territory where his recapture was complicated by the defiance of local notables, and the full efforts of Ottoman officials became less concentrated on solving the mystery and more on asserting state hegemony in Gavurdaği and its recalcitrant local notables. These were Ali Bekiroğlu Ali Ağa and Küçük Alioğlu Mistık Pasha, the former being outwardly
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hostile to the Ottoman administration and the latter being the defiant hereditary governor of Payas.

Fears that the use of military force or the removal of Mıstık to reapprehend Halil would result in the eruption of violence in the region had guided Ottoman policy to work with rather than against Mıstık, who was sometimes cooperative but never successful in delivering Halil. Johnson was hopeful that his fear of the US navy and the decisiveness it had shown in activities against pirates in North Africa some decades prior would persuade him to cooperate. In August 1862, Kabuli Effendi warned Mıstık that he had two months to arrest Halil before further measures would be taken.95 When Mıstık was then temporarily removed from his posts and his sons were also removed from their positions as müdürs of Çay and Kurtkulağı, Mıstık pledged to capture Halil but only after their positions had been restored.96

Mıstık’s household was allowed to maintain its presence in the region during the coming months as tensions continued. Enraged by the execution of his son, Ahmed’s father had reportedly “shaved his head and given himself up to robbery and murder and vows that he will take the lives of those who have brought about the execution of his son.” The situation was also shaky for American missionaries that continued to push into new communities of the Cilicia region. In one instance, Mıstık unsuccessfully attempted to support missionaries who were driven out of Çokmerzimen by Armenians there who feared the trouble that missionary presence would bring.97 Although he was the most powerful player in local politics, Mıstık struggled to see his will enforced. In July of 1863, he wrote a letter to the Ottoman government reporting that he had sent a group of some 150 horsemen into the mountain to find Halil, where they clashed
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with a group of mountaineers resulting in casualties on both sides. He later made additional offers to use military force under his command to retrieve Halil. Yet, even in this proposition, there were doubts that Mistik actually had any intention of catching the assassin.

Consul Johnson and Kabuli Effendi began to advocate the complete removal of Mistik and his family from the region for about a year from fall 1862 onward. Of course, doing so would be delicate. As Kabuli noted in his conversations with the Grand Vizier Keçecizade Fuat Pasha, a figure known for his use of military force in stamping out unrest in Mount Lebanon a few years prior, Mistik could not be removed until reforms were put in place to surround the entire area with loyal governors and a military presence. Later, in debates surrounding the position of Mistik Pasha, Fuat Pasha would maintain this position; according to Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, an historian and statesman who will soon enter this story, Fuat Pasha told Kabuli Efendi that “Now is not the time to make an issue out of Payas.” The Ottoman statesman was unwilling to make a larger conflict out of the assassination of a single missionary by a mountain bandit.

Despite these worries, Kabuli Pasha arranged for Mistik’s removal, confident that a strong showing of force could subdue the region. In November of 1863, Hurşid Pasha, the governor of Adana, visited Mistik in Payas ostensibly to offer aid in curtailing brigandage. A small banquet was prepared. As they dined, hundreds of troops gathered around the area and subsequently descended on Mistik and his men. Johnson reported that “the prisoners were sent to Alexandretta tied in disgraceful manner on miserable donkeys” and from there were sent to
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Istanbul, thus bringing an end to the long reign of Mistik and his kin in the Payas region. In pursuit of Halil, Ottoman officials had adopted a measure that would now require them to establish a new order in Gavurdağ.

The consequences of Mistik’s arrest were far-reaching and made manifest every prior fear about social upheaval and civil war. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha referred to Mistik as a “veil of illusion (hayâl perdesi),” a thin veneer of order that once pulled back, revealed the chaos and unrest that lay in wait. Mistik’s son Dede had escaped, and the second most important political player in Gavurdağ, Ali Bekiroğlu Ali Ağa, took to the roads around Payas with his allies and immediately set about harassing and robbing travelers that had previously passed in relative peace. Instructions from Fuad Pasha to arrest Halil by all means necessary in January of 1864 promised further military escalation. Despite the use of diplomatic and subsequent military means to capture Dede, brigandage continued in the absence of a strong local or central authority capable of controlling the mountain. Whereas a local governor had once served as a barrier to capturing the assassin, it became increasingly clear that only the installation of a new government would achieve this goal.

As for Halil, who had been rumored to be wandering around various parts of the Arab provinces from Baghdad to Kilis to Syria, he would eventually be captured some years later. He had in fact remained in the area, living on the margins of society, protected by the local community and possibly the person of Ali Bekiroğlu Ali Ağa. He was safe enough that he visited
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his wife regularly throughout his period as a fugitive.\textsuperscript{106} His capture would only come on the heels of a momentous war over Cilicia’s geography. An incident that began with the murder of a meddling missionary, had brought the Ottoman administration to the limits of its political efficacy in the highlands of Cilicia dominated by complex tribal networks. Though it did not initially involve these tribes per se, political developments of the case built towards a larger conflict. During the Coffing investigation, the Ottoman authorities had already found it necessary to delay the movement of pastoralist communities towards their summer pastures in order to maintain order.\textsuperscript{107} With the supposed culprits having come from the Ulaşlıs of Gavurdağ, the notables of which impeded the investigation and now harbored bandits in the mountains, the Ottoman government was as it had in the past facing a potential confrontation with the whole of tribal society in Cilicia.

In 1865, the Ottoman Interior Ministry began preparation for a military campaign to subdue the entire Cilicia region and its tribal communities by removing the local notables from their political positions of power and resettling nomadic communities around areas of winter pasture in Çukurova where they could be controlled. This military campaign, which was called the \textit{Fırka-t Islâhiye} or Reform Division, would achieve goals long pursued by Ottoman administration such as securing the orderly taxation and conscription of local communities, preserving security, and encouraging the cultivation of new soil. It was equally a battle against the old political order and an attempt to drive a wedge between local communities and the derebeys that had long reigned supreme. It was also most fundamentally a battle for the mountains and in that regard for the control of movements of the communities that were their seasonal inhabitants.

\textsuperscript{106} BOA, İ-MVL 472/21365 no. 4 (20 Cemazeyilevel 1284 [19 September 1867]); no. 17 (29 Temmuz 1284 [10 August 1868]).
\textsuperscript{107} BOA, A-MKT-UM 567/9, Ahmed to Sadaret, Marash (21 Zilkade 1278 [20 May 1862]).
These imperatives were embodied by an emerging notion of Ottoman civilization and one of its leading proponents, Ahmed Cevdet Pasha. Educated in the traditional disciplines of Islamic learning and heavily influenced by the ideas of the times regarding civilization, progress, and statecraft, he had written the definitive work of history on the Ottoman Empire in the decades leading up to the Tanzimat during his time as state chronicler that detailed the long struggle of the Ottoman state with its derebey clients. With a fresh appointment as Vali of Aleppo in 1864, Ahmed Cevdet Pasha now presided over a large province that had subsumed the Adana region and was strengthened by the recent provincial reforms. With this appointment, Ahmed Cevdet would pass the threshold from writing history to making history through his activities overseeing the settlement of tens of thousands of pastoralists, a process that however incomplete it would remain, would fundamentally alter the sociopolitical structure of Cilicia and its ecology.

The story of the Coffings and their ill-fated mission into the mountains was the forgotten catalyst of these events. Whether or not it was significant in and of itself is a matter of perspective. What it does reveal, however, is the extent to which the geography of Cilicia that fostered the various forms of transhumance had a pervasive impact on what occurred in that region. It is more common for environmental historiography to treat such factors on a larger time scale, exploring the ways in which almost imperceptible changes in climate and geography shape the course of human history and the shape of human society. In this chapter, I have offered a different view, exploring the mundane yet profound ways in which geography impacted the daily decisions of historical actors. In the process, I have also attempted to illustrate the complex relations governing politics in the Cilicia region and the ways in which geography differentiated the political terrain. The details of these relations emphasize the layers of action and intention.

behind historical events that rarely find their way into the archive. In this regard, the Coffing case is important for understanding the nature of political and social relations on the eve of immense reforms both in terms of imagining how they were but also how they became and they would become.
CHAPTER 3
THE BOOK AND THE SWORD: AHMED CEVDET AND THE CIVILIZING MISSION

The Sultan has sent to you a book and a sword. Those who obey the book have no business with the sword, and otherwise, the sword is ready.1

Warning circulated by the Reform Division

They say the state made a decree about us
The decree is the Sultan’s, but the mountains are ours.

A line from the poetry of local bard Dadaloğlu

During the summer of 1865, Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, scholar, statesman, and newly-appointed Governor of Aleppo, was miles away from his family in Istanbul.3 “Currently we are with the imperial army encamped on the high hills near Iskenderun, and thanks be to God, all of us are in good health. I have no troubles other than being apart from you,” he wrote in a letter to his wife Adviye Rabiye soon after his arrival in Cilicia.4 He would spend the better part of that summer with an army encampment, traveling “from mountain to mountain”5 in the Gavurdağı region known for banditry and deep-seated hostility towards Ottoman authority. His task was to convince or force the tribal communities of the region to settle and register their populations with

1 Cevdet, Tezâkir, 168.
2 Öztelli, Köroğlu ve Dadaloğlu, 81.
3 Cevdet was appointed as Vali of Aleppo to implementing new reform following the Provincial Law of 1864. It appears that Aleppo was enlarged to include Adana, Marash, and Urfa specifically for the purposes of settling the tribes in those areas. BOA, I-DH 545/37906 (24 Şaban 1282 [12 January 1866]). Miscellaneous correspondence of Cevdet Pasha with his family primarily during his time in Aleppo is available at the Ottoman archives in the Yıldız Palace collection.
4 BOA, Y-EE 142/7, no. 12 (6 Muharrem 1282 [1 June 1865]).
5 BOA, Y-EE 142/7, no. 11 (15 Muharrem 1282 [10 June 1865]).
the government. Yet, it was not the threat of brigands and rebels but rather the danger of Cilicia’s notorious summer heat that seemed to concern his family. “There’s nothing to worry about,” he assured. “Thank God that even though the days are a bit hot, we set up camp in high places. They receive air and one can breathe there (hava alır ve teneffüs olunur), and so we are in no condition to complain.”7 Concern about the changing weather travelled in both directions. “It’s starting to get hot. Don’t stay in Istanbul,” Cevdet warned his wife. “Although it’s even hotter here, we are setting up camp in elevated and open places and then leaving.”8 Noting the suffering of some of the other officials in the party, Cevdet boasted as if invigorated by nature’s challenge that “for someone who never summers outside of the Bosphorus, spending the summer in such a dusty dirty place is a bit difficult. However, since I’ve experienced more heat and discomfort before, I pay no mind to such minor things.”9

The composure displayed by this middle-aged bureaucrat in letters to family should not obscure the fact that Cilicia was an adventure for Ahmed Cevdet Pasha. As an Islamic scholar and historian born in the town of Lovech (modern-day Bulgaria) who had spent most of his life in the Ottoman capital, Cevdet was entering the unfamiliar territory of the Cilian Highlands and the massive expanse of plain that would serve as the new home for tens of thousands of pastoralists and immigrants. “Çukurova is an unknown world (bilmediğimiz bir âlem),” he would write in awe of the natural landscape that surrounded him. “The tips of the spears of passing

6 Cevdet mentioned such activities only occasionally in letters to his family. See: BOA, Y-EE 142/41 (7 Safer 1282 [2 July 1865]). He appears as a loving father eagerly gathering gifts for his family and routinely sending “kisses on the eye” to his son Ali Sedad and his two recently-born daughters Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye. Cevdet’s gifts would include Turkmen wool carpets and a beautiful little foal for Ali Sedad, local products of the region’s rich pastoralist economy. BOA, Y-EE 142/7, no. 14 (16 Muharrem 1282 [11 June 1865]); Y-EE 142/8, no. 1 (11 Rebiulevel 1282 [4 August 1865]).

7 BOA, Y-EE 142/7, no. 14 (16 Muharrem 1282 [11 June 1865]).

8 BOA, Y-EE 142/7, no. 10 (22 Muharrem 1282 [17 June 1865]).

9 The historical center of Ottoman Istanbul is located at the southernmost point of the Bosphorus on the Golden Horn. It was popular during the nineteenth century for well-to-do Ottomans during this period to retreat to summer homes in the cleaner and less crowded villages of the northern Bosphorus that are washed by cool air from the Black Sea.

10 BOA, Y-EE 142/7, no. 21 (19 Safer 1282 [14 July 1865]).
Kurdish horsemen cannot be seen. It is as if the power of the vegetation displays all of its majesty and splendor here.” At first glance, it was a veritable paradise. Cevdet remarked that “even if it does not rain, the plains are nourished by the gentle dew that descends upon the earth at night,” as if to suggest a perfect state of nature with clear streams and brooks running through “emerald-green meadows (zümrüd gibi çemenler).” However, there was trouble in paradise. With a tone of apprehension, he added “even if the francolins taking flight all around and the herds of gazelle bounding to and fro add cheerfulness/prosperity (şenlik) to this charming prairie (mürgzâr-e letâfet), the wild boars as well as the various snakes that one meets at every turn bring fear/savageness (vahşet).”[11] There were human hazards as well in the form of semi-nomadic tribes that dominated the landscape. Cevdet lamented, “What good is it when because of its being the roaming grounds (cevelângâh) of tribes, there is no sign or indication of agriculture or human labor (insan emeği) to be found?”[12] The line that Ahmed Cevdet Pasha treded through Çukurova seemed to trace the ambiguous threshold separating the menace of a dark and ancient swamp from a bright and verdant frontier that the region could become.

Ahmed Cevdet and the Reform Division or Fırka-i Islâhiye were in the midst of a decisive battle over geography and indeed ecology with the local communities of the Cilicia region. By dislodging tribal communities from the mountain, regulating or eliminating the practice of seasonal migration, and encouraging the cultivation of cotton in the Çukurova plain, the Ottoman administration was to enforce, at least in theory, the yet-unimplemented reforms of the Tanzimat period, collecting taxes, enlisting soldiers, and playing a role in the quotidian life of Cilicia as never before. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha’s rare position as an important intellectual presiding over aggressive provincial restructuring allows the activities of the Reform Division to

---

11 The deliberate juxtaposition of şenlik and vahşet with their dual meanings illustrates the paradox of “wilderness” as both opportunity and hazard in the eyes of civilization as such.

12 Cevdet, Tezâkir, 170.
provide a unique window onto the links between state theory and practice during the Tanzimat period. The notion of using an army for reform or *islah* rather than mere conquest or pacification reflects the relatively early stages of an “Ottoman civilizing mission” within the mindset of Tanzimat and post-Tanzimat Ottoman statesmen like Cevdet. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, lead commissioner of the Reform Division, was one of the principal intellectual figures within the development of an Ottoman conception of civilization or *medeniyet* that would come to inform decades of imperial policy. Perhaps because of his background as a historian, the reports and accounts of Ahmed Cevdet Pasha are unusually rich in detail and commentary when compared with those of his contemporaries, revealing layers of consciousness that are usually elusive in Ottoman sources of the time. However, the Reform Division typified a new trajectory that emerged wherein the longstanding civilizational and moral superiority of the Ottoman administration vis-à-vis its tribal subjects attained a sense of moral obligation.¹³

Increasingly, late Ottoman discourses regarding nomads and religious minorities have been seen as reflecting a colonial mentality similar to those of European contemporaries.¹⁴ In order to evaluate this comparison, I argue that it is necessary not just to study the words of Ottoman statesmen in Istanbul but also examine how state practice was carried out on the periphery. In the next two chapters, I discuss Ottoman settlement policies in Çukurova and the Reform Division’s use of force in achieving settlement goals. Ottoman policy in the Cilician countryside may in some ways resemble settler colonialism, but the categories between settler and indigenous become extremely blurred, especially in light of settlement’s terrible impact on

¹³ As a contrast, some nineteenth century accounts of battles with tribal communities such as Yezdis in Eastern Anatolia reflect more longstanding sentiment of superiority maintained by Ottoman administrators; however, these accounts are framed in the language of conquest and subjugation rather than reform. BOA, HAT 1333/51988 (20 Safer 1253 [26 May 1837]).

¹⁴ See Deringil, “‘They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery’; The Late Ottoman Empire and the Post-Colonial Debate.”; Makdisi, “Rethinking Ottoman Imperialism: Modernity, Violence and the Cultural Logic of Ottoman Reform.”; Faika Çelik, “‘Civilizing Mission’ in the Late Ottoman Discourse: The Case of Gypsies,” *Oriente Moderno* 93, no. 2 (2013).
the people for whom land was registered and houses were built. This basic difference emerges from the involuntary nature of this settlement, which was contrary to the understandings of health in the Cilicia region.

This chapter explores the underlying logic of the Reform Division and its activities in Cilicia and explains what they meant for the populations it targeted and their relationship with their lived environment. The dual goal of undermining the power of local elite while bringing Cilician populations into a more governable state through settlement became above all an effort to tame the geography of Cilicia and people who used it. In other words, it was an attempt to impose a standardized system of governance on a differentiated population and geography accustomed to a political, social, and economic order structured according to the specificities of the Cilicia region, undoing what Karen Barkey refers to as the “segmented” imperial rule that defined early modern Ottoman statecraft. While the immediate influence of the derebeys and their political networks in Cilicia were ultimately curtailed with relative ease through a combination of cooption and combat, reshaping an ecological order predicated on mobility to conform to a model of civilized and settled agriculture would prove more challenging. These challenges will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

Due to a thematic focus, I will not offer a chronological narrative of the Reform Division’s activities. Gould’s dissertation provides an excellent summary of the different phases and progression of events, and this section of the dissertation by contrast seeks to highlight the less-studied and discursive aspects of Cevdet’s narrative and the documentation surrounding forced settlement. See Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 74-119. For readers of Turkish, transliterated publications of Ahmed Cevdet Pasha’s two similar narratives of the Reform Division from Cevdet’s Tezākir and Marûzât are also available. See Cevdet, Tezākir; Ahmet Cevdet and Yusuf Halaçoğlu, Marûzât (Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1980). In addition to these accounts, an earlier version of Cevdet’s reports on the Reform Division is kept at Atatürk Kitaplığı. See Ahmed Cevdet, "Kozan ve Gavurdağı hakkında layiha," Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları B.31/956 (Atatürk Kitaplığı, 1865). This version along with documents form the Ottoman archives as well as French, British and American sources will be given some priority in this chapter.

As Barkey argues, Ottoman rule did not involve aggressive attempts making political relations uniform across the empire. This is part of her discussion of how the strategies of nation-states differ from those of empires. Karen Barkey, Empire of difference : the Ottomans in comparative perspective (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 12-14.

Discussed in Chapter 1. The derebeys were local elite that maintained hereditary titles from the Ottoman government and often ruled in a semi-autonomous fashion. A rough European equivalent might be that of the “lord.”
The greatest failures of the Reform Division’s ambitious policies would not be attributable to economic or cultural causes but rather plain ecological realities constraining settlement in a region such as Cilicia. As Ahmed Cevdet Pasha’s letters to his wife underscored, he was well aware of the links between mobility and health in this region and that seasonal migration was undertaken to avoid malaria. Thus the forced settlement of seasonally-migratory communities and its disastrous impacts must not be viewed as the product of modernist naiveté. Nor as will be shown was it mere indifference. The Reform Division comprised a deliberate attempt to contain and moreover mobilize a recalcitrant population in a battle against a malarial geography, a battle that no matter how costly, would become the defining feature of a rural policy that would stretch beyond the Empire into the Turkish Republic in the sparsely populated and vast hinterlands of Anatolia as civilization gave way to the nation and the mobile pastoralists of mountains gave way to peasants and villagers on the plain.

**A Revolting Geography**

Humans are civilized in nature (*medeniüttab*’), meaning that they cannot live separately like beasts (*behaim gibi*), but rather they need to help each other by forming societies (*cemiyet*) from place to place. These human societies are of various orders and the society of tent-dwelling (*himeneşin*) tribes is of the lowest order (*edna derece*), which, by procuring the basic human needs, reach the aim of procreation—the fruit of the tree of life. However, they are deprived of knowledge, the productive sciences, and all the complete human attributes that are the result of the shape and form of civilization (*medeniyet*). Just as village people (*ehl-i kara*) are considered to be forsaken by the proper influences and results of civilization when compared with the inhabitants of large cities, [tent-dwelling tribes] likewise remain far from civilization in comparison with village people.18

Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, *Tarih* Vol. 1

Because Ahmed Cevdet Pasha was himself a historian, his writings regarding the Reform Division and its activities are far from typical of accounts issued by Ottoman governors, bureaucrats, and military personnel. On one hand, their readability and depth of description, commentary, and reflection go well beyond the customary reports in the archive. On the other

---

hand, they are clearly constructed with an eye not just to portraying the events in a particular way, as all reports are, but to contribute to the writing of the events in question into the pages of history. While Cevdet’s writings on the Reform Division were ultimately published in multiple versions, earlier manuscript copies reflect the evolution of his narrative regarding the costly and transformative settlement campaign. One manuscript, a report on the Reform Division’s activities in Gavurdağı and Kozan (the mountainous hinterland regions of Cilicia) reflects this evolution in striking terms. The original title Cevdet gave to the report, “Some geographical circumstances of the places controlled and reformed by the Reform Division (Fırka-i Islâhiye maarifetiyile zabt ve sılah olunan yerlerin baz-ı ahval-ı coğrafiyesi),” was rather conventional. However, in this manuscript, he crossed out the word “geographical (coğrafiye)” replacing it with the word ihtilaliye, thereby dramatically changing the title (see Figure 16). Conventionally, ihtilal (اختلاف) means disruption or disorder. However, in the sense intended by Cevdet Pasha, ihtilal was intended as a type of rebellion or “revolution.” In fact, he uses the same word to describe the French Revolution in his twelve-volume history of the Ottoman state and its world. In other words, with a single modification the “geographical circumstances” of Cilicia were somehow transformed into “revolutionary events.”

---

19 This manuscript is kept at Atatürk Kitaplığı in Istanbul. Cevdet, “Kozan ve Gavurdağı hakkında layiha.”
20 Not to be confused with the similar sounding Arabic verb ihtilal (اختلاف) meaning “to occupy.”
Yet, in referencing *ihtilal*, Cevdet was certainly not referring to any “revolutionary” activities on the part of the Reform Division per se, though he certainly considered its achievements momentous. Indeed, Cevdet saw the French Revolution as a turning point in world history but in a thoroughly negative sense. The revolution represented danger, destruction and disorder for the Ottoman statesman. Thus, the *ihtilal* Cevdet spoke of in his account of the Reform Division was far from some glorious republican overthrow of Cilicia’s feudal order and its succession by the modern Ottoman bureaucracy. Rather, Cevdet meant the open rebellion of an entire region and its inhabitants. And by easily substituting rebellion for geography, Cevdet underlined the logic wherein a mountainous region defined by its rebellious nature would be pacified and reformed by the steady hand of the state.

The political ecology of Ottoman Cilicia was governed by the seasonal migration of local communities that maintained a large degree of autonomy from the government in Istanbul (see

---

Chapter 1). Tenuous Ottoman control in the mountainous areas of Cilicia such as Kozan and Gavurdağı was predicated on the cooperation of tribal notables, local elites, and in particular, a semi-dynastic class of officials called derebeys that derived power from their local legitimacy. The activities of the Reform Division, which entailed the removal of these local officials and the settlement of the nomadic communities they presided over, were thus represented as a struggle between two unequal parties: the forces of barbarism and backwardness embedded in the local geography of Cilicia on one hand and the bearers of civilization leading the army of a newly-reformed Ottoman Empire on the other. This narrative conforms to a variation on the trope of Ottoman decline that gained particular currency during the Tanzimat period. Before becoming Governor of Aleppo, Ahmed Cevdet Pasha had played a leading role in the development of this narrative as a historian in the employ of the Ottoman government. His twelve-volume history on the decades leading up to the abolition of the Janissaries in 1826 documented the Ottoman state’s struggles with the forces of decentralization and decay represented by external rivals, internal political groups, and agents of local autonomy. Within the narrative of Cevdet’s Tarih, a broader understanding of civilization emerged around the Ottoman state, and while considerable space was devoted to prominent figures of European civilization such as Napoleon, the classical institutions of Ottoman governance were at the center.22

Ahmed Cevdet was heavily influenced by the ideas of Ibn Khaldun, whose work was popular among Ottoman intellectuals, especially after its translation into Turkish during the late eighteenth-century.23 Cevdet had translated parts of Ibn Khaldun’s Muqaddimah and relied on Khaldun’s theories not only in Tarih but also in his first-hand observations about the Reform

22 For a discussion of Cevdet on Napoleon, see ibid., 133-41.
23 Kasaba, A Moveable Empire, 3-4.
Division itself.\textsuperscript{24} Khaldun’s work is known for its dialectical understanding of society based on a dichotomy between settled and nomadic or civilized and barbaric life. Writing in the context of medieval Arab politics and historiography, he expressed this dichotomy in a tension between settled society or \textit{ḥadāra} and nomadic societies or \textit{badāwa} that persisted outside the sphere of state hegemony. The harsh conditions of primitive life gave nomadic societies a higher degree of cohesion, which Khaldun called \textit{aşabiyya} or in Turkish, \textit{asabiyet}. Settled societies were by contrast vulnerable to incursions from without due to their moral and economic decline along with the physical weakness that accompanied luxury. Cevdet’s continual reference to Ibn Khaldun and his terminology within his early writings and \textit{Tarih} in particular has led some scholars to conclude that he had simply adopted Khaldun’s theories and applied them to the Ottoman context.\textsuperscript{25} However, as Christoph Neumann points out, Cevdet’s use of Khaldun’s terms and his treatment of Ottoman history reflect at times unusual analogies that would suggest a new interpretation of Khaldun or at the very least the messiness of Khaldun’s categories when applied to specific contexts.\textsuperscript{26} Cevdet also inverts the relationships between important concepts such as education and civilization, arguing that the latter is a product of the former in contrast to Khaldun. Most significantly, Cevdet’s understanding of civilization is founded on the premise that the inevitability of rise and fall – expressed in the life cycle of states described by Ibn Khaldun – could be broken by reform.\textsuperscript{27} As with any work of interpretation, his reading of Khaldun involved the appropriation of concepts and alteration of meanings to fit his own societal context, and in doing so he created a distinctly Ottoman or Islamic vocabulary with which to narrate a state-centered vision of progress.

\textsuperscript{24} More on this in Chapter 4. Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, \textit{Marûzât}, 182.


\textsuperscript{26} For example, Cevdet describes the Janissaries – the very guardians of civilized state power – using the concept of \textit{asabiyet}, a trait normally Ibn Khaldoun ascribed solely to nomadic societies.

\textsuperscript{27} Neumann, \textit{Araç tarih amaç Tanzimat: Tarih-i Cevdet’in siyasi anlami}, 176-83.
Within this view, Cevdet adopted an environmentally-deterministic understanding of Cilicia’s savageness. In his conception of the Reform Division and its mission, Cevdet sought to frame the mountains of Cilicia as geographical spaces inhabited by semi-autonomous communities lacking civilization. “Since the time of conquest (hîn-i fetihden berî), Gavurdağı — that is, Cebel-i Bereket — has been in a state of rebellion (hâl-i isyân),” he wrote. “The government of the Ottoman state (Devlet-i aliye) has never entered the mountains of Kozan.”

According to Cevdet Pasha, these mountains had persisted in a “state of rebellion (hâl-i serkeşî),” rendering Gavurdağı a “den of thieves (eşkiyâ yuvası)” and a place where murderers (cânîler) could “escape the clutches of the state (hükûmetin pençesinden kurtuluyor),” all while rebellious tribes roamed the wilderness.

In his description of the plans for the campaign in a subsequent letter, Ahmed Cevdet developed a more complete and elaborate justification for bringing the land and people of Cilicia under the control of the Ottoman state, one typical of colonial discourses. Cilicia’s uncivilized character was rooted in the human and terrestrial geography; the tribes of Cilicia were Seljuks that joined with the Ottomans during the conquest but “because the inhabitants were savage and the terrain difficult (ahâlisi vahşî ve yerleri sarp olduğundan),” most of the region was never brought under Ottoman rule. Thus, Cevdet claimed, in the mountains of Gavurdağı (itself literally meaning “Gavur/Kafir Mountain”), the people had “remained in a state of ignorance (cehâlet içinde kalmış idiler),” attributing to the inhabitants of the region a status of savagery.

28 The common name for the region, Gâvurdağı, has the connotations of being the land or “mountain of infidels;” so the name Cebel-i Bereket, “mountain of blessing,” could be used as a more formal designation or even be seen as euphemistic. Today the region is officially known as Nur Dağları, i.e. “light mountains.” More below.
29 Tezâkir, 108.
30 A term applied to non-Muslims and often to Christians. In this case, it was commonly believed by individuals such as Ahmed Cevdet that the Turkmen and Kurdish tribes of the mountains —like the Armenian Christian populations—were not true Muslims. This attribution also appears in the reports of European travelers, for example: Favre and Mandrot, Voyage en Cilicie, 17. More in Chapter 7.
31 Tezâkir, 111-12.
One of the more striking statements he made about the manners and customs of the region’s inhabitants regards a segment of the population that he deemed to be of Turkish origin (fil-asıl türk), which had taken on the abhorrent manners and customs of their Kurdish neighbors, meaning that they were living a more nomadic lifestyle conducive to acts of brigandage.\textsuperscript{32} He maintained this distinction when differentiating between the different tribes of Cilicia, saying “when compared with the Kurds [of the region], the Turkmens were the much lesser of two evils (çok ehven idi).”\textsuperscript{33} Within this idea was contained an interesting distinction between a Turkish ethnic origin and a civilized, “Turkish” way of life juxtaposed with the uncivilized “Kurdishness” that resulted from the habitation of Anatolia’s mountain regions.\textsuperscript{34} Meanwhile, the good settled inhabitants of the region such as Farsaks\textsuperscript{35} of the mountains of Kozan were imprisoned by geography and the unruly autonomy of the tribes and local notables that surrounded them.\textsuperscript{36}

Cevdet’s understanding of sexual mores as expressed in his views of Cilician society reflects one way in which his writings bent Khaldunian understandings of decadence to argue for the forcible civilization of Cilicia.\textsuperscript{37} For Khaldun, the heart of civilization rotted with moral depravity; but for Cevdet moral decay lay on the uncivilized frontier of the empire. He noted that tribal leaders frequently exceeded the four-wife limit imposed by Hanafi law, mentioning one

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 125-27.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 120. For more on tribes of Cilicia and official discourses about their relationship to civilization or medeniyet, see BOA, İ-MMS 30/1256, no. 1, Vechi to Muhacirin Komisyonu (29 Kanunuevvel 1279 [10 January 1864]).
\item \textsuperscript{34} These categories, while antecedents of present day Turkish and Kurdish identities, should not be understood as synonymous.
\item \textsuperscript{35} The term Farsak refers to the local Muslim inhabitants of the Kozan/Feke region who were neither Christian nor nomadic. According to one report, they comprised approximately 7,000 to 8,000 households. BOA, İ-MMS 30/1256, no. 5 (23 Kanunuevvel 1280 [4 January 1865]).
\item \textsuperscript{36} Ahmed Cevdet’s pity for this group is expressed using words such as “miskîn” and “biçâre,” standing in stark contrast to his harsh language in describing the rest of the region’s population. Cevdet, Tezâkir, 112-14.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ibn Khaldun notably ascribed all forms of social corruption to the effects of civilization and luxury normally found in the city. Ibn Khaldun and Franz Rosenthal, The Muqaddimah: an introduction to history (New York: Pantheon Books, 1958), 469.
\end{itemize}
who had married as many as nine wives without divorcing his earlier wives and that many others had pursued additional unions without a formal marriage.\textsuperscript{38} Another supposedly abhorrent practice he mentions was that of the Tecirli tribe, among whom marriages frequently occurred after pregnancy.\textsuperscript{39} Yet, the uncivilized practices of Cilicia’s tribal societies went beyond mere moral looseness. Cevdet described the completely perplexing family codes among the Tecirli that allowed women to divorce their husbands as follows: “A wife could be divorced from her husband by sending him news saying ‘I’m not happy with him.’ Her husband would then announce [this news] to the tribe and have them ask ‘is there a woman who likes him?’ If a woman emerged and said ‘I like him,’ he would marry her.”\textsuperscript{40} This practice flew in the face of Ahmed Cevdet’s understanding of proper Islamic law.\textsuperscript{41}

Cevdet’s view of the relationship between geography, civilization, and moral corruption is particularly significant given his later role in the first codification of Islamic personal status law in the creation of the \textit{Mecelle}, and made even more complex by the fact that his two daughters Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye would go on to be prominent authors among the earliest Ottoman women’s movements of the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{42} For Cevdet, the absence of formal governing institutions, \textit{medreses}, and sharia courts was to blame for the uncivilized practices he encountered in Cilicia. Even when he noted the presence of some learned men in Kozan, he remarked that those who sought Islamic learning had to travel as far as Kayseri to receive an education.\textsuperscript{43} Meanwhile, the Gavurdağı region remained completely under “the

\textsuperscript{38} Cevdet, \textit{Tezâkir}, 112.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 163.
\textsuperscript{40} The Tecirli tribe was not the only community of the region with such a practice. Among the Aneze Bedouins of Northern Syria, women could initiate a divorce with their husbands’ permission or a ruling by the judge of an Ottoman court. Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, \textit{Marûzât}, 148.
\textsuperscript{41} Cevdet, \textit{Tezâkir}, 163.
\textsuperscript{42} Fatma Aliye would go on to write a biography of his father. See Fatma Aliye, \textit{Ahmed Cevdet Paşa ve zamanı} (Istanbul: Kanaat Matbaası, 1914).
\textsuperscript{43} Cevdet, \textit{Tezâkir}, 114.
The mountains of Cilicia had not only sheltered ignorance but prevented civilization from extending its reach.

The circles of causation that continually led Cevdet to geography in his explanations of Cilicia’s savageness can be seen in his view of some of the settled communities in the region, which were also targeted by the Reform Division’s activities. The Armenian mountain stronghold of Zeytun was of special concern for him. The leaders of Zeytun had managed, in the midst of the Coffing affair discussed in Chapter 2, to successfully defy Ottoman taxation a few years prior through a rebellion buttressed by the intercession of France. Cevdet insisted in the planning of the Reform Division that the people of Zeytun be dealt with the same way as the notables and tribes of Kozan. This point is crucial for understanding the parameters of Cevdet’s Ottoman civilizing mission. First, the Reform Division, while being framed as an army charged with facilitating the successful settlement of nomads, would target uncooperative settled populations as well. Second, while the main purpose of this army was to secure the Gavurdağı and Kozan regions that had become so disrupted during the Coffing affair, Cevdet envisioned the army’s potential realm of activity as extending not just to places such as Zeytun but also into the heart of predominantly Kızılbaş or Alevi regions such as Hısn-ı Mansur, Akçadağ, and Dersim as well as the undefined remainder of Eastern Anatolia. The Reform Division, like the notions of civilization and progress used to legitimize its activities, was in this view infinite in its potential realm of operation, bound only by time, resources, energy, and the intransigence of a savage population and environment. Yet, in practice, its activities would be focused on securing the loyalty and settlement of the Cilicia region’s transhumant inhabitants.
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Possessing the Mountains

At the outset of Part One, I told the story of Dadaloğlu and his songs of resistance. Everything from the sturdy Arabian horses to the winding roads including the mountains themselves appear in his lyrics as definitively “ours (bizim).” The Reform Division had ambitious and far-reaching goals, but its first objective would to address that very claim to possession of geography by be to pacifying the communities of Gavurğaşı and rein in the chaos that was unleashed when Küçük Alioğlu Mıstık Pasha, Cevdet’s “veil of illusion” (in Chapter 2) and protagonist of Dadaloğlu’s songs, was removed in 1864. In this regard, the Reform Division’s first targets were figures such as Mıstık’s son Dede and Ali Bekiroğlu Ali Agha who represented the primary political challenge to Ottoman hegemony in the mountains. As they pursued men they referred to as “bandits” in the mountains and Cevdet articulated theories of environmental determinism linking savagery and the mountains, Dadaloğlu responded with an elegant rebuttal, dismissing in a few simple words both the army’s claims to dominion and the intellectual’s efforts at denigration: “the mountains are ours.”

Evidently well-aware of the daunting nature of their task, the Reform Division was militarily-equipped to assert Ottoman claims to the mountains. With eleven battalions from Crete, Aleppo, Marash, and Adana positioned in Gavurğaşı and another five from Sivas in Kozan, each accompanied by a regiment of cavalry, it was the largest army to visit the region since İbrahim Pasha’s invasion in 1832. The division was also crafted with attention to the particular local geography. Its commander, Derviş Pasha, had recently proven successful in battling rebels in Montenegro and was thus deemed the ideal leader for an excursion into “the
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Montenegro of Syria” as Gavurdağı was sometimes imagined. Knowing that Ibrahim Pasha had successfully employed mountain-savvy Druze fighters in Cilicia, the Reform Division sought to replicate this strategy. The Albanians and Zeybeks of Reform Division, the supreme martial character of whom Ahmed Cevdet remarked upon, were experienced fighters capable of operating in mountain terrain. Added to their ranks were 200 Georgian and Circassian horsemen under the command of the Georgian Mirimiran Arslan Pasha as well as 300 Kurdish horsemen of Eleşkirdli Mehmed Bey. Many had fighting experience during the Crimean War. Equipped with mobile long-range cannons and brand new rifles from Şişhane alongside other new technologies such as binoculars and the telegraph, the Reform Division was a state of the art fighting force uniquely composed for the purpose of mountain warfare.

In theory, the Reform Division would be concerned with combating bandits and small fighting forces of men loyal to important tribal figures. The aim was to liberate, reform, and serve the Ottoman civilians of the region, not to oppress them. However, Cevdet had anticipated the potential messiness of the settlement project in Gavurdağı. While he said that reform elsewhere in places like Kozan would merely require removing the Kozanoğlus from power,
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Gavurdağı would be more complex. “Our impending battle with Gavurdağı would be with thieves and bandits and the brigand inhabitants who were devoid of religious zeal.”

Cevdet was pessimistic about the power of persuasion in a region the very name of which indicated an infidel nature. It would be one thing to free a civilian population from the clutches of an oppressive government, but as Cevdet portended, “fighting with the population (ahali) is always difficult.” In order to avert this outcome, the Reform Division issued a general pardon to those who were willing to surrender peacefully to its authority; however, Cevdet’s calls for cooperation were met with neither acceptance nor rejection. The main tribal leaders and their men had already taken refuge in the mountains as the people concealed themselves. In order to force the action, Derviş Pasha proceeded to attack and torch some villages loyal to those leaders. This outright aggression must have shocked the local population. As it was remembered in the poetry of Dadaloğlu, “Derviş Pasha ravaged the provinces / All the flowers of our homeland have wilted / We’ve worn black and thrown out the reds / Our gold is no good, our silver turned to bronze.” The burning of tents and houses, which would be used repeatedly by the Reform Division as a method of forcing the surrender of rebels and the movement of populations, was intended to displace local inhabitants and more easily facilitate their resettlement.

Tensions between the policies of pacification and the policies of settlement immediately emerged out of these confrontations. The population of Gavurdağı, while targeted for settlement, was not necessarily nomadic in terms of Cevdet’s Khaldunian formulation. They were semi-pastoralists that maintained villages and planted food crops, coming down from the yayla to
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harvest the seasons’ yield every year. In the region of Çerçili, which Cevdet refers to as a “den of thieves and bandits (hırsız ve haydut yatağı)”, these crops had been left in the fields as the population of most of these villages had departed for the yayla with the advance of the Reform Division. In their absence, the army set fire to their “homes (haneleri)” and forbade them to build new ones.57 Meanwhile, they allowed the already pacified Delikanlı tribe that was facing a food and fodder shortage to gather the crops of Çerçili and return to their encampments.58 In short, the Reform Division had driven settled agriculturalists from their villages, which were burned, and allowed nearby nomads to consume their crops. In other cases, the activities of the Reform Division created permanent dislocations of populations unrelated to its core activities. For example, approximately 200 Armenian families from the town Hadjin were permanently relocated to a sparsely populated region of the Sivas province, ostensibly to protect them from harm during the process of settling the region’s tribes.59

Resistance manifested itself not only in an unwillingness to descend from the mountains but also attempts to flee encampments and settlements established in the plains. The Reform Division’s activities involved controlling the movements of the region’s communities, preventing their passage to the yayla, and encouraging them to settle. Yet, because of the summer perils of malaria and heat and because their pastoralist economies depended on migration, many of these communities evaded settlement orders and returned to the yayla when possible, leading to the use of military force. For example, when the Tecirlis who normally migrated to the Marash region during the summer were settled in Çukurova, a group of some 300 households led by Palalı Hasanoğlu Süleyman Agha defied settlement orders and retreated into

Gavurdağ, protected by 200 fighters from the village of Haruniye.\textsuperscript{60} They would subsequently be defeated and kept in Çukurova by police checkpoints in the mountains.\textsuperscript{61} The same would soon after be done for their neighbors the Bozdoğan, as well as the Kırıntıs and Tatarlus in Kozan.\textsuperscript{62} Whereas once the mountains had been refuge, now they stood as the walls of a prison. Local communities also attempted to disrupt the operations of the Reform Division in other ways, in one case interrupting the construction of a telegraph line between Aleppo and Adana that passed through the new town of Yarpuz in Gavurdağ.\textsuperscript{63} Once the telegraph was completed, however, it would greatly enhance the Reform Division’s operation.

In response to rebellion, the Reform Division used strong displays of force, killing hundreds of fighters and capturing many others in the process. Prisoners were either released elsewhere or in some cases sentenced to hard labor. More dangerous figures were executed; in one instance the crucifixion of an alleged spy upon a tree at a key mountain pass was used to discourage resistance.\textsuperscript{64} The fighting produced tales of memorable resistance to the Reform Division. Afşar villagers in the Taurus Mountains still preserve the lament of Deli Halil, a wanted bandit who had escaped from exile in Edirne, to his village of Kayabaşı where a “short but sanguinary encounter ensued.”\textsuperscript{65} Halil was able to escape through the back of the village as his mother, whom Cevdet refers to as “the great troublemaker (büyük beliye) of that area,” stood on a rooftop and encouraged Halil’s men in their confrontation with the Ottoman soldiers. She
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received a severe but non-fatal gunshot wound in her hand and side.\textsuperscript{66} Halil and his wife escaped on horseback to the Ulaşlıs and the territory of Ali Bekiroğlu, where he would eventually be taken into custody.\textsuperscript{67} While the Reform Division sought to eliminate bandits, the war transformed those who resisted into heroes in the eyes of many.

However, for all their resistance, by winter 1865, most of the tribal notables of the Cilicia region either surrendered or submitted outright to Ottoman authority. The Reform Division, while in many ways a force of destruction, had come to Cilicia with a goal beyond mere conquest. The violence and coercion it employed in subjugation of the local population were in the service of a higher goal of fostering settlement, effecting obedience to the Ottoman rule of law, and bringing to a region known for its barbarism the virtues of a modern civilization. But the violence had just begun.

**Resurrecting Alexander**

It is no surprise to find references to Alexander the Great and his victories over the Persians in Cilicia within the travel narratives of history-obsessed European visitors to the Adana region during the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{68} Yet, for all the Western travelers to follow in Alexander’s footsteps, none made more boisterous claim to have done so than Ahmed Cevdet. During the first phases of the Reform Division’s campaign at the historical junction between Anatolia and Syria, Ahmed Cevdet and the military commander Derviş Pasha sought to erect two fortifications in their own names. While gathering the stone to do so, they came across a slab bearing a Greek inscription among the historical ruins in the vicinity. According to Ahmed Cevdet, it read “here
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is where Alexander set down his criminal law (İskender burada cezâ kanununu vaz’ etti).\(^{69}\)

Veracity notwithstanding, the less than subtle symbolism of this account conveyed how Ahmed Cevdet understood the activities of the Reform Division in the region. It was a conquest of world historical import; they were marching in the footsteps of history, and in rebuilding the fortifications of Alexander the Great, they were rebuilding a fallen civilization.\(^{70}\)

Much like Alexander more than two millennia before, the Reform Division had arrived in Cilicia prepared for battle, yet though the sword of the Reform Division was mighty, Ahmed Cevdet Pasha was hopeful that the book, i.e. the promise of the Tanzimat and Ottoman rule of law, would attract the loyalty of Cilicia’s inhabitants with minimal bloodshed. The Reform Division offered many incentives to the local population in order to secure their allegiance peacefully. Pardoning of unpaid taxes and the forgiveness of those who had evaded military conscription were concessions made to win the trust of the people.\(^{71}\) Meanwhile, notables were extended new titles and positions. As Cevdet arranged to settle pastoralist communities of the plain, their leaders were settled into newly-formed towns such as İslahiye (named for the Firka-i İslahiye) and Hassa that would serve as administrative centers of these frontier regions.\(^{72}\) Those who had most symbolized resistance to central Ottoman rule and were too dangerous to remain in the area were granted lucrative pensions or salaried posts elsewhere in the empire, the pensions in some cases being heritable to their wives and children.\(^{73}\) The Reform Division also received the complete cooperation and allegiance of Giragos II, the Armenian Catholicos of Sis, a religious and political figure with tremendous sway among Armenian communities in Sis and
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Meanwhile, Armenians from the mountains complained of the injustices they suffered under the rule of the derebeys; in an Armeno-Turkish letter to the Governor of Adana a local bishop recounted the crimes of the Kozanoğlus, one of whom had allegedly raped an Armenian woman, causing her husband to hang himself from shame and helplessness. The Reform Division further benefited from the cooperation of local council members in Adana, who acknowledged the impossibility of reforms so long as the tribes remained in a state of “nomadism (bedeviyet).”

The operations of the Reform Division went well beyond appeasing the populations of Cilicia, however. A major component of its work was convincing them that the newly-founded state presence would be lasting and effective. For example, the notables of the Ekbez region were summoned to the aforementioned Nigolu fortress where the Reform Division had encamped. The oldest among them, a man named Ahmed Bey, refused to go along with the plans of the Reform Division and relinquish his position, saying that if the Ottomans actually restore the Nigolu fortress, he would take their activities seriously. As Cevdet reported, the fortress that Alexander had once repaired was soon restored and Ahmed Bey then requested exile in Aleppo and a salary, which was promptly granted. A similar situation occurred with a local notable in Kozan, who expressed willingness to cooperate but noted that he had owed money to the Kozanoğlus, seeking a guarantee that those debts would be erased and that the Kozanoğlus would not be able to subsequently extract money from him. Upon this guarantee, he willingly gave his allegiance to the Ottoman government. Cevdet represented this incident as an example of the people simply being unaccustomed to taxation, but in fact it is more accurately a reflection
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of hesitation to submit to a new ruler before the old derebeys had been replaced. More generally, these cases show that behind Cevdet’s theories about civilization was a pragmatism that condoned what were essentially bribes.

In the mind of Cevdet Pasha, the Reform Division opened the doors of civilization before the inhabitants of a region long cloaked in darkness. The communities of Gavurdağı and Kozan appear in his paternalistic narrative as simple villagers easily frightened and impressed. Cevdet marveled at the cashless societies of the Cilician countryside and the speed with which money introduced by the Reform Division changed the nature of commerce. Cilician villagers were not accustomed to selling items such as butter or onions needed by the Reform Division. Because the trappings of the Reform Division were quite a curiosity for the rural inhabitants of Cilicia, they attracted much attention from the children in the villages. Cevdet remarked upon how little contact these people seemed to have with broader Ottoman society. In one section of his narrative, he relates an interaction between the chief secretary of the Reform Division Mazhar Bey and a thirteen-year-old child, which went as follows:

He asked [the child], “Would you like money” and he responded, “I would.” “What will you do with the money,” he asked, and when [the child] said “I don’t know what they do with money,” he said “well how can you want something you don’t know about?” [The child] said “for a few days there’s been talk of money in our village, so I’d like to see it.” Upon this, Mazhar Bey took some shiny coins from his pocket and gave them to the child. He looked and said “it’s a strange thing,” and when he wanted to hand them back, [Mazhar Bey] said, “take them, they’re yours.” “Well what should I do with them?” [the child asked]. Mazhar Bey said “You give these to the artisans and merchants coming from Adana and you buy a fez or something like that, whatever you want.”

The symbolic suggestion of the purchase of a fez, which was becoming the hat of choice for civilized Ottoman men of the period, points to the Reform Division’s focus on bringing the inhabitants of Cilicia into the cultural fold. Though money seemed unfamiliar to the people of
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Cilicia, Cevdet marveled at how quickly they were to learn “the worth of money (paranın kadri).” Before long, they had children of the villages running errands and relaying messages on behalf of the Reform Division for small tips.\textsuperscript{81} Indeed, the presence of the large army in Çukurova resulted in the sudden explosion of commercial activity and trade with the Reform Division.\textsuperscript{82} In Sis, the soldiers were drinking so much lemonade that the price of lemons quickly began to rise and additional supplies were brought from the nearby town of Kars (Kadirli).\textsuperscript{83}

Even more important than the apparent expansion of commerce in Cilicia due to the presence of the Reform Division was the transformation that it seemed to initiate in the realm of property. In the newly founded town of Osmaniye, Ahmed Cevdet found an old house that might be suitably repaired to serve as the next government building. When he inquired with the local notables about the price of the prospective repairs and purchase, the amount given was so low that he asked, “Well what about the price of this house’s lot (arsa)? Have we cheated the owner?” His interlocutors began to laugh at him, saying, “Can land have a price (toprağın pahası olur mu)?”\textsuperscript{84} The notion of individual ownership of land was confusing in a context where most empty land was used collectively by pastoralists as pasture for their animals. The tribes of Çukurova were, according to Cevdet’s reading of the situation, entirely unaccustomed to buying and selling property, which would become a key feature of the property regime in Ottoman Cilicia following the implementation of the 1858 Land Code and the registration of land over subsequent decades (see Chapter 5).

Equally important to the implantation of Ottoman modes of transaction, taxation, and ownership was the establishment of proper Islamic institutions among the Muslim populations of
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the hinterland. Most of the communities targeted by the Reform Division were cited by Ahmed Cevdet for various unorthodox practices and a general lack of knowledge about what he deemed proper Islamic behavior. The Reform Division very symbolically presided over the rare holding of Friday prayers in the mountains of Kozan, an event that “shook the foundations” of the local derebey governments. In the area of religion, Cevdet was especially serious in his civilizational endeavors, which would be rooted not so much in the core values or principals of Islam but rather the Ottoman incarnation of its institutions. One of the first measures undertaken by Ahmed Cevdet to alleviate this lack of Islamic institutions was the construction of a court in the town of Elbistan north of Marash in 1867, which would serve to incorporate the ostensibly Muslim citizens of the mountains into the Ottoman legal fold. This was apparently successful, as the court remained in operation for the rest of the Ottoman period.

Cevdet believed that the promise of good governance and civilization would draw the local inhabitants of the Cilicia region away from their outlaw leaders and towards the glow of a civilized and settled society. In other words, the book would with time easily accomplish what could never be done by the sword. The most critical aspect of this policy was of course the construction of homes for tribes to replace their seasonal encampments, fostering their rapid transition to agricultural life. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha expressed a firm belief in the efficacy of this policy; the mighty book and sword of the Reform Division were sure to succeed. However, what he and the other administrators of the Reform Division neglected was a third factor shaping the outcome of settlement policies, one external to state policy or perhaps even human agency: the role of extra-human factors, namely geography, climate, and microbes.
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Deus ex Cholera

While the efforts of the Reform Division met with considerable success during the early months of activity in Gavurdağı in the summer of 1865, these developments would be hampered by unforeseen constraints as the season wore on. Soon after crossing to the northern edge of the Çukurova plain in the town of Sis in late autumn, the army encountered the effects of a cholera epidemic that was beginning to work its way into the mountains. Ahmed Cevdet noted during the army’s ascent towards Feke in the Kozan region of the Taurus Mountains that they were continually being passed on one side by funeral processions and on the other by sick villagers being carried away on the backs of animals.88 “I don’t know if the Reform Division was struck by the evil eye or what (firka-i islâhiye’ye nazâr mi isâbet eyledi bilmem),” Cevdet would remark.89 Having achieved impressive results in just six months of operation, the Reform Division’s progress in the name of civilization would be scaled back.

Although contagious diseases do often appear in history as inexplicable, impersonal, and even supernatural forces, the impact of cholera during the operations of the Reform Division can hardly be interpreted as coincidental. This was evident in the way that the disease began to spread through the ranks of the army; when some among Cevdet’s detachment showed symptoms of cholera, immediate orders of quarantine were issued. Yet, İsmail Pasha, one of the commanders in the Reform Division, viewing those orders as unnecessarily inhumane, broke the quarantine and allowed the soldiers to mix. Cevdet noted that following this moment, “by the unknowable intentions of God (bi-hikmetillahi teala), cholera immediately spread throughout the
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Clearly, a failure to maintain proper quarantine protocol had exacerbated the impact of cholera on the weary army of the Reform Division. This does not, however, mean that the cholera epidemic that ravaged Cilicia in the fall of 1865 was avoidable. The presence of tens of thousands of soldiers and animals in Çukurova facilitated the spread of germs in the unsanitary conditions of an already moist and malarial countryside. Indeed, the people who had been summoned from the yayla to towns such as Sis in order to carry out the implementation of the new reforms were put at heightened disease risk by virtue of their presence in the area. Yet, it was the bacteria traveling in the small intestines of Ottoman soldiers that must have been the source of this epidemic and its magnitude, meaning the vaunted army of civilization brought death with it in a number of guises. Though there had been no recorded spread of cholera beyond the Ganges delta region of Bengal before 1817, by the time of the Reform Division, three previous pandemics had moved cholera throughout Asia, Europe, and the Americas. It is worth noting that cholera first entered Cilicia during the second global cholera pandemic when Mehmed Ali’s army invaded Syria in 1832. However, during this invasion, the armies under the command of Ibrahim Pasha spent little time in the mountains, and apparently cholera had not yet scaled the slopes of the Taurus range until the reform division outbreak in 1865, which was part of the fourth global cholera pandemic that had begun in Bengal
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and had spread to the Middle East reportedly with hajj pilgrims ultimately killing tens of thousands of them.\textsuperscript{94}

Ottoman authorities in Adana had some warning of the impending risk. Cholera had broken out in Egypt in late June, and by mid-August had spread to Iskenderun and Aleppo, where the French Consul Bertrand noted that “the panic among the upper class [was] indescribable.”\textsuperscript{95} By September the cholera epidemic was claiming around 350 lives per day in the city. However, as Bertrand noted, the lack of medical personnel in the province made it impossible to adequately address and contain the disease.\textsuperscript{96} By October cholera had spread to the littoral and parts of Adana where, especially due to the presence of the Reform Division, the uncontrolled movement of people and the lack of medical supplies and staff was especially acute.\textsuperscript{97}

The provincial government in Adana was ill-equipped to confront an epidemic event with the sole country doctor (\textit{memleket tabibi}) of the region not even being present at the time. When news of the outbreak and its spread into the villages surrounding Tarsus reached Istanbul, three doctors were dispatched without delay to investigate the “terrifying illness (\textit{illet-i muhavvıfa}).”\textsuperscript{98} In the meantime, cholera struck the local population with tremendous speed. Cevdet described the collective shock brought on by the death of Deli Halil, the feared rebel opponent of the Reform Division who with the help of his wife and mother had made a defiant stand against Ottoman rule. He began to show symptoms of cholera after finally being apprehended and died
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the next day. “He was a tall, very handsome, strong-built, solid-bodied, well-proportioned, soldierly and brave young buck,” Cevdet said. “For him to suddenly die like that gave the people quite a scare.”99 Deli Halil was hardly the only actor in the drama of the Reform Division to succumb to the disease. While Cevdet’s detachment was in Sis, Kiragos Efendi, the Armenian Catholicos of Sis who had cooperated with the Reform Division, died suddenly of cholera and was given an honorable funeral complete with a military band supplied by the Derviş Pasha.100 Meanwhile, Aşır Pasha, the Mutasarrıf of Marash who had also contributed to the settlement campaign, perished in the midst of the epidemic.101 In this region of contested sovereignty and complicated topography, disease, at least for the moment, appeared to reign sovereign.

As the death toll climbed, the army began to scatter for a “change of air (tebdil-i hava).” The Georgian, Circassian, and Kurdish cavalry that had been so effective in the mountains of Gavurdağı were beleaguered and proved no match for the disease. Of the fourteen battalions that had originally arrived with the reform division, just five remained. This gave Kozanoğlu Yusuf Agha an opportunity to gather men to his side and launch a new bout of resistance to the Reform Division in the mountains of Kozan.102 One account mentions that he feigned sickness in order to escape exile with the help of Muslim villagers in the area.103 With time, money, and energy running short, the Reform Division headed to Kozan in hopes of quickly apprehending Yusuf Agha and his small group of bandits, circulating news to the tribes and villages of the region that he was wanted dead or alive.104 According to Cevdet Pasha, Yusuf was captured soon thereafter, and arrangements were made for him to be deported along with the rest of his family to Istanbul;

99 Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 167.
100 Poghosean, Hachêni āndanur paţmut’iwnê, 527-28.
101 Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 166. The Reform Division’s engineer Enis Bey also died of cholera. Cevdet, Tezâkir, 185.
102 Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 168.
103 Poghosean, Hachêni āndanur paţmut’iwnê, 528.
104 Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 169.
however, when he tried to escape, he was shot and killed by a guard. Yet according to rumors of the time, Yusuf Agha had been deliberately executed. In fact, one Armenian source described a scene in which Kozanoğlu Yusuf Agha was brought to Hadjin, publicly shamed before a large crowd of onlookers, executed, and left to rot in a barrel in the center of town for months as a cautionary sign for those contemplating any similar acts of defiance.

While the messy conclusion to the Kozanoğlu affair portended future problems in the Taurus Mountains, the Reform Division was otherwise remarkably successful at coopting local notables. In fact, for all the killed and imprisoned brigands, burnt villages, and cholera victims that were left in the Reform Division’s wake, the heads of local dynasties fared rather well. The most prominent figures such as Mistik Pasha and Menemencizade Ahmed Bey came away with handsome salaries in exile, as did many other lesser notables of the region. They would for the most part seamlessly integrate into an emerging wealthy class of Ottomans that kept one foot in Istanbul and the other in the provinces. Meanwhile, others were given new posts and places in the provincial councils, effectively replicating the social hierarchies of communities in the Cilician countryside only within what Ottoman officials hoped would be a more orderly political climate. The cholera epidemic had indeed put a limit to the extent of the reforms that could be undertaken. Most crucially, the army was unable to reach Zeytin in order to formally reestablish Ottoman rule and taxation in the mountain village. Similarly, plans to continue north into the Taurus Mountains towards Dersim were suspended. However, the primary obstacle to the implementation of reforms in Adana — the rule of local dynasties — had been severely curtailed if not entirely eliminated as of 1866. Upon his return, the real work of the Reform Division,

---

105 Cevdet, Tezâkir, 188.
106 Poghosean, Hachêni êndhanur patmut’îwnê, 529.
constructing new villages in Çukurova and convincing the region’s pastoralists to inhabit them year-round, would commence.

Costly and ambitious though they would be, the settlement policies of the Reform Division led by Ahmed Cevdet Pasha would meet tremendous setbacks in the coming years. The resistance of Cilicia’s pastoralists to settlement and their longing for the mountains would only grow as summers of malarial misery ensued in the swampy Çukurova plain. As unfavorable environmental factors converged with structural and economic problems in the Ottoman Empire, disorder and unrest gave way to outright rebellion, leading to a reversal of many of the Reform Division’s policies during the first decade of settlement. Yet, there was to be no returning to the Cilicia of old and the political ecology of unfettered seasonal migration triumphed in the songs of Dadaloğlu. Though the achievements of the Reform Division would ultimately prove less grand than had been projected, this period would irrevocably change what it meant to live and to die in Ottoman Cilicia.

The eventual failures of settlement campaigns, just as certain aspects of the Reform Division’s campaign in Cilicia described above, illustrate the ways in which factors such as geography and disease played an important role in the outcome of Tanzimat-period reform in the Ottoman Empire. As Ottoman statesmen sought to implement a more involved and standardized form of governance during the 1860s, differentiated local practices and political ecologies presented obstacles to this project. Meanwhile, influential politicians such as Cevdet Pasha perceived the lack of “civilization” in the Ottoman countryside in part as a consequence of the lived geography. Thus, that geography appears not merely as an independent and sometimes unseen actor but rather as an enemy identified by the makers of Ottoman policy in their ambitious attempts at transforming the empire. This theme will carry through subsequent
chapters of this dissertation, as I explore the issues of settlement and disease in late Ottoman and post-Ottoman Cilicia.
CHAPTER 4
THE STENCH OF PROGRESS: LIFE AND DEATH ON THE OTTOMAN FRONTIER

Wherever the virgin soil is opened, virulent marsh fever seems to burst forth and smite down all around, and nothing but generations of patient culture can subdue the soil afresh, and render this plain a safe abode for man.

E.J. Davis, *Life in Asiatic Turkey* (1879)

Raw settlement means annihilation.

*Kuru iskân imha demektir.*

Besim Atalay, *History and Geography of Marash* (1914)

Don’t stay in Adana, my son / A mosquito will get in your eye

*Adana’da kalma oğlum / Gözlerine mucuk çokar*

From lament of an Afşar mother whose son died of malaria

Ahmed Cevdet Pasha toured the Cilicia region to see the progress of the Reform Division and its settlement activities in autumn of 1866. He recalled, “As we left Kars-ı Zülkadriye and reached Sis, we passed through three hours of continuous cotton fields. As far as the Kozan mountains on our right and as far as the Ceyhan River on our left, everything our eye could see was cultivated, and the air smelled sweet (*mis gibi*).” Cevdet marveled at the developments taking place in Upper Çukurova. “Then for a time a bad smell reached our noses. ‘I wonder if there is a carcass somewhere,’ I asked Hüseyin Bey.” His companion responded, saying, “It’s nothing. It’s just that we’ve left the fields and come to a yet uncultivated area. That’s where this bad smell is coming from. Last year when we toured Çukurova we had passed through all of these bad smells. However, because everywhere was the same, we didn’t notice it.” The clean, white cotton of progress made the swamps of Çukurova all the more foul. “Now that one part is reformed and cultivated,” Hüseyin Bey explained, “the smell of the ruined and deserted areas is more foul.

---

1 Davis, *Life in Asiatic Turkey*, 71.
3 “A mosquito will get in your eye (*gözlerine mucuk çokar*)” refers to the notorious flies and mosquitos of the Adana plain but also is a figurative expression referring to possibility of sudden ill fortune or health.
4 Özdemir, *Öyküleriyle Ağıtlar*, 263.
noticeable. After all, the reason for Çukurova’s bad air is its ruinedness (harabiyet). This shows that if it is developed, its air will become finer.” Cevdet remarked that this statement was supported by studies of Ibn Khaldun, the theories of whom were now being tested. The scent of progress was in the still pungent but ever-improving air of the Çukurova plain.

Yet the sweet-smelling rows of cotton that tantalized the optimistic nostrils of Ahmed Cevdet differed considerably from the account of the summer after settlement offered in Yaşar Kemal’s Binboğalar Efsanesi. “All summer long the plain reeked of carrion,” he wrote. “The mosquitoes were merciless. The malaria was disastrous. That summer previously unseen epidemic diseases ravaged the area. Çukurova was full of animal and human skeletons.” Though fictional, Yaşar Kemal’s narrative was built from material lingering in the collective memory of Çukurova’s rural population. The experience of settlement was very much alive during his childhood and survived during his subsequent research and interviews in the area. Among rural communities of the Adana region — especially those claiming tribal descent — settlement remained consistently associated with a cataclysmic moment of hardship, sickness, and a gradual break with tradition. The sweet aroma of progress had been accompanied by the rotting stench of death. Settlement meant improvement of the land, but it also meant death and suffering for those doomed to do the labor of improvement.

Though the immediate shortcomings of the Reform Division would become clear within the span of a few years, a more systematic critique of forced settlement would take decades to emerge. In a local history of the Marash region composed during the World War I period, a young Ottoman intellectual and member of the Committee of Union and Progress named Ahmed Besim (later Atalay) offered one of the earliest criticisms of Tanzimat-era settlement policy.

---

5 Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 182.
6 Kemal, Binboğalar Efsanesi : Roman, 71.
“Raw settlement means annihilation (kuru iskân imha demektir)” was his way of describing the Reform Division’s impact on the tribal populations of Çukurova such as the Tecirli and Cerid tribes. “An age-old life and livelihood cannot be changed suddenly. While they should have been reformed and settled gradually, this was not done. Troops were drawn upon them. Armies were sent. Cannons were fired. The encampments and the summer and winter pastures were torched and toppled.” His interest in the tribes of Çukurova was primarily nationalist; he saw in the Turkmen tribes of the Marash region a legacy of authentic Turkic culture in Anatolia. But his critique of Ottoman settlement policy was nevertheless harsh. The Reform Division did not merely “settle” the tribes, “no, it killed them and buried them” he exclaimed. He cited the example of villages where the settled population had died out and been mostly replaced by later Kurdish migrants much like the family of Yaşar Kemal, which migrated to the Çukurova from Eastern Anatolia after the First World War and settled near the Hemite fortress on the Ceyhan River (see Chapter 8). For much of Cilicia’s population, settlement or iskân, the act of causing one to reside or live in a particular place, meant in practice an order to die in that place.

The violence of the Reform Division and its forced settlement campaigns did not end with the withdrawal of the Ottoman army. A more invisible form of violence lingered in Eastern Çukurova during the decade following settlement. Hunger and epidemic malaria swept through the Cilician countryside and people and animals perished in large numbers. Birth rates plummeted and infant mortality rose. Muslim immigrants from the empire’s northern borders watched their communities reduced to mere fractions of their original settler populations.

7 Ahmed Besim decried the persecution of Turkish nomads in a time when ethnic nationalism was on the rise and newly-realized Turkic brethren were being brutally treated by Russian armies in Central Asia. While Besim lamented the passing of Anatolia’s tribal societies and the extinction of their magnificent horse breeds, he did not question the necessity of settlement, only the way in which it was carried out. Nor did he mention any parallels between the even more brutal displacements of Anatolian Armenians taking place right in Marash during the war period. Atalay, Maraş Tarihi ve Coğrafyası, 71-72.
Meanwhile, the pastoralists settled by the Reform Division resisted agricultural life and sought to maintain their migratory practices where possible. With the economic crisis of the 1870s, during which the Ottoman Empire faced bankruptcy, and famine throughout Anatolia, hardship fostered resentment and led to quotidian resistance that gave way to outright rebellion in 1878. In response, the provincial government ultimately adjusted the settlement orders, granting permission for seasonal migration for health purposes. While the Reform Division had been successful in breaking the power of local notables and establishing central government authority in the region, the initial experiment of settlement was a dramatic failure for many of those involved.

Although these years of suffering are attested to in both sources of the time and popular memory, Ottoman archival documents pertaining to the state of affairs in Eastern Çukurova during the first decade of settlement give relatively little detail about this experience. On the level of official discourse represented in the government yearbooks or salnames, the struggles and failures of settlement were suppressed. This is on one hand a testament to the ways in which forces such as disease, hunger, and poverty function as a sort of “silent violence,” inflicted through systematic indifference and buried by denial. Yet, the lack of documentation was itself a symptom of what killed the settlers of the plain; an Ottoman government wracked with debt had become unable to monitor and manage let alone care for this frontier population.

In this chapter, I will explain the experience of settlement in Cilicia following the Reform Division’s activity and post-Crimean War immigration between 1865 and 1878, the period during which active efforts to forcibly settle tribes in Cilicia were most pronounced. I will give special attention to the principal impacts of settlement and explore their immediate social impacts among the communities affected. The plight of these new settlers was in part a

8 See introduction. Watts, Silent Violence.
consequence of Çukurova’s geography; however, factors limiting the budget of the Ottoman government as well as logistical realities that created a more uneven distribution of resources, medicine, wealth and consequently suffering in the region also played a large role. In the face of these complications, the Ottoman administration was forced to ease its strict control of movement and enforcement of settlement orders. While the failures of this process impacted the ways in which settlement activities would be carried out in the future, many of the trends and trajectories established by the Reform Division would nonetheless leave a lasting imprint on the socioeconomic life of rural Cilicia for decades to come. Pre-Tanzimat Cilicia had been defined by its heterogeneity, and the disparities between the theory underlying settlement policy and its actual impacts meant that this heterogeneity was translated into a pervasive economic and political unevenness. Meanwhile, the communities impacted by settlement policy would be left broken and marginalized as settlement became synonymous with loss and dispossession.

**Primitive Little Places: Life on the Ottoman Frontier**

When the Reform Division began overseeing the incremental construction of villages and settlement of tribal communities in the Çukurova region in 1866, whatever resources could be found in the nearly treeless expanses of the plain were employed in construction. In the case of the Bozdoğan settled in Hemite, they were able to benefit in part from the rich quality of the stones from old structures that turned up continuously during the digging of foundations.⁹ Cevdet Pasha took this as a sign that the area had once supported a flourishing civilization and was thus poised to again swell with cultivators and inhabitants. Indeed, it became common during subsequent settlement activities to choose sites of ancient cities and fortresses as regions of village construction.¹⁰

---

¹⁰ For an example of this logic, see BOA, ŞD 2114/18, no. 4 (18 Şaban 1286 [10 November 1869]).
Yet, these buried ruins were in fact indicators of just how far from habitability such regions had come. İslahiye, a new settlement named after the Reform Division or Firka-i İslahiye itself, was one such example. Constructed near the remains of the Nikola fortress, İslahiye was to serve as a model settlement and form a new administrative center among tribal populations on the edge of the plain. When British clergyman E.J. Davis visited the town during the 1870s, it had the makings of a colonial outpost in the wilderness. According to Davis, “it was a very marshy and unhealthy place” at the time of settlement, “and corvée laborers, masons, and carpenters, had been sent from Marash to build houses for the forced immigrants. The health of the place had, however, not much improved. The country is so level… that very little would be needed to make a good carriage road… But the unhealthiness of the country would be a great obstacle to colonization.”11 Davis had a similar impression of Osmaniye, another new settlement built not far from the medieval fortress of Toprakkale. “It is a primitive little place, with a cold, bracing air in winter, but in summer it is nearly deserted, owing to malaria. The people live almost entirely by their flocks and herds, and, although the soil is fertile, there is but little cultivation.”12 There, Davis lodged in the home of an Armenian man — just one of five Armenian families to settle in the village — who warned him about the danger of the region’s fauna. A leopard had killed a villager and his son the year before and wolves constantly threatened the population and livestock of the area. Davis was kept up that night by the howling of jackals and the numerous dogs that roamed the town.13

Çukurova was no place to settle for the unadventurous, and even the most entrepreneurial and determined newcomer continually grappled with a hostile frontier environment. Davis met one such character, a “daring and resolute” settler named Nikola Arslan, upon his visit to the

11 Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey, 103.
12 Ibid., 79.
13 Ibid., 78-80.
ruins of Anazarba\textsuperscript{14} on the north side of the Ceyhan River just south of Sis. Arslan, a Syrian Christian from Tripoli (modern-day Lebanon), had recently bought up the property around the abandoned city and brought twenty or so households from his native town as laborers. They lived within the remaining walls of the medieval city, forbidding Muslims to settle among them and warding off “the thievish prowling Circassian” bandits that sometimes robbed the villagers of Çukurova. Though he had bought the previously uncultivated land from the Ottoman government at a bargain price and the soil was fertile, he was struggling to turn a profit in the wake of a terrible flood that had engulfed his property.\textsuperscript{15} When asked if the region was healthy, Arslan, himself the native of a malarial region of the Eastern Mediterranean coast, reported that he had at least enjoyed good health in his six or seven years of inhabitance at Anazarba. But the frontier spirit of Arslan, who represented the rare breed of voluntary settlers in the region, was not one often encountered in Eastern Çukurova at that time.

Lt. Ferdinand Bennet, a British Consul in Anatolia charged with reporting on the impacts of provincial reform and charting the geography of interior regions between 1879 and 1882, followed in Davis’s footsteps a few years later, and his impressions were similar though even more thoroughly negative. The towns were malarial, poor, and deserted in the summer during the seasonal migrations. Meanwhile, police were exceedingly few, and they were poorly equipped and even more poorly compensated. In other words, there was hardly any impression that the Reform Division had left a tangible impact beyond slight improvements in the security situation. In fact, it was hard for Bennet to detect a significant government presence in the countryside. The dilapidated houses built by the Reform Division seemed to have already blended in with the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{14} Anazarbus or Ain Zarba was an Assyrian settlement rebuilt by Byzantine Emperor Justianian I during the sixth century. It was later claimed by the Abassids before being taken by the Crusaders and becoming part of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia. It was depopulated during the Mamluk invasion of the fourteenth century. Today it is known in Turkish as Anavarza.

\textsuperscript{15} Davis, \textit{Life in Asiatic Turkey}, 141.
\end{footnotesize}
ancient ruins. In Osmaniye, Bennet remarked that, “they live in reed or rush wigwams rather than homes, roughly thatched and affording as one would suppose hardly any protection in winter. They are the crudest dwelling places imaginable, and it is painful to notice debris of former stone or mud houses in the many villages where they now prefer to use reeds.”

Houses had been built for the tribes of Cilicia during the 1860s, but they had preferred to return to more temporary structures.

Only a decade after the Reform Division’s auspicious arrival in Cilicia, the state of the villages it had constructed was bleak, and seasonal migration seemed to be the norm. This was the result of a failed attempt to overpower the ecology of a region in which the swampy lowlands of the plain had warded off permanent inhabitance for centuries. The Ottoman government had settled tens of thousands of immigrants and pastoralists on vacant lands, distributed seed, in some cases issued tax exemptions, and even overseen the construction of many houses.”

“Whether this was an experiment or not I know not,” remarked Bennet in reference to this bold attempt that had yielded such limited results. Experiment, accident, or otherwise, frontier settlement in Çukurova had meant death and misery for many others.

The reasons for the short-term failure of these settlements were largely geographical in nature. The locations of new settlements were overwhelmingly in regions where cultivation was extremely sparse and the low flat terrain was rather marshy due in part to the passage of the Ceyhan River and its tributaries. In these regions, malaria, a disease long endemic to the Mediterranean, threatened any human who dared to spend the night, let alone reside

---

16 TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
17 BOA, MVL 1041/7 (26 July 1865).
18 TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
19 In his study of settlement, Gould argues in partial contrast to this statement noted that 9% of the settlements created by the Reform Division were on river banks or places with swamps and another 31% were on the plain. However, he relied on the classification system used in Republican-era studies denoting settlements of either “flat” or “hilly,” which was imaginative but likely failed to capture the full scope of malaria’s reach. Gould, “Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885”, 179.
permanently. Yarsuvat, the original Nogay settlement on the river, as well as other villages of Circassians and Chechens in the Kars district are examples of settlements built in the heart of swamps where malaria would be prevalent. The situation was very similar for most of the tribes settled by the Reform Division, especially those most directly considered natives to the Çukurova/Gavurdağı area such as the Tecirlis, Bozdoğan, and Cerids. For example, a portion of the Tecirli and Cerid communities were settled in the Cerid winter pasture areas east of the Ceyhan River. Their villages formed a cluster of small settlements near the town of Osmaniye. Two of the principal settlements in this cluster were named Cevdetiye and Dervişiye for Ahmed Cevdet Pasha and Derviş Pasha respectively. In these eight villages, 451 houses (hanе) were built. They had constructed a sizeable number, but they were likely only enough to accommodate a portion of these communities.

The hazards of this policy were well-understood. Though the soil and general agricultural prospects of these regions were by all accounts excellent, the eminent threat of malaria and the general challenges to cultivation posed by the frequent flooding of the Ceyhan River, which in years of high rainfall would connect with the Seyhan River in Eastern Çukurova, made settlement a risky prospect. In this regard, the Reform Division represented an attempt to test or implement an ecological theory based on a particular reading of Ibn Khaldun’s writings about civilization (see Chapter 3). Encouraging and forcing settlement in Eastern Çukurova would cause the health situation of these locales to improve. As the decree regarding the settlement of Tecirlis and Cerids around Osmaniye indicated, “God-willing in the coming year with the

---

20 As I explained in Chapter 1, Çukurova was a region of settlement not only for pastoralist tribes but also large numbers of migrants fleeing persecution in the Russian sphere.
21 The villages and number of households were as follows: Dervişiye: 123, Cevdetiye: 81, Rızaıye: 48, İzzeddin: 47, Yaveriye: 46, Azizli: 43, Tevfikiye: 40, Şükriye: 23. BOA, İ-DH 551/38360, No. 1 (6 Muharrem 1283 [21 May 1866]).
expenditure of some effort they will succeed in more planting and cultivation.” Just as providing incentives such as seed to immigrants was expected to secure their stable settlement of Eastern Çukurova, tribes with some help from the state and a lot of elbow grease could quickly turn the fertile soils of the Cilician swamps into fragrant fields of wheat, cotton, and sesame.

Ahmed Cevdet and his contemporaries possessed understandings of geography and climate’s impact on human bodies. Again, as Ibn Khaldun had argued, the physical differences between people inhabiting different regions of the world were in part a result of climate’s impact on bodies, which over time became adapted to the soil and sun of particular regions. Thus, Ottoman officials clearly believed some peoples were better suited for habitation of Çukurova than others. For example, a letter to the Vali of Adana from the Meclis-i Vala pertaining to the settlement of the Karakayalı tribe during the activities of the Reform Division refers to the difficulty of year round habitation. The Karakayalı wintered in Çukurova but the yaylas were located hundreds of kilometers away in the Konya province around Ereğli. Like many of the communities targeted by the Reform Division, the Karakayalı were to be settled around their winter quarters; however, “since they have long been accustomed to the yayla (menülkadım yaylaya alışmış oldukları cihetle),” the letter indicates, they could not be expected to suddenly encamp in “warm locations (mevaki-i harre).”

Cevdet Pasha knew the importance of “change of air” during the summer, and more importantly, he believed that it was against the physical constitution Cilicia’s settlers to live in such climates. Like Ibn Khaldun, Cevdet thought that different environments produced different bodies. For example, according to Cevdet the Circassians settled in Çukurova had been moved to

---

22 BOA, I-DH 551/38360, No. 1 (6 Muharrem 1283 [21 May 1866]).
23 BOA, MVL 707/87, to Adana Valisi (14 Safer 1282 [9 July 1865]).
Uzunayla “because mountain people cannot live on the plains.”\textsuperscript{24} In other cases he argued that certain newcomers were well-suited to the local geography. He claimed, for example, that Tatars from Kuban settled in Çukurova were able to handle the climate because they were from a river-valley region of Crimea.\textsuperscript{25} Since the constitution of these communities was determined more by habit and experience rather than a hardcoded biological or racial essence, there was room for flexibility, but the tribes settled in Çukurova were by Cevdet’s definition mountain people in every sense. The mountains were their “home (silâ)”; they associated mountain spaces with good health. This is why the powerful Afsar tribe preferred to settle permanently at higher elevations even if it meant spending cold winters in a barren mountain landscape.\textsuperscript{26} Yet, like most settlers of the period immigrant, tribal, and otherwise, the pastoralist communities of Cilicia did not have much say in the matter. The underlying logic of settlement policy dictated that the least salubrious areas would be targeted for settlement. Because both immigrants and nomads were employed towards the goal of developing previously uncultivated land, most were settled in sparsely-populated regions of low-lying plains such as Çukurova despite understandings of health and disease ecology that might have dictated otherwise. In this case, the political goal of pacification and the more radical objective of encouraging settlement trumped any concerns about the health impacts of Çukurova’s geography. This policy would bring catastrophic suffering and sorrow to the inhabitants of the new Cilicia.

\textsuperscript{24} Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, \textit{Marûzât}, 182.

\textsuperscript{25} Similar racial discourses about disease had buttressed the employment of African slaves in the hot climate of the American South, though the descendants of these slaves would suffer from malaria well into post-segregation era. See Humphreys, \textit{Malaria : poverty, race, and public health in the United States}.

\textsuperscript{26} BOA, MVL 712/104 (2 Rebiulevvel 1282 [14 July 1865]); Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, \textit{Marûzât}, 147.
Feverish Years

As explained in Chapter 1, seasonal migration was critical to understandings of health among not just pastoralist communities but all inhabitants of Adana during the early modern period. The hot, sticky summers of Çukurova were indelibly linked with the distinct symptoms of malaria. The fever and shivering associated with this disease were understood to be a product of the hot weather and bad air of the area during summer. According to today’s understandings, the fact that Çukurova offered ample breeding ground for the anopheles mosquito, the sole vector of malaria, made it such a difficult place to spend the warm months during which those insects proliferate. By settling nomads in these areas, the Ottoman administration subjected these communities to elevated disease risks.

Malaria is caused by a parasite that lives in human blood and is spread between humans by the bite of an anopheles mosquito. Only the female anopheles mosquito can be a vector for malaria since only she engages in bloodfeeding. Mosquitoes are prolific breeders and require only stagnant water for their larvae to hatch. Buckets, irrigation ditches, and other human-made bodies of water are sufficient to provide a breeding ground. As Norbert Becker writes, “there is hardly any aquatic habitat anywhere in the world that does not lend itself as a breeding site for mosquitoes.” However, natural sources of sitting water such as swamps, marshes, rivers, lakes and the like have historically been the most flourishing environments of the mosquito. Some mosquitoes prefer to lay their eggs in large flooded or reeded zones such as swamps where water is still. Thus, in between the reeds with which the settlers of Çukurova built their huts lurked the future makers of their malarial misery.

---

27 Norbert Becker, Mosquitoes and Their Control (Berlin; London: Springer, 2010), 22.
28 Ibid., 9.
29 Ibid., 12.
Because mosquitoes are cold-blooded, their most active periods of the year are the warm months when temperatures remain high. As such, mosquitoes thrive in the hot summer sun of the Mediterranean littoral. Like many bloodfeeders, some mosquitoes do their best work at night when the cover of darkness and slumber render their prey especially vulnerable, but there are others that feed during the day and at dusk as well. There are dozens of species of anopheles mosquitoes worldwide that are significant vectors of the malaria parasite.

The two main strains of that malaria parasite present in Çukurova during the Ottoman period are *Plasmodium vivax* and *Plasmodium falciparum*. *P. vivax* is the less lethal of the two species and requires an isotherm of 16° C to thrive; *P. falciparum*, the more dangerous of the two, requires a summer isotherm of 20° C to proliferate. Thus, the malaria of tropical and subtropical climates is especially lethal for those lacking resistance. Depending on the year, the climate of Adana maintains an average mean temperature of above 20° C from May through October, meaning that the malarial months began in late spring and ended in autumn during the Ottoman period, a few weeks after the last bites of the season. Once temperatures drop below 10° C, mosquitoes begin to hibernate, meaning that regions or months with lower temperatures would be free of malaria risk. The mean annual temperature of most regions of the Taurus Mountains north of Adana is below 10° C. In part because of this fact and especially due to the lack of sitting water, these areas of high elevation exceeding 1000-1200 meters are not typically malarial zones.

The seasonal migrations to the mountains in Cilicia that began in May and ended with a gradual return at the end of summer were timed perfectly to avoid the malarial months and

---

30 Ibid., 28.
32 For example, this was the maximum elevation deemed necessary for DDT spraying in the Adana region during anti-malarial activities of the 1950s.
therefore offered the ultimate prophylactic against the disease. By migrating en masse to regions where mosquitoes could not thrive, pastoralist communities were subjected to very negligible risk of malaria, as almost no one among their community would carry the parasite in their blood. Other aspects of pastoralist life such as the maintenance of large flocks may have further reduced exposure to malaria. If the mosquitoes of Çukurova were as “zoophilic” as research suggests, pastoralists were to enjoy a type of mosquito-borne-disease resistance called zooprophylaxis due to the vector’s preference for the blood of animals such as goats and donkeys.33

Settlement was experienced as a dramatic turn in the relationship of these communities with the disease environment, as malaria risk suddenly rose from effectively zero to threatening every single member of the community. Though known primarily for its lingering and debilitating effects, malaria is often a fatal disease. For them, even *P. vivax*, which is generally associated with milder but recurring fevers, could become a lethal affair. The more deadly species of malaria, *P. falciparum* strikes suddenly with severe fever, often killing the infected with painful symptoms such as brain inflammation. During the Ottoman period, this variety of malaria known through its particular symptoms and effects was known as *kara sitma* or “black fever/malaria.”34

Because malaria is a parasite that lives in human blood, it can remain there and impact the host year after year. The first encounter with malaria is the most likely to be deadly. In this

33 O. Demirhan and M. Kasap, "Bloodfeeding behavior of Anopheles sacharovi in Turkey," *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association* 11, no. 1 (1995). For more on zooprophylaxis see Allan Saul, "Zooprophylaxis or zoopotentiation: the outcome of introducing animals on vector transmission is highly dependent on the mosquito mortality while searching," *Malaria Journal* 2, no. 32 (2003). There are also forms of genetic resistance to malaria that develop within populations that experience continued contact with the disease over many generations. Evidence of these types of resistance in the form of blood conditions such as sickle cell can be found mainly in tropical regions such as Sub-Saharan Africa but also in a smaller degree throughout the Middle East and the Mediterranean littoral. However, it is doubtful that transhuman populations of Anatolia, who spent parts of the year in the interior would have enjoyed significant genetic resistance, nor would have Caucasian immigrants. No human body can be said to be well-suited to a malarial environment, but these communities were particular ill fit much as Ahmed Cevdet had noted.

34 Tevfik Rüştü (Aras), *Sitma'ya Karşı Muharebe (The Battle Against Malaria)* (Selanik: Rumeli Matbaası, 1326 [1910]), 1.
regard, malaria is especially dangerous for infants and children. Children born to women who experience malaria during pregnancy often suffer from low birth weight, making them more vulnerable to various illnesses and leading to high rates neonatal mortality.\textsuperscript{35} The way that malaria interacts with pregnancy also has harsh results for women who become afflicted with maternal malaria. The intermittent fevers typical of \textit{P. vivax} infection that are normally manageable become more severe and even fatal; malaria during pregnancy greatly raises the risk of miscarriage or infant death. In nineteenth-century conditions, birth to a mother suffering from malaria meant a likely premature death. Worse yet perhaps, women with malaria are at high risk of dying during or immediately following childbirth.\textsuperscript{36} As for men, impotence is among the most psychologically severe effects of malaria. Added to this was the likely feeling of impotence due to inability to work. Because the malaria sufferer often remains bedridden, the disease is a major disruption to labor and livelihood of families, particularly in rural settings. In fact, as malaria epidemiology was more completely understood during the twentieth century, Turkey and many other states would begin to treat malaria as a distinctly rural disease (more in Chapter 12).

The disease environment described above is precisely what faced those who tried to settle in the lowlands of late Ottoman Cilicia. Because of the pervasive risk of malaria in Çukurova, the first full summer of settlement in the plains did not pass smoothly. Cevdet remarked that the tribes accustomed to nomadism (\textit{göçebelik}) “abhorred” the settlement orders from the beginning.\textsuperscript{37} Consul Skene of Aleppo reported in August of 1866 that the Turkmen tribes that normally migrated between Çukurova and Kozan were in revolt. “[Cevdet] Pasha destroyed their


\textsuperscript{37} Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, \textit{Marûzât}, 179.
tents, and built village for them on the low grounds,” he explained. “Suffering of late severely from the heat and unhealthiness of the latter, they begged to be allowed to pass a couple of months on the cool heights of the Taurus range, but that permission was refused, and they have declared themselves in open revolt, burning their villages and retiring to their strongholds in the mountains where they are preparing to defend themselves against all attempts to dislodge them.”

In this case, reinforcements from Aleppo were used to force these communities to return to their villages for the remainder of the season, and in subsequent years, the province would use police to limit the movement of recently settled pastoralists where possible.

Because the provincial government did everything in its power to prevent the new settlers from migrating during the summer, the period from the beginning of the Reform Division’s activities in summer of 1865 until the summer of 1873 was one of intense suffering brought on by the epidemic spread of malaria and the loss of livestock due to insufficient pasture. Quantifying the impact of malaria and other settlement-induced factors on the population of Çukurova during the 1860s and 70s is hazardous. The Ottoman government did not keep any reliable statistics about mortality of its subjects during the period in question, and in fact, available population figures are hardly reflections of reality.

38 TNA, FO 195/800, 1866 No. 10, Skene to Lyons (22 August 1866).
39 TNA, FO 195/800, 1866 No. 10, Skene to Lyons (22 August 1866).
40 When they could, Ottoman subjects often resorted to elaborate measures in order to avoid being counted. In one baffling case, it seems some villagers in Sinop successfully convinced the Ottoman government that their children were being carried off by a hyena-like creature. Samuel Dolbee, “The Hyena Monster of Sinop and the Vagaries of Ottoman Population Counts,” Tozsuz Evrak, no. 12 (2 August 2012). During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, references to these large number of unregistered inhabitants appear in the archival record and elsewhere as “hidden population (nüfus-i mektume).” Officials were aware of these uncounted individuals and often included estimates of their possible numbers in their reports. For example, the census official in Adana report in 1897 that likely 20% of province’s population was not registered and that people deliberately misrepresented their birth, death, and marriage dates. BOA, Y-PRK-DH 9/41 (5 January 1897). Another good example of this phenomenon arises from a report on the sancak of Lattakia in Syria and the Nusayri population of the mountains. It offers detailed population statistics in the form of tables, only to indicate that actual figures were more than 25% higher due to an inability to properly count people in the mountains. BOA, Y-PRK-UM 2/43, no. 1 (8 Şevval 1297 / 30 Ağustos 1296 [12 September 1880]). Although census and registration practices improved over the last decades of Ottoman rule, in Adana, there consistent references to large numbers of “hidden population” right up to the World War I period.
The issue is further complicated by the fact that no official publication ever alluded to this suffering or the impacts of settlement. It is only mentioned, as far as I can tell, in archival correspondence and a handful of documents referring to modification of settlement policy. This was after the pitiful health situation of these settlers drew serious attention because their floundering was becoming detrimental to the needs of the state. In a series of documents from 1876 that redefined the terms of settlement for these pastoralist communities, the general contours of settlement’s impacts were laid bare. Settlement had led to “the loss of a great many lives in terms of population and livestock (nüfusça ve hayvanatça pek çok telefat).” The stark impact of settlement in the area of health and mortality was particularly glaring among the youth; whereas in the past these communities “were raising able-bodied men of age fit for military service, now it is rarely seen.” The issue of disease had been compounded by the fact that while sheep and goats had comprised the backbone of pastoralist society in Cilicia as the ungulate proletariat that bore the brunt of suffering in terms of scarcity and hardship, preventing these communities from migrating meant that pasture was extremely scarce. While the soil was fertile, the combination of exacerbating factors led to a condition in which instead of a gradual expansion of agriculture and prosperity, the settlements of Eastern Çukurova saw “local wealth and prosperity regressing day by day.” The ill-effects of settlement were thus resulting in considerable losses in terms of military and tax base.

See BOA, DH-MKT 541/51 (9 Rebiulahir 1320); DH-ID 80/26 (28 Receb 1332 [9 June 1914]), pg. 2. Ottoman subjects chose to hide their numbers not only to avoid paying taxes; for Muslim subjects, escaping conscription, which was being newly implemented throughout the empire during the Tanzimat period, was perhaps the most significant source of motivation. Most of the tribal communities in the Cilicia region had avoided conscription during the Crimean War, and during the first years of settlement the draft lottery was conducted only with intense supervision. As a result of these factors, official population statistics reflect the number of inhabitants the state was capable of counting rather than accurate numbers, which were often much higher. For more, see Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); Justin McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities: the population of Ottoman Anatolia and the end of the empire* (New York: New York University Press, 1983).

41 BOA, ŞD 2117/55, No. 4 (24 Rebiulahir 1293 [19 May 1876]).
Much as indicated in the Ottoman documents described above, British Consul Lt. Bennet found demographic devastation in the countryside of Çukurova during his visit. His most severe estimate regarded the Nogay Tatars settled at Yarsuvat (modern-day Ceyhan), whose numbers had plummeted by 80% from roughly 15,000 to just 3,000. He likewise noted that half of the newly arriving immigrants from the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 had perished by late 1880. This is not the only report pertaining to such immigrants in Çukurova reflecting staggering numbers. While frequent Ottoman reports with language stating that, for example, in the case of immigrants settled in Adana in 1878, “most of them (ekserisi) are dying due to the heaviness of the air” may seem vague or hyperbolic, such levels of mortality were a possibility. The case of local pastoralists settled in Çukurova appears to have been less statistically extreme though still very striking. Bennet estimated that roughly half of the people settled by the Reform Division in Çukurova had died “after three or four summers on the plain” and their flocks and dwindled accordingly.

The only detailed numbers pertaining to post-settlement demographic change arise from the Ottoman yearbooks or salnames for this period. These sources do not contain reliable raw population data for the reasons mentioned above, but available estimates for certain districts

---

42 TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880). French travelers Favre and Mandrot made similar observations about post-Crimean War migrants after their Cilician excursion in 1874. Favre and Mandrot, *Voyage en Cilicie*, 40.
43 BOA, I-ŞD 40/2123, no. 2 (12 Ramazan 1295 [28 August 1878]).
44 TNA, FO 424/132, pg. 110, Bennet to Dufferin (22 March 1882). Gould’s dissertation contains some additional lengthy quotations from Bennet. Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885".
45 Special thanks to Mehtap Çelik and her students at Mersin University for sharing some of their salname research with me. The data in salnames for this period presents a number of analytical challenges. The Cilicia region, which was part of the Aleppo province until 1868, was reorganized as the Province of Adana. There was some shifting in the boundaries of districts. In addition, salnames are inconsistent in terms of how population data is represented. Sometimes only the number of households is given. Sometimes both population and number of households. General population figures for this period in Adana appear to represent only adult males, but this is apparently not the case for other salnames. For example, the Aleppo salnames appear to switch over to representing both male and female population in H. 1288, because the population suddenly doubles with no significant change in number of households.
might at least be compared to each other. For example, the numbers indicate a precipitous population decline in the district of Osmaniye. Whereas one assumes that better methods of registration and counting were pushing salname population numbers upward during the late 1860s and early 1870s, Osmaniye reflects a decline. The H. 1285 (1868) salname put the population of Osmaniye at roughly double what it would be by 1876 after years of decline; in other words, the salname indicates a 50% drop in population.\textsuperscript{46} No other districts reflected the level of population decline found in Osmaniye, although the nearby Kars district did experience an apparent small drop in contrast to the general rise observed in other districts.\textsuperscript{47}

The lingering demographic impacts on settled communities in Çukurova would become more easily quantified as population figures improved in reliability over the final decades of Ottoman rule, but by then, the boundaries separating tribal communities from the other inhabitants of the region were obscured.\textsuperscript{48} According to the data of Vital Cuinet, the nomadic

\textsuperscript{46} Cengiz Eroğlu, Murat Babuçoğlu, and Mehmet Köcher, \textit{Osmanlı vilayet salnamelerinde Halep} (Ankara: Global Strateji Enstitüsü, 2007), 184. The H. 1284 \textit{Salname} of Aleppo offered population figures for most districts but not Osmaniye. SV-Haleb (1284 [1867]); SV-Adana (H. 1287 [1870]); SV-Adana (H. 1294 [1877]). These numbers are complicated by the fact that the population estimates for Osmaniye in H. 1286 (1869) were erroneously low. I hesitate to take this figure at face value. Ibid., 181. Another important indication might be that the population declined faster than the number of households listed in the \textit{salnames}. In 1868, there were roughly 3 people (presumably adult males) per household whereas in 1876, there were just over 2. However, most of the districts in the Adana province reflect a similar decline in the ratio represented in population estimates.

\textsuperscript{47} Population estimates for Kars are not consistent over the 1867-1877 period. According to the data, the Kars district grew substantially between 1868 and 1870 but then proceeded to decline in population.

\textsuperscript{48} In an article published many years after his dissertation, Gould attempted to evaluate the demographic impact of settlement on the first generation after the Reform Division by comparing \textit{salname} data from the 1860s and the 1890s. Gould found that while most districts increased significantly in population, the population in Kars, Sis, and Karaisali decreased substantially between 1868 and 1890. This was despite an increase in the number of villages. Gould, "The Burning of the Tents," 82. Unfortunately, the figures provided by Gould, while conceivably accurate, do not reflect reliable data. I attempted to replicate Gould’s results and widened the pool of data to include the 1882/3-90 census tabulated by Karpat and averaged \textit{salname} data for the years of 1867-1877 in order to reduce the effect of statistical fluctuations. It would seem that Gould did not recognize the fact that the 1860s data included only male population whereas the data from 1890 is from an overall census, which in fact makes the disparities between those figures far greater. However, it is also clear that Cuinet’s data diverges markedly from Karpat’s 1882/3-1890 census data, although the overall population numbers for the Adana province are virtually the same in both sources. If we evaluate Karpat’s data alongside the \textit{salname} data, we find that the population in the census data for most districts of the Adana region is roughly double, we assume, because the census counted females. Kars, Osmaniye, and Karaisali exhibited the least increase among these figures while the population of Adana, Payas, and Sis increased the most. In summary, Cuinet’s data was not reliable, the \textit{salname} data is inconsistent, and even the Ottoman census data is probably only a rough approximation. The data, to the extent we may rely on it, does
The population of Turkmen and Kurdish communities in the Adana province was almost 40,000, whereas that figure had been around 80,000 in the study of Victor Langlois. Meanwhile, the population of other groups had risen. Perhaps this represented a significant decline in population, perhaps the estimates contained a wide margin of error, or perhaps many had come to be labeled as what Cuinet referred to as “Ottomans proprement dits” by the 1890s.49

Whatever the mortality figures might have been, contemporary observations of life in Çukurova portended trouble for communities settled there. Bennet remarked that in the villages of Eastern Çukurova there were “hardly any children.”50 His observation, while not offering a means of quantitatively evaluating the impacts of settlement, illustrates what malaria and mortality meant for families. Though often obscured within academic historiography, the daily deaths of parents, spouses, children, relatives, friends, or patrons are events laden with intense emotion. Among the communities of Cilicia, as was the case throughout most of the Ottoman Empire and elsewhere, a common aspect of mourning and marking of a beloved or important individual’s death was a lament or ağıt, a song telling the story of that person’s life, exploits, and ultimate passing. These laments serve as vivid snapshots of individual instances of suffering deemed significant enough for posterity.

A collection of such songs from the area surrounding Sarız in the Taurus Mountains, a major area of settlement for Afşars, reflects the extent to which disease and malaria in particular played a role in this memory. Numerous songs about those who died of disease illustrate that

indicate low to zero population growth in certain regions of tribal settlement, and given that many immigrants had also been settled in those areas, the general conclusion that high mortality and low rates of reproduction in those areas prevailed appears accurate. See SV-Adana (H. 1287, 1293, 1294); Eroğlu, Babuçoğlu, and Köçer, Osmanlı vilayet sahnamelerinde Halep, 174-84; Karpat, Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics, 124-27; Vidal Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, vol. 2 (Paris: Leroux, 1891), 5.

49 Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie; Langlois, Voyage dans la Cilicie. As Gould notes, even if the Afşars were not counted in these statistics due to their being settled outside of the boundaries of the Adana province, the numbers still reflect a 22% decrease. Gould, "The Burning of the Tents." 84.

50 TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
sickness was both traumatic and quotidian. In one song, a headstrong teenager storms off to Adana over a disagreement with his family. When his mother goes after him, she arrives to find he has already died of malaria.\textsuperscript{51} In another a man goes to Adana to sell livestock and meets the same fate; his sister writes his lament.\textsuperscript{52} Yet another tells the story of Avşar, the brother of a famous female lament composer named Kır Sultan, who during the first years of settlement during the 1860s becomes ill, resulting in his inability to have children. According to the local customs, he is placed inside a sheep skin in hopes that he will recover, but instead he passes out and dies without progeny.\textsuperscript{53} Most symbolically, the lament of Hacı Bey, the Afsar leader who negotiated their settlement with Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, tells the tale of his sickness and passing soon after settlement in Pınarbaşı.\textsuperscript{54} Disease was not the only danger threatening new settlers. Limitations on migration made it difficult to sustain livestock numbers. For example, the Afsars who settled on the yayla, rather than facing the risk of malaria, were confronted with the challenge of passing the winter in the brutally cold and snowy Taurus Mountains. Many animals died of cold and lack of pasture during the winter, and as a result, many humans died as well. Molla Mehmet’s lament, composed by his daughter, explains these hard times and her father’s death of tuberculosis.\textsuperscript{55}

Besim Atalay’s \textit{Maraş Tarihi} contained another song, recorded decades later among old Turkmen who had survived the settlement process. One old man wept as he uttered the lyrics of a Dadaloğlu composition:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Padişah\textsuperscript{q}t\textsuperscript{c}an ferman geldi, ne diyem?}\quad The decree came from the Sultan, what can I say?
\textit{Yolumuza iskân düştü gideyim}\quad Settlement has come our way, so I’ll go
\textit{Yeşil yayaları kime terkeyim?}\quad To whom should I leave the green \textit{yaylas}?
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{51} Özdemir, \textit{Öyküleriyle Ağtılar}, 263.  
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 267.  
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 129.  
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 303.  
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 333.
In his earliest work from the 1940s, Yaşar Kemal sought to compile the folklore of Çukurova and the various laments found around in the area surrounding his native village of Hemite, and through a perusal of these snapshots of suffering, he became acquainted with the memory of tribal settlement. His collection of essays called Çukurova Yana Yana described the accounts of settlement relayed by an old storyteller in his native village. He explained, in simple terms how the Ottoman army defeated the tribes and settled them into the plain: “They stuffed the tribes into Çukurova... Patrol brigades were sent to the mountains. The people started dying of malaria (sitma).” Disease and settlement are closely linked in the memory of Çukurova’s rural communities. This association serves to underscore the way in which nomadic pastoralists were subjugated and forced to take up village life against their collective will. By the 1940s, the pastoralist population of the Adana region had for the most part sedentarized. The process of settlement was remembered bitterly among the people of Çukurova who knew the songs of Dadaloğlu and other bards.

In the absence of firm statistics about malaria mortality in Çukurova during the 1870s, we might at least look to a case of comparison. In colonial Bengal, seasonally-migratory populations had been subject to British settlement policies, leading to epidemics that were studied by colonial doctors. While these scientists possessed no exact explanation for the cause of malarial fever at the time, their detailed statistics regarding mortality give us a snapshot of what it meant to contract malaria in a nineteenth-century settlement region with a sub-tropical climate. While

56 Atalay, Maraş Tarihi ve Coğrafyası, 70.
57 Kemal and Dino, Ağtlar : Folklor derlemesi.
58 Kemal, Çukurova Yana Yana, 12.
59 One such song, complaining of mosquitoes, swamps, and longing for the yayla was recorded by Pertev Naily Boratav. Boratav, Çukurova’da folklor derlemeleri, 268-69. Gould has made a translation of the poem along with a few others. Gould, "The Burning of the Tents," 83.
impacts were varied, in some of the settlements of Bengal created by the British, malaria mortality exceeded 25%.60

The experience of local pastoralists in Çukurova likely resembled their counterparts in Bengal more so than their immigrant neighbors, who were utterly decimated by local disease environments. Settlement claimed many lives, but ultimately its worst impacts would be impoverishment and marginalization. The divergence of these fates was the result of economic and ecological factors; though not well-suited for immediate settlement, Cilicia’s tribes possessed certain forms of wealth and knowledge about the local geography that enabled them to confront the hardships of settlement more easily than needy immigrants from the Black Sea basin. However, immigrants were also less fortunate than tribes in that their fates were hitched to the horses of the Ottoman state. They were dependent on that state for material support and security, and were unable to move without its permission and assistance. Cilicia’s local pastoralists by contrast were still largely in opposition to the state, which sought forcibly to limit their movements and disrupt a preexisting ecology. This point became especially clear when the state’s finances began to falter at the beginning of the 1870s, reducing budgetary allocations for expensive projects such as settlement while increasing tax burdens, meanwhile weakening the state presence and allowing pastoralists to migrate and move more freely once again. If geography had been the main barrier to settlement, the political economy of the 1870s would deal the most critical blow to Ottoman settlement policy in Cilicia and the efforts of the Reform Division.

60 Samanta, Malarial Fever in Colonial Bengal.
Flight or Famine

From the time of the Reform Division’s arrival, Cilicia’s pastoralist communities were hostile towards the settlement orders and most notably limitations on summer migration. These orders could not be enforced with mere words. They could only be kept in their villages during the summer by the soldiers that patrolled the mountains and guarded key roads and passes. Constant surveillance and armed presence was necessary for the Ottoman government to keep people in their places. Yet, financial and political issues began to preoccupy the Ottoman administration, and in 1873, less than a decade after the genesis of the Reform Division, the region saw a sudden resurgence in transhumance and a general disregard for the settlement orders.61

This surge in movement may have simply resulted from the dissolution of police and military presence in the Cilician countryside, which had gradually faded due to budgetary constraints and the thanklessness of tasks such as patrolling mountain passes.62 But the resurgence of transhumance was like fueled by economic upheaval and panic in Ottoman Anatolia as well. From 1873 to 1875, severe famine ravaged the more inland regions such as Ankara and Yozgat. Starvation was especially concentrated in the rural areas, catalyzed by a period of intense drought. It was by no means the first famine to visit the Anatolian heartland, though it may well have been the most pronounced. Somewhere between 100,000 and 250,000 people died during these years of crisis.63 The level of starvation was shocking and attracted international attention in the form of relief efforts, but Anatolian peasants were by no means

61 BOA, ŞD 2117/55, No. 4 (24 Rebiulahir 1293 [19 May 1876]).
62 Lt. Bennet remarked that police were not regularly paid in the Adana province and was particularly struck by the fact that the few police he met in Gavurdağı did not even have uniforms. TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
63 Özge Ertem, “Eating the last seed : famine, empire, survival and order in Ottoman Anatolia in the late 19th century” (European University Institute, 2012), 13.
alone in their misery.\textsuperscript{64} Catastrophic famine had hit Algeria and Iran a few years prior.\textsuperscript{65} Indeed, during the 1870s, Egypt, Brazil and vast swaths of the Chinese countryside would all fall prey to drought-induced famines on a scale that was previously unrecorded.\textsuperscript{66}

While drought and famine are often synonymous in historical sources, the work of Cormac Ó Gráda and others on the history of famine points to layers of causality for shortage and starvation that include natural factors and disasters, political economy, the functioning of transportation networks and markets, cycles of poverty, and other socioeconomic factors.\textsuperscript{67} In other words, famine is not the absence of calories but rather a situation in which some have access to food and others do not. Thus, in the background of this discussion of drought-induced famine in the Ottoman Empire during the 1870s should be a consideration of the rapid administrative restructuring, commercialization of agriculture, and reorganization of taxation that had recently occurred.

Glimmers of impending economic crisis emerged on the margins of the empire in the years leading up to 1873. Famine in Bñghazi during 1871 and 1872 that impelled refugees to even take to the sea portended possible trouble for other Ottoman regions.\textsuperscript{68} The Ottoman administration was ill-equipped to provide famine relief or prevent an exodus of starving peasants. As another year of drought descended on Anatolia in 1873, panic ensued. In autumn 1873, reports came in that grain stores in many of the villages had been looted due to the shortages from provinces of inner Anatolia such as Yozgat, which began to receive grain from

\textsuperscript{64} BOA, HR-TO 250/21 (24 May 1875); 250/32 (26 July 1875).
\textsuperscript{65} See Gallois, \textit{The Administration of Sickness : medicine and ethics in nineteenth-century Algeria}. Also BOA, HR-SYS 4/29 (8 September 1871).
\textsuperscript{66} For a discussion of these waves of global famine, see Davis, \textit{Late Victorian Holocausts : El Niño famines and the making of the third world}.
\textsuperscript{68} BOA, ŞD 1376/7 (21 Safer 1288 [30 April 1871]); 251/17 (13 Rebiulahir 1289 [8 June 1872]).
When more local sources of reserves proved insufficient, the Ottoman government prepared to send large shipments of grain from elsewhere. Additional help in the form of tax relief was another basic means of assisting the Anatolian peasants. Yet, famine relief was not a simple matter of adjusting economic arrangements or sending grain. Even when grain was sent, the possibility that merchants and officials would hoard or sell grain at unfair prices loomed large.

When it came to drought, Adana was geographically fortunate. Çukurova’s position between the mountains and the sea meant that even in dry years, water and rain were rarely scarce to the point that starvation threatened the region as a whole. The Adana region supplied emergency grain to Cyprus, for example, in 1872 as shortages raged elsewhere. However, the harvest of 1873 reflected the effects of drought, with the wheat harvest of Adana registering at just 20% of the prior year’s total. The harvest of 1874 was excellent, however. In fact, Adana was one of the principal towns that became a refuge for those fleeing starvation in the countryside, only to become the place of their deaths in a much less fortunate disease geography. The *New York Times* reported in January of 1875 that as a result of famine in Anatolia, “50,000 persons have migrated from various parts of the country to the City of Adana, half of whom have since succumbed to disease. The strange climate, distress, and extreme rapaciousness of the tax-
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69 BOA, A]-MKT-MHM 466/45 (21 Şaban 1290 [2 October 1873]); 469/30 (9 Şevval 1290 [18 November 1873]).
70 BOA, A]-MKT-MHM 466/65 (23 Şaban 1290 [4 October 1873]).
71 Ertem, "Eating the last seed: famine, empire, survival and order in Ottoman Anatolia in the late 19th century", 74.
72 This being said, there had been droughts in the Adana-Tarsus during prior decades severe enough to merit tax reductions for the residents of the region. BOA, A-MKT 128/100 (14 Cemaziulevvel 1264 [6 April 1848]); MVL 25/22 (4 Receb 1264 [25 May 1848]).
73 BOA, ŞD 243/24 (29 Receb 1289 [20 September 1872]).
75 Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey, 186; Report upon the commercial relations of the United States with foreign countries for the year ending September 30, 1874, 1129.
gatherers aggravate the mortality.” E.J. Davis reported that half of the people who had come to Adana during the winter of 1874 had died of disease. Like the pastoralists and immigrants who toiled in the swamps of Çukurova, famine victims who fled to the more fertile fields of Adana were met only with malaria and disease.

Suffering was spread unevenly in the region. Settler populations in Eastern Çukurova, particularly among immigrants, were already dropping fast. Malaria had killed thousands and created abnormal rates of infant mortality. Farmers suffering from severe fevers were often too weary to properly work their fields. Poverty and indebtedness were becoming rampant. Pastoralists unaccustomed to agriculture struggled to provide as flock numbers dwindled. Whatever grain stores existed were likely depleted during the first years of settlement. Meanwhile, the province possessed poor roads beyond the strip connecting Adana to Tarsus and Mersin, meaning that the only paths in Eastern Çukurova were small dirt roads that were frequently impassable due to flooding on the low and swampy plain. Although Adana had grain to spare, transportation during the famine had been inadequate for those supplies to reach the interior. As the main trade routes increasingly flowed between Kayseri and Adana and from Adana to the sea, Eastern Çukurova was cut off from the economic networks that would possibly bring relief.

77 Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey, 169.
78 In another article from The New York Times, the disease mentioned in Adana and Tarsus were dysentery and typhus; yet, because it was difficult to separate the symptoms of these ailments from malaria and because reports of epidemic fever were often reported as typhus at the time (malaria’s transmission being unknown), we might expect that even more than those diseases, malaria killed those who fled to Adana in the summer. “Famine in Asia: a record of suffering,” The New York Times (26 July 1875), pg. 3. Typhus is caused by a bacteria transmitted by skin parasites such as fleas and ticks, and should not be confused with typhoid, a disease of similar symptoms transmitted through bodily fluids and therefore most commonly in contaminated water.
79 TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
80 Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey, 187.
The uneven infrastructure and coverage of trade networks in Çukurova not only affected food supplies but access to other essential goods such as medicine. Although malaria was suddenly part of daily life for newly settled tribes and immigrants, access to anti-malarial medicines was difficult to secure. E.J. Davis offers a fascinating window into what it meant to contract malaria in the Cilician countryside. While touring Çukurova, he contracted a horribly debilitating fever that left him bed-ridden in Mersin. He secured some quinine at an exorbitantly expensive rate, but soon understood that it was highly diluted and of poor quality. Davis may well have died of malaria without that medicine; indeed many Europeans visiting semi-tropical regions met such a fate. Moreover, as unfortunate as Davis may have seemed, having spent considerable money on marginally effective drugs, he was nevertheless quite fortunate compared to the average immigrant or pastoralist. When they contracted malaria, they would have been in no position to purchase a medicine that at any rate was virtually unknown to their communities. While it would become common for the Ottomans to send doctors and medicine to sick communities of immigrants in Anatolia (discussed in Chapter 6), government dispensation of doctors and quinine in the countryside was very sparse at the time. I found no evidence of doctors being sent to communities in Eastern Çukurova before the new wave of immigration following the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-78.

Leaving aside the poverty in the eastern portion of the Çukurova plain, the economy of Adana was reeling in its own right. The resurgence of American cotton production after the US Civil War and the collapse of global cotton prices during the 1870s with the onset of a global depression...
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81 Ibid., 464-66.
82 A travel companion of his in fact died of disease while in Adana. Ibid., 179.
83 One rare example I have found from the period comes from Mount Lebanon, where in summer of 1876, the kaymakam petitioned the Ottoman government for shipments of free medicine to alleviate the impending impact of malaria, which he mentioned would be especially acute among the Druze villagers. BOA, ŞD 262/53 (14 Cemaziyelahir 1293 [25 June 1876]).
84 Four doctors were sent to treat these settlers in Çukurova. BOA, İ-ŞD 40/2123, no. 2 (12 Ramazan 1295 [28 August 1878]).
depression that some argue lasted for decades hit Ottoman planters hard.\textsuperscript{85} Cotton production had grown rapidly since 1860 and many landowners had become highly-invested in this white gold. Faced with their own economic woes, cultivators and merchants actually sought to export grain from Adana to the Mediterranean in the midst of the Anatolian famines, despite its being banned by the Ottoman government, and local officials could do little to stop it.\textsuperscript{86} With many cultivators becoming deeply indebted and institutions such as the Ottoman administration and the British Relief Commission possessing limited capacity to force local actors to respond properly, the poor of Cilicia struggled to survive. A correspondent for \textit{The London Times} who passed through Çukurova and into inner Anatolia remarked that “the rich are now poor; the poor are dead or have emigrated,” and he described meeting small communities of pastoralists and villagers who had sold their animals and fled elsewhere.\textsuperscript{87}

Flight to another province may have helped hungry peasants in some cases to avoid starvation, but the economic conditions that contributed to the famine in Anatolia pervaded the Ottoman Empire. Adding to drought, local food shortages, provincial weakness, and poor infrastructure in rural Anatolia was a pervasive lack of money afflicting the Ottoman budget. While the 1860s had brought a tremendous wave of state interventions in the Ottoman countryside, medicine for sick peasants was hardly a priority for Ottoman statesman confronted with the imminent financial collapse of the empire. Following the Crimean War, the Ottoman Empire received large loans from European lenders. In fact, the year that saw the ambitious

\textsuperscript{86} Ertem, "Eating the last seed : famine, empire, survival and order in Ottoman Anatolia in the late 19th century", 174.
\textsuperscript{87} “Famine in Asia: a record of suffering,” \textit{The New York Times} (26 July 1875), pg. 3.
activities of the Reform Division represented the peak of Ottoman borrowing.\textsuperscript{88} With the financial woes of the 1870s and the mounting famine, 1873 became a year that would rival 1865 in terms of total borrowing (see Table 3).\textsuperscript{89} While major investments in the military and administration of the empire had been expected to help build a stronger tax base, debt at interest rates between 8 and 10\% mounted much faster than revenues, and with the global financial crisis, by 1875, the Ottoman Empire would face bankruptcy. This resulted in the formation of an international commission charged with managing the Ottoman Public Debt, which placed a significant portion of the empire’s budget under the control of foreign entities.\textsuperscript{90}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Loans Taken by Ottoman Government in £\textsuperscript{91}}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & Amount & Year & Amount \\
\hline
1854 & 2,286,285 & 1869 & 12,000,000 \\
1855 & 5,131,250 & 1870 & 10,177,109 \\
1858 & 3,687,500 & 1871 & 4,161,000 \\
1860 & 1,273,262 & 1872 & 9,457,276 \\
1862 & 5,440,000 & 1873 & 21,306,000 \\
1863 & 5,680,000 & 1874 & 17,400,000 \\
1865 & 22,141,818 & 1877 & 2,600,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Within this context, commitment to sustained settlement efforts was wavering. While Cevdet Pasha, local merchants and officials, and foreign consuls in the region may have viewed the Reform Division as a firm step in the direction of civilization, the view from Istanbul was different. The fact that the Reform Division had been funded with borrowed money added a dark layer of irony to the story of its failures. During a trip back to the capital in 1866, Ahmed Cevdet

\textsuperscript{88} The Ottoman government took two large loans in 1865 to repay Crimean war debts and meet a large budget deficit. Murat Birdal, The Political Economy of Ottoman Public Debt: insolvency and European financial control in the late nineteenth century (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 28.
\textsuperscript{89} Most of this debt was also for budget deficit. Ibid., 28.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 39.
\textsuperscript{91} Based on data in ibid., 28.
had been ridiculed by his contemporaries for embroiling the Ottoman state in such an exorbitantly expensive affair that essentially amounted to building houses for shepherds. Kamil Pasha quipped that Ahmed Cevdet was a spendthrift (mutasarrif bir adamdır).\(^92\) Although Fuad Pasha had supported the Reform Division initially, Cevdet felt betrayed that he did not defend the activities being carried out in the Cilician countryside. “The world of politics is another world,” Cevdet remarked, where “one would sacrifice even their own sibling.”\(^93\) Although houses were still unbuilt, police supervision was still required to prevent migration, and other improvements were needed in the lives of newly settled pastoralists, funding petered out in part due to lack of support in Istanbul. The long task of settlement would be impossible given the state’s financial woes.

Cevdet had already advocated some important public works projects in addition to the homes, tax exemptions, and salaries that the Reform Division showered upon relatively cooperative figures. But the improvement of the plain would prove boundlessly expensive. When in 1869, new settlers around Payas requested that swamps be drained to improve the health conditions of the region, a subsequent report recognized that “the heaviness of the air was a powerful barrier to the settlement order,” but due to the size of the swamps around Payas, the state could only afford to focus on draining smaller patches of wetlands. The “cleansing (tathîr)” of the marshes stretching along the coast between Payas and Iskenderun would be postponed due to the impossibility of its expense, though the settlement policy would remain in place.\(^94\) As will be discussed further in Chapter 6, such projects would in fact be put on hold for a very, very long time.

\(^92\) Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 173.
\(^93\) Ibid., 175.
\(^94\) BOA, ŞD 2114/22, no. 1 (16 Rebiulevvel 1287 [4 June 1870]).
Far from being able to sustain the expenses required for proper settlement and improvement of land as deemed fit for civilization, the provincial budget was soon inadequate for even proper payment of police and soldiers to control the movements of the population. One French traveler noted that the government struggled to keep officials and military personnel in their posts during the fever-filled months of July, August, September, and October.\textsuperscript{95} Thus, while state presence in Cilicia had increased, security was by no means complete. Small acts of defiance began immediately after the initial campaigns of the Reform Division in 1864-65. In fact, a rebellion led by Ali Bekiroğlu Ali Agha in 1867 against the local government and the settlement orders in the region, while not a major threat to Ottoman rule, was already a sign that complete hegemony had not been achieved. British Consul J.H. Skene remarked that “the embarrassment it has caused foreshadows the manner in which Turkish rule will fall. The extreme financial exigencies of the central government had left the Provincial chest absolutely empty.”\textsuperscript{96}

Skene may have underestimated the resilience of a malleable order that had survived for centuries in the Ottoman Empire; however, he was absolutely correct in identifying the tenuous nature of the changes the Reform Division had sought to bring about. Financial and administrative crisis might not have toppled the empire, but it did undermine its settlement policies in the countryside. Thus, during the years of turmoil beginning in 1873 and lasting through the Russo-Ottoman War until 1878, Ottoman hegemony in the Cilician countryside would not be contested outright, but rather subverted as the local inhabitants resumed their migratory practices, which were tacitly sanctioned and tolerated by a lack of state response. Gasping for a breath of fresh air, the communities settled by the Reform Division were slipping

\textsuperscript{95} Favre and Mandrot, \textit{Voyage en Cilicie}, 21-23.
\textsuperscript{96} TNA, FO 195/800, Skene to Lyons (22 May 1867).
through the cracks in the Tanzimat edifice to escape to higher pastures during summer, portending a near future in which this unsustainable ambiguity regarding the legitimacy of Ottoman authority in the area would be formally resolved.

**The Swan Song of the Derebeys and the Endurance of Transhumance**

The Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-78, known in Turkish as the ‘93 War\(^\text{97}\), represented a climax of instability for Tanzimat-era Ottoman society. Coming on the heels of financial crisis and widespread famine in the empire, the defeat further depleted the state coffers and resulted in another massive influx of poor and sick immigrants from the Caucasus and the Balkans numbering more than 100,000.\(^\text{98}\) In the heat of the crisis, popular discontent in the Cilician countryside escalated and found an outlet in two distinct forms of resistance, one of which precipitated an ephemeral panic and the other of which led to official concession of limited migratory rights to communities who had already eroded the completeness of Ottoman settlement policy.

The more fleeting but much more conspicuous display of discontent in Cilicia at the time was that of the Kozanoğlu rebellion of 1878, during which the Ottoman administration briefly lost control of Adana’s hinterland and the main routes of travel. Kozanoğlu Ahmed Pasha was a close relative of Kozanoğlu Yusuf Pasha (see Chapter 3), who had been killed by Ottoman authorities during the Reform Division’s activities twelve years prior. The Kozanoğluses had been given salaries and settled in the Balkans and Istanbul. The women of the family meanwhile had maintained freedom of movement to look after the financial affairs and property of the Kozanoğluses. Thus, the Kozanoğluses enjoyed continued wealth after the Reform Division, and while they were living in exile, were able to maintain connections to the region. In 1876,

\(^\text{97}\) For the Rumi year of 1293.

\(^\text{98}\) BOA, ŞD 2418/12 (8 Zilhicce 1295 [21 November 1878]).
Armenians in Zeytun led by Babik Pasha had expelled Ottoman authorities from the mountain village that had been relatively unaffected by the Reform Division (more in Chapter 7).\textsuperscript{99} Coupled with the disorder caused by conscription problems during the war and the influx of migrants, a segment of disaffected Muslim inhabitants of Cilicia found an opportunity to rebel.\textsuperscript{100}

In Spring of 1878, Ahmed Pasha requested that he and his family be permitted to move to Konya for a “change of air” during the summer, employing a pretext often used to escape Adana during the summer to sneak back in.\textsuperscript{101} But Kozanoğlu was not headed for the sweltering plain; from Konya, Ahmed Pasha would enter the Kozan region of the Taurus Mountains, the territories his family had governed for generations until the arrival of the Reform Division.

The rebellion began in summer 1878, while local authorities were thoroughly occupied with Babik Pasha in Zeytun. Ahmed Pasha rallied support from around Sis as well as Belenköy, Çatma, Fekke and Rum in the mountains. A major component of the fighting force was drawn from among the disaffected tribes of the region who, having since learned to dodge the ban on migration, were already gathered on the yayla at the time.\textsuperscript{102} The rebellion also earned the support of some minor officials and perhaps most significantly, the müftü of Sis, all of whom were natives of the area.\textsuperscript{103} These notables had been eager to submit to the Reform Division

\textsuperscript{99} With the end of the Reform Division, Fuad Pasha had explicitly instructed Ahmed Cevdet to avoid using military force in Zeytun, asking him to act only in his capacity of governor. Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûçât, 178.

\textsuperscript{100} Kozanoğlu reported chiefly being encouraged by a number of local notables with whom he had corresponded from Istanbul: Çamurdanzade Mustafa Efendi, Şeyh Ali Efendi, Hocazade Abdullah Efendi, Múftü of Sis Halil Efendi, Múftü of Hadjín Mehmed Efendi, Karslı Háhım Efendi, Göçelí Halil Efendi, Samur Ağá, Vezir Ağá, Tabur Ağası Ahmed Ağá, and Yiğitoğlu Hüseyin Efendi. BOA, İ-DH 775/63109, no. 46 (12 Şevval 1295 [27 September 1878]).

\textsuperscript{101} BOA, ŞD 2889/13, no. 3 (4 Cemaziulevvel 1295 [25 April 1878]); CADC, CCC, Alep 35, pg. 283. Destrées to Waddington (31 August 1878); Poghosean, Hachêni endhanur patmut'ivné, 532.

\textsuperscript{102} In his interrogations, Kozanoğlu mentioned in particularly a leader of the Sirkuntas named Berber Abdullah. BOA, İ-DH 775/63109, no. 46 (12 Şevval 1295 [27 September 1878]). These rebels are referred to as “Kurds and Afşars” in Armenian sources. Poghosean, Hachen endhanur patmut'iwne, 532.

\textsuperscript{103} In the interrogation records, most of the involved parties, including the müftü Halil Efendi and Kozanoğlu Ahmed Pasha himself deny active participation and portray themselves as having been coerced or convinced by others, often seeking to deflect blame. It is interesting to note that in the case of müftü Halil Efendi, the interrogators actually caught him lying about his active participation in the rebellion, even furnishing a letter written by Halil
some years before, but they were now the voice of discontent in the Cilician countryside. They forced the mutasarrif of Sis to leave the area, took control of the roads, and set about destroying the telegraph lines. While Ottoman interrogation records of Kozanoğlu and his men reveal a tight-lipped pasha eager to minimize his punishment for an ill-fated rebellion, French consular sources more richly reflect the rhetoric wielded by Kozanoğlu’s uprising in the region. Kozanoğlu criticized the Ottoman government on its own terms, saying that they had not behaved as sound Muslim rulers and that the agricultural prosperity and order which had been promised by Cevdet Pasha and the Reform Division had not come to pass. With this new governing pact broken, Kozanoğlu issued a renewed claim to his ancestral territory, which had been passed down for more than three centuries. Kozanoğlu also blamed the Ottomans for not being able to defend the empire against Russian aggression; however, the rebellion was more about the mountains than religion or sect, as Kozanoğlu also sought to coordinate with Babik Pasha in Zeytun in order to expand the rebellion. While this coordination did not materialize, Kozanoğlu did receive the support of some Armenian notables in Hadjin.

As if in an encore performance of Kozanoğlu Yusuf Pasha’s standoff with the Reform Division twelve years prior, the Ottoman administration responded to Ahmed Pasha by dispatching more than 2,600 soldiers along with 500 cavalry and 3 cannons to Kozan. Cevdet Pasha and İzzet Pasha, who had been two of the principal figures in the Reform Division, came
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104 BOA, I-DH 774/63021 (6 Şevval 1295 [21 September 1878]).
105 CADC, CCC, Alep 35, pg. 296. Destrées to Waddington (14 September 1878).
106 Poghosean, Hachêni ėndhanur patmutʻiwné, 533.
107 CADC, CCC, Alep 35, pg. 300. Destrées to Waddington (28 September 1878)
to the Adana province as well to set about negotiating with Kozanoğlu and his men. Ahmed Cevdet went to Sis, and İzzet Pasha was sent to force Kozanoğlu’s surrender, offering the Sultan’s pardon. Upon his refusal, the Ottoman troops, which heavily outnumbered Kozanoğlu’s forces, headed into the mountains. As the rebels scattered, the Ottoman soldiers chased Kozanoğlu until finally meeting from opposite banks of the Zamanti River to negotiate his surrender. With this surrender, the family was once again exiled, this time with Ahmed Pasha and others being sent to Tripoli in modern-day Libya. Ahmed Pasha would die there in 1890. Yet, the children of the family would be allowed to continue their education in Istanbul following the rebellion, ensuring the family’s incorporation into the Ottoman elite.

The Kozanoğlu name, memorialized by the rebellion of Yusuf Pasha against the Reform Division in 1866, remains synonymous with the defiant legacy of the Adana region’s tribes and local elite. “The Song of Kozanoğlu”, which commemorates that struggle, is part of the national corpus of folklore in Turkey today. In the Adana region, the song had already become widespread during the Ottoman period; as mentioned in the introduction to Part 1, Cilician Armenians of the diaspora in the United States remembered the saga of Kozanoğlu’s standoff with Ottoman authority decades after the expulsion of the region’s Armenian population with the withdrawal of the French occupation. The former residents of Hadjin made sure to include the
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109 BOA, A-MKT-HM 483/6 (27 Şaban 1295 [14 August 1878]).
110 Poghosean, Hachêni éndhanur patmut’ıwnê, 534. A copy of the pardon is available in the Ottoman archives. BOA, Y-PRK-AZJ 7/39 (1878?).
111 Ibid., 534-35.
112 BOA, I-DH 776/63153 (12 Şevval 1295 [27 September 1878]).
113 BOA, DH-ŞFR 146/29 (8 October 1890).
114 BOA, I-DH 786/63878 (17 Cemaziulahir 1296 [22 May 1879]). For a complete family tree of the Kozanoğlus up to the 1980s, see Kozanoğlu, Kozanoğulları.
115 Wolfram Eberhard found multiple versions of this song among Armenian-Americans, but in one case it appeared to have been modified to commemorate an Armenian notable of Hadjin that was loyal to Kozanoğlu instead. Eberhard, Minstrel tales from Southeastern Turkey, 54-56.
song in the village history they published in Los Angeles during the 1940s. As the lyrics go, “Mighty Kozanoğlu, whose fame is so great, said ‘I will not leave my place.’”

The second Kozanoğlu rebellion, which had ended with no bloodshed and Ahmed Pasha surrendering to exile far from his ancestral mountains, marked the end of a time in which the heads of tribal lineages could serve as leaders of discrete political communities in the Adana region and defy Ottoman rule. Following this event, there would be no derebey rebellion of this nature in the region in the sense of an outright challenge to Ottoman rule by the old tribal notables. In other words, the Reform Division had succeeded in establishing political hegemony among the tribal communities of Cilicia. The derebeys had with varying degrees of willingness joined the Ottoman fold. Figures such as Kozanoğlu may not have actually led large-scale rebellions, but their grievances and aspirations did to some extent embody the broader discontent in the Cilicia region following settlement. The legacy of such individuals is naturally ambiguous. A record of French consular correspondence from the time features a reference to Kozanoğlu Ahmed Pasha as a “chef révolutionnaire”; in the margins of the record book remains a question mark signifying the confusion of a reader who may have been a superior in the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs at the time or someone who may have come much later (see Figure 17). Was Kozanoğlu a rebel chief or a revolutionary chief? Writing in 1878, the French consul who penned the letter probably intended to convey the modern-day meaning of rebel, but whatever the case, the question mark in the margins reveals the process by which rebels with time may come to be remembered as revolutionaries as their symbolic legacy grows. If Kozanoğlu is remembered today, it is not for his own deeds, but rather because the forces he resisted have had a traumatic and transformative impact on the communities he left behind.

---

This point naturally returns us to the question of Ahmed Cevdet Pasha and the very geography of Cilicia that he had made synonymous with rebellion, which like the French Revolution, disrupted in some way the march of civilization (see Chapter 3). Though he had since moved on to other governorships and would become first and foremost a statesman concerned with legal and educational reform, he had returned to Cilicia in 1878 to close the Reform Division chapter. With the Kozanoğlus seemingly once again held in check, he could leave the region knowing that the project started more than a decade prior, despite its shortcomings, had borne some fruit.

Yet before his departure, he oversaw the settlement of a second much more enduring type of resistance that had emerged in response to the Reform Division’s demands. A twelve-article decree from October of 1878 codifying the new parameters of seasonal migration among Cilicia’s tribes read like a formal contract granting on paper what had already been accomplished in practice. Part of the reason that Kozanoğlu’s rebellion did not earn more local support was
likely that the tribes were already in defiance of settlement orders and in 1876, certain preliminary concessions regarding the right to seasonal migration had been made to some communities.\textsuperscript{117} Due specifically to health risks and the threat of malaria during the summer months, the tribes would be allowed special rights to continue migrating as they had resumed doing so in the early 1870s. The decree did not totally scale back the activities of the Reform Division; these communities were still expected to settle in villages and take to agriculture. Some would not be permitted to take their animals to the \textit{yayla}, and they were expected to return perhaps a bit earlier in the season than was expected. On paper, this maintained the settlement imperative and a view of the Ottoman government dictating and controlling the movement of the local communities. In effect, it essentially meant that the pastoralists of Cilicia, after years of disease, death, and hardship, had regained their rights to the mountains in exchange for their obedience (see chapter appendix for translation of the decree).\textsuperscript{118}

Given the intense interest Cevdet had taken in the settlement project, the modified terms of migration, while symbols of a profound failure, might have eased the conscience of a bureaucrat about to leave the provincial chapter of his career in the past. Although the Reform Division’s campaign in Cilicia made it into some of his subsequent publications, the suffering of the tribes and their eventual triumph was omitted from his own account. When his daughter Fatma Aliye sat down to write the biography of a devoted father preoccupied with the fields of education, scholarship, and law, the momentous settlement experiment he had supervised during her infancy would be far from her memory.\textsuperscript{119} The dissociation of Tanzimat intellectuals and bureaucrats of Istanbul from the hugely formative provincial context of that period of imperial restructuring was already underway. The role of the countryside would be wiped from the

\textsuperscript{117} BOA, ŞD 2117/55, No. 4 (24 Rebiulahir 1293 [19 May 1876]).
\textsuperscript{118} BOA, İ-MMS 60/2843, No. 3 (26 Şevval 1295 [23 October 1878]).
\textsuperscript{119} Aliye, \textit{Ahmed Cevdet Paşa ve zamanı}.  
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historical narrative of modernization articulated in the imperial center that gave way to the modern Turkish state. Meanwhile, the overarching narrative of reform ensured that the hardships and failures of tribal settlement would be thoroughly suppressed.

The 1877 Salname of Adana, an official government publication that would come to serve as a reference for information about the province as well as a basic source for future historians, mentioned neither disease nor rebellion. For the district of Osmaniye, which became the swampy deathtrap of both immigrants and pastoralists over the prior decade, the description was hopeful. “Since the inhabitants of this kaza were settled and sedentarized (tavitin ü iskân) by the Reform Division and its land is of the utmost degree of fertility,” the salname indicates, “the aforementioned inhabitants are working to increase the cultivation of wheat, barley, cotton, sesame, millet, and rice and raise various trees, and they are reaping the fruits of their labors.”

While that narrative would prove true in the abstract sense that agricultural production in Eastern Çukurova would grow over time, it erased the countless individual tragedies that settlement had entailed and would continue to bring. In describing the geography of the region, the rivers, swamps, and lakes appeared as mere bodies of water — not sources of disease. The yaylas with their “fine climate” rated mention, but the voices of those who struggled to maintain access to them were stifled.

In this regard, the observations of Lt. Bennet and other Western observers who traveled the region and noticed that the settlements and towns constructed by the Reform Division were in ruins and transhumance prevailed were partly mistaken. The settlements themselves were
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120 SV-Adana (H. 1294 [1877]), pg. 106.
121 Gould alluded to Bennet’s biases in a rather astute manner stating that “when the military consuls saw the tribes previously settled by the Reform Division once more on the move, they assumed that reform had failed, yet no one thought the British Embassy in Istanbul less civilized for its annual migration up the Bosporus to Tarabya, where it spent the summer.” Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885”, 171.
unquestionable failures and evidence of squandered funds that could never be regained. However, some equilibrium had been established in the relationship between Cilicia’s tribes and the government. Seasonal migration would continue and the bitter memory of forced settlement would linger, but contention over hegemony would not. The pastoralists of Cilicia remained consigned to the villages and yaylas afforded them by the Reform Division, but the mountains remained essentially theirs. It was the plains which they would be forced to share with an emerging class of capitalists and cultivators whose pursuit of profits would turn the Adana-Mersin region into an economic powerhouse of the Ottoman countryside.

Conclusion to Part 1

Contestation over land and the hardships of settlement are universal themes in narratives of the human past, occurring in almost cyclical fashion as in the formulation of Ibn Khaldun. Yet, if an 1860s campaign to pacify, settle, and ultimately disinherit an indigenous nomadic population from the lands they used sounds familiar, that is because it did not stand alone. The 1860s witnessed a global eruption of wars of colonial expansion and national unification — conflicts that could be described in various ways but shared the characteristic of asymmetrical struggles over land rather than imperial confrontations. Even if these conflicts seemed inevitable, their specific timings were not random. If not for the US Civil War that created a demand for cotton or the assassination of a missionary in search of some mountain breeze (discussed in Chapter 2), the Reform Division may not have possessed such an aggressive and interventionist quality. Indeed, tribal settlement would remain an important policy until the end of Ottoman rule, but in later decades certain forms of accommodation would be employed in
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122 Discussed in Introduction.
123 Discussed in Chapter 1 and 2.
regions such as Eastern Anatolia with radically different but perhaps ultimately equally tumultuous outcomes.

The Reform Division was in many ways a radical and novel attempt at reform that sought in a moment of ambition and strength to undo a deep-seated political and ecological order and bring progress and civilization to a region where Ottoman authority was contested.\textsuperscript{124} Perhaps since it succeeded in its political goals, both critics and supporters of the Reform Division and observers official, scholarly, local or otherwise have ascribed to this event impacts that it simply did not have. Most importantly, the Reform Division did not succeed in settling the tribes of the region as agriculturalists nor did it eliminate the practice of seasonal migration, despite how it is often remembered by historians and the descendants of these communities themselves. Settlement would prove to be incremental and contingent on the restructuring of the local ecology in the Çukurova region through the management of water and wetlands, new approaches to disease, and the gradual emergence of an economy that offered nomadic communities real incentive to settle or eliminated settlement’s alternatives. As for seasonal migration, so long as Adana remained notoriously hot, humid, and fever-ridden during the summer, year-round habitation would remain the exception and not the norm (more in Chapters 6 and 13).

Call them failures, shortcomings, and deeds left undone, the divergences between the theories backing the attempted forced settlement of tribes in the Çukurova region as well as other attempts to encourage habitations in these areas and their actual outcomes may be conceptualized as the agency or power of nature and geography in shaping the courses of historical events. I argue that such an understanding is however incomplete and rather contrary to an earnest appreciation of the awareness of historical actors with regards to their lived environment in the Adana region. Long before science and medicine would link disease to parasites in mosquitoes

\textsuperscript{124} Discussed in Chapter 3.
rather than the stench of carrion in the air, the people who tilled the soil or grazed their animals in Çukurova’s fertile landscape knew what settlement would mean for their lives, and so did the state officials involved in the formulation of settlement policy. A “nature as actor” framework for understanding Çukurova's history encourages a more nuanced understanding of events often narrated in strictly political terms. However, in producing a narrative of settlement that scrubs away or minimizes the consciousness of human actors, we run the risk of ignoring the indifference, willful ignorance, and even malice behind state policies. Even if Ahmed Cevdet viewed the Reform Division as a “scheme to improve the human condition”\textsuperscript{125} in the formulation of James C. Scott, the communities it targeted ultimately experienced its failures not as mishap but as vicious dispossession.

These points will be of special relevance in Part 2 of this study, as I continue to examine the ecological transformation of the Adana region over the last decades of Ottoman rule. This period witnessed an unprecedented intensification of technological intervention in the environment of the countryside as Cilicia was solidified as one of the empire’s great cotton belts. This period also coincided with what appears in hindsight as the extreme political polarization of the wildly diverse populations that inhabited this peripheral center of Ottoman life. During the tumultuous World War I period, which lasted nearly a decade, the harshest facets of this new order emerged to aid in its violent undoing. After increasingly intense waves of upheaval washed over the Adana region, it would seem that only the mountains remained in place.

\textsuperscript{125} Scott, \textit{Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed.}
CHAPTER 4 APPENDIX

BOA, İ-MMS 60/2843, No. 3
26 Şevval 1295 [23 October 1878]

From Ahmed Cevdet Pasha
Instructions regarding the inhabitants of Çukurova and their going to the yayla

1. bent: Mukaddema Firka-i Islâhiye tarafından Kozan ve Cebel-i Bereket dağlaryla Çukurova hakkında içra olunan tenbîhât üzerine hareket olunarak beş altı seneden beri Çukurova'da iade olunan göçebelik usûlu terk olunacaktır. Fakat Temmuz ibtidasından Ağustos'un on beşine ve nihayet âhirine kadar sair-i yerlerde dahi adet olduğu vechen lüzûm-u sahih üzerine tebdil-i havaya muhtâc olanlar civardaki mürtafi` ve münasib yerlere gidip gelmeye me'zun olacakları

2. bent: Adana sancağı dahilinde ve Çukurova'da bulunan Karakayalı ve Kürkçü ve Karahacılı aşiretleri yaylağa gidip gelmek hususunda Karaisalı kazasında mütevattın olan Menemenci aşiretine muvâfik yolda hareket etmelidirler. Çünkü Menemenci aşireti Mayıs’ın on beşinden âhirine kadar koyun ve siğır ve develerini çobanlarıyla birlikte kendilerine mahsûs yaylaklara gönderip kendileri hınta ve şa’îr hasılatını almak ve sisam ve pamuk tarlalarının otlarını ayıklamak üzere köylerinde kalıyorlar ve Haziran’ın evahirine doğru tebdil-i hava için evlal-u ayallarıyla beraber yaylalarına gidiyorlar ve Ağustos’un evasında köylere gelecek sisamlarını çekip gömük ettikten sonra yine yaylalarına azîmet ve Eylül’ün evailini geçirdikten sonra hayvanlarıyla beraber köylerine avdet ediyorlar ve ol vakit sisam ve pamuk hasılatını alıyorlar. İşte bâlâda mezkûr olan aşair-i erba’a dahi Menemenci aşiretinin usûluna muvâfik bir yolda olarak Adana sancağı dahilinde müناسib yaylaklara gidip gelebiliyorlar.

Article 1: Action shall be taken upon the orders previously implemented by the Reform Division regarding Kozan, the mountains of Cebel-i Bereket, and Çukurova, and the practice of nomadism that has been returning in Çukurova for the past five or six years shall be abandoned. However, from the beginning of July until the fifteenth and finally the end of August, those who need a change of air in other places shall be permitted upon true necessity to go to and return from the surrounding elevated and appropriate areas in the manner that is customary.

Article 2: The Karakayalı, Kürkçü, and Karahacılı tribes found in the Adana sancaq and Çukurova must behave in the way that accords to the Menemenci tribe settled in Karaisalı kaza with regard to going to and returning from the yayla. For the Menemenci tribe sends their sheep, cattle, and camels along with their shepherds to their own yaylas by May 15 and the end [of May], stay in their villages in order to harvest the wheat and barley and weed the sesame and cotton fields, go to the yayla at the end of June with their wives and children for a change of air, return to their villages in the middle of August and return again to their yaylas after drawing and burying the sesame to return to their village along with their animals after spending early September [at the yayla], and then harvest the sesame and cotton. As such the four tribes mentioned above can go to and return form the suitable yaylas in the Adana sancaq in a way that accords to the practices of the Menemenci tribe.
3. bent: Çukurova’da sakin Sırkıntı aşiretinin karyelerinde yazın sular çekilip de hayvanlarını idare edemeyecek dereceye geldiğinde, temmuz evvelinde azâmet ve avdet ve ikâmetlerinde kimesneye zarar etmemek şartıyla ve iki ay muddetiyle yaylamak üzere Kozan’da kendilerine mahsus olan İnderesi nam mahalle gidip gelmeğe mezûn olacaklardır. Ve bir de köyun ve keçilerini Temmuz’dan evvel dahi çobanlarıyla beraber İnderesine günderebileceklerdir.

4. bent: Kozan’a mülhak Kars-ı Zulkadiyre kazasında mütevattın olan Bozdoğan-ı Bâlâ aşireti hakkında Sırkıntılar gibi mu’âmele olunacaktır yani onlar dahi iki ay muddetiyle kazaları dahilinde civar yaylalara gidebilirler.

5. bent: Sis kazasına tâbi’ İdem ve Kabasakal gibi Çukurova cihetinde vâkı’ karyeleriyle Kars-ı Zulkadiyre kazasının kezalik Çukurova tarafında vâkı’ karyeleri ahalisinin bütün bütün kışlak mahellelerini terk etmemeleri ve azâmet ve avdetlerinde kimesne hakkında mazarrat vukûa getirmemeleri şartıyla ve temmuz ibtidasından itibaren nihayet iki ay muddettiyle yaylalarına gidip gelmeleri caiz olacaktır.

6. bent: Gerek Sis ve gerek Kars-ı Zulkadiyre kazalarında beş altı seneden beri adet olduğu üzere hey’et-i hükümetle umum ahalinin yaylaya çıkmaları katiyan memnu’dur. Fakat yaylada bağları olanlar üzere mevsiminde bir aydan nihayet iki aya kadar bağlarına gidebileceklerdir.

Article 3: As the waters in the villages of the Sırkıntı tribe residing in Çukurova retreat during the summer to the extent that they cannot care for their animals, they shall be allowed to go to and return from their place called İnderesi in Kozan in order to summer for two months in the beginning of July on the condition that they do no harm to anyone during their arrival, departure, and stay. They will also be able to send their shepherds along with their sheep and goats to İnderesi before July.

Article 4: The Upper Bozdoğan tribe settled in the Kars-ı Zulkadiyre kaza attached to Kozan shall be dealt with as the Sırkıntıls, meaning that they will also be able to go to and return from surrounding yayлас in the kaza for a period of two months.

Article 5: It shall be permissible for the inhabitants of the villages belonging to Sis kaza on the Çukurova side like İdem and Kabasakal and likewise the villages on the Çukurova side of Kars-ı Zulkadiyre kaza to go to their yaylaş for a period of two months starting from the beginning of July on the condition that they do not entirely abandon their winter places and while coming and going they do not cause any harm to anyone.

Article 6: It is absolutely forbidden for the government council and the general inhabitants of both Sis and Kars-ı Zulkadiyre kazas to go to the yayla as has been customary for the past five or six years. However, those who have orchards on the yayła shall be able to go to their orchards for one to two months during the season in order to pick grapes and boil molasses.

8. bent: Aziziye tarafında mütevattın Afşar aşiretiyle Çerkeslerin kışlamak ve hayvan ra’y etmek bahânesiyle kışın Çukurova’ya inmeleri memnu’dur. İnerler ise te’dib ve cebren iade olunacaklardır.


Article 7: Although they live in the most fertile and well-watered parts of Çukurova, the Kurdish tribes called the Lek, Hacılar, and Kırrıntı attached to Sis kaza are always harming the people and occupying the government by engaging in robbery. Henceforth, they are forbidden to go out to the yayla. In particular, it is in no way permissible for them to go to Rum nahiye. If during July malaria falls into their ranks, those who need a change of air along with the rest of the inhabitants are allowed to go out to the suitable and elevated places in Sis kaza such as Çatma and Üçbék. However, in that case they must leave their animals in their villages. They shall not go out to the yayla with their animals, and they like the rest of the inhabitants and tribes will be obliged to practice agriculture. It is not permissible for them to be found in huts made from reeds and in a scattered state. They will be made to live collectively in the villages formed by the Reform Division, build themselves houses of stone and mud brick, and properly form villages. They shall all be bound by interlinked surety and the thieves that emerge from among them, whatever of these three tribes they be from, the damages they do to the population will be indemnified to that tribe.

Article 8: The Afşar tribe and the Circassians settled in Aziziye are forbidden to come down to Çukurova during the winter under the pretext of wintering or grazing their animals. If they come down, they shall be punished and forcibly returned.

Article 9: The inhabitants of the villages of Kıyı nahiye attached to Osmaniye kaza in Payas sancak go to yaylas in Çebel-i Bereket i.e. Gavurdağı, which are their own homes each two to three hours from their villages every year after gathering the harvest, and they have a change of air without disrupting their agriculture. Their practices must be adopted as exemplary and comparable for the Cerid, Tecirli, and Bozdoğan tribes in Payas sancak.
10. bend: Cerid ve Tecirli ve Bozdoğan-i Zir aşiretleri emr-i ziraatine halel götürmemek ve hayvanlarını beraber getirmeyip köylerinde terk etmek ve kimesneye zarar etmemek şartıyla mücerred tebdil-i hava için Temmuz ibtidasından Ağustos gayetine kadar Cebel-i Bereket’in Payas sancağına tabi olan yerlerine gidip gelebileceklerdir. Ve fimaba’dı yaylamak üzere âhar sancağı tecavüz edemeyecekler. Ve beylerinde yayla münazaası zuhur etmemek üzere Cebel-i Bereket’te her birinin yayla yerleri tayin u tahdid olunmak lazımlığın için Osmaniye kaymakamının taht-i riyasetinde olarak komisyon yapılacaktır.

11. bend: Maraş sancağına muzâf Hassa kazası ahalisi yaylamak üzere Kapılı’ya kadar çıkıp Kapılı derbendini tecavüz etmeyecekler.

12. bend: Maraş’a tabi İslahiye kazasında bulunan aşiretler mücerred tebdil-i hava için Temmuz ibtidasından Ağustos gayetine kadar Cebel-i Bereket’in canib-i cunûbunda vaki ve münasib mevkilere çıkabileceklerdir. Fakat Payas sancağı hududunu tecavüz etmeyeceklerdir ve bunların yayla mahelleri tayin olunmak üzere İslahiye kaymakamın taht-i riyasetinde bir komisyon yapılacaktır.

Article 10: Without violating their agriculture orders or bringing their animals with them, the Cerid, Tecirli, and Lower Bozdoğan tribes shall be able to go to and return from places in Cebel-i Bereket’s Payas sancak solely for change of air from the beginning of July to the end of August on the condition that they neither abandon their villages nor harm anyone. Hereafter they shall no longer trespass upon another sancak in order to summer. Since it will be necessary for each one’s yayla places in Cebel-i Bereket to be designated and determined so that no yayla disputes emerge among them, a commission headed by the kaymakam of Osmaniye will be formed.

Article 11: The people of Hassa kaza attached to Marash sancak shall go up as far as Kapılı and not go beyond the Kapılı pass in order to summer.

Article 12: The tribes found in İslahiye kaza attached to Marash shall be able to go out to suitable places located on the south side of Cebel-i Bereket solely for change of air from the beginning of July until the end of August. However, they shall not infringe upon the borders of Payas sancak, and in order to designate their yayla locations, a commission headed by the kaymakam of İslahiye shall be formed.
As the story goes, summer of 1878 brought hot and rainless days to the Adana province and parched its fertile fields. For those involved in agriculture, as most were, this threatened not only the prospects of lucrative crops like cotton but also the food supply of the region. Just a few years earlier, famine had decimated the villagers of Central Anatolia, many of whom had flocked to the malarial Adana plain only to meet a grim fate. While the townsfolk of Adana had been comparatively lucky, the reverberations of drought and famine were felt throughout the countryside. With drought looming once again, anxiety swept throughout the region and into the city of Adana itself.

In an atmosphere of escalating panic, Adana’s notables formed a committee including the local mufti to urge the governor of Adana to take action in the form of a prayer for rain.\(^1\) This ritual is well attested by those who knew the city during the late Ottoman period. People young and old would participate in the familiar “bodi bodi” prayers, evoking the mercy of God to alleviate drought saying, “into the well of the grain-hoarder, into the farmers’ fields, God give us watery rain.”\(^2\) In the villages, group rain prayers might have occurred in a field or cemetery. In Adana, they held the prayer above the Seyhan River in the center of the old Stone Bridge, and it was expected that a representative of the government be present.

Ziya Pasha, the new governor of Adana, was summoned to the bridge by a group of concerned townsfolk. However, he was a new kind of official; as a renowned poet and leading

---

\(^1\) Rain prayers were often official business in the Ottoman Empire. For example, rain prayers were convened in Biga to stave off drought, and the mutasarrif even wrote back to report success. BOA, A]\-MKT-MHM 296/21, no. 3 (18 Şevval 1280 / 14 Mart 1280 [27 March 1864]). During the Eastern Anatolian famine of 1880, the Ottoman government organized rain prayers throughout the empire including in schools. BOA, Y-MTV 3/71 (19 Cemaziyelevvel 1297 [16 April 1880]).

figure in the Young Ottoman movement, he had observed the dawn of a short-lived era of liberal politics with the 1876 Constitution. Though the constitution had been suspended by Abdul Hamid II months before and Ziya Pasha had been relegated to an official post in Adana, he still held true to the intellectual spirit of the Young Ottomans that had defined the Tanzimat period. As such, he refused to participate in what he saw as a superstitious prayer with a clever turn of phrase. He told the crowd that he was afraid that God might ridicule him for begging for rain when the plain surrounding Adana had been endowed with tremendous water resources from the massive rivers that crossed it. Rather than a rain prayer, Ziya would give Adana a new water works project, changing the course of the Seyhan River and by extension the course of history.

This was the story by which Ziya came to be remembered in Adana. He became a celebrated figure of early Republican politicians, civil servants, and writers who were particularly interested in public works from the 1930s onward. While legend commemorates Ziya’s momentous decision, the archival record reveals his involvement with a project that was in fact relatively modest. The idea was to enable the regulation of the Seyhan River’s flow by digging a channel on the river north of the town, minimizing the impact of floods and opening the way for future irrigation. It was an early example of a measure that would become increasingly common in Ottoman rivers over the coming decades.

---

3 For more on Ziya Pasha and the Young Ottomans, see Nazan Çiçek, The Young Ottomans: Turkish critics of the Eastern question in the late nineteenth century (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2010).

4 This is a common legend about Ziya Pasha in Adana. The earliest mention of this story that I could find was an article that appeared in Yeni Adana newspaper in 1937. “Yağmur ve dua [Rain and Prayer],” Yeni Adana 15 April 1937. It is also mentioned in the memoirs of Damar Arıkoğlu and a few historical works. Arıkoğlu, Hâтрalarım, 15; M. Kaya Bilgegil, Ziyâ Paşa üzerinde bir araştırma [A Study on Ziya Pasha] (Erzurum, Turkey: Atatürk University Press, 1970), 293; Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885”; Taha Toros, Şair Ziya Paşanın Adana Valiliği (Adana: Yeni Adana Basimevi, 1940).

5 For an early example see, İsmail Habip, "Meşhur Şair Ziya Paşanın Adana Valiliği [Famed Poet Ziya Pasha's Governorship in Adana],” Çakurovada Memleket 1931.

6 BOA, ŞD 2118/35, map (1878).
Figure 18 Ziya Pasha's Seyhan barrage plan (Source: BOA, ŞD 2118/35)
However, the plan was not a great success. Subsequent flooding of the Seyhan would overtake the barriers of the dam commissioned by Ziya Pasha and inundate many properties near the river. Growing discontent with Ziya’s administration and liberal spending in a time of relative economic crisis pushed local notables to the point of rebellion. Several messages were sent to Istanbul accusing Ziya Pasha of tyrannical behavior and unspeakable injustices. In repeated telegrams, a group of Muslim and Armenian notables wrote they could “no longer bear the unfortunate transgressions of Ziya Pasha, who is famous for his tyranny (zulme meşhur),” describing his behavior as “barbaric (bedevi).”

Though he was not known for his diplomatic tact, the severity of Ziya Pasha’s crimes that had made the people of Adana “shed tears of blood” were of an undoubtedly subjective nature. They mainly pertained to his use of excess taxes to fund public works projects that were unwelcome to some. A complaint signed by more than seventy residents of Adana enumerated his wrong deeds. In addition to the river works, Ziya’s detractors complained that he had destroyed the metal cover of a market and replaced it with a fire-prone wooden bedestan structure without initially consulting the report of a credible engineer. Worse yet was his frivolous spending on a theater, which he built on a lot forcibly expropriated from a local resident and hosted a company from Beirut performing Ziya’s own translation of Tartuffe. The theatre was attached to a tavern they referred to as an “işrethane”, a den of vice that in the eyes of some was no better than a brothel where men and women drank and caroused freely.

Ziya Pasha’s love of fine drink and theater was not necessarily a cause of concern for all, though. Telegrams from some of the Christian inhabitants of Adana countered the allegations of

---

7 BOA, HR-TO 556/15 (24 February 1879).
8 BOA, ŞD 2118/35, no. 15 (5 Şubat 1294 [17 February 1879]).
9 Bilgegil, Ziyâ Paşa üzerinde bir araştırma, 291. Cited in Gould, “Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885”.
10 BOA İ-ŞD 45/2413, no. 16 (15 Şubat 1294 [27 February 1879]).
tyranny by attesting to Ziya Pasha’s enlightened nature, accusing a few “disgraceful individuals” of fabricating complaints against the governor.\textsuperscript{11} Ziya Pasha likewise defended his actions, saying that the improvements he had made were justified. The wooden roof for the market would protect the people from the sun. The theater would pay for itself in time. The dam, the roads, and all of his projects were undertaken in the interest of the “public benefit (\textit{menfaat-i umumiye}),” with implicit disregard to the wishes of a few unhappy individuals.\textsuperscript{12} Ottoman intellectual and political activist Namık Kemal also wrote in defense of Ziya Pasha’s integrity.\textsuperscript{13} The transformation of Adana’s emerging urban space was becoming politicized and hotly contested.

Far from these debates was any question of whether more could be done to help the migrant settlers in the countryside of the Adana region, who suffered acutely from malaria, impoverishment, and inability adapt to life in new a setting. Of those who arrived with the Russo-Ottoman War, more than half of them would perish or flee within just a few years of settlement (see Chapter 4). The merchants of Adana waged war over taxes and Tartuffe as their new compatriots buried their kin.

Ziya Pasha was remembered by early Republican nationalists for his resolve in the face of these attacks.\textsuperscript{14} But in fact, the stress he faced in Adana seems to have broken him. Ultimately, the governor would be vindicated of serious wrongdoing or corruption, though the provincial treasurer (\textit{defterdar}) would be dismissed amid allegations of “lunacy (\textit{cunun}).”\textsuperscript{15} However, the entire affair must have taken a toll on an unhappy intellectual assigned to an unwanted post in a most unwelcoming climate. He and his family had already suffered from intense bouts with
malaria during his time post in Cyprus, and one of his children had died of the disease. Adana was certainly no better of a climate for the weary poet. During the summer of 1879, he had found some rest at the yayla in Gülek, but the trouble in Adana left him exhausted. Within a year after this episode, Ziya Pasha complained to the Porte of ill health and asked for a “change of air” or treatment. His doctor’s report confirmed that Ziya Pasha was bed-ridden due to the latest symptoms of his unspecified ailment. Soon after, Ziya Pasha succumbed to his illness and was buried beside the Great Mosque of Adana, a sixteenth-century structure built by the Ramazanoğlu dynasty that controlled the Cilicia region before it was subjected to direct Ottoman rule in 1608. Nazan Çiçek described his death as “lonely, disappointed, and penniless.” Adana remained without a governor for months until former Foreign Ministry Abidin Pasha’s appointment. Abidin Pasha built a proper türbe for Ziya Pasha, which remains in the park beside the mosque to this day.

Although he is sometimes remembered as one of the first great “modernizers” to come to Adana, Ziya Pasha’s governorship was short, tumultuous, and relatively ephemeral. His attempts to contain the Seyhan floods were limited in their impact. Many similar attempts would recur as dams of the Seyhan River were rebuilt time and time again over the next century. The Tanzimat-era notion of the “public benefit” that he had championed proved contentious, and the polarizing nature of his tenure reflected a divergence between different factions within the urban elite who exerted a growing economic influence over the surrounding plain. The themes embodied by this
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17 Bilgegil, Ziyâ Paşa üzerinde bir araştırma, 319-20.
18 BOA, A]-MKT-MHM 485/40, No. 3 (17 Mart 1296 [29 March 1880]).
19 Çiçek, The Young Ottomans: Turkish critics of the Eastern question in the late nineteenth century, 46.
20 BNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 10, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (10 November 1880)
In Part 1 of this study, I described a political ecology in which rhythms of seasonal migration supported large pastoralist communities whose political leaders reigned supreme in the mountains and countryside of the Adana province. This political ecology was disrupted but not wholly destroyed by attempts at forced tribal settlement and the implantation of Muslim immigrants in Upper Çukurova during the 1860s. However, when malaria proved such a tremendous barrier to permanent habitation that settlers were faced with the option to flee or perish, the strictness of settlement policies were scaled back, allowing the old transhumance to endure in a more subdued form on the margins of the plain. Meanwhile, landowners in Adana prepared the plain for the incremental expansion of commercial agriculture and the rise of cotton in the regional economy.

Part 2 of this study examines the ecological transformation that accompanied the rise of a new political economy that revolved around cotton. Late Ottoman Çukurova tells the story of rapid agrarian commercialization. New actors and social groups rose to the center stage of society in Adana, such as the tens of thousands of new migrant workers that emerged to fill the deficit of labor created by cotton’s sudden rise. But this wealth, which was centered in the city, contributed to the tremendous unevenness of the plain, as settlers in the province’s eastern portion remained relatively isolated from the economic benefits of commercial agriculture. For a great comparison with the phenomenon of unevenness in the South Asian context, see Goswami, *Producing India: from colonial economy to national space.*
as understandings of malaria and disease transformed. As these measures were incomplete, old methods of coping such as seasonal migration endured. However, the changing property regime of the Cilicia region resulted in unequal outcomes for the new rich and the pastoralists of old. This was one of many tensions that contributed to conflicts in the region.

The sudden economic growth and migration made Adana an unlikely center of cosmopolitanism in the empire that was matched by few cities in terms of its communal diversity. The communities of Adana and the towns and villages of the plain lived together for most of the late Ottoman period. Yet the nature of agrarian change that thrived on movement, economic exploitation, and competition fostered tensions, disparities, and potential for conflict. While the reinstatement of the constitution in 1908 created optimism for the middle class, the shocking 1909 Adana massacres, which manifested as an outburst of violence against the region’s Armenian communities, exposed those tensions. Despite these tumultuous events Adana went back to business as usual on the eve of the First World War, but nothing was quite the same.
CHAPTER 5
THE UNEVEN PLAIN: AGRARIAN LIFE IN LATE OTTOMAN ÇUKUROVA

Adana was a large and incomparable city because of progress (harachitumutian) while a big village because of agriculture.¹

Hakob Terzian, Adanayi Geanke (1909)

Improved transport will enable our agriculture, our commerce, and our industries to mutually unite towards augmenting the riches of our district. The large products of the interior, which all gravitate by a natural law to the sea, will be stimulated to increased energy by the facilities afforded by railway communication. This form of social progress is superior to all others, as its effect is immediately visible and palpable; of this the railways of the world are the silent but material and indisputable witness.²

Abidin Pasha, Governor of Adana (1884)

The [Ağırçar] have become poorer as a result of their struggles with the Turks. They live almost entirely on the produce of their diminished flocks and herds and of their scanty tillage. They cultivate a little barley, but vegetables and fruit are unknown to them… They build their own huts, and construct their own rough ploughs, yokes, and thrashing-sledges, but little else. Money is practically unknown to them. Produce is exchanged for clothes, which are brought to them by travelling hucksters.³

British Naval Intelligence, A Handbook for Asia Minor (1919)

The economic growth of the Adana and its adjacent countryside during the 1860s was rapid, and it accelerated over subsequent decades.⁴ Already by 1871, one American missionary remarked that “Adana now presents much of the bustling life of an American city.”⁵ Much like emerging American cities such as Chicago, Adana was rising out of the swamp to become a regional center.⁶ No one was a more enthusiastic proponent of this development than Abidin Pasha, who served as governor of Adana from 1880 to 1884. A former minister of foreign affairs, his appointment to Adana may have been a demotion; however, it afforded him the opportunity to

---

¹ Terzian, Atanayi keankʻi, 10.
³ Naval Intelligence Division Great Britain Admiralty, A Handbook of Asia Minor, vol. 4 (London: Naval Staff, Intelligence Dept., 1918), 87.
⁴ Special thanks to Meltem Toksöz for additional insight regarding many subjects of relevance to this chapter.
obtain land and participate in the Ottoman frontier experiment.\textsuperscript{7} He became the first to import a steam plow, which arrived by way of Bedford to Adana. For Abidin Pasha, progress was both a political goal and a hobby as well. Lt. Bennet remarked that the governor had “rubbed his hands in glee as he talked of the possibility of working all night by the light of the moon” using the new steam plow he had ordered from Britannia Iron Works in the United Kingdom (see Figure 19).\textsuperscript{8} In addition to his pursuits in the field of agriculture, Abidin Pasha would oversee the construction of a railroad line between Adana and Mersin that promised to open up the plain to commerce and thereby to the world economy. As Çukurova’s cotton industry grew, merchants, investors, and workers flocked to Adana in search of the fortune that progress promised.

Yet, the view from the other side of the plain seemed less promising. The sparsely populated stretches of Upper Çukurova were relatively cut off from the economic changes taking

\textsuperscript{7} Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885".
\textsuperscript{8} TNA, FO 222/8/2, 1881 No. 24, Bennet to Dufferin (6 December 1881). The Ottoman archives contain a lengthy correspondence regarding Abidin Pasha’s purchase, which includes a full brochure of Britannia Iron Works’ products. BOA, HR-SFR (3) 282/31.
place. The Reform Division had failed in its attempts to settle the pastoralists that had resumed their seasonal migrations. Moreover, its efforts to impose an even method of governance in the countryside proved infeasible, as the Ottoman administration increasingly accommodated tribal political structures in its efforts at maintaining order. For example, in 1892, the Şura-yı Devlet investigated repeated complaints of the inhabitants of villages surrounding İslahiye regarding the abuses of the Delikanlı and Çelikanlı tribes that dominated the area. The leaders of these tribes had not only resisted the settlement orders but also became the new lords of those settled in the area. One of the people who testified against them was Kara Mehmed, the muhtar of the village of Hanağzı on the eastern flanks of the Amanus Mountains. He complained that the tribal aghas of the area were preventing the locals from cultivating around a warm spring near the village and forcing them to allow sheep and cattle to graze on the spot. However, because these aghas were themselves part of the local government, the villagers’ complaints had long fallen on deaf ears.

The testimonies of Kara Mehmed and many others like him were all of this variety. The Delikanlı and Çelikanlı tribes were disrupting the lives of settled agriculturalists in the region. However, the Şura-yı Devlet was reluctant to initiate significant change. It concluded in the report of the investigation that “although the tribal aghas there generally and especially those in question do not possess morals good enough to befit the description of loyalty, obedience, and proper conduct of the country and civilization (medeniyet),” their detractors had clearly “exaggerated” in their complaints. In other words, the conduct of the local tribal notables in İslahiye, while not sanctioned, could be tolerated for the sake of stability. Roughly three decades

---

9 A British traveler who passed through Çukurova in 1878 remarked that “cultivation may be said to end at Missis,” meaning that the eastern half of the plain differed starkly from the well-cultivated area surrounding Adana. Henry C. Barkley, A Ride through Asia Minor and Armenia (London: Murray, 1891), 191.
10 BOA, ŞD 2601/35, No. 5 (3 Temmuz 1308 [15 July 1892]), pg 2.
11 BOA, ŞD 2601/35, No. 12 (7 Teşrinievvel 1308 [19 October 1892]).
after the Reform Division’s triumphant arrival in Çukurova, the very town that was founded and named after that army — the Firka-i İslahiye — had become a symbol of its shortcomings.

For those who possessed capital, the Reform Division had opened up the plain for agricultural expansion, the rise of a thriving export economy at Mersin, and the growth of factories and workshops in Adana and Tarsus. A new class of landowners emerged to employ droves of migrant workers that sowed the once dormant soil of the Çukurova plain. But rapid economic development also created uneven outcomes. A small mercantile class prospered as the land was worked by tens of thousands men and women who migrated sometimes hundreds of kilometers in order to earn a small amount of cash. The population that had been targeted for settlement and civilization by the Reform Division remained marginal and peripheral to this economy. With the rise of rail and steamships, the gap of unevenness on the plain widened. As Meltem Toksöz has argued, the rise of cotton in Çukurova created a surging economy that linked the Cilicia region to world markets and laid the foundation for the modern agrarian regime of the region, and by the end of the Ottoman period, Upper Çukurova was the main frontier of this expansion.\(^\text{12}\) However, the corollary to this narrative is that for most of the Ottoman period, Upper Çukurova, the central region of tribal and immigrant settlement, would remain comparatively poor, insalubrious, and cut off from commercial networks. The story of late Ottoman Cilicia was thus a tale of two plains.

**From Pasture to Plantation**

Adana was not the only province to witness a tremendous expansion of agriculture during the final decades of the Ottoman period, but its growth was especially staggering. In 1908, a British consul remarked that “general cultivation increases by about 5% a year by the taking up

---

of new lands." According to Ottoman agricultural statistics, among the provinces of Anatolia, Syria, and Iraq, Adana occupied just 2.6% of the surface area but accounted for 6.7% of all cultivated territory by 1909. Alongside Trabzon, it had become the most densely cultivated Asian province with 11.67% of its area used for agriculture. It was not only the extent but also the type of cultivation that made Adana so unusual. With roughly 1.3 million dönüms of land planted with cotton in 1909 and 1913, it was far and away the leading cotton-producing region. This created a radically different land regime. Whereas Ottoman provinces of Asia dedicated under 5% of cultivated land to commercial crops such as cotton, sesame, tobacco, and opium, a full third of all cultivated land in Adana was planted with those items. This of course meant that the Adana province had much less relative land devoted to food and subsistence crops. While the empire-wide average allocation to grains in 1909 was around 85%, Adana planters offered just 63.9% of their land to wheat, barley, and other staples. Only the inhabitants of the Mediterranean Islands (Cezair-i Bahr-i Sefid), which put 13.5% of land towards legumes (Adana

---

14 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-yı Osmani Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325], (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1327 [1911]), te. This is particularly striking given that Adana, much like some other Anatolian provinces, contained large swaths of relatively uncultivated mountain territory. While Ottoman statistics about cultivation generally included the Libyan provinces of Trablusgarb and Bengazi, I have adjusted the calculations to omit those provinces because their unusually large surface area of mostly desert skews empire-wide statistics. For more on Ottoman claims to the Libyan desert, see Minawi, "Lines in the Sand: The Ottoman Empire's Policies of Expansion and Consolidation on its African and Arabian Frontiers (1882-1902)."
15 Trabzon's area of cultivation was 11.7%. The Province of Aydıncık, which included the thriving port of İzmir, exhibited a similarly high percentage at 10.53%. 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-yı Osmani Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325], te. These statistics do not include the region Mount Lebanon, a small mutasarrıflık that may well have been even more densely cultivated.
16 Ibid., 174; Memalik-i Osmaniye'nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913], (İstanbul: Ticaret ve Zıraat Nezareti, 1330 [1914]), 20.
17 Ottoman statistics categorize these products as sanaiye, a classification distinct from grains, legumes, and orchards. The only other provinces to allocate even 10% of their cultivated land to such commercial crops in 1909 were Istanbul at 13.6%, Beirut at 10% (apparently excluding Mount Lebanon), and the small sancak of Jerusalem at 10.1%. 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-yı Osmani Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325], the.
just 1%) and 25% towards orchards, used less land for cereal cultivation than farmers of Adana in relative terms.\textsuperscript{18}

This is not to say that the Adana province suffered from grain shortages. A 1909 study by the Ottoman Ministry of Agriculture revealed that among Asian provinces, Adana had one of the best grain fields per capita ratios in the Empire at 6.1 dönüms of grain for every registered inhabitant. Farmers in the Ankara province, who put some 90% of their land towards grain, had just over 5 dönüms per head. Erzurum, a province where almost 99% of cultivated land went to grain, had just 2.7 dönüms of grain for every resident. Adana’s unusually high ratio in these statistics might appear to be the consequence of a statistical miscalculation; whereas the number of dönüms of grain per cultivating household in the Ottoman Empire ranged from 15-50, the kaza of Adana itself boasted 218 dönüms of grain for every cultivating household, more than four times its already high provincial average of 49. These anomalous numbers arose not from error but rather from the truly exceptional political ecology of late Ottoman Çukurova.

The agriculturalist population of the Çukurova plain had been small for most of the Ottoman period.\textsuperscript{19} Yet, even before the cotton boom of the 1860s, Çukurova was already home to some cultivators that had expanded under Egyptian rule during the 1830s.\textsuperscript{20} Their farms, or çiflik, were large plantation-like estates that drew labor from surrounding villages and migrant labor networks from Northern Syria in particular.\textsuperscript{21} They were clustered around Adana and Tarsus in the western half of the Çukurova plain, and when the rise in commercial agriculture

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., the.
\textsuperscript{19} Prochazka-Eisl and Prochazka argue that due to population growth on the coast of Northern Syria, significant migrations of Alawis or Arab Nusayris to Çukurova occurred during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Procházka-Eisl and Procházka, \textit{The Plain of Saints and Prophets}, 49-52.
\textsuperscript{20} Large numbers of Egyptians and Sudanese had settled in Adana during the Ibarhim Pasha’s invasion. Ibid., 40. For more, see Toksöz, \textit{Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton}, 41-55.
\textsuperscript{21} The records of the Egyptian government contain documentation pertaining farms in Çukurova during and immediately after the Egyptian occupation of the 1830s. See: AUB, Asad Rustum Collection, Box 3 1/10, letter from Mehmed Arif regarding farm of Ahmed Pasha.
began during the 1860s, the number of farms quickly began to expand rapidly from this area along the same model. Farms soon lined the main road linking Adana and Tarsus to the Mediterranean port of Mersin.\textsuperscript{22} The development of the cotton economy was rapid, and as a result, the structure of the agrarian regimes in Çukurova differed markedly from other parts of the Ottoman Empire. Whereas a village pattern of settlement and agriculture was common in most of Anatolia, much of the cultivation around Adana occurred on large estates owned by single individuals. Merchants and landowners of the western Çukurova plain had begun registering land promptly with the issuance of the 1858 Land Code, and there land was worked by wage laborers and sharecroppers.\textsuperscript{23}

As a result, Çukurova exhibited an unusual landholding pattern wherein workers largely from outside the province worked the land of a relatively small number of cultivators.\textsuperscript{24} The aforementioned 1909 study indicated that of all the cultivator households in the Adana province, around 46\% owned plots of 50 dönüm\textsuperscript{s} or more, a single dönüm representing just under 1 km\textsuperscript{2}. This was especially pronounced in the sancak of Adana where 76\% of the households commanded more than 50 dönüm\textsuperscript{s}, and in the kaza of Adana, this number was 95\%. Not a single farm of less than 10 dönüm\textsuperscript{s} was to be found there. Districts with the landholding pattern of the sancak of Adana were exceedingly rare in the Ottoman Empire. I have compared the statistics of the 1909 cultivation study in Adana with those of ten other provinces from throughout the empire (Hüdavendigar/Bursa, Aydın/İzmir, Ankara, Konya, Erzurum, Trabzon, Diyarbakır, Beirut, Aleppo, and Suriye). On the provincial level, only Beirut at 55\% and Diyarbakır at 47\% exhibit higher concentrations of 50 dönüm\textsuperscript{-plus landholdings than Adana’s at 46\% as of 1909.

\textsuperscript{22} E.J. Davis remarked in the 1870s that around the cities of Adana and Tarsus, “almost every acre” was cultivated. Davis, \textit{Life in Asiatic Turkey}, 148.
\textsuperscript{23} Toksöz, \textit{Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton}, 135-36.
\textsuperscript{24} A similar landholding pattern emerged in Egypt with the cotton boom. Tucker, \textit{Women in nineteenth-century Egypt}, 34.
Beirut was a strictly coastal province, since Mount Lebanon was administratively separate and not included in these statistics.\textsuperscript{25} Diyarbakır was a large region where like the Adana province, significant settlement and sedentarization of nomadic pastoralists was carried out during the Ottoman period. On the \textit{sancak} and \textit{kaza} levels, only a handful of mainly coastal \textit{sancaks} throughout the empire resembled the landholding pattern found in Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin. For example, the \textit{kaza} of Söke in Aydın was 92\% large farms in 1909. The \textit{kazas} of Sur (Tyre) and Haifa in Beirut reflected 87\% and 94\% respectively. This data points to a correlation between large landholders and newly-settled lowlands of the Mediterranean littoral that were previously either swamps or pasture.\textsuperscript{26}

The Ottoman policy of allowing purchases of large swaths of “vacant” or uncultivated land at bargain rates allowed investors from elsewhere to make a fortune in Çukurova. One family that capitalized on this policy was the Sursocks of Beirut, who owned land throughout modern-day Lebanon, Israel/Palestine, Syria and Çukurova. The family papers of the Sursocks in Lebanon offer a rare glimpse at the network of intermediaries that facilitated cultivation in large estates along the coast from Alexandria through Akka and Beirut to İskenderun and Mersin (more in Chapter 6 and 8).\textsuperscript{27} The Sursock family was firmly based in Beirut by the end of the Ottoman period, but they continued to be one of largest landholding families in Çukurova.

\textsuperscript{25} This made for especially imbalanced figures, as the old mountain settlements of the Taurus region offset to some degree the large estates of Çukurova in province-level statistics.

\textsuperscript{26} Further evidence of this phenomenon might be seen in Hūdavendigar, where the \textit{sancak} of Bursa, a longtime region of dense economic activity and one of the wealthiest provincial centers, exhibited a landholding pattern of 72\% small and medium farms, whereas the countryside of Ertuğrul \textit{sancak}, which was a major destination for new immigrants, was just 57\% small and medium farms.

\textsuperscript{27} The rents that the Sursocks collected on properties in Çukurova around the turn of the century were a fraction of their revenues for property in Beirut and Alexandria. For example, in 1900, rents for Mersin were 38,800 \textit{kuruş} versus 135,631 for Beirut and 212,046 for Alexandria. USEK, Sursock, 18078/9. The records of the Sursock family are at Université Saint-Esprit De Kaslik in Lebanon. Some files that attest to the holdings and activities of the Sursock family in Mersin and Tarsus include USEK, Sursock 18022; 19232; 19249. Special acknowledgement goes to Graham Pitts for introducing me to this collection.
Another rising landholder in the agrarian scene of Ottoman Çukurova was none other than Abidin Pasha himself. While Lt. Bennet may have seen the governor’s agricultural endeavors as hobbyistic, over less than five years as governor of the province, he amassed a considerable estate on lands in eastern Çukurova that like those of the Sursocks had been granted for the purposes of expanding cultivation on vacant lands. Yet another absentee landholder in the Çukurova region was the personage of Abdul Hamid II, whose estate comprised some 45,000 dönüms worked by Caucasian immigrants near Yarsuvat, which had been renamed Hamidiye in honor of the Sultan. Mübeccel Kiray states that Muslim land owners such as the Sultan were given large estates in order to limit the amount of land acquired by the rising Christian middle class.

Meanwhile, many urban residents of Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin, which attracted large immigration from the 1860s onward, became heavily invested in the agrarian economy. One of the most prominent families in Adana was that of the Bağdadizades, whose patriarch Abdulkadir played an important role not only in the economy but also by exerting power within the local government (more in Chapter 7). Others made their wealth in trade, industry, and banking. Toksöz notes the particular prominence of Konstantin Hacı Mavromatis, a Greek from Cyprus who established himself in Mersin during the 1850s. His family built a fantastic network of diplomatic and financial connections throughout the Çukurova region. These bankers and merchants made their wealth from the maintenance of the economic apparatus that held the agrarian economy of Çukurova together.

---

28 BOA, DH-İD 160-2/56, No. 5 (11 Şubat 1324 [24 February 1909]). Bennet predicted that Abidin Pasha would not profit from these lands acquisition because they were mostly in the vicinity of Adana and prone to flooding. TNA, FO 222/8/2, 1882 No. 3, Bennet to Dufferin, Adana (6 February 1882).
29 Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 178.
30 Kiray, "Social Change in Çukurova: A comparison of four villages," 180. See also Ener, Tarih boyunca Adana ovasına bir bakış.
Although the political economy of the Adana region may have been dominated and financed by large landholders and wealth banker-merchants, these individuals were relatively secondary in terms of the physical processes that radically changed the ecology of the Çukurova plain. Its transformation from pasture to plantation was carried out primarily by two actors: the human component of largely migrant labor from the various surrounding provinces of Anatolia and Syria and the plants, particularly cotton, which overtook much of the Çukurova plain by the end of the Ottoman period.

**Economy in Motion**

The worker issue in Adana is truly an issue that needs to be straightened out. They depart mostly from cold regions, walk for weeks, and come to a warm and humid climate like Çukurova, and in exchange for 30-40 paras, they work under that burning sun and spend their nights in the open. Because of such unhealthy foods [that they eat], most of them just up and die.

Dr. Şerafeddin Mağmumi (1895)

In 1909, Adana pharmacist Hagop Terzian sought to describe his native city that had recently been ravaged by communal violence targeting the region’s Armenian population to a broader Armenian audience centered in Istanbul. He wanted to counteract assumptions that Adana was a backwards, frontier region but emphasize the role of agricultural wealth in its rapid rise. “Adana was a large and incomparable city because of progress (harachtimutium),” he said, but simultaneously “a big village because of agriculture.” By most estimates, the population of Adana had doubled if not tripled in a half century to some 80,000 inhabitants, growing at a faster percentage rate than the Ottoman capital itself. Yet Adana was also a city entirely surrounded by

---


33 Mağmumi and Kayra, *Bir Osmanlı doktoru'nun anıları*, 175.

orchards and fields in which local inhabitants kept livestock and agricultural workers lodged all around the city’s periphery. It was the center of a vast agrarian space that pulsed with a constant flow of labor and commerce.

Throughout the year, the city of Adana expanded and contracted as if the lungs of the Çukurova plain, and cotton was the oxygen it breathed. Cotton was the chief crop linking Adana to world markets and the one that enabled urban entrepreneurs in the region to make their fortune. Businessmen and cultivators tracked the annual fluctuations in prices and demand for the various strains of cotton. The product was sold widely both within the Ottoman Empire and abroad, and while the major diplomatic empires were eager observers of the cotton trade, they were not always its major recipients, which varied with time. In 1876, the major destinations of cotton from Adana were Austria and France at about 30% of total export from Mersin; another 30% stayed in the Ottoman Empire. Spain received 10%.35 In 1903, by comparison, almost 40% of Adana’s cotton produce remained in the Ottoman Empire, perhaps indicating the impact of local spinning factories on the market, and most of the exports went to nearby Austria-Hungary, Italy, Spain, and Greece. France took only a negligible share of this produce (see Table 4 below).36 By 1908, Germany was added to the list of chief recipient countries for Çukurova cotton, of whom the foremost was Spain.37 Adana’s cotton may not have been as compatible with factories in Manchester and Lyon, which would have preferred the product of Egyptian or

35 Reports from Her Majesty’s consuls on the manufactures, commerce, &c., of their consular districts, vol. 4 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1877), 965.
36 Italian reports indicate that Italy received around 14% of the cotton leaving Mersin as of 1905. Lamberto Vannutelli, "Cenni sulla produzione del cotone in Asia Minore," Bollettino della Società geografica italiana 7(August 1906): 863.
37 Wylie, Report for the Year 1908, 16. Toksöz indicates that Germany became the largest recipient of Çukurova cotton during the last years of Ottoman rule due to the establishment of the establishment of the German Cotton Society of the Levant in 1906. Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 153.
American seed rather than Adana’s local or yerli\textsuperscript{38} variety. Despite official efforts to encourage the expansion of the former, local cultivators had persisted in planting mainly yerli.\textsuperscript{39} By the end of the Ottoman period, yerli was even on the rise as it served the purposes of growing German textile manufacturers who found that it blended well with wool.\textsuperscript{40} But more importantly, Egyptian cotton did not take well to the region’s climate, and the American strain, which had been developed under the conditions of a centuries-old slave-labor based planation economy, was much too labor-intensive for the taste of landowners in Çukurova.\textsuperscript{41}

---

\textsuperscript{38} “Yerli” of course means “local” in Turkish but because foreign sources usually refer to this cultivar by its Turkish designation I have left it as such.

\textsuperscript{39} BOA, A-MKT-MHM 256/79 (4 Ramazan 1279 [11 February 1863]); 257/97 (27 Ramazan 1279 [6 March 1279]).

\textsuperscript{40} Wylie, \textit{Report for the Year 1908}, 13.

\textsuperscript{41} BOA, DH-MKT 1231/9, No. 1 (13 Kanunusani 1323 [26 January 1908]); ibid., 13. E.J. Davis also noted that imported seed varieties such as Syrian wheat or Egyptian cotton needed to be constantly brought in or else the crops of subsequent years would “degenerate” and “sink back into the type of the district.” Davis, \textit{Life in Asiatic Turkey}, 56-57. Seed shortages were often an issue in Çukurova and the Ottoman administration sometimes banned seed export. BOA, SD 2120/53 (6 Rebiulahir 1299 [16 February 1882]); MV 49/29 (7 Rebiulahir 1307 [19 November 1889]).
Labor was indeed the central concern of major cultivators in Cilicia. The agrarian economy had shifted so rapidly that there was a tremendous shortage of labor in the area during the spring and fall. The days when Turkmen and Kurdish pastoralists accompanied by hundreds of thousands of animals would pour into Çukurova at the end of summer were coming to an end, and the once dominant pastoralist economy was continually being pushed to the margins of the Cilicia region. But in their place, a new type of migration emerged, one not based on the seasonal rhythms of climate and disease but rather on the times of planting and harvest on Çukurova’s cotton plantations and burgeoning fields of wheat, sesame, and barley. These workers entered the region from every direction.\textsuperscript{43} During the 1880s, roughly 40\% came from the Nusayri Arab villages of Çukurova and the littoral of Northern Syria as far south as Lattakia.\textsuperscript{44} The rest came from Anatolia. Villagers from around Kayseri, the Armenian towns of the Taurus Mountains, and inland regions further east like Harput and even Erzurum came seeking fortune in the fertile plains of Çukurova. Kurdish and Assyrian migrant workers from Mardin, Diyarbakir, Van, Mosul, and even the other side of the border with Iran were added to this diverse mélange of

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{1903 Adana-Mersin Export Figures\textsuperscript{42}}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|l|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Destination of Cotton} & \textbf{Destination of Grains and Cereals} & \textbf{Major exports (as \% of total value)} \\
Ottoman Empire & 39.8\% & Ottoman Empire & 31.1\% & Cotton & 55\%
Austria-Hungary & 19.9\% & Belgium & 31.7\% & Grains and cereals & 18\%
Italy & 19.8\% & UK & 19.6\% & Sesame seed & 6\%
Spain & 10.8\% & Egypt & 10.1\% & Timber and tree products & 5\%
Greece & 6.2\% & France & 7.9\% & & \\
Russia & 1.5\% & & & & \\
UK & 1.1\% & & & & \\
France & 0.9\% & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{42} Compiled from data in Townshend, \textit{Trade of the Vilayets of Aleppo and Adana for the Year 1903} (London: Foreign Office, 1904), 24. See appendix for full table.

\textsuperscript{43} A similar relationship between the cotton-cultivating Nile Delta and Upper Egypt emerged over the latter half of the nineteenth century. Tucker, \textit{Women in nineteenth-century Egypt}, 33.

\textsuperscript{44} Davis, \textit{Life in Asiatic Turkey}, 172.
labor from every corner of Cilicia’s horizon. 100 to 200 permanent migrants from as far east as Afghanistan had settled on the outskirts of Adana and Tarsus as agricultural laborers and watchmen.\textsuperscript{45}

Estimates of annual labor flows varied wildly and were contingent in part on the strength a particular season’s prospective harvest. E.J. Davis reported 50,000 to 70,000 laborers annually at harvest time in 1874.\textsuperscript{46} Lt. Bennet reported 40,000 to 50,000 workers arriving in April and May as of 1881.\textsuperscript{47} In 1885, Abidin Pasha reported to Ottoman diplomats in London that 50,000 people came annually to the Çukurova region for agriculture, a number similar to his estimates for the population of Adana and its vicinity.\textsuperscript{48} Dr. Şerafeddin Pasha referred to the numbers reaching as many as 100,000 in the 1890s during an inspection of a cholera epidemic in the region, although an account by a local official in Adana from 1898 referred to just 42,000 such workers.\textsuperscript{49} A later and more detailed health inspection of the Adana region from 1901 mentioned 60-70,000 workers coming to Adana each year from outside the province.\textsuperscript{50} Meanwhile a financial inspection of the Adana province from 1903 refers to 50-60,000 migrant workers.\textsuperscript{51}

W.J. Childs, who traversed the Adana region largely on foot just before the First World War, mentioned 100,000 to 150,000 migrant laborers working the agricultural land surrounding a city of roughly the same size.\textsuperscript{52} Perhaps both numbers were exaggerations, but the economy of Adana

\textsuperscript{45} BOA, DH-MKT 330/45 (12 Receb 1312 [27 December 1895]); ŞD 633/18, No. 4 (7 September 1893); TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1881 No. 3, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (22 January 1881). British intelligence indicated that the Afghans and Indians in Çukurova “have immigrated to escape from British rule.” Admiralty, \textit{A Handbook of Asia Minor}, 43-44.

\textsuperscript{46} Davis, \textit{Life in Asiatic Turkey}, 172.

\textsuperscript{47} TNA, FO 222/8/2, No. 3 Bennet to Dufferin, Adana (6 February 1882).

\textsuperscript{48} BOA, HR-SFR (3) 282/31, No. 52 (11 February 1885).

\textsuperscript{49} Mağmumi and Kayra, \textit{Bir Osmanlı doktorunun anıları}, 174; Ziya, \textit{Tabsıra yahut Adana Temaşaşı}, 18.

\textsuperscript{50} BOA, I-DH 1386/33, no. 7 (30 Nisan 1317 [13 May 1901]).

\textsuperscript{51} BOA, A-MKT-MHM 523/51 (16 October 1903). A medical inspection from 1909 cited the same exact range. BOA, DH-MKT 2801/54, No. 1 (17 Rebiuvel 1327 [26 March 1909].

\textsuperscript{52} Childs, \textit{Across Asia Minor on Foot}, 343. According to the 1909 account of Hakob Terzian, the workers numbered only 20,000, though the author was as keen as other to note their demographic and cultural impact. Perhaps in stating this number Terzian related mistakenly a figure that corresponded to the number of Armenian migrant
had grown at an alarming rate over the preceding decade. During the First World War, the Governor of Adana estimate prewar labor flows at 70-80,000 people.\(^{53}\)

Aside from the fact that population figures of the period often vary, the disparity between these estimates is a natural consequence of the fact that the definition of who was a migrant worker and who was local was ambiguous. In general, the number of agricultural workers in Adana during the peak periods was perceived to equal or exceed the number of permanent urban inhabitants. These temporary workers formed the majority of laborers on large farms; Lt. Bennet found that a 6500 dönüm estate he visited hired 25 permanent winter hands but 120 extra workers at harvest times.\(^{54}\) A report from 1912 indicated that while the male and female population of local agricultural laborers in Çukurova was around 2,000, the migrant worker population could be more than 100,000.\(^{55}\)

---

\(^{53}\) BOA, DH-I-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 12-13, Hakki to Dahiliye (30 Teşrinisani 1331 [13 December 1915]).

\(^{54}\) TNA, FO 222/8/2, pg. 54, “Report on the Vilayet of Adana” (6 February 1882).

This annual influx left a major imprint on the city of Adana and made it one of the most expensive places to rent and own property in the Ottoman Empire. The presence of a large floating population of workers, many of whom were unmarried men, also impacted various aspects of the urban culture; Adana was known for a robust nightlife, with taverns (meyhane), cafes, and gambling becoming a common feature of the city. Street food sold by traveling cooks such as mumbar (stuffed sheep intestine), şırdan (stomach), and liver — not to mention the now renowned Adana kebabs — were relatively cheap sources of meat that workers could enjoy as a small pleasure during otherwise strenuous days of planting and harvest in Adana’s countryside. Workers also brought a rural feel to the city during the peak seasons of demand. The week began on Tuesday, when workers, employers and middlemen would congregate at the  

---

56 Terzian, Atanayi keank’ë, 10.
57 Ibid., 10-12.
58 Abdülkadir Kemali, father of novelist Orhan Kemal and native of Ceyhan, recalled in his memoirs how as a child he longed to taste the mumbar and liver that he would sometimes see workers enjoying on their breaks. Abdülkadir Kemali and İşık Ögüç, Orhan Kemal’ın babası Abdülkadir Kemali Bey’ın anıları [The Memoirs of Orhan Kemal’s Father Abdülkadir Kemali Bey] (İstanbul: Everest Yayınları, 2009), 4. The fact that Adana cuisine is identified by these very dishes today is a testament to how the diets of workers as well as the tastes they brought from the home countries have colored the diets of today’s Turkey.
“farmhand market (irgaıı paızarı).” Dr. Şerafeddin remarked that on Tuesdays, Adana was a “human sea (insan deryası)” due to the presence of on average 40,000 or more workers in search of employment.\(^{59}\) The locus of this activity was the Stone Bridge, which was impassable due to the number of people gathered there for business.

On the other side of the coin, working in Çukurova must have had a profound effect on the communities that contributed significant amounts of labor. Their transformation from peripheral peasants to wage laborers in the heart of the empire’s fastest growing frontier transformed many households. While workers are always referred to in the abstract, and it appears that many of them were single, young men, it is clear that a very large percentage of them were in fact women.\(^{60}\) The sudden rise of female wage labor among Armenians, Kurds, and Arab Nusayris, which removed women from village fields and the household economies of the mountains, had likely implications for gender roles among those ethnolinguistic groups in particular. Meanwhile, the rise of migrant labor, which was commonly referred to as \textit{gurbet}, meaning exile or estrangement, instilled a culture of seasonal displacement and separation among the working villagers of rural Anatolia and Syria.

Beyond social effect in Adana and at home, the movement of seasonal workers fundamentally reshaped the ecology of the Çukurova plain, which witnessed the expansion of cultivation and a concurrent rise in demand for labor with every strong harvest. From the beginning of the cotton boom in the 1860s, government officials had played some role in orchestrating worker movements from Eastern Anatolia through facilitating correspondence about labor demands.\(^{61}\) Reports regarding need and timing would be relayed from Adana to

\(^{59}\) Mağmuni and Kayra, \textit{Bir Osmanlı doktoru'nun anıları}, 175.

\(^{60}\) See BOA, ŞD 2120/46 (20 Teşrinisani 1296 [2 December 1880]); DH-ID 80/26 (9 Haziran 1330 [22 June 1914]); Tsapalos and Walter, \textit{Rapport sur le domaine impérial de Tchoucour-Ova}, 76.

\(^{61}\) BOA, A)–MKT-MHM 328/84, No. 1 (8 Mart 1281 [20 March 1865]).
labor-supplying provinces such as Diyarbakir and Bitlis via the Ministry of the Interior. Yet the social lubricant of this entire process was the figure of the elçibasi, a person originating from the local villages of the migrant workers who led the convoys of caravans to Adana and negotiated the terms of labor. This figure, sometimes referred to in Ottoman documents as a mütahit, or contractor, received a wage from the employer roughly twice that of the workers and also earned a small commission from the workers themselves. Once on the farms, these middlemen took on the role of supervisors, dining and sleeping separately from the workers with the manager (çiftlik kâhyası) and other permanent staff. Thus, while the elçibasi was the link between workers in their villages and employment in Adana, there was likely more animosity than solidarity between these two groups; Hilmi Uran noted that the elçibasi was known for wielding an umbrella and a whip.

The umbrella would have been no small status symbol, as the fields of Çukurova held little tree cover or shade to offer respite from the sun and heat. Agricultural laborers worked long days; excluding the various break times, the workday lasted roughly ten or eleven hours. Precisely for this reason, the workday was organized around those virtually-sacred break times (soluk) that were in and of themselves an important part of worker compensation. The farms had cooks called odacis who supplied sustenance to the workers. One British Consul of Adana remarked, “if the food is bad, the men strike at once.” The workday’s end was marked by a ritualistic chant that in addition to alluding to many figures in the daily lives of Ottoman workers, mentioned by name Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt, who was reportedly responsible for

---

62 BOA, DH-MKT 1712/31, No. 1 (14 March 1890).
63 A document from 1892 reports the daily wages of mütahits and workers around Mersin at 5 and 3 kuruş respectively. BOA, ŞD 2124/28 (6 Cemaziyelahir 1310 [14 December 1892]); Uran, Adana Ziraat Amelesi, 13-14.
64 Ibid., 15.
65 Ibid., 10.
66 Wylie, Report for the Year 1908, 14.
shortening the work week during his time in Cilicia. Thus, while the disparate nature of their origins discouraged worker organization these certain types of consciousness regarding labor practices comprised the moral economy that governed the migrant working class.

The breaks were vital to the workers not just because they needed rest but because they were given meals provided by the farm. The first meal came after about an hour of work in the morning and was comprised of a loaf of bread. The “pilav break,” during which workers were given a bowl of bulgur or barley, came in the late morning was comprised. The next break known as the “ass break (göt soluğu),” which came at the high heat of the afternoon, was intended solely for sitting. Alongside an optional prayer break in the afternoon, a roughly forty-five minute break for a meal occurred for lunch. The workers would generally eat a loaf of bread with barley soup, compote or ayran. There was usually a water boy on hand in the fields during work hours. Although the meals they received throughout the week were an important component of worker compensation, Dr. Şerafeddin noted that the food he encountered during his health inspections was very poor. It was common to find workers being served moldy bread or “rock-hard” pilavs cooked in foul-smelling oils. He blamed this poor nutrition for contributing to the deplorable health conditions of migrant workers in Çukurova.

Poor nutrition contributed to the Ottoman migrant laborers’ already precarious health situation. Their movements were timed to the various agricultural seasons of the year and not to the patterns of transhumance that most residents of Cilicia practice for health reasons. “Mortality amongst the labourers is high,” E.J. Davis remarked following his visit during the 1870s. “These

---

67 Uran, Adana Ziraat Amelesi, 10. According to Damar Arıkoğlu, the local labor commission in Adana was also founded during the time of İbrahim Pasha’s occupation. Arıkoğlu, Hâtıralarım, 16. See also Procházka-Eisl and Procházka, The Plain of Saints and Prophets, 40. More in Chapter 11.
68 Ayran is a yogurt drink.
69 Uran, Adana Ziraat Amelesi, 7-10.
70 Mağmumi and Kayra, Bir Osmanlı doktoru'nun anıları, 175.
poor fellows come down from a pure mountain air to the deadly heat of the Cilician plain; they are exposed all day to the burning sun… in a climate always more or less malarious.”71 Fever, sunstroke and dysentery were the most common afflictions facing these workers, and in addition to being vectors for epidemic diseases such as cholera, migrant workers in Adana contributed to the province having unusually high rates of syphilis.72 Workers would return from the fields at the end of the week only to die suddenly of malaria or another disease in the often squalid conditions of the inns or open-air encampments of workers that dotted the edge of Adana. As Davis wrote, “a man feels a little ill, headache and shivering come on, he is obliged to retire, and in an hour or two he’s dead.”73 Those who survived did not necessarily leave their microbes in Çukurova when they returned home. Samuel Jamentz, an Ottoman-Armenian doctor who grew up in the mountain town of Hadjin, which he described as “a region endowed with such incomparable climate, mountains, and water” that it made “a marvelous summer-place (amaranots),” lamented that workers would return with malaria and other disease that they contracted in the insalubrious swamps of Çukurova, thereby spreading disease otherwise foreign to the Taurus Mountains (more in Chapter 6).74

Disease was not the only risk facing these migrants. Predatory lending landed many workers in a state of chronic debt, and gambling was widespread. Elçibaşis played a prominent role in this small-scale lending and gambling.75 Yet, going to Adana for work was perhaps the biggest gamble of all, as a poor health situation and uncertain terms of employment awaited. While demand for labor was certainly high, it often varied based on the rainfall, demand for

71 Davis, *Life in Asiatic Turkey*, 172.
75 Uran, *Adana Ziraat Amelesi*, 15.
cotton and other crops, and the general capacity for cultivators to plant during a given year.

Wages could rise as much as 50% higher than normal in a strong year, but if demand was low workers faced the reality of going home empty-handed. In an extreme case, the disruption caused by the Adana massacres left over one thousand Assyrian workers who had traveled roughly 600 km from the villages around Midyat without work in Adana and unable to return home.76

This being said, a successful season in Adana was certainly lucrative in comparison with economic opportunities in the crowded mountain regions where land and work were harder to come by.77 In April 1896, for example, the governor of Bitlis wrote to the Interior Ministry asking how much the estimated daily pay rate for workers that season would be so that it could be announced during the annual procurement of workers occurring through the region.78 The ministry responded that while daily wages were normally 5-6 kurus, that year authorities in Adana were reporting that it was “anticipated (melhûz) that it would not drop below 8 to 10 kurus on average.”79 This ambiguity made working in Adana an uncertain venture; however, because Adana often reported wages for agricultural workers roughly double that of other provinces, the opportunity would have been difficult to resist.80 A British official noted in 1880 that agricultural laborers in Adana earned 5 to 12 kurus daily plus food, and Lt. Bennet similarly indicated in 1882 that migrant workers in Adana were paid 5 to 10 kurus daily.81

76 BOA, DH-MKT 2843/31 (30 Mayis 1325 [13 June 1909]).
77 In 1914, the governor of Adana Hakkı Pasha said the that men and “even women” of the Taurus Mountains were in a constant state of roaming due to the lack of opportunities there, and suggested that 2,000 households from the crowded town of Hadjin should be settled somewhere in Çukurova to reduce the demographic pressure. BOA, DH-ID 80/26 (9 Haziran 1330 [22 June 1914]).
78 BOA, DH-MKT 2074/36, No. 1 (10 Nisan 1312 [22 April 1896]).
79 BOA, DH-MKT 2074/13, No. 2 (13 Nisan 1312 [25 April 1896]).
80 In 1892, the Governor of Adana reported daily wages of 6 kurus, whereas the mutasarrıfs of Içel and Yozgat reported 3 and 3.5 kurus respectively. BOA, ŞD 2124/28 (13 Kanunuevel 1308 [25 December 1892]); 2124/29 (14 Kanunuevel 1308 [26 December 1892]); ŞD 2124/30 (22 Kanunuevel 1308 [3 January 1893]).
81 TNA FO 222/8/2, No. 3 Bennet to Dufferin, Adana (6 February 1882).
Table 5 Estimated Wages (in kurus) of Various Professions in Ottoman Adana, February 1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Weekly/ Daily Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>30 to 50 / week (5 to 8 / day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>3 to 7 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmakers</td>
<td>15 to 20 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>200 to 230 / month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet-makers</td>
<td>14 to 18 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>10 to 14 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>3000 to 10000 / year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppersmiths</td>
<td>13 to 14 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm Laborers</strong></td>
<td>5 to 12 / day plus food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Farm Laborers</td>
<td>300 to 400 / year with board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farriers</td>
<td>3 to 7 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harness-makers</td>
<td>7 to 10 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>10 to 14 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics (engineers in mills)</td>
<td>4 Ottoman lira / month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>7 to 9 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives in cotton mills</td>
<td>3 to 4 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>8 to 11 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>30 to 70 / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopmen</td>
<td>2 to 4 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>3 to 6 / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmiths</td>
<td>8 to 10 / day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table offers indications of why migrant workers, who hailed from villages and mountain towns where wages were likely substantially lower, might undertake the arduous and risky journey to labor in the deadly fields of Çukurova. Their pay was comparable to many other professions in Adana and in a good year could exceed those amounts. Likewise, migrant laborers who came at peak agricultural times such as planting and harvesting earned substantially more per day than the annual rate of a permanent farmhand. They could also move, for example, to and from other agricultural regions such as İzmir in search of more work.

Despite the numerous issues surrounding the seasonal migration of workers to various parts of Anatolia for the purposes of agricultural labor, relatively little was done by the Ottoman government beyond some oversight and regulation of movement (more in Chapter 7). Working conditions and the rights of workers vis-à-vis their employers were areas of particular ambiguity. Only with the reinstatement of the Ottoman constitution in 1908, concern for working conditions...

---

82 Adapted from data in TNA, FO 424/106, pg. 457, Cooper to Tenterden (9 June 1880).
seems to have increased. The Şura-yı Devlet commissioned reports regarding working conditions in the agricultural sector in preparation of a document that clearly defined the rights of estate-owners and cultivators towards their laborers and vice versa. The language of the documentation surrounding this measure clearly indicates that it was a matter of worker rights. The report explained that the state of agricultural workers in the Ottoman Empire was “miserable in every aspect (ez her cihet perişan),” describing these laborers as “poor” uninformed souls employed under unfavorable terms and cruelly exploited. According to this report, the protection of workers’ rights (hukuk) was not just a matter of humanity but in fact posited as critical to the proper expansion of the Ottoman Empire’s agricultural economy.⁸³

---

⁸³ BOA, BEO 3599/269906, no. 2 (22 Cemaziyelahir 1327 [27 June 1909]).
Producing Çukurova

The Second Constitutional Era was indeed a period of rapid rise in agricultural output in the Ottoman Empire and especially in Adana, and this economic growth was chiefly the fruit of migrant labor. Adana’s annual cotton crop had already grown to over 50,000 bales during the first decade of the 1900s. The crop of 1909, despite the disruption of the Adana massacres, was easily one of the best on record, with over 75,000 bales of cotton recorded, although the following year’s crop was much subdued, due to flood and the labor effects of the violence (more in Chapter 7). However, 1911, 1912, and 1913 saw record crops, so that on the eve of the First World War, Adana’s projected cotton harvests were roughly double that of the average harvests of a decade prior (more in Chapter 10). This growth represented a general increase in agricultural output and not merely a greater concentration on cotton. For example, in March 1911, the Governor of Adana sent a telegram to the Ministry of the Interior requesting that measures be taken to encourage a greater influx of workers from Ankara, Konya, Aleppo, Mamuretülaziz, and Diyarbakir, because the year’s grain crop was exceptionally large when compared with years past and with the season coming to a close, there was still not enough labor in the region.\(^{84}\) In a span of decades, Çukurova had seemingly become a plantation where cultivation was limited only by the number of hands available to plant and pick the crops.

\(^{84}\) BOA, DH-ID 107/20, No. 2 (24 Mart 1327 [6 April 1911]).
This growth was due in part to the slow emergence of a political economy in which landholders employed migrant labor that flowed into the province every year, and as these networks became more formalized and workers grew accustomed to this form of labor, the system acquired a certain order, albeit one that appeared most unfavorable to the workers themselves. Another factor in this growth was the slow mechanization of agriculture in Çukurova. Toksöz notes that by 1910, there were 60 threshers, 300 steam plows, 1000 reapers, 200 pumps, and 50 steam and gas engines in the vicinity of Adana. Mechanization allowed for increased yields and diversification of economic activity. For example, in the 1860s, one of the most highly demanded jobs for migrant laborers was that of the reaper (orakçı). However, as

Figure 23 Estimates of Çukurova’s Annual Cotton Crop

Cotton Production of Çukurova (bales per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>60000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>80000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>120000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>140000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


87 BOA, A]-MKT-MHM 328/84, No. 1 (8 Mart 1281 [20 March 1865]).
mechanical reapers were introduced at the beginning of the twentieth century, demand for human
reapers declined. This freed laborers to perform other tasks still done by hand such as hoeing. Nevertheless, gangs each comprised of dozens of men toured the countryside with large imported
threshing machines that greatly helped lighten the labor load of the grain crop. Likewise, steam
plows such as the one first introduced by Abidin Pasha began to spread, albeit not in the form of
individual ownership but rather as machines that could be rented or contracted. Nonetheless, the factor of human labor in Çukurova’s agricultural economy would remain fundamental.

The concern of labor was especially important as the region began to industrialize and
become more involved in the processing of cotton for export and the weaving of textiles. The
cleaning of cotton, which required separating the cotton fibers from the seeds and the rest of the
boll (koza) — an activity known in Turkish as koza şiflemek — had long been one of the major
economic activities involved with the industry. Unlike agricultural work, the cleaning of cotton
bolls was mostly carried out by local residents in the towns and villages of Çukurova, who were
usually paid in kind, keeping roughly 1 out of every 8 to 10 bolls for their own sale. This allowed
households that worked together – parents, children, and all – to supplement their incomes
during the harvest season, and it was an activity that widowed women in particular could use to
get by. With the spread of cotton gins and spinning mills in the Adana region, this mode of
labor was industrialized. Entire families shared the responsibilities of a particular machine in a
particular factory that operated continuously (with the help of electric light) as family

88 Uran, Adana Ziraat Amelesi, 5.
89 Wylie, Report for the Year 1908, 14.
90 Admiralty, A Handbook of Asia Minor, 45.
91 Terzian notes that these families used the money to pay their rent, which was usually due on November 1. Terzian, Atanayi keank’ê, 9. Judith Tucker’s work on women in nineteenth century Egypt offers particular insight onto how the rise of cotton changes the nature of women’s labor and offered some opportunities for economic autonomy. Tucker, Women in nineteenth-century Egypt. For similar questions regarding silk in Mount Lebanon, see Khater, Inventing Home.
members—especially women and children—alternated turns on the machines. Arshaguhi Teodik reported seeing one such factory where hundreds of women and children worked in 1909. Mechanization increased demand for labor as more cotton was consumed locally; in the case of a spinning factory in Tarsus, houses were built for Armenian workers who were to be brought from Hadjin, Zeytun, and Aintab to meet the demand.

Table 6 Number of Cotton Gins in Çukurova, 1908

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Number of Factories</th>
<th>Number of Gins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamidiye (Ceyhan)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yenice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In various villages</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above chart shows the extent of industrialization that was occurring in Cilicia by the end of the Ottoman period. In addition to the numerous factories and workshops associated with the cotton industry, various flour, rope, ice, and oil factories could be found in the cities of Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin. Yet, this chart also clearly indicates an economic division of the province. The easternmost cotton gins were located in Hamidiye on the banks of the Ceyhan River that divided the province in half. The western strip of Lower Çukurova between Adana and Mersin had witnessed rapid agricultural growth, but in the eastern region of Upper Çukurova this change was not so palpable. There was another side to the story of Çukurova’s transformation.

92 Wylie, Report for the Year 1908, 14.
94 Wylie, Report for the Year 1908, 11.
95 Ibid., 12.
96 For more on mechanization, see Toksöz, *Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton*, 168-76.
The Other Plain

When Abidin Pasha inaugurated the construction of the Adana-Mersin railway line, he foretold a future in which commercial growth would accomplish what the governments of the Tanzimat period had failed to do with heavy-handed reforms. He declared that “the large products of the interior, which all gravitate by a natural law to the sea, will be stimulated to increased energy by the facilities afforded by railway communication.”97 The Western newspapers that covered this speech with anticipation were mainly concerned with how the railway would impact imports and exports, but on some level, Abidin Pasha had in his mind the disastrous episode of settlement from the 1860s and 70s. Lt. Bennet remarked that Abidin Pasha was “well aware of their past history and can… be trusted not to repeat the former

inhumanity." Inconfidence that economic change might induce the pastoralists of Cilicia to settle more easily than force, they were allowed to migrate as before during a period in which the Hamidian regime adopted a more accommodating policy towards tribal populations.

The railroad, which cut travel time for goods between Adana and Mersin to 2 to 2.5 hours, did bring change, and the products of the interior did begin to “gravitate by a natural law to the sea.” There, a growing fleet of sailing vessels and steamships awaited. By the end of the Ottoman period, Mersin was regularly visited by steamships from the Ottoman Empire and eleven other countries, and more than 1200 vessels annually. This economic reorientation appeared so stark that the merchants of İskenderun, which had been the Mediterranean port of the city of Aleppo (one of the largest in the empire), petitioned the Ottoman government in 1913 to make their district part of the Adana province on the premise that their economic future was with Çukurova and that region belonged to the “Turkish” areas of Anatolia. Although the request was denied, it illustrates the extent to which economic growth in Adana impacted the gaze of businessmen in the region, and how in turn, that reflected on the way local communities understood their engagement with emerging discourses of national identity.

While economic growth was significant, it was also uneven. Until 1911, the railway stopped in Adana, and east of the city, goods moved at a slower pace. Distances between locations in Upper Çukurova remained impossibly far. For example, the traveling time between

---

98 Gould, "Pashas and Brigands: Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 166.
99 A British consul in Adana asked to have his post moved to Mersin, where more important commercial activities and movements were taking place, saying he could “reach Adana by train in two hours” if need be. TNA, FO 195/1930, Massy to Currie, Mersina (31 March 1896), pg. 9.
100 Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 152, 59.
101 Their eight points included the importance of the railroad as well as cultural, climatic, political and economic ties to Adana that were stronger than those to Aleppo. BOA, DH-ID 183-2/7, No. 2 (4 Teşrinisani 1329 [17 November 1913]).
102 This detail should be intriguing for those interested in local engagement with the contentious incorporation of this region into the Republic of Turkey during the 1930s. For more, see Sarah D. Shields, Fezzes in the River: identity politics and European diplomacy in the Middle East on the eve of World War II (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).
Hamidiye (the main center of immigrant settlement in Çukurova) and the next town to the east, Osmaniye (the center of tribal settlement in Cebel-i-Bereket), was eight hours. Arshaghi Teodik remarked that Eastern Çukurova was a place where villages and towns were separated by many hours and even days. The distance between Adana and Mersin on the coast and Adana and Sis in Upper Çukurova was the same – roughly 70 km – but while rail moved people and goods to Mersin in just 2 hours, Sis was 18 hours from Adana (see Table 7). The absence of adequate transportation meant that the already struggling villages of Upper Çukurova were disproportionately disconnected from markets in Adana and beyond. Major transport in the region remained in the hands of camel drivers.

---

103 TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
104 Teodik, _Amis mē i Kilikia_, 141.
105 Terzian, _Atanayi keank ‘ē_, 6.
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Table 7 Distances of different parts of Cilicia from provincial capital of Adana as conventionally measured in hours  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mersin (by train)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Karaisali</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muhacirin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sirkinti</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gulek</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaniye</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bozdoğan</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Namrun</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Feke</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadjin</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An even more vivid illustration of the diffuse geography of Upper Çukurova and the long distances faced by residents of the area might be the example of 14 households of 63 immigrants founded near the village of Kömürdülü in 1897. Their settlement was a full three hours from Kömürdülü along a very bad road, leaving them helplessly disconnected from the village and much less the outside world. In their case, the situation was extreme enough to merit resettlement to a village that would be newly founded for them called Yeniköy, approximately one hour from Cevdetiye.  

The trouble of these migrants illustrates how impossibly sparse settlement in many parts of Upper Çukurova remained. While Cebel-i Bereket sancak was similar in size to the Adana-Tarsus-Mersin region, its population as of 1914 was less than one-third of the latter’s.

---

107 SV-Adana (H. 1294 [1877]).
108 BOA, DH-TMIK-S 69/49 (12 Receb 1325 [8 August 1907]).
A comparatively low population density also led to numerous difficulties regarding administration of the eastern portion of the Adana province. There, local governments suffered from disproportionately poor budgets and lack of personnel. Administrative buildings and important symbols of state power such as the prison received comparatively little attention. In some cases, this state of affairs threatened the Ottoman state’s ability to monopolize violence (more in Chapter 7), but beyond this, it challenged the efficacy of provincial administrative reform, which in the case of Cilicia, had been focused on reining in unchecked autonomy and the power of local notables.

In the introduction of this chapter, I discussed the Ottoman investigation of a large number of complaints by villagers in Eastern Çukurova against the tribal notables or aghas of the region. While settlement and administration reform were aimed at curtailing the power of such
figures, in practice the image of the oppressive village *agha* who controls large amounts of land and forces the local residents to obey his will became synonymous with life in rural Cilicia. Yaşar Kemal’s most famous novel, *İnce Memed*, revolves around the struggles that arise from a political economy characterized by landholding village *aghás* and the young men and women who lived under their thumbs in the diffuse and wild geography of Çukurova.\(^{109}\) This uneven distribution of property and power in the countryside may seem to many readers as quintessentially tribal features of these economies. However, given the relatively egalitarian tendencies of nomadic pastoralist societies and the often disruptive influence of settlement in this regard, we may see the political economy depicted in *İnce Memed* as representative of the post-settlement world of Çukurova.

As mentioned above, much of the Adana region’s agrarian expansion had occurred in the form of large estates that employed migrant labor. The natural consequence of this rapid expansion on uncultivated and unregistered land was for large tracts of terrain to be registered to single owners and families. However, this was somewhat contrary to post-1858 Ottoman land policy, which sought to register as much land as possible to as many people as possible in order to increase the tax base and officially register Ottoman citizens. Thus, while the 1858 Land Code did in some cases create large estates and eventually facilitated the sale and purchase of parcels of land, it was in many cases aimed at creating small landholders. The work of Martha Mundy and Richard Suamarez has shown how this may have been particularly true in Greater Syria and regions such as Transjordan, where most rural land registration occurred not in 1858 but rather over the course of subsequent decades by surveyors that went to villages and registered pieces of land that may have been held communally to individuals.\(^{110}\)

\(^{109}\) For an English translation of this work, see Kemal, *Memed, My Hawk*.
\(^{110}\) Mundy and Smith, *Governing Property: law, administration, and production in Ottoman Syria*. 
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By the end of the Ottoman period, the landholding pattern in Eastern Çukurova was almost exactly the same as in Western Çukurova. Around Ceyhan, 88% of cultivator households owned more than 50 dönüms of land. In the sancak of Cebel-i Bereket, the households surveyed indicated a similar figure of 74%. Toksöz notes that a “former nomad” named Alaybezade Mahmud held 5,000 dönüms alone. This is despite the fact that land was registered incrementally in the manner described above. As Gould shows in his study of tribal settlement in Cilicia, the registration of property occurred in the 1880s some fifteen years after settlement. When it did, the landholding pattern emerged on paper as fairly egalitarian. Unlike the western portion of the plain, relatively small plots of land were registered to individuals. A similar property regime would have been in play for the waves of migrants who came to Çukurova, as settlement policy involved issuing a land deed to each family. However, as Gould notes, the historical evidence of registration flies in the face of Çukurova’s notoriously unequal distribution of property during the early Republican period. Gould, referencing the ethnographic work of Wolfram Eberhard in the region, hypothesized that land may have been registered to individuals, but that in practice local notables kept the deeds and controlled access to the land. I would add to this possibility one major point: the situation in Eastern Çukurova was likely such that many people abandoned or sold their land.

Within the various literature on land in the Ottoman Empire, there is a general tendency to underestimate the extent to which Ottoman subjects may not have wanted to own land. I am not referring only to a desire to avoid paying taxes or conscription. In the case of Adana, I am referring in particular to settlers, be they pastoralists or immigrants, who simply did not want to
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111 See above.
112 Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 179-80.
113 Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885".
114 Ibid.
live in the environments where they were settled. As explained in Chapter 4, pastoralist communities settled by the Reform Division tried to return to a transhumant mode of living and abandoned agricultural lands. Within this climate, it was not only possible for land to change hands easily and at a low price; it was possible that many settlers simply left their land or were buried on it. This is also true for migrants, who frequently fled their settlement areas rather than waiting to petition for resettlement. In their cases, this was likely tied to the inhabitability of swampy parts of Çukurova, where settler mortality was high. Lt. Bennet described malaria in the eastern part of the plain as especially insalubrious. British Consul Chemerside reported in 1879 that of the new batch of immigrants who came to the İslahiye region – roughly 2000 families – most fled or died so that only 25 families or so remained. “It is really terrible to see these half-starved, fever-stricken wretches and the little skeleton babes tugging at the empty breast,” he wrote in describing the settlers’ predicament. Bennet meanwhile remarked upon how this dynamic had already created a small and very prosperous class of immigrant landowners around the Ceyhan River, where disease quickly whittled down large settler populations to a few hundred individuals. The emergence of large estates in Eastern Çukurova was partially a consequence of just how difficult agricultural life was there. The settlers who were able to adjust were left with bountiful land, which was worked by seasonal laborers.

In May of 1866, a number of villages had been formed the members of Cerid and Tacirli communities around the town of Osmaniye. According to a count in 1916, either half had changed name or disappeared. But four main villages still survived. Two named for Cevdet
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115 For example, one report indicated that over 800 recent immigrant households had sold their farms and seed for cash. BOA, DH-MKT 1289/55 (10 Şaban 1326 [24 August 1908]).
117 TNA, FO 424/106, p395-6, Chemerside (1 October 1879).
118 Due to the impacts of conscription and the general upheaval of the war period, one might be hesitant to employ statistics from the war period; however, because these particular counts were in terms of household rather than strict population, I hypothesize that they would have been less vulnerable to those fluctuations.
Pasha and Derviş Pasha, who oversaw the forced settlement (see Chapter 3), were among the names that remained. The four villages had grown by about 7% in fifty years, one was significantly smaller. Dervişiyê was essentially the same size as it had been upon its foundation in 1866. Cevdetiye, perched a gentle hill along the main road, had fared the best.

*Table 8 Population of four villages formed by Reform Division (in households)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1866</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dervişiyê</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tevfikiye</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaveriye</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cevdetiye</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>313</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WWI-era British intelligence about the Cilicia region indicated that in contrast to the economic growth occurring in the Adana-Mersin region, the countryside remained cut off. The intelligence manual described the impacts of settlement saying that “the [Afşars] have become poorer as a result of their struggles with the Turks.”\(^\text{120}\) In his study of settlement, Gould suggested in a somewhat optimistic tone that economic change in the region gradually induced tribal populations to settle. This would only appear true in the sense that the marginalization of the pastoralist economy left little alternative. However, it must be noted that even though some of the tribal groups (Cerid, Tacirli, etc.) settled during the Reform Division’s operations in Cilicia faded from the archival record after the 1870s, new nomadic groups emerged that were also targeted for settlement.

The settlement of some nomads created a space for others to thrive. One particularly conspicuous group of pastoralists to emerge in late Ottoman Cilicia is the Aydınlıs. They
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\(^{119}\) BOA, DH-UMVM 114/37, No. 4 (24 Teşrinisani 1332 [5 December 1916]); I-DH 551/38360, No. 1 (9 Mayıs 1282 [22 May 1866]).

\(^{120}\) Admiralty, *A Handbook of Asia Minor*, 87.
represented a few thousand transhumant individuals.\textsuperscript{121} This particular tribe’s name does not appear in Langlois’s original survey of the Cilicia region from the 1850s.\textsuperscript{122} Similarly, the name does not appear in the writings of Ahmed Cevdet from the period of settlement.\textsuperscript{123} Archival documents pertaining to this tribe begin to appear around the turn of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{124} Much like the Afsars, Cerids, Tecirlis, and Bozdoğan targeted by the Reform Division, their seasonal migration brought them through the Marash region into Çukurova on an annual basis. Their yaylas were located in the regions of İzmit, Konya, and Bursa.\textsuperscript{125} Whether this was a new community formed out of the remnants of defeated tribes or simply a group that expanded its territory once the Reform Division had marginalized others in the region is not clear. It appears that there may be overlap between the groups formerly referred to as Afsar and the new Aydınlı in the Cilicia region. At any rate, by 1901, there were reports of clashes between police and Aydınlı sheep thieves, leading to discussion regarding their prospective settlement.\textsuperscript{126}

In 1905, a letter indicating that the Aydınlıs were not registered with the census bureau and that they hid themselves in the forests of the Taurus Mountains to avoid being counted stated that since their winter quarters were in Sis and Kozan, they should be registered there.\textsuperscript{127} When in 1907 the local government had yet failed to register them, the mutasarrıf of Kozan and governor Bahri Pasha proposed a settlement policy using military force similar to the ones implemented previously in Çukurova wherein the Aydınlıs would be allowed to migrate

\textsuperscript{121} It is hard to get clear estimate of the Aydınlı population. In 1907, the mutasarrıf of Kozan reported around 2000 Aydınlıs in the vicinity of Hadjun during the summer, but this would have been only one segment of their total population. He also noted that their households (hane) were comprised of at least 8 to 10 people each. BOA, DH-TMIK-M 258/17, No. 1 (30 Temmuz 1323 [12 August 1907]).

\textsuperscript{122} Langlois, \textit{Voyage dans la Cilicie}.

\textsuperscript{123} See Cevdet, \textit{Tezâkir}.

\textsuperscript{124} The earliest that I have found is a telegram referring to a report about different minority communities in the Adana region that included a description of the Aydınlıs. BOA, DH-ŞFR 172/28 (11 Mart 1311 [23 March 1895]).

\textsuperscript{125} BOA, DH-MKT 943/8, No. 1, Bahri Pasha to Dahiliye (23 Şubat 1320 [8 March 1905]).

\textsuperscript{126} The group of thieves killed a police corporal in one of these skirmishes. BOA, Y-MTV 217/7 (2 Muhtarrem 1319 [9 April 1901]).

\textsuperscript{127} BOA, DH-MKT 943/8, No. 2, (8 Muhtarrem 1323 [2 March 1905]).
seasonally so long as they built houses in the Adana province and registered their population.\textsuperscript{128} This was not implemented, however.\textsuperscript{129} In fact, discussions of possible tribal settlement projects during the years leading up to the First World War indicate that the Aydınlıs were one of many groups of pastoralists who wintered in various parts of Çukurova that remained outside the pale of settlement policy.\textsuperscript{130} In 1916, one roaming group of 48 families of the Aydınlıs in the district of Tacirli (see Table 8) was larger than half of the villages there.\textsuperscript{131} Some nomadic Aydınlıs would continue to move within the Adana province into the 1950s.

**Late Ottoman Trajectories**

In 1914, the governor of Adana Hakkı Bey toured the countryside of Çukurova and the Taurus Mountains just as he had done in “Kurdistan” during years prior.\textsuperscript{132} His view of the countryside reflected the unevenness described above. He reported that there was not even a single road in the area that could be considered paved (şöse). The land of Çukurova was swampy; the villages of the Taurus Mountains overcrowded. Disease and poverty were everywhere. However, the fertile land presented a tremendous potential as well. It could provide a home to tens of thousands of families of cultivators if need be.\textsuperscript{133} Upper Çukurova, swampy and remote though it remained, was certainly the agricultural and settlement frontier of Ottoman Cilicia. As Toksöz indicates, the Adana-Tarsus region had intensified cultivation to the point of near-saturation by the 1890s, and future expansion would have to occur in the uncultivated expanses of the eastern plain in areas such as modern-day Ceyhan.\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{128} BOA, DH-TMIK-M 258/17, No. 1 (30 Temmuz 1323 [12 August 1907]).
\textsuperscript{129} BOA, DH-TMIK-M 258/17, No. 7 (7 Teşrinisani 1323 [20 November 1907]).
\textsuperscript{130} BOA, ŞD 2139/6, No. 12 (11 Şevval 1328 [2 October 1910])
\textsuperscript{131} BOA, DH-UMVM 114/37, No. 4 (24 Teşrinisani 1332 [5 December 1916]).
\textsuperscript{133} BOA, DH-İD 80/26 (9 Haziran 1330 [22 June 1914]).
\textsuperscript{134} Toksöz, *Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton*, 176.
The Ottoman government had attempted to promote cultivation in the east of the Adana province from the 1860s onward. Tribes were settled. Immigrants were brought in. Land was distributed and model farms were established. During the Second Constitutional Era, the Ottoman government even agreed to lease a large swath of the imperial holdings in Çukurova to French investors who promised to hold drain the swamps and involve immigrants and local inhabitants alike in agriculture. While the disruption of the First World War would prevent the realization of this plan, the fact that attempts to settle and cultivate the more marginal regions of Çukurova led to what might in retrospect be considered a colonial venture are a testament to the intransigence of the region’s geography.

From the 1860s onwards, powerful economic incentives drove Ottoman landowners to cultivate sections of the Çukurova plain that had previously been used as pasture or laid as swamps. Meanwhile, the imperatives of political reform in the Ottoman Empire also dictated that new, obedient settlements be formed in these regions. This heralded the reversal of a centuries-long process that had made the mountains the center of life in the Cilicia region. Mountain settlements had become crowded; communities that were deemed rebellious were being incrementally driven from the mountains by the Ottoman government. This process was playing out not only in the Adana region, but in many parts of the empire and the Mediterranean world.\(^{135}\) A number of ecological and economic factors were fueling a slow swing in settlement back towards the plains.

This process, along with its uneven effect, can be observed in the demographic shifts that occurred in the Cilicia region over the last decades of Ottoman rule. The port of Mersin grew faster than any other part of the province, springing from a town with just 2000 inhabitants.
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during the 1860s to one of 10,000 inhabitants by the 1890s and more than 20,000 by the First World War. The town of Adana also grew rapidly, from 30,000 to as many as 80,000 registered inhabitants during this period. The town of Tarsus grew more slowly during this period, though its population doubled. According to Ottoman census figures, the Adana-Tarsus-Mersin region grew by more than 50% between 1882 and 1914, meaning that growth of urban centers outpaced population growth in the countryside. The below table offers my estimates of population in these cities based on the totality of sources I have found from the Ottoman period.

**Table 9 Estimated Population of Urban Centers in Cilicia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1864</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>80000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marash</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>55000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eastern portion of the Çukurova plain also witnessed considerable demographic growth during the last decades of the Ottoman period, according to census statistics. The *sancak* of Cebel-i Bereket had an almost 40% increase in population between 1882 and 1914, keeping pace with the general rate of growth in the province indicated by census data. This figure did not necessarily refer to significant urbanization as in the western part of the plain; Hamidiye, for example, was a town of just a few thousand inhabitants by the end of the Ottoman period – in other words – as small as the initial settler population that founded the town at Yarsuvat after the Crimean War, though most of those settlers had died. Instead, this increase in registered population reflected a combination of successful surveillance of a larger percentage of the tribal population and the effects of a steady influx of immigrants into the countryside. By contrast, the districts at the interface with the Taurus Mountains, Sis, Kars, and Karaisalı witnessed more

---

136 See Chapter 14 for complete discussion of sources.
limited population growth. As a *sancak*, the census reflected just 8% population growth for Kozan from 1882 to 1914. This likely indicates a flow of migration towards Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin coupled with low population growth among tribal populations settled in the plains regions. The mountains had been the true center of life in Cilicia, serving as the seat of local political authority and legitimacy and the locus of habitation or seasonal activity for the majority of the region’s inhabitants. But with most of the transhumant populations settled on the plains and mountain villagers flocking to the city, the mountains were losing a great deal of their importance. Although it may not refer to precise population numbers or actual changes in population, the below table based on Ottoman census data is intended to reflect a general demographic shift towards the Adana-Mersin region.
Table 10 Percentage population change reflected in 1882 and 1914 Ottoman census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sancaks</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana/Tarsus/Mersin</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebel-i Bereket</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozan</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select Kazas</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mersin (coast)</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaisah (mixed)</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feke/Hadjin (mountains)</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sis/Kars (mixed)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İslahiye (plains)</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The economic future of Cilicia clearly rested with the plains. But the mountains were still extremely important in one single regard for virtually all the region’s inhabitants: they were the only place where one could find respite from the brutal summer heat and the lingering threat of malaria. The comparative failures of settlement in Upper Çukurova are a testament to the fact that the region could not be fully transformed without a major shift in approaches to ecology. Although life in Cilicia had been reoriented towards the plain and the coast, only with the elimination of this seasonal risk could the region’s inhabitants sever ties with the yayla entirely.

Largely in response to the new ecological issues posed by settlement policy, the Ottoman government made various attempts to improve living conditions in the swampy expanses of Çukurova. New approaches and understandings of malaria emerged throughout the last decades of the Ottoman period, but these new understandings in many ways only emphasized the intransigence of the disease in the face of human intervention. In the next chapter, I will discuss the transformation of longstanding practices of seasonal migration during the late Ottoman period within a rapidly changing political ecology in Cilicia. In addition to examining medical

\[137\] Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics.*
and ecological interventions aimed at eliminating disease in the Cilicia region, I will explore the various attempts to harness the region’s water resources and the intersection of commercial agriculture with malaria ecology. Realizing that it was a major barrier to settlement and an impediment to public health, the Ottoman administration adopted serious measures in hopes of scaling back malaria’s depredations. Yet, the impact of these measures would be limited, and with other aspects of settlement, economy, and geography fueling a rise in malaria, the pre-settlement disease ecology that defined life in the Cilicia region would endure.\footnote{For more about the agrarian economy of Çukurova during the First World War period and the decades of the Republic, see Chapters 8, 10, 11 and 14.}

Table 11 Official Count of Human and Animal Population in Adana Province circa 1913\footnote{Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics; Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913]. The Ottoman agricultural statistics actually contain more detailed information about the animal population, including gender, the number of castrated males, and young. This is my simplified representation of the statistics and not precisely the categories used by the Ottoman administration to count animals and people.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaza</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Goats</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Buffaloes</th>
<th>Work Animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>93,217</td>
<td>120,300</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>29,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumurtalık</td>
<td>7,274</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>91,250</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaisalı</td>
<td>27,791</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>16,538</td>
<td>72,047</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaniye</td>
<td>13,968</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>5,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islahiye</td>
<td>11,427</td>
<td>35,908</td>
<td>34,731</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>22,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahçe</td>
<td>18,934</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassa</td>
<td>10,337</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>42,893</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dörtyol</td>
<td>22,842</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>29,320</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sis</td>
<td>24,833</td>
<td>41,459</td>
<td>108,400</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>26,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadjin</td>
<td>30,522</td>
<td>7,201</td>
<td>48,652</td>
<td>7,037</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>10,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feke</td>
<td>17,989</td>
<td>5,253</td>
<td>36,486</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars</td>
<td>18,212</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>32,100</td>
<td>15,050</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>12,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>31,434</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>89,900</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>65,701</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,922</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>14,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>411,019</td>
<td>422,473</td>
<td>690,392</td>
<td>201,007</td>
<td>11,193</td>
<td>200,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{Includes horses, mules, donkeys, camels, and oxen.}
CHAPTER 6
THE OTTOMAN QUAGMIRE: MALARIA AND SETTLEMENT IN ÇUKUROVA

Toprakla oynayan mezarını kazar.
“He who plays with the soil digs his own grave.”

~ Ottoman proverb

In a series of lectures at the Ottoman medical faculty of Istanbul in 1911, a veteran doctor named Feyzi Pasha (Feyzullah İzmidi) introduced a class of eager students to the myriad issues surrounding malaria (sitma), which he also referred to as “swamp sickness (maraz-ı merzagi)” and “swamp fever (bataklık humması).”¹ He lectured on the latest medical advances regarding the treatment of malaria, highlighting the singular role of the anopheles mosquito in transmitting the parasite between humans and displaying copious charts and figures explaining the epidemiology of the disease and its effective treatment. However, perhaps more interesting for the medical student (and certainly for the historian of medicine today) were the doctor’s anecdotes that drew on nearly forty years of medical practice. His career had overlapped with a unique period of medical history in which the Ottoman Empire witnessed the emergence of new understandings of and approaches to malaria. When he began practicing medicine in the 1870s, the seasonal fevers associated with this disease were still attributed across the globe to the

¹ Feyzullah İzmidi, Sitma: Maraz-ı Merzagi (Istanbul: Tanin, 1911). The popular name for malaria in Anatolia was sitma, which refers to the particular symptom of fever accompanying the disease. The term maraz-ı merzagi used by Feyzi Pasha was not common and seems to be a neologism derived from the French term paludisme, which refers to the role of swamps in facilitating the spread of malaria. There is no proper name for the disease along the lines of the English malaria, which refers to “bad air,” however, frequent mentions of “the heaviness of the air (vahamet-i havâ)” when discussing malaria in nineteenth-century Ottoman documents offer a rough equivalent. This is discussed at length during Chapter 1. A very special thanks to Nermin Ersoy for personally mailing me a copy of her rare biography of Feyzi Pasha. Nermin Ersoy, Doktor Feyzullah İzmidi (Kocaeli, Turkey: self published, 1998).
influence of bad air and the contagious forces called miasmas that emanated from rotting organic matter in wet regions such as swamps. While state efforts to specifically tackle the disease were limited circa 1870, the Ottomans had already been involved in concentrated efforts at swamp drainage to “clean up” such lands by the time that the malaria parasite was discovered in 1880 and the mosquito as its vector in 1897.  

Even before his medical training, Feyzi — like many of his contemporaries — understood malaria well from an experiential standpoint. In fact, his troubles with the disease as a youngster had been his principal motivation for pursuing a medical career. Throughout his lectures, he recalled numerous encounters with malaria from his childhood, digressing into colorful anecdotes that emphasized the intense suffering of the malaria experience. Feyzi’s anecdotes illustrated the extent to which malaria was a commonplace disease that visited countless Ottoman subjects on an annual basis. Much of what the doctor told his students about the use of quinine and anti-mosquito precautions was based on recently acquired knowledge, but the bulk of his warnings about how one becomes afflicted with malaria were part of longstanding conceptions of disease throughout the Ottoman period.

2 This chapter is written primarily from the vantage point of historical understandings of malaria, i.e. malaria is largely dealt with in the way that it was understood during the periods under discussion. However, it is useful know for the purposes of comprehension that today malaria is understood as a disease caused by a parasite that lives in human blood and is transferred between humans by anopheles mosquitoes. In temperate climates, it is particularly associated with summer, the period during which mosquitoes can proliferate. In this regard, it is also associated with swamps and large regions of stagnant water where mosquitoes can breed. Symptoms vary depending on the person and the species of the malaria parasite contracted, but it is most commonly associated with debilitating and recurring fevers. Malaria epidemiology is discussed at greater length in Chapter 4.
3 Ersoy, Doktor Feyzullah İzdiği, 9.
4 For example: “When I was a kid, I studied at the Hanlarbaşı school in İzmit. Our house was in the Hazar İlyas neighborhood. These two neighborhoods are quite far apart. At school, from time to time a malarial spell would come, and my teacher would send me home upon noticing that I was ill. All the way home, I would drink water with great avarice from the fountain and vomit as I ran. Really in that moment, the taste of that water I drank is not something to be forgotten. As they once said in a meeting I was in, the taste might only be compared to that experienced by the inebriated when they become parched (dili damağı kuruyup) in the middle of the night, get up, and drink water as if slaking lime (kireç söndürür gibi).” İzغذي, Sima: Maraz-i Merzagi, 23. Malaria was apparently so commonplace that in at least one instance, an Ottoman student was denied a makeup of an exam that he had failed because he was suffering from malaria at the time. BOA, MF-MKT 530/2 (15 Cemaziahir 1318 [10 October 1900]).
Within these understandings, geography was the key factor. He explained, for example, that his native İzmit was in a malarial zone because of its low elevation and marshy terrain resulting from proximity to lakes and wetlands. Yet, he added that even within large malarial zones, elevation was crucial, saying “although İzmit is surrounded by water and close to the sea, high places on the hills are so safe that they can be considered impervious to [malaria].” If these lectures are any indication, Ottoman doctors understood malaria as a disease resulting from certain types of human interaction with their environment, and as such, the apparent rise in malaria during the nineteenth century could have been explained by ecological changes. This point was further supported by Feyzi Pasha’s recurring warnings about malaria’s differential impact on railroad workers and agricultural laborers due to their proximity to malarial spaces such as swamps or irrigation ditches and water canals. The relationship between rural labor and malaria is poignantly illustrated in a once common proverb cited by Feyzi Pasha: “He who plays with the soil digs his own grave (toprakla oynayan mezarı kazar).”

This proverb echoed eerily similar sentiments expressed by a British traveler, Edwin Davis, who visited the expansive countryside of the Adana region during the 1870s, when the fertile Çukurova plain was in the midst of an agrarian revolution. “Wherever the virgin soil is opened,” Davis wrote, “virulent marsh fever seems to burst forth and smite down all around.” Malaria had devastated early settlers of the Çukurova plain in unprecedented ways, and as such, the Ottoman government’s attempts to prevent people from moving to the yayla (summer pasture) were regarded as a death sentence (see Chapter 4). For the modernist-minded thinkers of

---

5 Ibid., 9. Later, he reiterated that people in these elevated regions catch malaria less frequently than those living near the railroad or the port and that even living on the top floor of an apartment building could be an important factor. Ibid., 19.
6 Ibid., 14. This proverb resembles a Khorasani saying alluding to the pitfalls of digging irrigation ditches (karez) mentioned by Peter Christensen: “snake charmers, lion tamers and karez diggers very seldom die in their beds.” Peter Christensen, The decline of Iranshahr: irrigation and environments in the history of the Middle East, 500 B.C. to A.D. 1500 (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press : University of Copenhagen, 1993), 120.
the period, perhaps, the rampant malaria was a necessary byproduct of progress in that settling and working the land were understood as the only means of making areas more habitable. Davis claimed that “nothing but generations of patient culture can subdue the soil afresh, and render this plain a safe abode for man,” and likewise, Feyzi assured his students that “malaria likes unworked lands and desolate, empty countryside. It cannot hold up in the face of civilization and the efforts of mankind.” Yet, if progress was to be the answer to malaria, it was also the cause; the unprecedented settlement of new land or the digging of canals for drainage throughout the late Ottoman period inevitably imperiled countless willing and begrudging participants in this transformation who would have been better served to stay out of the wet, sickly swamps of the settlement frontier.

This chapter examines how the Ottoman administration and society addressed the issue of malaria, which posed a major obstacle to the theory underlying settlement in the empire. This phenomenon was by no means unique to the Adana region, but due to its geography, the tension between disease and settlement was particularly pronounced. Previous studies of settlement in Adana during this period have fixed their gaze on the economic growth experienced in this region during the latter half of the nineteenth century, discussing settlement mainly in so far as it related to the facilitation of agricultural expansion. Vital quotidian concerns such as malaria have been ignored or mostly discussed as independent and natural factors in the Adana region,

---

7 Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey, 71.
8 İzmidi, Stıma: Maraz-ı Merzagi, 17.
9 The entire Marmara region, from Bursa to İzmit and Adapazari all the way towards Anakara was an area of intense immigrant settlement where malaria was a constant issue. See BOA, A-MKT-MVL 118/65 (11 Muḥarram 1277 [18 July 1860]); BOA, DH-MKT 1862/117 (13 August 1891) DH-MKT 2759/35 (13 Safer 1237 [21 February 1324]). Attempts to settle tribes in modern-day Iraq also resulted in malaria epidemics. BOA, DH-MKT 1953/84 (14 May 1892); DH-SFR 346/36 (21 May 1905). Meanwhile, Selanik (modern-day Greece), which by the end of the Ottoman period was one of the most industrialized, was also one of the most malarial. (Aras), Stıma’ya Karşı Muharebe (The Battle Against Malaria). From Tripoli (modern-day Lebanon) to Trabzon, lowland settlements in the nineteenth century experienced serious troubles with malaria.
taking for granted the conventional wisdom of the mid-nineteenth century that settlement would eliminate the disease’s impact.\textsuperscript{11} A close tracing of Ottoman state practices, however, reveals that those officials most intimately involved with governing settlement regions had a more nuanced understanding of the predicament — the Ottoman quagmire — wherein the nature of the land as it were undermined the very means of its improvement. In an attempt to curtail the devastation wrought by malaria, the Ottoman government employed practices that diversified as understanding of malaria grew. Swamp drainage gave way to quinine as the state-of-the-art method of eliminating malaria; yet, the use of quinine fully eliminated neither malaria nor swamp drainage. In fact, older practices, especially seasonal migration, lingered not only through the Ottoman period but also as the struggle against malaria became a nationalist one during the second constitutional era and into the first decades of the Turkish Republic (discussed further in Chapters 12 and 13).

**High and Dry**

In 1878, after more than a decade of toiling on the scorching and malarial plains of Eastern Çukurova under the careful watch of gendarmes stationed at key points at the entry to the Taurus and Amanus Mountains, the leaders of more than a dozen tribes representing tens of thousands of individuals targeted by the Reform Army (\textit{Fırka-ı İslahiye}) had succeeded in forcing the local government to ease its settlement policy. Governor of Aleppo Ahmed Cevdet Pasha was the figure most closely associated with the forced settlement campaigns that sought to bring civilization to the Anatolian countryside (see Chapter 3), but having conceded that the settlement project was too impractical and costly, he presided over a compromise with the

\textsuperscript{11} One notable exception is Andrew Gordon Gould’s study of the Reform Division and the tribal settlement policies in Adana, which emphasized the impact of settlement on these communities, which was a result of the disease environment of settlement regions. However, Gould’s dissertation ended abruptly with the year 1885 with little discussion of subsequent decades or Ottoman attempts at tackling the issue of malaria. Gould, "Pashas and Brigands: Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885".
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pastoralist communities of the region regarding their seasonal movement. His declaration lifted the ban on migration during the hot summer months specifically for health reasons, even mentioning the very issue of malaria (see Chapter 4 appendix). However, this change in policy also affirmed certain aspects of the new order. Most of the tribes were not permitted to bring their animals with them during the migrations. This restriction was intended to protect the budding agricultural industry that was emerging on the very soils of their former pastures.\textsuperscript{12} However, it likely meant a tremendous reduction in the population of their once expansive herds of sheep and goats, the economic backbone of these communities for which sufficient grass would no longer be found. Although the terms of settlement varied slightly from community to community, in many cases, the orders upheld the local population’s right to migration \textit{strictly for health reasons} so long as they lived the remainder of the year as settled farmers and faithful villagers of the centralizing empire. Thus, while they maintained some autonomy, they were increasingly marginalized economically (see Chapter 5).

This constant negotiation of the terms of settlement would be a major theme throughout the Ottoman domains during the final decades of the nineteenth century as more settlements were founded and \textit{muhacirs} (immigrants)\textsuperscript{13} continued to pour in. Alongside nomads, who continually resisted settlement orders, \textit{muhacirs} consistently sued for resettlement on the basis of an inability to adapt to the local climate of the regions they arrived in. By the end of the Ottoman period, their right to this freedom from the burdens of geography had been enshrined as a legitimate and

\textsuperscript{12} BOA, İ-MMS 60/2843, no. 3 (11 Teşrinievvel 1294 [23 October 1878]).

\textsuperscript{13} This term is discussed in greater detail at the outset of the dissertation. \textit{Muhacirs} are a group variously described as migrants, refugees, or immigrants. They entered the Ottoman Empire mainly from areas where Russian expansion threatened the life and livelihood of Muslim inhabitants or where they were forcibly expelled under the allegations of rebellion. Their settlement was overseen by a government commission called \textit{Muhacirîn Komisyonu}. For more see Cuthell, "The Muhacirin Komisyonu : an agent in the transformation of Ottoman Anatolia 1860-1866".
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indeed the only legitimate justification for resettlement.\footnote{BOA, DH-HMŞ 27/68 (5 Cemâze yilevelvel 1334 [10 March 1916]). Late in the Ottoman period public health officials established formal health precautions for the foundation of new villages, singling out swamps as the primary source of health issues such as malaria. Yeni Tesis Olunacak Köylerde Nazar-ı Dikkate Alınacak Esasat-ı Sihhiye ve Mevcut Köylerin Bu Cihetleden Mümkinün Olduğu Kadar İşlahı, (İstanbul: Ahmed İhsan ve Şürekası, 1914), 4-5.} A prominent example from the Adana region where requests for resettlement were obliged and resulted in a positive outcome for a given community is that of Saadiye or modern-day Atlılar, where a Circassian immigrant community petitioned for resettlement to a more salubrious region. They were granted a village at a high elevation some fifty kilometers from the port of Mersin. Their culture and language — Shapsug\footnote{Circassian is a vague umbrella term referring to various ethnic groups of the Caucasus during the Ottoman period. Sources that are sometimes unclear about the exact origins of immigrants simply refer to them as “Circassians.” This issue is discussed elsewhere in this study. In the case of Saadiye, we know the original language of the inhabitants only due to Mehtap Çelik’s oral history interviews there.} in this case — survived in this village well into the latter half of the twentieth century, before urbanization and economic change more closely linked the settlement to the city of Mersin.\footnote{Mehtap Çelik’s work on Atlılar is unpublished, but Harika Zöhre and myself recorded a short interview with her about the subject on Ottoman History Podcast. “Anadolu’ya Bir Göç Öyküsü: Mersin Atlılar Köyü,” Mehtap Çelik, Harika Zöhre, and Chris Gratien, Ottoman History Podcast, no. 112 (4 July 2013).} Yet, the scarcity of “good land” during a period in which large landholders were also expanding to meet commercial agricultural demand meant that resettlement was sometimes not possible and would only occur after what was sometimes an ordeal of years.

As for the expectation that cultivation would ameliorate malaria’s worst effects in the region with time, the efficacy of this belief in practice was questionable. Maintenance of ecological spaces where land was managed with care for the disease environment could certainly do much to eliminate swamps and wetlands, which provided the most suitable breeding ground for mosquitoes. Thus, we find many indications that by the turn of the twentieth century, inhabitants of the city of Adana perceived the “quality of the air” to be improving due to increased cultivation around the city. Yusuf Ziya, an Ottoman official who produced one of the only romanticized depictions of the region’s climate during the period, wrote in 1898 that thanks
in part to the gardens and orders extending one to two hours all around the city, the heaviness or “severity of the air (vahamet-i hava),” a common reference to the presence of malaria, was subsiding year by year.\textsuperscript{17} Though no other source reflects the affection for Adana’s climate that Yusuf Ziya expressed, there are other indications with regard to the cities of Adana and Mersin that cultivation was improving the perceived quality of the air.\textsuperscript{18}

However, the labor and expertise required to expand cultivation to the point of eliminating malaria was simply not available. In 1898, when the role of mosquitoes in transmitting malaria was just becoming understood, the British consul of Aleppo declared that “the Adana plain is probably the most fever stricken part of Asia Minor. The heat of summer is tropical and far more trying than in India, averaging for several months 38\degree or 39\degree centigrade during which time a pernicious and deadly malaria prevails.”\textsuperscript{19} That year, the British Vice-Consul of Adana requested that the city be permanently added to the list of places where diplomatic consuls would be permitted to leave for health purposes.\textsuperscript{20}

In the face of these realities, Ottoman officials devised new approaches to malaria that were very much common to this era of imperial expansion in other regions of the globe during the Hamidian period (1878-1908). The two main strategies were wetlands management and medicine. Both involved social, ecological, and biological interventions, and both came with severe drawbacks and limitations due to economic and logistical realities. Neither would be

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Ziya, \textit{Tabsrə yahut Adana Temaşası}, 13-14, 17. Yusuf Ziya’s account is particularly fascinating in that he wrote it in part to counteract Adana’s malarial reputation. He concluded his work by stating, “Despite poor Adana’s reputation for heaviness of air, I have taken the liberty of publishing this in the form of an essay in hopes that it will aid in correcting this widespread opinion to a small degree.” Ibid., 23.
\textsuperscript{18} In 1903, British Vice-Consul Townshend noted that “The tendency of the climate is to improve under increased cultivation and the consequent disappearance of marshy ground. Malarial fever is prevalent at certain times, and there have been a few cases of cholera during the past year in the eastern part of the vilayet; but on the whole there is nothing likely to impede commerce beyond some occasional delay caused by quarantine restrictions.” Townshend, \textit{Trade of the Vilayets of Aleppo and Adana}, 17. British intelligence from around Word War I indicated that the climate of Mersin was said to have improved to the point that “the town is quite habitable for Europeans all the year round.” Admiralty, \textit{A Handbook of Asia Minor}, 715.
\textsuperscript{19} BNA, FO 78/4938, Barnham to Salisbury, Aleppo (6 June 1898), pg. 32.
\textsuperscript{20} BNA, FO 78/4938, Barnham to Salisbury, Aleppo (2 July 1898), pg. 3.
\end{flushright}
successful in fully containing the disease, although at times there were signs of positive impact. However, these policies determined the trajectory for subsequent battles with malaria that continued through Second Constitutional Period (1908-1914) and well into the Republican era.

**Draining the Empire**

İskenderun (Alexandretta) is a port city on the Eastern Mediterranean in the modern-day Hatay province of Southern Turkey located at the very edge of the greater Çukurova plain. Thanks to its climate and the complaints of frequent foreign visitors, it owned the distinction of being arguably the most maligned malarial region in the Ottoman Empire. Hanna Minah, the acclaimed Syrian author, spent much of his childhood in this region, which was part of the French mandate during the interwar period. He poetically and pessimistically described this milieu in an autobiographical novel appropriately entitled “The Swamp (Al-Mustanqa’).” The region’s geography is indeed befitting of the term mustanqa’ not just because of its myriad wetlands but also because of the sense of predicament or quagmire conveyed by the word’s double meaning. Managing the waters of the region to prevent malaria would require constant labor and settlement; yet, malaria was a major obstacle to both.

Working on a twentieth-century understanding of disease, Minah attributed the malaria of the swampy countryside of this region to the presence of mosquitoes.21 Early modern descriptions of İskenderun by Ottoman and European travelers variously attributed the malarial quality of the region to noxious swamps, heavy air, and in one case, rotting dead frogs. These accounts all point to the prevalence at the time of miasmatic understandings of disease; the insalubrious quality of wet regions such as İskenderun was invariably a result of “bad air” caused

by the nearby swamps (see Chapter 1 for complete discussion). Although these areas were not yet understood as breeding ground for malaria-spreading mosquitoes, conventional wisdom said that avoiding swamps or cleaning them would be an effective way of improving the health of the port.

Given the pervasiveness of malaria and its impacts in this region and its commercial importance as the main Mediterranean port for the city of Aleppo, it is no surprise to find that İskenderun was one of the principal sites of drainage efforts in the Ottoman Empire from a relatively early period. When in 1831 Mehmed Ali sent the Egyptian army under the command of his son Ibrahim Pasha on an offensive against the Ottomans, leading to a nearly decade-long occupation of Syria and Cilicia, one of the public works projects undertaken in İskenderun was the drainage of the swamps. According to William Burckhardt Barker, the son of the British consul in Aleppo and longtime resident of Cilicia, this resulted in a few years of relatively malaria-free life in the port; however, when upkeep of the drainage canals faltered under the Ottomans İskenderun once again was “the tomb for all who inhabit it at any length of time without change of air.” Some eighty years after the departure of Ibrahim Pasha when the French mandate government first occupied this region following World War I, they found the marshes of İskenderun in very much the same condition. The problem had persisted despite the

---


23 Barker and Ainsworth, *Cilicia, its former history and present state*, 114.

24 “Syrie et Liban : rapport mensuel d'ensemble,” (September 1921): 37. WWI-era British intelligence indicated that in İskenderun, “many of the natives live in the drier parts of the marshes, but the better-class residents leave the town as much as possible in the summer to live in the mountains to south of the town.” Admiralty, *A Handbook of Asia Minor*, 689.
fact that throughout this era of reform, İskenderun’s drainage or “cleansing (tathir)” was attempted on numerous occasions. The first major Ottoman attempt on record was initiated in 1847 but stopped at the docks when the budget proved inadequate to extend work into the swamps surrounding the town. Many subsequent attempts were made during the intervening decades with a final attempt to contract drainage to a foreign company due to insufficient state funds in 1912.

The logistical limitations of swamp cleanup throughout the entire Adana region were to be even greater and promised to reach the countryside at a much slower rate. Aside from the vast tracts of wetlands that dotted the entire plain of Çukurova, properly containing malaria through water management would also require massive work on the Seyhan and Ceyhan rivers, which flooded the entire region including the city of Adana on a cyclical basis, leaving breeding pools for mosquitos in their wake. This issue too was complicated, because besides the obvious costliness and impracticality of containing the flow of an entire river, the construction of barrages and dams inevitably redirected water in ways that created property issues. Ziya Pasha’s barrage on the Seyhan River in 1878 discussed in the preface to Part 2 of this study had failed to


26 Similar reports on the impact of Iskenderun’s swamps on the health of the region were written in 1868 and 1872, with evidence of further measures taken to drain the swamps in 1879, 1893, and 1902, suggesting that the issue of drainage in Iskenderun was a continual and cyclically occurring crisis brought on by the utter infeasibility of sufficiently altering the environment so as to permanently rid the region of bad air coupled with issues like corruption and embezzlement of money intended for use in these efforts by officials or individuals charged with overseeing the work. BOA, 1-ȘD 1/31 (15 Zilhicce 1284 [8 April 1868]); Y-EE 35/94 (25 Cemazeyilevel 1289 [31 July 1872]); SD 2215/65 (23 Şevval 1296 [10 October 1879]); DH-MKT 53/26 (13 Safer 1311 [26 August 1893]); BEO 2805/210320 (20 Safer 1324 [15 April 1906]); BEO 2724/204240 (20 Şevval 1330 [20 January 1903]); DH-MKT 2659/5 (21 Şevval 1326 [10 January 1904]); DH-ID 44-2/18, no.4 (24 Temmuz 1328 [6 August 1912]).

27 The aforementioned 1912 report from the Aleppo governor regarding the swamps of Iskenderun indicated the intent of draining areas near the town “sooner (acilen)” and the rural areas “later (âcilen).” BOA, DH-ID 44-2/18, no.4 (24 Temmuz 1328 [6 August 1912]).
achieve its purpose, damaging the governor’s reputation in Adana. Yet, this would not be the last failed attempt to rein in the Seyhan River, as it defiantly followed its usual course of flooding over subsequent decades, periodically destroying the barrages and bridges that crossed it. Arshakuhi Teodik, an Armenian from Istanbul who visited Adana in 1909 to study the impact of recent massacres on local Armenians, witnessed by chance a major flood of the Seyhan River. She described the terrible scene of damage, death, and sickness due to the flooding. Soldiers pulled the bodies of gypsies and animals from high waters that had the color and character of sewage.

Controlling the Seyhan and the Ceyhan, which have historically convened almost as if by ritual in the center of the Çukurova plain every so often to form one massive expanse of water (more in Chapter 12), was not a simple matter. And given the challenges of eliminating malaria through drainage in areas of population and capital concentration such as the ports of İskenderun and Mersin or the city of Adana, attempts to curtail malaria’s impact via wetlands management in the impoverished countryside where tribes and new immigrants were being settled were sure to yield unimpressive results and come with a high cost. An early offer from a French investor to clean up some swamps in Adana during the 1870s was rejected due to hesitance about giving foreigners rights over Ottoman territory. Such offers were frequent in Çukurova. An 1888 report by Akif Bey from the Public Works Ministry, stressed the great importance of cleaning up

28 BOA, İ-ŞD 45/2413 (21 Rabiulahir 1296 [14 April 1879]).
30 Teodik, Amis mě i Kilikia, 66-71.
31 For example, the regulation of Nile waters in Ottoman Egypt was only possible through longstanding and intricate practices of irrigation and water management employed by large numbers of Egyptian peasants. See Mikhail, Nature and empire in Ottoman Egypt : an environmental history. As there were comparatively few rural residents of Çukurova during the Ottoman period, such practice was not possible.
32 BOA, SD 502/32 (4 Muharrem 1297 [18 December 1879]).
33 BOA, DH-MKT 1235/78 (19 Muharrem 1326 [22 February 1908]).
the Seyhan, Karasu, and Ceyhan rivers as well as cleaning up the swamps in the Adana province, indicating pessimistically that there simply was not enough money available for the ministry to perform the task independently, thus leaving the issue to be someday settled possibly by contracting such a project to a “respectable” company. Yet, where concessions were granted, they tended to inspire resistance among the local population. For example, alleged concessions made to the Baghdad Railway Company to drain swamps in Çukurova in April 1911 sparked rumors that local inhabitants might be dispossessed and inspired fierce protests in Mersin and İskenderun.

Allowing wealthy Ottoman subjects to register large tracts of “unused” land for cleanup was an alternative to enlisting foreign companies and investors. In these contracts, improving the land through drainage and other methods was stipulated as a condition of these exceptional land grants. One family that capitalized on this policy was the Sursocks of Beirut, who owned swamplands throughout modern-day Lebanon, Israel/Palestine, Syria and Çukurova (see Chapter 5). While certainly upsetting the distribution of wealth in the emerging agrarian economy, such landowners were not necessarily detrimental to the policy of cleanup. However, in the case of the Sursocks, there is evidence from both the İskenderun and Mersin areas that much of their property remained swampy unkempt, which during WWI provided an excuse for the local government to attempt to repossess it (more in Chapter 8). Another prominent landowner that acquired swampy land was Abidin Pasha, the enthusiastic governor of Adana remembered as one of the city’s great builders (see Chapter 5). The man credited with bringing the steam plow

34 BOA, DH-MKT 1478/56 (4 Cemazeyilevvel 1305 [18 January 1888]).
35 CADC, Turquie, Chemin de fer de Baghdad 13, pg. 5, Lancy to Cruppi, Mersin (11 April 1911); BOA, DH-ID 44-2/18, no.4 (24 Temmuz 1328 [6 August 1912]).
36 See USEK, Sursock 18022; 19232; 19249.
and the railroad to Adana hoped to profit from his large landholdings and help agriculture thrive in Eastern Çukurova. Yet, after his death, Ottoman investigations into the legality of the land he had acquired, which were intended for the settlement of Circassian muhacirs, revealed that they were mostly abandoned.  

Clearly, a more proactive approach to the region’s ecological challenges would be necessary to eliminate wetlands, as landowners could not be trusted with the cleanup of swamps. Amidst the various difficulties of promoting swamp drainage, the Ministry of Forestry encouraged the cultivation of eucalyptus — a notoriously thirsty tree used in French Algeria and California to desiccate wetlands — by distributing seeds with instructions in Turkish and Arabic in hopes that local farmers and landowners would sprinkle them on the wet and disease-prone soil of the empire’s warmest provinces. On the eve of the First World War, a British traveler named W.J. Childs noted the following:

In portions of Mersina may be found a curious resemblance to an Australian town, due partly to the presence of Australian trees, but also to the British influence of those who constructed the railway in a new town of wide spaces and cheap land and hot climate. Approach the low-built railway station along its avenue of young eucalyptus trees — red-gums I think they are — and the illusion becomes almost perfect.

---

38 Abidin Pasha was accused of misconduct during his governorship (see Chapter 5), yet the illegitimacy of his landholdings was only acknowledged by the state following the reinstatement of the constitution, when many of the major figures associated with the Hamidian period were marginalized and came under scrutiny. BOA, DH-İD 160-2/56 (27 Rabiulahir 1331 [5 April 1913]).


41 Childs, _Across Asia Minor on Foot_, 341.
The example of eucalyptus growth in the Adana region, which would be expanded during the Republican period (see Chapter 12) offers an example of the globalized ecology emerging in part out of colonial spaces from Australia to Algeria.

Another water-related issue exacerbating the impacts of malaria was commercial agriculture, which put workers in contact with malarial environments in the countryside during the warm months. Seasonal laborers contracted malaria with startling frequency, leading many to their deaths. The prevailing logic of the time was that the cultivation of cotton and wheat would ultimately lead to the creation of a more salubrious countryside and the malarial misfortune of workers was a natural consequence of “playing with the soil” as Feyzi Pasha put it. However, as the nature of malaria and the ecological impacts of commercial agriculture became better understood, the overall beneficial impact of agriculture vis-à-vis disease was called into question. This was especially true in the case of rice cultivation. Unlike cotton and wheat, which would be easily destroyed by inundations, rice requires wet and even aquatic soil conditions to thrive. Sitting water with vegetation such as reeds or in this case rice stalks was an absolutely ideal breeding grounds for mosquitos (see Chapter 4).

Rice had been cultivated in the swampy regions of Upper Çukurova near Sis and Marash from perhaps the beginning of the Ottoman period. Land reform and the forced settlement of the tribes who seasonally migrated through these regions allowed local landowners to expand the cultivation of rice so that it became the main produce of Marash. Rice became viewed as extremely lucrative the way cotton was in the western half of the Adana province (see Chapter 5). However, Ottoman health officials became aware that the cultivation of rice created vast havens for mosquitoes, and during the last decade of the Ottoman period, the relationship

---

between rice cultivation and malaria was the subject of debate among Ottoman statesmen and within the parliament.\textsuperscript{43} In 1909, the Ministry of Interior ruled that the ride paddies (çeltik) in Marash must be maintained at least three kilometers from the city in order to protect public health and ward off malaria.\textsuperscript{44} However, these measures provoked tremendous pushback from cultivators in Marash, who complained that the bans of rice cultivation were unnecessary and unfair.\textsuperscript{45} This matter would remain an issue of contention in the Marash region well into the 1950s.\textsuperscript{46}

Despite the complications described above, the late Ottoman period undoubtedly witnessed massive ecological interventions either sanctioned or sponsored by the state in Adana. This is only to say that these did little to achieve the often stated goal of improving public health, though they did often accomplish other goals. The more serious and successful attempts at controlling water occurred where such measures aligned with commercial interests. For example, swamp drainage between Tarsus and Mersin began immediately with the cotton boom of the 1860s in this area, and the docks in Mersin were cleaned up by 1868.\textsuperscript{47} Similarly, the necessities of the Adana-Mersin railways and desires to run steamboats on the Seyhan River provided added impetus for water management.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{43} Although these debates were held well after the role of the mosquito in malaria transmission was known, the law refers to “rotten water” causing the ill health effects. The debates are extremely intriguing in that many Ottoman parliament members vehemently denied that rice paddies were the source of illness using examples from locations such as Egypt and Japan, whereas others like Nazaret Daghavaryan Efendi, a parliamentarian from Sivas, cited examples from Bulgaria where towns near rice paddies had rates of malaria as high as 75%. TBMM, MM 1/8, Vol. 2, ink50, pg. 612-620 (23 February 1909).

\textsuperscript{44} BOA, DH-MUI 13-3/10, No. 5 (2 September 1909).

\textsuperscript{45} See BOA, DH-ID 99/6, No. 2 (16 May 1911); BOA, DH-UMVM 105/42, No. 3 (18 February 1916). British intelligence cited these marshes around Marash for their negative health effects. Admiralty, \textit{A Handbook of Asia Minor}, 712.

\textsuperscript{46} This is discussed in Chapters 12 and 14.

\textsuperscript{47} BOA, MVL 689/34 (18 Cemazeyilevvel 1281 [19 October 1864]); İ-MVL 582/26133 (11 Şaban 1284 [8 December 1867]).

\textsuperscript{48} BOA, A-DVN-MKL 24/3 (3 Şaban 1300 [9 June 1883]); İ-MMS 73/3342 (26 Safer 1300 [6 January 1883]).
The most ambitious projects involving water in Adana to receive approval were for irrigation, which was seen as offering great potential for boosting agricultural production. French engineers drew up a scheme to drain and irrigate the entirety of central Çukurova during the last years of the Ottoman period.\(^{49}\) Of course, improper irrigation has long-term ecological consequences, such as soil salination. But beyond this drawback, we can see how these irrigation projects would do little to improve the economic well-being of those being settled, whose villages were mostly east of Misis. Moreover, the stagnant water of irrigation ditches channeled mosquitoes and their larvae into the heart of rural settlements, thus only exacerbating the issue of malaria.

The unintended disease consequences of public works projects such as irrigation often went undetected due to the fact that malaria was already a pervasive aspect of daily life. However, certain isolated incidents where a change in the course of a river or location of a swamp caused an immediate rise in malaria indicate the broader trend. In 1900, the course of the Savrun River, a tributary of the Ceyhan River flowing near Kars-ı Zülkadriye, was altered in order to construct an irrigation canal. This brought stagnant water into new areas near the towns of Kozan and Kars-ı Zülkadriye, resulting in complaints of health issues from the local inhabitants.\(^{50}\) Within seven years, the Ministry of the Interior ordered that the course of the Savrun must be returned to its original state due to these complications.\(^{51}\)

The visions of Çukurova as a “Second Egypt (Mısır-ı Sani)” devised as early as İbrahim Pasha’s occupation of the region in the 1830s did materialize with time, leading to increasingly ambitious ecological interventions (see Chapter 1). In 1908, the Ministry of Interior called for the complete drainage and sale of swampy, unused land in the Çukurova region for the purposes of

\(^{49}\) BOA, HRT-H 2042/2.
\(^{50}\) BOA, DH-MKT 2352/92 (30 Muharrem 1318 [30 May 1900]); BEO 2246/168435 (15 Şevval 1321).
\(^{51}\) BOA, DH-TMIK-M 249/44 (4 Cemazeyilahir 1325 [15 Temmuz 1907])
increasing state tax revenues. By 1912, such imperatives had been expanded to encompass the entirety of the Ottoman Empire in a policy of universal swamp drainage. The virtue of draining and maintaining wetlands had been enshrined and would serve as a center of state public works policy in the coming decades of the Turkish Republic. Malaria remained an aspect of these policies well into the post-World War II period. Yet, over the last decades of the Ottoman period, as swamp drainage rose, understandings of malaria changed such that this policy was no longer viewed as the most efficient means of improving public health. By the 1890s, acting on the human body in the form of quinine medicines and later acting on the bodies of mosquitoes through the use of pesticides and other anti-mosquito measures would emerge as the new weapons in an evolving struggle to contain the growing impact of malaria on the settled nomads, immigrants, and agricultural workers of the Anatolian peasantry.

52 BOA, DH-MKT 1235/78 (19 Muharrem 1326 [22 February 1908]).
53 BOA, BEO 4048/303549 (19 Cemazeyilahir 1330 [5 June 1912]). The public works ministry produced a map showing the locations of these swamps, with intense concentrations in the provinces of modern-day Iraq. BOA, HRT-h 372 (c1914).
54 An excellent example of this phenomenon is the ecologically disastrous draining of Lake Amik near Iskenderun and Antakya that occurred over the decades following the region’s incorporation into Turkey in 1939. More in Chapter 14.
Treating Europe’s Sick Man

During a cholera epidemic that ravaged Anatolia and Syria in the 1890s, Ottoman health inspector Şerafeddin Pasha (Mağmumi) travelled throughout the empire overseeing the treatment and quarantine operations of the health ministry, recording his experiences in an account that is unparalleled for its time in its richness of detail regarding the disease environments of the particular regions he visited. These memoirs reflect the pervasiveness of epidemic diseases such as malaria in Adana during that period, the challenges of implementing quarantines and administering treatment in remote, rural regions, and the significant financial limitations placed on the health ministry.55 The archival record suggests that the latter issue affected Şerafeddin Pasha personally, as he had trouble being reimbursed for his activities and complained of being treated as an ordinary traveling doctor. Given the stressful conditions and hardship faced as well as witnessed by this concerned doctor and civil servant throughout his career, we may speculate as to why in November of 1914 — just months into what would come to be known as the First World War — Şerafeddin Pasha attempted suicide by hurling himself into the Bosphorus from a public ferry carrying passengers back and forth between the European and Asian sides of the Ottoman capital.56

The Hamidian period (1878-1908) coincided with the rise of bacteriology and the notion of the germ, which in turn ushered in a new era of Ottoman medicine. These new understandings resulted in the proliferation of various treatments, the rise of a modern medical corps, and the emergence of hospitals and medical schools in the empire’s cities. Alongside ecological interventions in swamps, lakes, and rivers, biological interventions intended to treat malaria

55 Şerefeddin Mağmumi and Cahit Kayra, Bir Osmanlı doktorunun seyahat anıları : yüzyıl önce Anadolu ve Suriye (İstanbul: Boyut Kitapları, 2008), 173-216.
56 BOA, DH-MKT 2513/142 (8 Rabıulahir 1319 [25 July 1901]). The disillusioned doctor was rescued from the waters of the Bosphorus by his fellow passengers, who were awarded medals for their good deed. BOA, DH-KMS 29/21 (6 Muharrem 1333 [19 November 1914]).
came to the fore. Particularly following the discovery of the malaria parasite in 1880, quinine was seen as a potential remedy for the ailment.\(^{57}\) While Ottoman doctors had written about and experimented with quinine as early as the 1720s, the ability to test the blood of a patient, thereby offering a more precise identification of malaria, allowed for quinine sulfate (or sulfato as it was commonly known in the Ottoman Empire) to be administered with greater efficacy.\(^{58}\) Proper use of quinine reduces or eliminates the presence of the malaria parasite in human blood, and its impact was more immediately measureable than that of swamp drainage. As the table below indicates, during the first decade of the twentieth century, when the Ottoman state began organizing the distribution of quinine, the health ministry reported that the number of annual deaths from malaria had dropped from over 15,000 to just around 3,500 in proportion with increased amounts of quinine expended.\(^{59}\) This chart likely did not indicate malaria’s full impact, since it was less often a mortal disease than a debilitating one, and the statistics only reflected individuals who could be tested and verified as having contracted malaria. Yet, alongside similar experiments with quinine in the Ottoman Navy, where malaria was almost completely eliminated, this data illustrates that quinine was in theory an excellent tool in combatting the disease.\(^{60}\)

\(^{57}\) For an overview of quinine an its use in the Ottoman Empire, see Feza Günergun and Şeref Etker, “From Quinaquina to ’Quinine Law’: A Bitter Chapter in the Westernization of Turkish Medicine,” *Osmanlı Bilim Araştırmalari* 14, no. 2 (2013).


\(^{60}\) The aforementioned lecturer Feyzi Pasha referred to these new statistics in his lectures as the great promise for future anti-malarial activities.
Table 12: Ottoman Health Ministry Statistics on Malaria Mortality (Source: Sıhhiye Mecmuası Vol. 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kg of Quinine Distributed</th>
<th>Recorded Malaria Deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td>15865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
<td>13558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td>9907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>7234</td>
<td>8513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>14071</td>
<td>8501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>18712</td>
<td>7838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>20723</td>
<td>4871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>24351</td>
<td>4160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>23635</td>
<td>3463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>21656</td>
<td>3488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>22795</td>
<td>3533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of quinine in practice, however, presented many obstacles. While the emergence of a pharmaceutical industry centered on the production of quinine medicines had greatly reduced prices by the 1890s, all quinine sulfate manufacturers were located in Europe or the United States. This made the Ottoman Empire totally dependent on imports to meet its high quinine demands, and serious issues of regulation arose. The abundance of inferior or fraudulent medicines led to an 1889 decision to inspect and evaluate all quinine imports on the basis of international standards. Following this decision, there were many cases of inferior medicines imported from France and Germany being refused, and in one case, the Ottoman government was forced by Britain to accept what was claimed to be a shipment of bad quinine. From British traveler E.J. Davis in the 1870s to Feyzi Pasha in the 1910s, there is ample evidence that

---

62 BOA, DH-MKT 1660/113 (29 Muharrem 1307 [25 September 1889]).
63 BOA, BEO 1115/83604 (5 Zilhicce 1315 [27 April 1898]); 1116/83691 (6 Zilhicce 1315 [28 April 1898]); 2195/164582 (23 Receb 1321 [15 October 1903]).
the quinine available in Ottoman markets was often diluted to the point of inefficacy.\footnote{Davis, \textit{Life in Asiatic Turkey}, 464-70; Ersoy, \textit{Doktor Feyzullah İzmidi}, 35.} Moreover, imported quinine sulfate remained expensive for poorer Ottoman subjects and because supply flowed first through urban centers, Ottoman villagers were at the end of the supply chain though arguably most in need of medicine.\footnote{An early indication of this phenomenon comes in 1876 from a request by the Kaymakam of Mount Lebanon for immediate shipments of free medicine for the poor of the region, indicating that the poorest inhabitants of the mountain and particularly the Druze would otherwise suffer epidemic malaria that year. BOA, ŞD 262/53 (14 Cemazeyilahir 1293 [7 June 1876]).} The lack of institutional structures also posed a serious challenge to medical treatment of malaria. The Ottoman government was first moved to open hospitals in Adana and Tarsus in response to the health issues surrounding migrant workers or \textit{gureba} (literally strangers) in the province.\footnote{BOA, ŞD 2116/27, No. 1 (14 Rebiulahir 1290 [30 May 1873]). A hospital was founded under Abidin Pasha in 1880 specifically to treat and inspect the tens of thousands of migrant workers in Adana treated both men and women. BOA, ŞD 2120/46, No. 7 (20 November 1880).} Over the coming decades, other Ottoman medical institutions as well as the clinics and hospitals of missionaries were opened mainly in the city of Adana.\footnote{The ABCFM opened a major hospital in Adana only after the massacres in 1909, but American missionaries were known for administering medical treatment among the populations they encountered long before that. Many were physicians themselves. See Cyril Haas, \textit{Eight Months' Work in a Turkish Hospital} (New York: Marshall Brothers, 1912).} While these emerged to alleviate the high demand for medical treatment, they were limited in terms of their impact on the countryside due to the distance between Adana and some of the more remote villages. The Ottoman medical establishment sought to open special clinics in a few towns of the region such as Bahçe in Eastern Çukurova.\footnote{BOA, DH-MKT 2517/48 (15 Rebiulahir 1319 [19 July 1901]).}

A more important institution in terms of the relationship between the Ottoman state and public health in the countryside was the different roaming medical establishments that served villages and new settlements of \textit{muhacirs}. Quinine distribution was a key component of the work
carried out by provincial doctors and the all-important “traveling doctor (seyyar tabib).”

Urban communities might have had reasonable access to quinine, but rural populations often relied on government intervention to secure their supply of medicine. During the earliest stages of quinine’s use, we find orders for emergency treatment of vulnerable communities such as newly-arrived muhacirs by dispatching some quinine along with a traveling doctor. In the Adana region, where settlements were new and urban growth was recent, the figure of the traveling doctor played a particularly critical role in the extension of health services beyond the center. However, if we recall the aforementioned Ottoman health inspector Şerafeddin Pasha’s indignant letter to the ministry complaining that he had been reduced to the role of such a doctor, we can begin to understand how the work of these individuals would have been challenging and often fruitless. In his memoirs, Şerafeddin Pasha described the desperate health situation of the Adana region during the 1890s and the utter lack of medical services outside of the city. A few traveling doctors could have hardly faced down the terrifying cholera and malaria epidemics that routinely swept through the region. In fact, it seems that many did not; we find an order from 1891 demanding that doctors not abandon the villages they were sent to, as many were apparently unwilling to risk entering the sickly Anatolian countryside. Likewise, pharmacists fearing exposure to infected individuals would sometimes close their shops in times of epidemics.

The function of rural doctors was primarily to deal with crises such as sudden epidemics; otherwise, they would roam a given province, frequenting small villages every few months to

---

69 For more, see Ceren Gülser İlikan Rasimoğlu, “The Foundation of a Professional Group: Physicians in the Nineteenth Century Modernizing Ottoman Empire (1839-1908)” (Boğaziçi University, 2012).


72 BOA, DH-MKT 1811/85 (12 Receb 1308 [21 February 1891]).
monitor the health situation. The diseases of primary concern for these doctors were cholera, malaria, and syphilis; they also performed the quite successful inoculation against smallpox. In 1901, there were just two such doctors in the Adana province.\textsuperscript{73} The work of these doctors was further complicated by the fact that they were treated with suspicion by the local population. The detection of cholera, for example could result in the implementation of a harsh quarantine in a particular village that would inevitably clash with the flight instincts of those fearing infection. Moreover, local medical practices often ran counter to the prescriptions of the emerging Ottoman medical corps. In the case of malaria, Anatolian peasants and townsfolk were accustomed to alleviating the feverish symptoms of malaria with a trip to the bathhouse or by consuming alcohol, both of which may have made them feel better but likely had little impact on the infection and may have made it worse.\textsuperscript{74} Convincing peasants to consume quinine sulfate and take it at the proper intervals would have been challenging, but it would become a major imperative of the Turkish Republic from the 1920s onward (see Chapter 12).

Through these medical networks, it appears that quinine gradually became understood as an effective treatment for malaria. In his lectures, Feyzi Pasha declared that “there is practically nobody who does not know that quinine is the medicine for malaria.”\textsuperscript{75} In light of apparent successes and rising demand for the quinine sulfate, the Ottoman government mandated for the first time that quinine be made available in every village for a moderate price in 1911.\textsuperscript{76} This was followed by a subsequent decision on the eve of World War I to offer free quinine to the

\textsuperscript{73} BOA, BEO 1713 128442 (19 Cemazeyilahir 1319 [3 September 1901]).
\textsuperscript{74} İzmir, \textit{Sitma: Maraz-i Merzagi}; Tevfik Rüştü (Aras), \textit{Sitmaya Karşı Muharebe} (Selanik: Rumeli Matbaası, 1326). The memory book of the town of Sis published by the Armenian diaspora in Lebanon also mentions in addition to “change of air (օդափոխութիւն),” the use of various prayers. In particular, they would tie a string around the malaria-sufferer’s wrist and say an incantation, proceeding to burn the bracelet and having the patient inhale the fumes. Keleshean, \textit{Sis-Madean}, 406. Among the Afsar communities of the Taurus Mountain, one remedy for fever was to wrap the patient in a sheepskin to let them sweat it out. Özdemir, \textit{Öyküleriyle Ağıtlar}, 129.
\textsuperscript{75} İzmir, \textit{Sitma: Maraz-i Merzagi}, 7.
\textsuperscript{76} BOA, DH-ID 55/31 (30 Receb 1329 [29 May 1911]).
Ottoman poor, a final step that would have seemed to enshrine the right to anti-malarial medicine of all Ottoman citizens advocated by Committee of Union and Progress member and Salonika’s health inspector Tevfik Rüştü Pasha. However, with supply issues constantly arising and limits to the efficacy of quinine persisting, malaria remained part of life in Anatolia for decades to come. During World War I, shortages of quinine and the disruptions of war would in fact make the disease a big killer once again (see Chapter 9). Yet, even prior to the war in a time of peace, malaria was still deadly. In 1910, one fourth of the deaths recorded in Adana’s district of Tarsus, for example, were due to malaria. This rate was certainly better than the one-fourth of entire communities that were sometimes wiped out by the disease upon initial settlement, but it meant that malaria remained part of quotidian life in the Çukurova region long after effective solutions had been devised and attempted.

The medical activities of La Société Anonyme “Le Coton” in Çukurova, which operated farms on imperial lands along the western banks of the Ceyhan River in eastern Çukurova (discussed in Chapter 5), offer a glimpse at some of the ecological and medical approaches to malaria in operation by the end of Ottoman rule in the Cilicia region. The company engaged in a number of activities in order to “improve the health conditions of the worker population.” These included swamp drainage, the distribution of free quinine and dispensation of medical care, the planting of trees, and pétrolage — pouring petroleum into lakes, swamps, and stagnant bodies of water to kill mosquitoes. The company’s approximately 60,000 francs of expenditures in this arena, most of which was dedicated to medicine and treatment and 8% of which was dedicated to

77 MV 231/141 (20 Cemazeyilahir 1331 [27 May 1913]); (Aras), Sıtına Karşı Muharebe, 1.
78 “Sıhhiye Mecmuası,” 1043.
79 The latter strategy was adopted in imitation of successful anti-mosquito campaigns carried out by the United States in Cuba that had helped reduce the impact of yellow fever. Tsapalos and Walter, Rapport sur le domaine impérial de Tchoucour-Ova, 32.
petrolage, were significant though only a fraction of its operating budget.\textsuperscript{80} Yet, that budget allocation was marginal in comparison with the projected cost of properly desiccating the 25,000 hectares of swamp in Çukurova, which the company estimated at 3,830,000 \textit{francs}.\textsuperscript{81} These figures point to the essential reason why the complete elimination of malaria, irrespective of the limits of both ecological as well as medical knowledge and practices, would remain a long way off in the realm of practical implementation.

The endurance of malaria as an issue throughout the emergence of ecological and medical approaches to disease points to perhaps the biggest shift in the Ottoman citizenry’s relationship with malaria. As time went on, tribal and immigrant communities that had experienced little exposure to malaria prior to settlement simply adjusted. This process is remembered as a hard and painful one in the semi-autobiographical work of Yaşar Kemal. In \textit{As Çukurova Burns}, he describes the memories of an old story teller of a village near Osmaniye (one of the towns founded in order to settle Çukurova’s tribes) regarding the long and bitter process of adjustment (see Chapter 4). The gradual acceptance of malaria as an inevitable part of daily life that must be tolerated was accompanied by a concomitant decline in these communities’ efforts to resist forced settlement as they acquiesced to growing state hegemony in the region.\textsuperscript{82} Malaria remained not only as a reminder of the intense suffering of those initial settlers but also of an irrevocable change in the relationship between the population and their geography represented by the decline and elimination of longstanding migratory lifestyles.

\textsuperscript{80} The company’s report, coauthored by a Greek doctor from the Algerian Pasteur Institute, indicated that expenditures in the area of health had fallen since the initial year. Ibid., 33.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 38.
\textsuperscript{82} Kemal, \textit{Çukurova Yana Yana}, 9-13.
Changes in the Air

In 1901, the educators of Adana wrote to the Ministry of Education pleading for permission to spend the summer in the mountains at the yayla (see Chapter 1). While the ministry required teachers and officials to remain in the towns of Adana and Tarsus in order to register students during the summer months, the climate was simply too hard for these employees and their families to bear. Malaria had claimed the lives of a few of their children during the previous summer. Moreover, since the inhabitants of Adana usually left for the yayla anyway, the teachers saw their remaining in the city as utterly foolish. While the wealthy people of Adana could afford to spend the summer at cooler and more salubrious orchards around the city, an educator’s salary was not enough to afford such residence.83 In response, the Ministry of Education offered a compromise, saying that the families could go to the yayla but that teachers must return to the city by August 15th for student registration, meaning that they would receive some respite during the summer but nonetheless be forced to stay in Adana during the absolute peak of malaria season.84

The position of state officials with regard to seasonal migration was ultimately conflicted. On one hand, we find occasional orders that adopt the strict stance towards seasonal migration emphasized during the activities of the Firka-ı Islahiye, the Reform Army that settled the tribes of Adana. In 1890, requests from the local governing councils of Sis (Kozan) and Kars-ı Zülkadriye (Kadirli) to move their operations to the yayla in order to escape the effects of the hot weather and malaria were denied.85 In practice, however, the phenomenon of seasonal migration, particularly among obedient, settled populations, was tolerated and even accommodated. An

83 BOA, MF-MKT 567/33, No. 1 (23 April 1901).
84 BOA, MF-MKT 567/33, No. 2 (25 April 1901).
85 BOA, DH-MKT 1760/79 (28 Muharrem 1308 [13 September 1890]). When the kaymakam of Bahçe was investigated for misconduct in 1910, the first of the twelve charges brought against him was his having gone to the yayla without permission. BOA, ŞD 2139/10, no. 4 (22 Zilkade 1328 / 11 Teşrinisani 1326 [24 November 1910]).
order that 40 armed personnel or prisoner guards be used to guard the roads of the Adana province during the summer on one hand illustrates the desire to control the movement of the population but on the other represents an acquiescence to this inevitable practice.86 Later in the Ottoman period, as the government recognized the pervasiveness of malaria better, the academic calendar of the public schools of Adana was even modified to allow students to complete exams early in May before heading to the yayla.87

The sometimes messy compromises between the Ottoman state and its employees as well as the local administration and its tribal subjects signify the ways in which mobility as a response to malaria continued to be a source of tension between state policy and local practice. While this tension resulted in the ultimate affirmation of migration or “change of air” as a legitimate excuse to move, it also changed the power dynamic in such a way that the state claimed the right to grant access to yaylas and created a situation in which poor and marginalized groups were disproportionately likely to lose access to such spaces. As the economic function of migration — i.e. as a means of finding additional pasture for animals — eroded, migration may have been unaffordable for poor villagers from Adana’s settled tribes. This certainly would have been the case for resettled immigrants, who were neither accustomed to Adana’s geography nor possessing the economic means to undertake such a journey. In other words, the yayla increasingly became a space used not as a summer pasture but rather solely as a place where those who could would find a change of air to beat the heat and malaria of the plain. This process would continue for decades into the Republic period, as the yayla was transformed into a place of leisure (see Chapter 13).

86 BOA, BEO 389/29112 (16 Şevval 1311 [22 April 1894])
87 BOA, MF-MKT 1120/21 (26 Rabiulahir 1327 [17 May 1909]). Amongst his other complaints, the aforementioned health inspector Şerafeddin Mağmumi reported that he was unable to visit the famous Cave of the Seven Sleepeers near Tarsus because the keeper had locked the cave and left for the yayla for the summer. Mağmumi and Kayra, Bir Osmanlı doktorunun seyahat anıları : yüzüyl önce Anadolu ve Suriye, 184.
The malarial geography of Adana touched everyone; Ottoman officials in Adana routinely asked for new posts to escape its hot climate, and in other cases officials were deemed unfit for service in Adana’s climate following a medical examination. Yet, the poorer segment of society and particularly those newly settled in Çukurova were least equipped to cope with the effects of Adana’s disease environment. Malaria’s impact as a consequence of new settlement was differentiated. The marginal segments of society — settled tribes, new immigrants, agricultural laborers, and poor inhabitants of remote villages — were hit the hardest. The effects of malaria are well-remembered among the successor communities of tribes and immigrants, who remember the period with a sense of victimhood. The Ottoman frontier experience was by no means exceptional; malaria played a critical role in nearly every area where new settlement occurred, including the United States. The sense that settlement was a forced condition and a site of sorrow is reminiscent of the experience of resettled American Indians and African slaves, whose suffering from the disease was imposed upon them and lingered longer than that of European settlers.

The trends outlined in this chapter would continue into the subsequent decades of the twentieth century as the new Republic of Turkey continued policies of drainage and quinine distribution in addition to adopting novel ways of tackling malaria. Adana would emerge as one

88 BOA, DH-MKT 2126/48 (5 Receb 1316 [19 November 1898]); 2247/25 (9 Cemazeyilevel 1317 [19 September 1899]). This phenomenon was not limited to Adana. In fact, the region where it was most pronounced was Yemen, a particularly hot climate where the Ottoman state had recently reasserted its rule and undertook what might be seen as a type of colonial endeavor during the late nineteenth century. Y-MTV 17/16 (21 Rabiulahir 1302 [17 February 1885]). See: Kuehn, Empire, Islam, and politics of difference Ottoman rule in Yemen, 1849-1919.
89 Malaria also disproportionately impacted agricultural workers and the poor. The Armenian orphanage in Adana indicated that 30% of the children at the Adana orphanage were “weak” and their main affliction was fever. Armenian Orphanage of Cilicia, “Teghekagir: 1909 Ogostos 7-1910 Dektemb [Report: 7 August 1909 - 31 December 1910],” Tparan O. Arzuman.
91 Humphreys, Malaria : poverty, race, and public health in the United States.
of the centers of Turkey’s — and indeed humanity’s — battle against malaria and nature (discussed in Chapter 12), used as a laboratory for research and treatment as its broader population lived under the oppression of the region’s bad air. Yet, the bad air accumulating over Adana due to settlement extended far beyond issues of disease and ecology. The climate of unrest and increasing tension between the region’s Muslim subjects (increasingly viewed as loyal) and its Christian subjects (increasingly viewed with suspicion) would culminate in a period of violence with the Adana massacre in 1909, the WWI period, and the subsequent French occupation that forever changed the human geography of Adana.

The connection between malaria and communal tensions was more than metaphorical. During the Hamidian period, we can observe how the ill effects of settlement may have reverberated across society and created rifts. In 1896, an encoded telegram from the Governor of Adana to the Ministry of Interior made the alarming claim that Adana would be at risk of invasion by Armenian rebels from the mountains that summer. The reasoning stated that much of the region’s Muslim populations, including a number of “exceedingly loyal” tribes, would be away at the yayla leaving the area mostly vacated.92 Given what has already been said about malaria and the summer in Adana, this would have been a suicide mission for the supposed Armenian army. In an era of anti-Armenian paranoia about separatism that was fueled by state actors, the veracity of such speculation is questionable, and the implications of this warning are those of a potentially self-fulfilling prophecy of sectarian bloodshed. A portion of the Muslim population would have to be prevented from migrating in order to keep Adana well-stocked with loyal inhabitants. Given the importance of seasonal migration in the livelihood and health of these communities, it is easy to imagine how such policies would foster animosity between Christians and Muslims.

92 BOA, DH-ȘFR 196/21, Faik to Dahiliye, Adana (29 Temmuz 1312 [10 August 1896]).
It is dangerous to read the entire history of Anatolia’s final Ottoman decades through the lens of an impending clash between Muslims and Christians. The issue of settlement in the Ottoman Empire was bigger than political or sectarian considerations. However, one cannot ignore the fact that settlement was used to further a policy of social engineering in the Ottoman Empire. The history of Adana, a religiously and ethnically diverse yet historically cohesive part of the empire, is telling in this regard. Settlers were soldiers in a war not just against nature but also an imagined Armenian menace. This policy is spelled out in surprisingly plain terms in an 1892 order from the Ministry of the Interior indicating that because of Adana’s large indigenous non-Muslim population, Muslims that had been immigrating to Anatolia from the troubled Balkans region should be settled on vacant lands near Christian villages in order to “increase the Muslim element there (unsur-u islamın oralarda teksiri).”93 The presence of such a policy would suggest the need for a study of the ecological, social, and political impacts of settlement in tandem, and in the following chapter, I attempt to link the broader issue of settlement with the most important political questions of the empire’s final decades through an exploration of communal relations in late Ottoman Adana.

93 BOA, DH-MKT 2006/33 (6 Rabiuelvevel 1310 [28 September 1892]).
CHAPTER 7
PLAINS OF CONTENTION: CONFLICTS IN THE CILICIAN COUNTRYSIDE

With a little over two hundred households, Bahçe was not a big town, though it had deep roots in Cilicia. When Cevdet and the Reform Division visited in the 1860s, there were already “fairly well-developed villages” in the area. Tucked away in the forested Amanus Mountains, Bahçe’s name means “garden.” The town supported a small regional economy that revolved around the cultivation of wheat and barley and animal husbandry. Although somewhat inaccessible, especially during the winter, its position along the road between Adana and Aintab brought some commercial activity. Like many old towns of the region, Bahçe was home to a small Christian minority. About one-fifth of the population in the area was Armenian. There were just under 20,000 people total in the district as of 1909 and just over that number of goats. Bahçe was home to the usual types of buildings one would find in an Ottoman town: a few mosques, a church, and some schools. It also had a small hospital that the Ottoman government had founded to combat syphilis. Alongside a small missionary presence, the recent arrival of German engineers and workers on the Baghdad railway construction had added some additional color. Bahçe was a town like many towns in the Ottoman Empire.

1 BOA, DH-ID 80/26, Hakkı to Dahiliye, Adana (28 Receb 1332 / 9 Haziran 1330 [22 June 1914]), pg. 3.
2 Cevdet and Halaçoğlu, Marûzât, 128.
3 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-yı Osmani Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325].
4 Lt. Bennet was unable to visit the town itself due to snow on the roads during his tour of Cilicia in 1880. TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 – Political No. 12, Bennet to Goschen, Adana (15 December 1880).
5 Karpat, Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics.
6 Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913].
7 BOA, DH-MKT 2517/48 (15 Rebiulahir 1319 [1 August 1901]).
8 Jonathan S. McMurray, Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001), 88.
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In April 1909, Bahçe was the site of a gruesome massacre. Krikor Koudoulian, who was a local teacher there at the time, published a detailed eyewitness account of his version of what transpired. Following a series of violent incidents that targeted the small Armenian minority of the region, a pogrom erupted during the second week of April. It involved large bands of Muslim men attacking the Armenian inhabitants of the town and surrounding villages, setting fire to homes and attacking those they could capture. According to Koudoulian, the violence was encouraged by the local mufti and aided by local officials, many of whom would subsequently lose their posts as a result. After the killings were eventually halted, the mufti would be among those hanged for their part in these bloody events. But before then, many Armenian men, women, and children would die at the hands of their aggressors. Some were shot, some were stabbed, and some were burned alive in their homes. Some sought protection to no avail with the German workers overseeing railway construction in the area at the time, who Koudoulian said appeared entertained by the chaos. Many of Bahçe’s Armenians fled elsewhere. Some, like Koudoulian, fled to the mountains above the town and were thus able to escape, though they were helpless to stop the carnage that unfolded below.

Koudoulian published his account as an example of the local rural experience during the Adana massacres of 1909, which had been widely commented upon by authors near to and far

---

9 Koudoulian, Hay lere, 37. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Şuşan Özoğlu, with whom I worked long hours on the sometimes graphic and exhausting published Armenian accounts of the Adana massacres.
10 Ibid., 43; H. R. Simonyan, Melissa Brown, and Alexander Arzoumanian, Destruction of Armenians in Cilicia, April 1909 (London: Gomidas Institute, 2012), 104.
11 The execution of the mufti was one of the aspects of the Ottoman government reaction that enraged some local Muslims in the wake of the massacres. See Cezmi Yurtsever, Müftüyü İdam Ettiler [They Executed the Mufti] (Adana, Turkey: Ekrem Matbaası, 2013).
12 Koudoulian, Hay lere, 43.
13 Ibid., 39. Koudoulian included in his account a lament written in Armeno-Turkish by a local resident who had escaped to the nearby yayla of Gövdedağı. He composed the song as he lived on grass in the mountains as he hid and wondered about the grim fate of those he knew in the towns and villages below. Ibid., 49.
from the epicenter of the violence. The massacres started in the city of Adana just two days after the beginning of Easter, when the city was filled to the brim with Christian visitors and seasonal workers involved in the annual planting of cotton. After a few days of violence, a second wave of massacres erupted throughout the Cilicia region. In Adana, a significant portion of the Armenian quarter was destroyed by fires and fighting. The violence in the countryside affected almost all of the villages and towns in the Çukurova plain. There were also reports of forced conversion.

When all was said and done, the multitude of burned and mutilated bodies

---

14 There are many first-hand accounts and other primary source materials that were published in the years after the massacres. For a discussion the numerous Armenian publications of the period, see Simonyan, Brown, and Arzoumanian, *Destruction of Armenians in Cilicia*, 6-11. Bedross Der Matossian’s doctoral dissertation also contains extensive references to much of the source material available in Armenian and certain newspapers of relevance. Bedross Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)" (PhD, Columbia University, 2008). Very recently, Ari Şekeryan has published transcriptions of three Ottoman Turkish reports by Armenians, including the report of Babigian, the CUP official sent to investigate the massacres who died mysteriously after filing the report. Ari Şekeryan et al., 1909 Adana Katliamı : Üç rapor (İstanbul: Aras, 2015). I have made use of some of the Armenian and Ottoman accounts mentioned in these works, but the full breadth of the source base is too numerous to list here. There are also a number of accounts written by American missionaries and foreign observers. For one short overview from the period, see H. C. Woods, *The danger zone of Europe: changes and problems in the Near East* (London: T.F. Unwin, 1911); Z. Duckett Ferriman, *The Young Turks and the truth about the holocaust at Adana in Asia Minor during April, 1909* (London1913); Rose Lambert, *Hadjin and the Armenian Massacres* (New York: Revell, 1911). I should note that most of the Armenian and foreign publications are available through HathiTrust, and the Ottoman accounts have recently been digitized and are available for download through Atatürk Kitaplığı in Istanbul.

15 Many authors have noted that Easter could be a tense time for communal relations or the outbreak of anti-Armenian sentiments, and that in general, Easter brought many Armenians to the city. Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 462, 67; Meltem Toksöz, "Multiplicity or polarity: a discursive analysis of post-1908 violence in an Ottoman region,” in Untold Histories of the Middle East: recovering voices from the 19th and 20th centuries, ed. Amy Singer, Christoph K. Neumann, and Selçuk Aksin Somel (Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2011), 219.

16 The Adana massacres encompassed two weeks of violence against Armenians in different parts of the Cilicia region, including two separate phases of massacre in the city of Adana. Narrating these events in full requires more space than is provided in this dissertation. The source material for the massacres is heavily weighted towards events in the city of Adana itself, especially due to the greater presence of foreign observers. This chapter deals more with contextualizing events in the countryside. For some overview of the massacres and their events, see Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 424-99; Simonyan, Brown, and Arzoumanian, *Destruction of Armenians in Cilicia*; Tetsuya Sahara, *What happened in Adana in April 1909? : conflicting Armenian and Turkish views* (İstanbul: Isis Press, 2013); Raymond H. Kévorkian, *La Cilicie (1909-1921) : des massacres d'Adana au mandat français* (Paris: Revue d'histoire arménienne contemporaine, 1999).

17 BOA, BEO 3591/269254, No. 1 (22 Haziran 1325 [5 July 1909]).
of humans and animals throughout the province became a danger to public health. The massacres, which many claimed had killed up to 20-30,000 Armenians, earned the young and relatively obscure city of Adana a sudden infamy on the international stage and among the broader Armenian community, resulting in a spate of writings about Adana by local Armenians, foreign eye-witnesses such as American missionaries, and Armenian intellectuals in Istanbul. Armenian authors began to label the events as “the Great Catastrophe (medz yegherne)” years before that term would be applied to what later became known as the Armenian genocide of the WWI period.

The Adana massacres were interpreted at the time through the political frameworks of the day that mainly employed the language of nationalist or communalist discourses. Many believed and continue to believe that the massacres were premeditated and coordinated in part by Ottoman officials, although official involvement beyond the local level has not been substantiated. But there must have been something very local about the conditions that created these massacres, even if they were incited and facilitated by certain political actors with specific goals. Why

---

18 BOA, DH-MKT 2813/75 (3 Mayis 1325 [16 May 1909]).
19 The question of how many people were killed during the massacres was much debated and discussed. Ottoman government officials initially estimated the number of deaths at around a few thousand but estimates rose substantially thereafter. There was a tremendous ambiguity regarding the number of casualties due to the difficulties of tracking people, especially migrant laborers. Many sources commonly refer to 20-30,000 deaths in the Cilicia region, although it is conceivable that this vague estimate was high. British Consul Doughty Wylie gave a tentative estimate of 15-25,000 immediately following the massacres. TNA, FO 195/2306, pg. 109 (21 April 1909). The number frequently cited in Armenian and foreign accounts from the period was sometimes around 30,000. For example, see Karabet Çalyan, Adana vak'ası ve mesulleri (Reforme Hınçak Cemiyeti, 1909), 23. Cemal Pasha cited a number of 17,000 Armenian and 1850 Muslim casualties. The Armenian patriarchate claimed 17,844 and later 21,361 Armenian dead. Toksöz, "Multiplicity or polarity: a discursive analysis of post-1908 violence in an Ottoman region," 224. For Babigian’s discussion of the numbers, see Hagop Babigian and Hagop Sargisyan, Atanayi eghernē (Constantinople [Istanbul]: K. Ardzagang, 1919), 18-20.
would people kill their neighbors in seemingly remote locations such as Koudoulian’s Bahçe in response to troubles that started more than 100km away in Adana?

Recent historiography on the Adana massacres tends to agree that there was something specific about Adana’s historical experience that made the region vulnerable to an outburst of anti-Armenian violence during the late Ottoman period. Stephan Astourian argues that “agrarian relations played a central role in the emergence of the Armenian Question and in interethnic relations.” Violence in Adana was tied to competition over land and differential economic outcomes of settlement. Owen Miller formulates an analogous argument, pointing to how economic and demographic change in the countryside contributed to a series of rifts between different Muslim and Christian groups operating on different layers of historical time. Bedross Der Matossian notes that the massacres occurred in Adana as opposed to elsewhere because of its complex demographic makeup and the city’s centrality as a destination for migrant workers. Finally, Toksöz contends that the region’s loss of economic autonomy and its linking to the national economy after the revolution upset the fragile distribution of power in the region, which had been built in relative independence from state structures. This perspective, which is complementary to Stephan Astourian’s reading of the issue of land in Çukurova, suggests that Cilicia’s rapid commercialization was a significant factor in what created the conditions of the Adana massacres, and that the violence was therefore a product of dynamics in the countryside.

Building on this research regarding the political and socioeconomic context of the Adana massacres, this chapter focuses on the agrarian dimensions of violence in Çukurova. But more

---

23 Owen Robert Miller, "Conjuncture, Contingency, and Interpreting Violence in late Ottoman Cilicia" (MA, Columbia University, 2008).
24 Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire: Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 446.
specifically, it focuses on the violent dimensions of agrarian intercommunality. Cilicia was home
to a highly contentious countryside, and that contention was by no means limited to disputes
between Armenians and their Muslim neighbors. The continuous movement of people, the rapid
acquisition of land by various groups and by various means, and the rising economic competition
associated with commercial development made territorial conflict a fundamental aspect of
quotidian life in Cilicia. In some cases, conflict broke down along confessional or ethnic
boundaries, but in others, it was simply a product of settlement’s logistical aspects and human
interaction with geography. The Ottoman government coordinated settlement, monitored and
regulated the ownership of land, and claimed jurisdiction over the Çukurova plain through its
legal institutions. However, agrarian change was fast and hectic in Cilicia, and where the
government was unable to adjudicate disputes, violence was one natural and possible outcome.

While the 1909 massacres broke out in the cosmopolitan, urban provincial capital of
Adana, the political tensions they embodied were formed in the countryside of what Janet Klein
has called “the margins of empire.”26 The movements of workers, migrants, and weapons, which
were difficult to regulate, were themselves a source of upheaval within the urban and rural life of
Adana. Even if communal violence had never occurred in Çukurova in the form that the
massacres assumed, various forms of contestation had pervaded life in the plain. Cilicia had been
nearly impossible for the Ottoman administration to govern under the political ecology of
transhumance (see Chapter 1), and with its removal and the installation of a political ecology of
cotton, new issues and tensions had emerged. These tensions, while not inherently communal,
are what made Ottoman Çukurova a burning plain of contention.

26 Klein, The Margins of Empire.
Locating Violence

In his cathartic account of the Adana massacres authored from a ship in İskenderun bound for Egypt in 1909, Artin Arslanian called referred to the events as “an eternal mourning for the civilized world.” The view from outside Arslanian’s native Cilicia region was certainly that the violence represented uncivilized forces. Indeed, both the Turkish officials who dominated the CUP and Armenians in Istanbul alike viewed the Adana massacres through the lens of a qualitatively different and more chaotic provincial setting. For Armenian intellectuals like Arshaguhi Teodik, Zabel Yesayan, and the like, Adana represented a national setback and served as an impetus to expand Armenian charity works such as hospitals and orphanages.

Armenians around the world, American and European observers, and the Ottoman government sought to understand how the massacres played out and who was indeed responsible for the carnage that unfolded in Adana during April 1909. But Cilician Armenians were faced with the separate question of how and why such events had occurred in their hitherto tranquil home. Hagop Terzian, an Armenian pharmacist from Adana, was among the first residents of the Cilicia region to discuss the massacres in a work entitled The Life of Adana (Ատանայի Կեանկը). This work was on some level an attempt to offer a representation of his native region to meet the sudden interest of a public that knew little about his local context and viewed Adana

27 Artin Arslanyan, Adana'da adalet nasıl mahkum oldu [How Justice Was Condemned in Adana] (Cairo: [unknown publisher], 1909), 5. Ari Şekeryan has recently transcribed and published the account of Arslanyan as well as Garabet Çalyan and Hagop Babigyan. Şekeryan et al., 1909 Adana Katliamı : Üç rapor.
28 Such a view is represented in the account of Arshaguhi Teodik, who toured Cilicia in the fall following the springtime massacres. During her journey through Çukurova, she imagined scenes of cruel butchery projected onto the harsh landscape of backwater towns like Hamidiye (Ceyhan) that she referred to as dark and uncivilized and its river as a “swallower of Armenians (հույունք)”. Teodik, Amis mé i Kilikia, 150. For her descriptions of life in Eastern Çukurova, see ibid., 140, 61. At one point she even remarked about the disgusting manner in which Kurdish workers she encountered devoured oranges that they plucked from roadside trees. Ibid., 164.
Terzian sought to illustrate how modern commercial development had created an educated, progressive urban society in Adana that was suddenly shattered by anti-revolutionary violence. Outside agitators such as İhsan Fikri — the editor of the newspaper İtidal — played an important role in his narrative of the events that disrupted the harmonious spirit of the revolutionary fervor of 1908 in a city in which “the word “gavur” had almost no presence.”

While not without some parallels, Krikor Koudoulian’s lesser-known portrayal of the rural context in Bahçe was different in this regard. His account was provocatively entitled Armenian Mountain (Hay Lere). This was his way of referring to the region of Gavurdağı or “Infidel Mountain,” officially known as Cebel-i Bereket. The creative substitution indicated that Koudoulian believed the name Gavurdağı was a derogatory reference to the area’s enduring Armenian character. This difference also pointed to divergent implications of the massacres in the views of these two authors. Terzian saw the violence as a backlash against the revolutionary optimism that had created such feelings of comradery among Muslims and Armenians in Cilicia who supported the constitutional movement and shouted “long live the Turks” and “long live the Armenians” to their confessional counterparts followed by chants of “long live the Ottomans!”

Koudoulian’s narrative treated the notion of Muslim-Armenian coexistence with much greater skepticism. He referred to “a few simple-minded, old-fashioned bigwigs (միամիտի հին գլուխջոջեր)” of the local Armenian community in Bahçe who were easily assuaged by false promises.

---

29 Terzian, *Atanayi keank’ě*, 11. Terzian was considered one of the most reliable firsthand observers of the massacres and he published numerous books on the issue. Many authors who use Armenian accounts, including Bedross Der Matossian, have used this account extensively.

30 Ibid., 32. İhsan Fikri had been civil servant in Selanik. He had married the daughter of Menan Bey, the Adana notable that had played an important role in disrupting the investigation of Jackson Coffing’s murder (see Chapter 2). Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire: Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 452.


assurances of protection and the continuance of the longstanding inter-confessional harmony in Cilicia amidst warnings of potential violence.\textsuperscript{33} When the violence began to erupt, the Armenians of Bahçe appealed to local Muslim officials for protection. In this case, Koudoulian offered up a saying that functioned just as well in Armenian as it does in Turkish: “he who falls in the sea grasps a snake.”\textsuperscript{34} In other words, Koudoulian saw attempts to appeal to Muslim officials as desperate and futile.

The two perspectives of Terzian and Koudoulian were not contradictory or irreconcilable. During the late Ottoman period, the view from Terzian’s Adana must have been optimistic. The local Armenian community was thriving economically, politically, and culturally, and the revolution promised unprecedented political parity for non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. For middle class Armenian professionals like Terzian, the sudden rupture must have been shocking and tragic. If Koudoulian’s narrative of the massacres in Bahçe expressed less surprise than that of his counterpart in Adana, it might have been in part based on the very different sociopolitical situation in Bahçe and the hinterland of the Cilicia region. Koudoulian himself even employed a geographically-deterministic description of the Armenians of Cilicia that hinted at the reason why Armenians of Çukurova could not defend themselves. Cilicia had a mixed climate, part mountain and part plains. As a result of their environs, the people of the mountains were tough, resourceful, energetic, freedom-loving, bold, noble and proud. Their neighbors on the plain meanwhile became calm, soft, frail and submissive. They were timid and had lost their love of freedom. In fact, he likened them to the uncivilized “little tribes” that surrounded them: “Assyrians, Fellahs (Nusayris), Kurds, Circassians, Turks, Arabs, Chaldeans, and so forth.”\textsuperscript{35}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{33} Koudoulian, \textit{Hay lerê}, 37.  \\
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 38.  \\
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 28-29.
\end{flushright}
While Koudoulian’s contrast between the people of the mountains and the plains was not likely a novel one, and indeed Ahmed Cevdet Pasha had held an identical view regarding the impacts of geography on Koudoulian’s own Gavurdağ during the activities of the Reform Division (see Chapter 3), his dichotomy spoke to a tension at the heart of Ottoman Armenian political life. Professionals like Terzian in Adana saw their community as flourishing, integrated, and enlightened. Koudoulian viewed the peaceful qualities of Çukurova Armenians as liabilities; for him, what they needed was more of the rebelliousness and self-reliance of Armenian mountain villagers, such as the village of Zeytun, which was often admired for its resistance to the Ottoman state. Koudoulian’s account of the massacres in Bahçe, published in 1912, reads as a cautionary tale that Armenians should recognize the danger of their situation.

The history of the Adana massacres and their aftermath does not offer easy lessons about the life of Ottoman Armenians, but Armenian reactions to the violence serve as a starting point for understanding how such a massacre might occur and how relations between different communities in Cilicia were differentiated from place to place. I argue that the Adana massacres
comprise two distinct facets, one of which was embedded in the urban politics of Terzian’s Adana and the reaction to the revolution and the other of which was more closely linked to the rural relations represented by Koudoulian’s Bahçe. In the city, what Bedross Der Matossian refers to as a polarized public space allowed political and economic competition to transform into verbal and ultimately physical hostility during a moment of conflict and political maneuvering.\textsuperscript{36} Just as the relatively peaceful coexistence in Adana before the massacres was to the ultimate advantage of important political and economic actors in the region, the change of course in a moment of crisis represented a strategic choice by a relatively limited group of individuals to move against Armenians of a similar class that had long been competitors and suddenly appeared as enemies (more on this below).

However, the foundation of the massacres was a broad arena of contention in the agrarian setting. The massacres, which involved every segment of rural society — including immigrants, pastoralists, and migrant laborers — represented a moment in which many Muslims in the countryside felt that they could not live with Armenians. This deterioration of what Nicholas Doumanis refers to as intercommunality was the potentiality for violence ignited by the political crisis of the revolution and counter-revolution.\textsuperscript{37} Although, this deterioration can be understood through the divisive language of nationalist politics that pitted Armenians against Turks and Muslims against Christians, the dynamics that made the language of nationalism meaningful for people in the Ottoman countryside must have been rooted in something more tangible than ideology. The Ottoman frontier was not a colonial frontier that enforced categories of difference

\textsuperscript{36} Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 444-47.

\textsuperscript{37} Nicholas Doumanis, Before the Nation : Muslim-Christian coexistence and its destruction in late Ottoman Anatolia (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
between settler and indigenous communities in legal or materials ways; yet, the nature of settlement gave rise to more complicated forms of intercommunal conflict.

**Beneath the Balance: Demographic Flux in Late Ottoman Cilicia**

The word “Gavur” had almost no presence in Adana… Often times it would be impossible to tell Armenian and Turkish youth apart when seeing them going around together. They were not differentiated by face, nor garb, nor manner; they were distinguished by name alone (anunov miayn gehaydnvein).  

Hagop Terzian, *Adanayi Geanke* (1909)

[In Adana,] Turks used to call older Armenian males “*dayı.*” And they would call the ones who called them *dayı* “*yeğenim.*” Turks would also call older Armenian women “*cici or cice*” … In the summer months, Turks would give their house keys to a poor Armenian family when leaving for the summer home in the foot of the Taurus Mountains. That family would both spend the summer here and watch over the house. They would also receive an amount of money in exchange. The homeowner returning from the summer home would find all of his belongings in perfect condition in their proper places.


Within local memory of conflicts between Muslims and Christians, a common trope is the juxtaposition of a harmonious coexistence destroyed by some sort of political rupture, often initiated by one side (the other side in fact) of the conflict. It is telling that the two above quotations regarding communal harmony by natives of late Ottoman Adana — one by Armenian pharmacist and intellectual Hagop Terzian and one by Turkish politician of the Adana region Damar Arıkoğlu — arose not from romanticized accounts of religious harmony but as preface to narratives of betrayal and bloodshed perpetrated by respective Turkish and Armenian neighbors.

These memories point to communal violence being understood as a phenomenon within which neighbors ceased to be neighbors and discrete communities simply lost the ability to live together.

---

38 “Gavur” is a semi-derogatory term referring to non-Muslims. Terzian, *Atanayi keankʻě*, 32.
39 *Dayı* means “maternal uncle” and is used to affectionately address older males. *Yeğenim* means “my nephew.” *Cici* means “sweetie” or in this context “granny” or “mama” and is used to affectionately refer to an older woman as one’s adoptive mother. Arıkoğlu, *Hâtıralarım*, 42.
In his study of memory among the communities of former Anatolian Greeks, Nicholas Doumanis describes the mundane everyday acts of living together or coexistence as “intercommunality in practice.” These ordinary interactions extended beyond economic interdependence to encompass forms of friendship and sympathy such as mutual home visits or acknowledgements of the communal other’s feast days. Doumanis sheds light onto how the relatively harmonious coexistence of divergent religious identities was not rooted in morals or ideology so much as in the concrete realm of daily interaction. Particularly before the ascendance of national conceptions of identity that became widespread only at the very end of the Ottoman period, proximity and putative relation were understood more through close contact rather than imaginings of shared geography or national belonging.

Such intercommunality was built upon a history of mutual acknowledgement, and thus, any significant demographic flux could be disruptive to intercommunality in the sense that the arrival of newcomers would require the construction of new bonds through quotidian interaction. As a region that witnessed both diachronic and cyclical demographic upheaval during the last decades of the Ottoman period, Cilicia was naturally vulnerable to disruptions of intercommunality. The continual arrival of Muslims immigrants from different regions adjacent to the Ottoman Empire, the economic migration of Armenians and other groups from other parts of Anatolia, and the economic transformation of the countryside that thrived on seasonal labor led to a significant degree of demographic flux. Added to this flux were the natural population movements associated with the old practice of urban, rural, and pastoral transhumance.

---

Doumanis, Before the Nation: Muslim-Christian coexistence and its destruction in late Ottoman Anatolia, 43.
Figure 27 Estimates of annual population movements in city of Adana

The above chart offers alternative way of looking at population in Adana, not diachronic, and yet indicating very dramatic demographic shifts. It approximates the annual fluctuations in the population of the city of Adana based on the lived geography throughout the seasons. It is merely an estimate, as annual movements, particularly labor flows, varied depending on the strength of a particular harvest or according to the general expansion of cultivation that occurred almost continuously. The majority of the “permanent” inhabitants of Adana (in gray) would leave the city during the summer, and large segments of population in the cold mountains (in blue), particularly Armenians of Hadjin, would spend their winters in the city (see Chapters 1 and 6). Meanwhile, a floating population of workers (in orange) coming and going from Adana to their homes in other districts and provinces, which would peak in spring and early fall contributed to a population of “non-residents” that at times was as large as the urban population.
itself (see Chapter 5). While the static population of the city of Adana at turn of the century was around 50,000 and perhaps as much as 80,000 by the end of the Ottoman period, the number of individuals passing through its space and operating in it throughout the year was thus more than twice those figures.

Urban spaces such as Adana and Mersin created a place for members of the various communities of the Adana region to interact, and to a significant extent, a middle class urban culture formed around the professionals, merchants, artisans, and cultivators who made their fortune from the plain but resided primarily in these urban spaces. These different communities were represented within the provincial council (meclis) and participated in the various daily and sustained interactions that would reflect a high density of connections between distinct communities living together. However, this practice of living together did not evenly include all of the itinerant populations who came to the region during the peak seasons. Many of the workers and winter inhabitants of Adana hailed from different regions with different social dynamics, and as visitors would have been more likely to identify with coreligionists in the city than the population as a whole. After all, the early state hospitals in Adana and Tarsus did not target a particular religious community; they were used to monitor and treat itinerant workers or gureba, a term that refers their being strangers, poor, and distinctly other.42

While the populations of cities like Adana were cyclically shifting, annual population movements in the countryside were equally pronounced. Pastoralists continued to practice seasonal migration after the settlement campaigns of the 1860s (see Chapter 3), and many brought their animals along despite official prohibitions (see Chapters 4 and 6). Villagers in Çukurova also practiced these migrations to avoid the heat and sickness of the plains during the

42 The Governor Abidin Pasha oversaw the construction of a new gureba hospital for men and women in Adana upon the request of local inhabitants. See BOA, ŞD 2120/46 (20 Teşrinisani 1296 [2 December 1880]). See Chapter 6 for more.
summer, and even immigrants that were relative newcomers to the geography of Adana adopted these practices to an extent. In some cases, settlements were formed with the intention of giving immigrants access to yaylas in the mountains in accordance with local practices. Meanwhile, immigrant populations settled at high elevations would often come down to Çukurova during the winter. Namely, Circassians in the Taurus Mountains wintered their horses in Çukruova although the government sometimes sought to prohibit these movements; in 1881, Lieutenant Bennet indicated that 7000 Circassian horses spent the winter on the plain.43

The seasonal movements of people to and from the cities, up and down the mountains, and in and out of the province had no inherent impact on the social relations of communities in the Cilicia region per se. However, these movements did have a few clear implications. First, people in the Adana region were hard for the authorities to track. Second, at any given time, cities like Adana as well as the countryside were full of people who belonged to somewhere else. Lastly, these movements assured that the Adana province was more integrated into the socioeconomic networks of neighboring provinces, especially the provinces of Northern Syria and Eastern Anatolia, which supplied large numbers of migrants, as well as regions to the north such as Ankara and Kayseri from whence merchants and pastoralists would continually arrive. This integration made Adana economically dynamic, but it also meant that the issues rooted in the other provinces could flare up in Cilicia.

In addition to the seasonal movements of local inhabitants and workers in Cilicia, the continual influx of migrants to the Adana province fueled a rapid demographic transformation, although the ratio of Christian to Muslim inhabitants in Adana did not change substantially. The

43 TNA, FO 222/8/2, 1881 “Report on the Vilayet of Adana”, pg. 61 (6 February 1882). Today, there are special breeds of horses by the name of “Çukurova” and “Uzunyayla” that were developed by these communities. The Çukurova is a cross between the Uzunyayla breed and Turkish Arabian horses. Bonnie L. Hendricks, International Encyclopedia of Horse Breeds (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 145, 430.
general population increase within the Cilicia region (see Chapter 5) was not merely a consequence of natural growth but rather the economic opportunities that attracted workers and merchants along with the continual arrival of immigrants who were settled into the countryside. As the economy drew migration from nearby provinces of the empire as well as foreign locals from Greece to Afghanistan, waves of Muslim migrants from the Caucasus, Balkans, and Mediterranean were periodically settled in Çukurova. The settlement of tens of thousands of Crimean and Caucasian immigrants after the Crimean War during the late 1850s and early 1860s as well as another wave of migration follow the Russo-Ottoman War in 1878 were only the beginning (See Chapters 1 and 4). Ottoman officials continued to see Adana as one of the most promising regions for migrant settlement in the decades that followed. This was due to the region’s relatively low population density and the renowned fertility of its soils. Periodic immigrant influxes to the Cilicia region would continue until the end of the Ottoman period. For example, more than 20,000 Muslim refugees from Crete were settled in the Adana region during the decade following the establishment of the Cretan state in 1898.

While such migrants were Muslims, they did not necessarily speak the local languages of the Cilicia region, which were primarily Turkish and Arabic. For the purposes of

---

44 Yusuf Ziya, a minor official in Adana who touted its virtues in some short published reflections on the city and its countryside, estimated in 1898 that the province could hold five to ten times its roughly half-million population at the time. Ziya, *Tabi̇sra yahut Adana Temaşası*, 12-13. The Adana finance inspector indicated in 1903 that the province could accommodate some 200,000 to 300,000 more muhacirs. BOA, A-MKT-MHM 523/51 (16 October 1903). In summer 1914, the Governor of Adana İsmail Hakkı issued a more detailed report on the matter after surveying the region, and despite his remarks about the region’s insalubrious climate, remarked upon locations where thousands more households could be settled, including over 10,000 at Çukurova Çiftliği around the Ceyhan River. BOA, DH-ID 80/26 (9 Haziran 1330 [22 June 1914]).

45 BOA, A-MKT-MHM 523/51, No. 1, Necib Mehmed to Sadaret (9 Şaban 1321 / 16 Teşrinievvel 1319 [29 October 1903]).

46 Both Muslims and Christians who were native to the Cilicia region spoke primarily, Muslims from Crete, for example, mainly spoke Greek, and Circassians spoke many linguistic varieties native to the North Caucasus. The predominant language in the Adana region throughout the Ottoman period appears to have been Turkish. This is the language of the earliest extant court records. In predominantly Arabic-speaking regions, court records are normally in Arabic. However the Nusayri, Syrian and Egyptian workers of the plain as well as many inhabitants of Adana and Tarsus would have spoken Arabic. Most Armenians and Orthodox (Rum) Christians in the Cilicia region spoke
intercommunality, new linguistic barriers may have reinforced divides between different groups, especially in the countryside. And though urban spaces provided the proximity necessary for different communities to “get to know each other,” the wide expanses of Çukurova meant that new villages were often isolated from neighboring communities.

The district of Ayas provides an example of the staggeringly disparate origins of villagers in that relatively sparsely populated corner of Çukurova. The following data is from 1921 but is more or less accurate for 1909 as well. Of 42 villages, over a quarter were inhabited mainly by the Bozdoğan Turkmens settled from the 1860s onward (see Chapter 3), and about another quarter were made up of Muslims from the Balkans (who arrived following the Balkan wars of 1912-3, i.e. after 1909). Alongside these two groups were a few Nusayri (Alawite) Arab villages, a Tatar village, a “Sudanese” village, a village of Cretan Muslims, a Kızılbash (Alevi) village, and the lone Armenian village of Nacarlı. Villages counted as “Turkish” or partly Turkish comprised just under 20%. Other elements of the population such as Nogays, Circassians, and Kurds were also present but too small in that district to comprise a majority of any village. This example is merely evidence that the communities in question had not long cohabitated the same region, since most of the villages were founded by communities that had only settled in Çukurova within half a century and in many cases, only a generation prior.

---

47 This data comes from a French survey of the Ayas district of the Ceyhan delta in 1921. Of course, many parts of the Çukurova plain experienced an unfathomable amount of demographic change during the years of the First World War. I have chosen this particular district because it had relatively few Armenians before the war, and Nacarlı was one of the only predominantly Armenian villages in the area (see Chapter 2). Thus, the deportation of Armenians and the process of repatriation likely had a comparatively small impact on the demographic makeup of this particular district.

48 CADN, 1SL/1/V, 287, Vol. 1. The reason why the French preferred to count the population in this manner was in part that Cilicia’s heterogeneity was a factor of instability that French administrators used to justify the establishment of colonial rule (see Chapter 10).
The situation described above made Cilicia one of the most ethno-linguistically diverse places in the Ottoman Empire. While less visible than the cosmopolitan shimmer of Istanbul, Selanik, Izmir, and Beirut, the rise of Mersin and Adana created a blend of individuals from different social classes representing almost every community in the Ottoman Empire and many from abroad. And from the beginning of the cotton boom in the 1860s until 1909, there were no signs of major discord between these different communities in the cities. For these reasons alone, we must not simplistically assume that demographic flux was on the whole a major source of instability or that “strangers” were solely to blame for the violence of 1909. Rather, it is necessary to more closely examine the nature of quotidian interaction between neighboring communities; Terzian and Arikoğlu may not have been wrong about the harmonious relations of their respective groups in Adana, but the archival record suggests that such a narrative might not apply to life in the Cilician countryside.

**1862: Post-Crimean War Encounters in Cilicia**

The brigandage of Muslim *muhacirs* from the Caucasus and elsewhere is a common trope within the historiography of late Ottoman Anatolia, and Circassian and Chechen communities did produce their fair share of bandits. An infamous example is that of Tek Taşak or “One-Nut” who took to the Taurus Mountains and made a (peculiar) name for himself as a ruthless outlaw during the 1870s. However, there are a few issues with the image of the Circassian bandit. First, Muslim immigrants, much like nomads and a wide variety of marginalized groups, rarely found a voice within the historical record, and as outsiders, they were easy scapegoats for

---

49 This only applies to the Adana-Tarsus-Mersin region and the plain. There were major massacres in Marash and Zeytun during the 1890s. More below.
50 TNA, FO 424/106 (27 October 1879), pg. 2.
violence in Anatolia. More importantly, fixating on migrant banditry obscures the fact that many immigrants came from communities that were expelled from their homes and faced an arduous journey the Ottoman Empire that claimed many lives only to settle in dissatisfying locations. Added to these points is the fact that immigrants settled in Ottoman Anatolia — or at least those settled in Çukurova — very frequently faced hostility from the local populations in the places they settled. Settlers did not bring violence; rather, violence was part and parcel of settlement.

The available evidence about early conflicts between settlers and locals in Cilicia suggests in turn that the violence suffered by migrants on the part of their new neighbors was essentially a matter of territorial dispute. The attacks that the Afşars made against the Circassians settled at Uzunyayla in 1862 were a natural consequence of strange migrants being settled onto the precious summer pastures of transhumant pastoralists (see Chapter 1). While the settlement at Uzunyayla created a major incident, the accompanying settlements in the Çukurova plain during that period did not face the same problem, even though the Afşars and many other communities wintered there as well. We may infer that this difference boiled down to a scarcity of grass at high elevations.

Around that same time, Circassian immigrants settled closer to Zeytun faced a similar conflict with their new neighbors. The mid-1860s were a politically charged time around Zeytun and Marash (see Chapter 2) and men from Zeytun attacked the Circassian newcomers as a result of a perceived encroachment on their territory. Small disputes escalated into large-scale fighting between the two communities, and after the Armenians killed what was reported as more than

---

51 It is telling that Lt. Bennet noted in 1880 that “as a rule the Circassians are credited with all lawless acts.” TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 1, Bennet to Goschen, Kaiserieh (16 June 1880).
52 One English traveler reported that when he met some Tatars in Çukurova during the late 1870s, “they spoke most bitterly of being forced to live out on the great plains, with no towns near enough to trade with, and always suffering from fever.” Barkley, A Ride through Asia Minor and Armenia, 195.
500 Circassians and the latter were unable to successfully retaliate, leaders representing the two parties apparently worked out a truce. It stands to reason that the number of Circassians killed was embellished for dramatic effect. The testimony comes not from the Ottoman archives but rather the account of Aghassi, a Zeytun native who composed an account of the village’s heroic story, which was published in French and included in the village history of Zeytun published in 1960. Aghassi’s account portrayed this incident as an ultimate success, as the Zeytuntsis were able to defend their ground on one hand and the two communities were ultimately able to agree to not attack and rob each other, conduct commerce freely and move between their adjacent settlements, and punish their own for any transgressions that might occur.

The outcomes of these two early conflicts in the history of settlement in Cilicia speak to the process by which intercommunality was established during this formative time in the history of Ottoman Anatolia. In the case of the Afsars and Circassians, the feud between the two groups was ultimately resolved through the Ottoman use of military force first to prevent the Afsars from further attacking the Circassian settlers and second to forcibly settle the tribal communities throughout the Cilicia region (see Chapter 3). The two populations were compelled to live in proximity but not encroach on each other’s territory. In the second case of the Zeytuntsis and the Circassians, the Ottoman government exerted little or no influence over the Armenian villagers in the Taurus Mountains and the two communities essentially came to an agreement after a period of hostility. In other words, these disputes were never adjudicated by a government mediator. In one case, the approach of Ottoman officials was to separate two parties fighting over the same space, and in the other, the conflict reached a semi-permanent agreement to live together in peace.

---

53 Miowtiwn, Zêytowni patmagirk [The History of Zeytun], 344-45.
Acemli was a small Armenian town below the hills between Kars and Marash. While the Ottoman government had broken the power of the derebeys in the Çukurova plain (see Chapter 3), there were pockets of local autonomy within which derebeys continued to exercise their power throughout the 1870s (see Chapter 4). One such figure named Kel Kişoğlu harassed the local Armenians in Acemli, leading them to abandon their village for settlement in the hills. During the 1870s, they preferred to stay out of the plain, descending only to harvest their crops but otherwise leaving their village vacant.

In 1878, immigrants from the Balkans were settled in the supposedly abandoned village of Acemli during the aftermath of the Russo-Ottoman War (93 Harbi). In the meantime, however, Kel Kişoğlu had been killed in 1877, thus making it safe for the Armenian inhabitants of Acemli to return. However, when they found their village occupied by new migrants, they complained to the local kaymakam, who offered Acemli’s Armenians monetary compensation in order to relocate. Nevertheless, the people of Acemli eventually sued to return to their village. Lt. Bennet (see Chapter 4), a British official in the region, intervened on their behalf, using his standing as representative of the British government — highly influential in the Ottoman Empire at the time — to press the local administration to return the village to its rightful owners.

The immigrants who had settled in Acemli resisted on the basis that in two years of settlement, over forty of them had already died, and they would be bitter to leave a place where they had buried so many. It was a morbid claim to usufruct rights, but a fair one given that an additional transfer might well bring further hardship. Yet ultimately, the original Armenian occupants won out and the Balkan immigrants were forced to relocate. During their exit, the frustrated migrants made a point of destroying the church and many of the houses in the village,
so that the original Armenian villagers returned to ruins. Neither the inhabitants of Acemli nor the immigrants were to blame for the predicament, and Bennet’s narrative does not indicate that the officials involved had meant any harm; rather, the conflict was the result of a bureaucratic misunderstanding due to confusion or carelessness.

Such instances were a natural outcome of the settlement process. During the Tanzimat period (1839-1878), settlement policy was carried out with some genuine concern for communal harmony and with attention to the issue of demographics. Nevertheless, communal conflicts were the product of inevitable ambiguities regarding land ownership in a region where so much movement occurred. In the case of Acemli, both the local Armenians and the Circassian migrants left with bitter memories of their counterparts, even though their predicament was the outcome of forces well beyond their control.

1890: the Hamidian Turn and the Place of Tribes

_Ermen’den aldı yoksula verdi_56 He took from the Armenian and gave to the poor 
from “The Lament of Çöllő,” Afşar folk song

By the 1890s, most of the land available for settlement in the Adana province was in the eastern portion on all sides of the Ceyhan River. The amount of settlement, redistribution of land,

---

54 TNA, FO 222/7/1, 1880 No. 2, Bennet to Goschen, Kaiserieh (3 August 1880); 1881 No. 10, Bennet to Goschen, Marash (11 May 1881).
55 For example, the Reform Division sought to settle multiple tribes in the same districts of Eastern Çukurova and later joined those districts to the adjacent district then called Muhacirin. When they sought to repopulate the region the port of Payas in 1870, the provincial government brought an equal number of Muslim and Christian settlers and used a similar approach to populate the town of Kars-ı Zulkadriye as well as ports such as Yumurtalık during the period. BOA, ŞD 2114/18, No. 4 (18 Şaban 1286 [10 November 1869]). This attempt to be mindful of demographic balances and create a settler population that represented a blend of the region’s different communities was pursued as a means of making the countryside of Cilicia more governable through the implantation of a full-fledged citizenry. However, such settlements were relatively few in number. Toksöz, _Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton_, 72. Toksöz notes that while economic factors were already drawing Armenians and Rum Orthodox from inner Anatolia at places such as Kayseri, Niğde and elsewhere to settle the coastal towns of Çukurova, this policy encouraged this process.
56 Özdemir, _Öykülerle Ağıtlar_, 197.
and resultant disputes that occurred there from the 1890s onward was significant. During the 1890s, a wave of paranoia regarding non-Muslims and Armenians in particular swept through the ranks of the Ottoman government. The archival record indicates that some officials saw large concentrations of Armenians as pockets of resistance waiting to erupt. This influenced the way provinces of Eastern Anatolia were governed in the immediate short-term (more below), and in the long-term, it created a policy of internal colonization through the explicit settlement of immigrants in close vicinity to large non-Muslim communities. This settlementality is expressed in an 1892 order from the Ministry of Interior. It indicated that because of Adana’s large indigenous non-Muslim population, Muslims that had been immigrating to Anatolia from the troubled Balkans region should be settled on vacant lands near Christian villages in order to “increase the Muslim element there (unsur-u islamn oralarda teksiri).” The Hamidian regime saw Christians as a fifth column in Anatolia, and migrants became participants in a project of demographic warfare. This policy seemed to be explicitly aimed at pitting Muslims and Christians against each other.

A few years later in 1895, there was tremendous violence on the peripheries of the Cilicia region. The town of Marash witnessed a pogrom the resembled massacres that occurred elsewhere in Eastern Anatolia during the period. This pogrom coincided with successful uprisings of Armenian communities in the mountains at Zeytun and the closely linked village of Çokmerzimen (Dört yol) by the coast. There were also tense moments around Hadjin but the

57 For overview of migration to Adana during this period, see Hilmi Bayraktar, "Kırım ve Kafkasya'dan Adana Vilayeti'ne Yapılan Göç ve İskânlar (1869-1907),” Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, no. 22 (2007).
58 BOA, DH-MKT 2006/33 (6 Rabıulevvel 1310 [28 September 1892]).
59 As one example, immigrants were settled near the village of Nacarlı, the lone center of Armenian population in its coastal district. BOA, ŞD 2130/14, no. 2 (4 Safer 1319 / 9 Mayis 1317 [22 May 1901]).
60 With fear and news of massacre spreading throughout the Armenian community, the people of Zeytun who were supported by the Hunchaks took up arms and rebelled against the Ottoman government in October 1895. Much like Sasun, it was not the first time Zeytun had led such a resistance (see Chapters 2 and 4). The rebels at Zeytun were able to hold out for four months until the conflict was resolved through European mediation in January 1896. During
violence did not escalate. The fact that communal relations became so contentious in the Taurus Mountains and near Marash, places where many pastoralists had been forcibly settled, suggested that as Astourian notes, unhappy settlement made tribal communities possible hotbeds of animosity.

While Cilicia witnessed the aforementioned events around Marash, the Çukurova plain itself was shielded from such violence, although there was potential. In October 1896, the Ministry of Interior received a telegram from the mutasarrıf of Cebel-i Bereket warning that a man from Adana named Emin Bey was visiting the heads of tribes in the İslahiye region to foment an attack on local Christians. İslahiye remained one of the parts of the Cilician countryside where the political mission of undermining the strength of the local tribal notables during the Reform Division never quite succeeded. The Kurdish tribes in the area had been coopted but not really forced to settle, and by the 1890s, it was clear that these groups had more power in the area than the Ottoman state (see Chapter 5). Such communities appeared to the aforementioned Emin Bey as a possible reservoir of anti-Armenian sentiment or potentially willing participants in violence against Armenians for other reasons.

The fact that these threats did not materialize also reflected the key role of the provincial government in preventing the escalation of communal tensions. Even if pastoralists were not

---

61 The British consul said that among bad officials in the Adana region, the kaymakam of Hadjin, who was a Circassian, was good and well liked. TNA, FO 195/1930, pg. 63, Massy to Currie (17 July 1896).
62 In the mid-1890s, there are many general reports of brigandage in Cilicia, some violence aimed at Armenians and other not. TNA, FO 195/1930, 93, Massy to Currie, Hadjin (3 September 1896). See BOA, A-MKT-MHM 613/25; DH-MKT 411/76.
63 There was a relatively minor alteration in Adana during which a few Armenians were hurt or killed in February 1896. TNA, FO 195/1930, 27, Christie (ABCFM) to Christmann, Mersin (25 February 1896).
64 BOA, DH-ŞFR 200/37, Hayri to Dahiliye, Yarpuz (19 Teşrinievel 1312 [31 October 1896]).
happy with the terms of settlement, sedentism in Çukurova did render them more governable. However, even though it was aimed and rendering them sedentary and agriculturalist, the policy of forced settlement also in some ways made these communities more distant from neighboring Armenian village. As Owen Miller notes, settlement removed certain important elements of symbiosis between transhumant communities and the settled village populations of the Cilicia region.\textsuperscript{65} In Wolfram Eberhard’s study of the impact of sedentarization in Cilicia, he stated that in the pre-Tanzimat social order of Cilicia, pastoralists and villagers achieved a high degree of harmony through their mutually-reinforcing economic activities. The animals of pastoralists fed on leftover materials after the harvest and offered free fertilizer in exchange. Pastoralists that did not farm were also reliant on villagers for purchasing grain and other agricultural products as well as material goods.\textsuperscript{66} The movement of pastoralists helped conduct trade between regions with relatively difficult conditions of transport, and pastoralists always had extra meat and milk to sell at periods of high demand such as religious feasts.

With their settlement, pastoralists had a reduced capacity to share in this equation. The resultant commercialization made their contributions less relevant to the economy. In the areas with most significant concentrations of wealth in the region, the railroad was a conveyor of goods, and everything a townsman with a modest income could desire entered the port at Mersin. But commercialization of agriculture also meant reduced pasture space, and perhaps even more symbolically, less room for pastoralists to share space with neighboring communities. The more intensively that land was used for agriculture, the less that was left over for sheep and goats to extensively graze. Therefore, settlement and the broader expansion of commercial agriculture did

\textsuperscript{65} Miller, "Conjuncture, Contingency, and Interpreting Violence in late Ottoman Cilicia".
create a greater disconnect between pastoralists and Christian villagers in the mountains and fostered competition over land with their neighbors in the plain.

In other parts of the empire, the role of tribal communities in the massacre of Christians was widely noted. In the wake of years of massacre in Anatolia, the Ministry of Interior formed a commission in July 1896 to determine the locations and populations of yet unsettled tribes throughout the provinces of Syria, Baghdad, Mosul, Aleppo, Beirut, Diyarbakır, Mamuretulaziz, Sivas, Erzurum, Van, Bitlis, Jerusalem, Zor, and Adana. Whether or not sedentism fueled or stemmed massacres is not clear. Astourian’s hypothesis of resentment as a result of differentiated outcomes of settlement in Çukurova holds, but structurally speaking, the fact that the provincial government wielded more power over local tribes does seem to have been a stabilizing factor during the 1890s. Nevertheless, it is important to note that restricting the movement and activities of pastoralists, while potentially keeping them in check, was not a form of adjudication in the event of disputes.

1908: On the Eve of the Revolution

The different types of agrarian contention described above occurred in Cilicia throughout the late Ottoman period. In the year leading up to the July 1908 revolution, there were a number of land disputes in the Çukurova region involving local populations and new settlers. The most visible such conflict occurred near Sis in the Upper Çukurova plain. Although by the 20th century, there were much greater concentrations of Armenians in Adana and elsewhere, the small town of Sis remained the center of the communal universe for Cilician Armenians. It was home to the Holy See or “Catholicosate” of Cilicia, which had been located in Sis continuously since the late thirteenth century and had survived the defeat of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia by the Mamluks in 1375. The Catholicos of Sis, who from 1902 through to the 1930s was Sahak II

67 BOA, DH-MKT 2076/74 (18 Safer 1314 [17 July 1896]).
Khabayan, was the most important Armenian political figure in the region. Sis was located at the edge of the Çukurova plain, serving as an intermediate point between the Armenian villages of the Taurus Mountains and the urban Armenian communities of Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin.\(^6\)

The town was perched attractively on the side of a sharp hill that contained a medieval fortress. Below the small town stretched expanses of wetlands that were common to the Çukurova region. In addition to the typical cereals of the Cilicia region, some of this waterlogged plain was used for the cultivation of rice. But much of the surrounding area was not under continuous cultivation. During the first decade of the twentieth century, some Circassian immigrants were given some of this swamp land for settlement in this area located very close to the town of Sis in a location called the Tilan Farm. The farm encompassed a fairly large region that occupied some 10,000 dönüms of agricultural land owned and used by the monastery of Sis. Half of the land was not under cultivation at the time. Figure 28, which appeared in an Armenian village history of Sis, exhibits the proximity of these encampments to the town. The tents of muhacirs can be seen in the distance beside the stream just outside of Sis, the picture having been taken from a hill on the edge of the town by the ruins of an old church.

As the dispute that followed laid bare, this new settlement was an attempt to curtail the demographic ascendance of Armenians in the Kozan district, and it was interpreted by the Armenians of Sis as a form of encroachment. The settlers became the natural claimants to ownership of this property by virtue of their inhabitance and cultivation, but the Monastery of Sis sought to defend its ownership.\(^6\) This dispute escalated into a violent confrontation that resulted

\(^6\) Keleshean, Sis-Madecan.

\(^6\) In fact, the properties belonged to the endowments of the Ramazanoğlus, the Adana dynasty that governed Adana before Cilicia’s incorporation into the Ottoman Empire and for many decades after, but it had long been in use by the monastery. BOA, A-MKT-MHM 529/13, No. 12 (7 Rebiulahir 1325 [7 May 1907]).
in the killing of a few of the immigrants.\textsuperscript{70} The monastery asserted its rightful ownership over the land and demanded that the immigrants be removed. Yet Ottoman officials were worried about the prospect of that land being settled by new Armenians, thereby increasing the ratio of Christians in the area. The decision regarding the land dispute at the Tilan Farm indicated that as long as Armenians were not brought from another province to settle there, the land could remain under the ownership of the Sis monastery and the immigrants would settle elsewhere.\textsuperscript{71}

However, the question of the Tilan Farms was reopened in 1909 when Bishop Mushegh, the prelate of the Armenian community in Adana, sought to open an agricultural school on the land. Just two weeks before the Adana massacres began, the provincial government in Adana was informed that rather than allowing “Armenians brought from outside to settle” there, the members of Muslim tribes in the regions should be given the land.\textsuperscript{72} Bishop Mushegh, who had gone to Cairo to raise money for the school was very disheartened by this development, which was a discouraging sign regarding the relationship between local officials and Armenians on the eve of the massacres, being that his relationship with the prior governor Bahri Pasha (more below) before the revolution had been excellent.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{70} Bishop Mushegh wrote about this in his account of the massacres. Der Matossian, “Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 449-50.

\textsuperscript{71} BOA, A-MKT-MHM 529/13, No. 12 (7 Rebiulahir 1325 [7 May 1907]).

\textsuperscript{72} BOA, BEO 3521/264057 (13 Mart 1325 [26 March 1909]).

\textsuperscript{73} Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 463.
The fight over the Tilan Farm was in essence a conflict over access to land between local Armenians and new Muslim settlers. The monastery had always claimed right to the property, even if not all of it was cultivated, and the placement of the settlers was seen as an infringement upon those rights. Meanwhile, the Ottoman settlement officials argued that the land belonged to no one by virtue of the fact it was uncultivated in a manner consistent with the overall land policy in the empire at the time. The factor that pushed the conflict towards violence was in part the political facets of the settlement, which were threatening to the local Armenian community of Sis. This small example indicates that even after 1908, the Refugee Commission continued to maintain a policy of settling Muslims and containing large conglomerations of Armenians.

The Tilan Farm affair was the most visible land dispute between local Armenians and new settlers in Cilicia leading up to the Adana massacres. However, there were many new settlers in Cilicia on the eve of the massacres, and many other instances of land disputes. One

---

74 Keleshean, Sis-Madean, 264.
involved a small village called Kesikkeli in the district of Kars (Kadirli) in Upper Çukurova. Kesikkeli is on the northern flank of the Ceyhan River in the middle of the plain. Based in its location, the settlement was likely created by Tatars, Circassians, or Chechens that migrated to the Ottoman Empire from the 1860s onward. Most of those immigrants probably died, but the ones who did not would have by 1908 built a small village for themselves in a region where agriculture was beginning to thrive. In summer 1908, the people of Kesikkeli had a dispute with some new migrants who had recently arrived from the Balkans. This small group of few dozen migrants had been settled in the area by the local government, but the inhabitants of Kesikkeli complained that the newcomers were encroaching upon their territory.

The conflict rose to the threat of armed hostilities should the immigrants not be found a different home. The local administration investigated the situation, and their findings showed that Çukurova was more crowded than it seemed. The problem was that it was difficult to find a settlement area for the new migrants with a suitable geography that did not have the “heavy air” for which Adana was so famous, which would cause the settlers to become ill or simply leave. Generations of migrants had likely suffered from malaria and high mortality as they made Kesikkeli into a sustainable settlement, but having done so, they were not eager to share the area with new neighbors. Finding a place that would be livable and available for migrants in Çukurova was difficult even though population was sparse. With large numbers of migrants arriving on a continual basis, such disputes must have been a facet of everyday life.

75 In this case, the inhabitants of the original village of Kesikkeli appear to have been Muslim based on names. BOA, BEO 3318/248781, no. 4-7 (17 Haziran 1324 [30 June 1908]).
76 There were a few similar cases in Eastern Çukurova in 1908. 100 people from that region were settled in the district of Sırkıntı near Kozan that September. BOA, DH-MKT 2640/26, no. 7 (23 Eylül 1324 [6 October 1908]). Further east, there was another dispute between immigrants and locals in İslahiye. BOA, DH-MKT 2672/71 (17 Teşrinisani 1324 [30 November 1908]).
Land disputes were not only occurring in the plain. A Circassian immigrant named Bilal wrote to the Şura-yi Devlet to report a longstanding feud between members of a tribe that was settled in Çukurova and the Circassians settled in a mountain village called Burhaniye of the İnderesi region near Feke that had been founded some sixteen years before. İnderesi was a wonderful place for Circassians to settle, and the migrants were no doubt pleased with life in Burhaniye. İnderesi was classified as a yayla region, and it must have reminded the migrants of their homes in the North Caucasus. The problem was that as such, İnderesi was also frequented by transhumant pastoralist communities from the plain, who were forced to settle in Çukurova but in accordance with Cevdet’s modified terms of settlement, permitted to migrate. In that document (see Chapter 4 appendix), İnderesi is clearly recognized as the yayla of the Sırkıntı tribe. The Circassians and the tribes likely quarreled every summer over the issue of pasture. Then in 1907, their feud became violent. Bilal notified the Şura-yi Devlet that one of the Circassians had killed and many more injured in a conflict over that yayla. The conflict was the consequence of overlapping land rights.

There are still other types of disputes regarding settlement that were common to frontier life in Çukurova. In spring 1909, local administrators corresponded about a group of migrants who had been stuck in limbo for an extended period. They claimed to be muhacirs from Kağizman near the city of Kars in Eastern Anatolia, a region that was occupied by the Russians. However, they had been left wandering when governors in other parts of Anatolia refused to allow them to settle, claiming that these migrants were gypsies of Iranian nationality. It is not

---

77 Village surveys from the 1960s in Turkey categorized land as either mountain, yayla, plains, or hills (dalgalı). Köy İşleri Bakanlığı, Köy Envanter Etüdlerine göre Adana (Konya: Yıldız Basımevi, 1967), 14.
78 BOA, ŞD 2137/27, no. 1, Bilal to Şura-yi Devlet, Aziziye (3 Eylül 1323 [16 September 1907]).
79 BOA, DH-MKT 1235/72, no. 4 (27 Mart 1324 [9 April 1908]).
clear if their predicament was the result of a cruel or careless official, a genuine ambiguity regarding their nationality, or a linguistic barrier of some kind.\textsuperscript{80}

As these examples illustrate, numerous forms of contention arose out of gray areas in the settlement policies of the Ottoman government in Çukurova. These disputes were not by any means limited to animosity between Muslims and Christians. Land was often mistakenly granted to settlers when already owned by preexisting communities, or in some cases, legal ownership was not even entirely clear. The number of these conflicts in Cilicia illustrates the level of constant contestation that was taking place in and around new agricultural settlements in the Çukurova plain on the very eve of the revolution and the massacres that would occur just one year later. It is important to note that local populations usually achieved relative harmony with new settlers once land disputes and tensions had been resolved, but the number of such conflicts means that intercommunality in the countryside of Cilicia was in a state of continuous disruption and reestablishment, and the Ottoman government was not always able to adjudicate.

**Life on the Margins**

Krikor Koudoulian’s region of Bahçe was one location where the massacres of 1909 were most violent. Accounts from the period indicate not just skirmishes, torching of homes, and violence directed at men but rather wholesale slaughter in the area.\textsuperscript{81} Bahçe was not in the Çukurova plain and did not contain a large number of settlers, and so its dynamics were not necessary comparable to those in districts such as Kars and Kozan. Yet the severity of the

\textsuperscript{80} It is hard to say with certainty what language such a community would have spoken. According to Tadevos Hakobyan, about 4/5 of Kağızman’s residents were Armenian at the time of the First World War; by then Kağızman had been part of the Russian Empire for a few decades. Hakobyan refers to the other residents of the region as “Turks,” but this probably just meant that they were Muslim. Tadevos Hakobyan, *Patmakan Hayastani kaghaknere* (Yerevan: Hayastan, 1987), 151.

\textsuperscript{81} Koudoulian’s account was not the only report from the Bahçe massacre. A Greek doctor working on the Baghdad Railway relayed an account to Doughty Wylie that told a very similar story. TNA, FO 195/2306, pg. 228 (6 May 1909).
violence could not have been a mere byproduct of the harsh mountain geography that Koudoulian referred to in the introduction to his account (see above).

Bahçe, though relatively isolated, was situated at the intersection of two different realms. The Amanus Mountains separate the Çukurova plain from the plains of Southern Anatolia and Northern Syria and the borderlands region that may be referred to as the Greater Jazirah. During the massacres in Bahçe and the other towns in the Amanus region, witnesses reported that the large, organized bands of men that were attacking the towns and villages came from other provinces, all of them further east. Simonyan mentions 10,000 men from Diyarbakir, Mamuretulaziz, Antep, Marash, and Malatya in his work. Whether the number is accurate is certainly worth questioning, but the fact that the forces involved in the massacres in and around Bahçe that were not native to the region had come from the neighboring provinces to the east and not from the west reveals that in the Amanus region, the violence emanated not from Adana, where the massacres began, but involved outsiders coming from the other direction.

Those regions of Eastern Anatolia had a very different history in the decades leading up to the 1908 revolution. Each of those provinces had seen major violence aimed at Christians during the period of the Hamidian massacres (1894-96). They were places where the Hamidiye cavalry, irregular units drawn from the various tribes of those regions, had a major presence. Indeed, Koudoulian mentions the Hamidiye by name in his account of the 1909 massacres in Bahçe. The Hamidiye cavalry was created for the purpose of securing Ottoman sovereignty around the border with the Russian Empire, but it was also aimed at subjugating the Armenians in those regions. In addition, these units created a means for the Ottoman Empire to project its own power in provinces when its authority had been in question. Eastern Anatolia had not

---

82 Simonyan, Brown, and Arzoumanian, *Destruction of Armenians in Cilicia*.
83 Not to be confused with the town of Ceyhan, symbolically named Hamidiye at the time. Koudoulian, *Hay lerê*, 43.
witnessed forced settlement campaigns on the level of the Reform Division, and the margins of local autonomy were wide.

A letter in Persian from an official near the Ottoman border with Iran from 1882 highlighted some of the difficulties of governing these regions. It stated that depredations of tribes that cross back and forth between the Ottoman and Persian sides of the border annually were taking a heavy toll on the “poor refugees (muhajirin-e bicharegan)” that came to the area presumably as a result of the war with Russia a few years prior. The official reported that neither the Persian government nor he was able to prevent these tribes from moving or attacking the communities settled in the area. In fact, the correspondence of the Ottoman embassy in Tehran reveals that during the last decades of the Ottoman period, the uncontrolled seasonal movement of pastoralists back and forth across the border was an important diplomatic issue between the two states.

The rationale behind the Hamidiye was that the formation of these cavalry would secure the political loyalty of mobile and generally autonomous populations in contested regions of the empire. The Ottoman government found cooperative tribes and armed them so that they could serve as extensions of imperial power into the periphery. Yet their creation led to an almost immediate escalation of violence. Some Hamidiye cavalry units made use of their newfound strength to dispossess local Armenian and Kurdish villagers. Meanwhile, Armenian communities of Anatolia had also begun to arm themselves. During the early 1890s, two Armenian revolutionary committees, the Dashnaks and Hunchaks, founded in Tbilisi and Geneva respectively, began recruiting and operating in Anatolia.

84 BOA, Y-PRK-TKM 4/14 (10 Teşrinisani 1298 [10 November 1882]).
85 See BOA, HR-SFR (20) 7/130 (14 Kanunuevvel 1298). See also Khazeni, Tribes and empire on the margins of nineteenth-century Iran.
After some small clashes in Anatolia during the early 1890s, the first major confrontation of the period occurred with the Sasun resistance in 1894. The dynamics of the Sasun rebellion and its ultimate conclusion laid bare the new tensions emerging in the political landscape of Anatolia. With the Ottoman government unable to assert formal rule in remote mountain regions it resorted to arming groups that could not be trusted to enact its will. When Armenians rebelled, the Ottoman government took it as a pretext to use harsh repressive measures or turn a blind eye to localized violence against Armenians. While conflicts between local Armenian and Kurdish communities were not wholly a nineteenth century phenomenon, the fact that the Sasun rebellion pitted Armenians supported by international organizations against local tribes armed by the Ottoman government, portended a dangerous escalation of these conflicts. Lastly, the people of Sasun had not been attacked by their neighbors but rather armed men who crossed over from another province.

During 1895, a series of violent massacres occurred throughout the Eastern Anatolian provinces. They reached not only into the countryside but into the cities and towns as well. Though they affected urban spaces, these instances of violence were embedded in the dynamics of the countryside that led to the Sasun rebellion and massacres. However, it is difficult to generalize about who supported and fueled the massacres, who stood by, and what forces worked to stem the violence. The Hamidiye cavalry played a major role in the massacres in parts of

86 Sasun, located in the mountains west of Lake Van, was a predominantly Armenian region where dozens of villages had long provided a unified front to Ottoman interference in their affairs. Like many communities throughout the mountains of Anatolia, they were known to live under the Ottomans in a state of semi-autonomy. In 1893, their villages were reportedly attacked by and successfully defended from a group of Kurds from Diyarbakir reportedly seeking to extract tribute. In 1894, the Sasuntsis refused to pay taxes to the Ottoman government until this situation was rectified, but instead, soldiers and irregular cavalry were sent against them. With a militia supported by the Dashnaks, the Sasuntsis resisted but were ultimately defeated, resulting in a massacre of few thousand villagers in the area of Sasun. Jelle Verheij, "Diyarbekir and the Armenian Crisis of 1895," in Social Relations in Ottoman Diyarbekir, 1870-1915, ed. Joost Jongerden and Jelle Verheij (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012), 94.

87 For example, the city of Diyarbekir saw clashes in November 1895 that claimed the lives of between 300 and 1200 Armenians as well as 70 to 200 Muslims. As Jelle Verheij points out, given the size of cities and towns of the period, these were extremely large numbers. Ibid., 86.
Anatolia, yet where main actors can be identified, it appears that figures with no formal position nor involvement with the Hamidiye were the primary movers in some cases.\textsuperscript{88} This was the nature of such pogroms, which started with a specific agitation but quickly swept in other elements. Massacres happened in most of the provinces of Eastern Anatolia: Bitlis, Diyarbakır, Erzurum, Mamuretülaziz, Sivas, Trabzon, and Van. They varied from small incidents to incredible mass slaughters. In addition to no less than tens of thousands and possible more than 100,000 Armenians killed during those years, families were dispossessed, women were abducted, and mass conversions to Islam occurred in the provinces affected.\textsuperscript{89}

Just as the 1909 massacres were trigged by political flux in Adana, the revolutionary period was also a time of political flux in Eastern Anatolia due to the reorganization of the Hamidiye cavalry. With the declaration of the reinstatement of the constitution, the Hamidiye — a symbol holdover of Abdülhamid II’s legacy — was targeted for reform. But as Janet Klein notes, during that first year, little was actually done to change the Hamidiye other than the fact that its name was changed and the government asked the cavalry to hand in their rifles.\textsuperscript{90} She also states that the supporters of the Hamidiye tended to oppose the new government of the CUP.\textsuperscript{91} The revolution had rekindled the discontent of many supporters of the old order in the Hamidiye regions. The people from those regions would have brought those sentiments with them as they traveled to Çukurova.

\textsuperscript{88} In Diyarbakır for example, Jelle Verheij argues that rural Kurds and Hamidiye regiments had little role. Ibid., 134.
\textsuperscript{89} Selim Deringil, ""The Armenian Question Is Finally Closed": Mass Conversions of Armenians in Anatolia during the Hamidian Massacres of 1895-1897,"\ compstudsocihist Comparative Studies in Society and History 51, no. 2 (2009).
\textsuperscript{90} Klein, The Margins of Empire, 107.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 114.
Marginal Movements

Accounts of 10,000 men traveling hundreds of kilometers to attack Armenians that they did not know may sound bizarre and even senseless. However, it is important to note that in spring 1909, tens of thousands of such men would have already been traveling to the Çukurova region, where they would earn extra money by working on the farms of the region during the cotton planting season. Throughout the 1909 massacres, especially in the city of Adana, these workers were cited as some of the principal perpetrators of violence as well as the victims. The conflicts between these workers greatly intensified the scale of the massacres, pointing to the ways in which communal violence can migrate. In a telegram following the massacres, the brand new governor of Adana Mustafa Zihni Pasha explained that “the region is full of outsiders (yabancı). Especially at crop times every year 50-60,000 workers come here. And this year a lot of workers came. Both [Armenians and Muslims] are obsessed with increasing their number of casualties by exploiting the large amount of workers and strangers whose names and circumstances are unknown.”

The Babigian report indicated that there were over 10,000 Armenians living around the Adana train station in tents, easy targets for armed mobs.

Doughty Wylie noted that the few hundred Muslims who were killed in Adana were almost entirely from among these workers, and there is little question that many of the Armenians who were killed, particularly in the city of Adana, died at the hands of other workers from Eastern Anatolia or Northern Syria.

From the very beginning of the cotton boom of the 1860s, the unmonitored movement of migrant workers and their haphazard residence in the city of Adana had been a concern for local authorities, as these groups were seen as prone to criminal acts. For example, in September of

92 BOA, DH-SFR 413/110, Zihni to Dahiliye, Adana (13 May 1325 [26 May 1909]).
93 Babigian and Sargsyan, Atanayi eguardin, 18-20.
94 TNA, FO 195/2306 (21 April 1909), pg. 109.
1870, a police corporal was talking with someone on the street near the government building in Adana when he was suddenly assaulted by a dagger-wielding Iranian man named Celib. The witnesses who identified Celib were Ottoman subjects from Süleymaniye and Diyarbakır. Like Celib, they were probably Kurdish workers who had come to Adana from further east looking for work during the fall harvest. Because the culprit was a foreign subject, the case involved the Iranian Consulate in Adana. The fact that labor migration brought foreign workers to Adana was one complication created by these unprecedented flows of traffic, and the Ottoman government sought to impose regulations that would somehow prevent the violent crimes associated with workers from taking place.

Especially during the Hamidian period, provincial administrations sought to more tightly regulate the movement of its subjects on the whole. Ottoman villagers were not usually allowed to move freely between provinces however they liked. Normally, one required a note of transit or *mürur tezkeresi* to travel for purposes such as visiting family, work, medical treatment, or “change of air.” However, these seasonal movements of workers, which were relatively unsupervised, allowed individuals to anonymously traverse Anatolia towards Adana and then elsewhere to cities such as Istanbul.

---

95 BOA, I-DA 8/194 (14 Cemaziyelahir 1287 [11 September 1870]).
96 BOA, DH-EUM-MTK 77/18 (18 May 1330 [31 May 1914]). This was true not only in the case of agricultural workers but also railroad workers constructing the railway of eastern Çukurova in 1914. BOA, DH-EUM-MTK 77/64 (28 June 1914).
98 BOA, DH-TMIK 210/56 (7 Şevval 1323 [22 November 1905]). As workers, particularly Armenians, moved from other parts of Anatolia to Adana either on a seasonal basis or permanently, they soon became tied to other migration networks. The growth of commercial agriculture in the Eastern Mediterranean had resulted in large waves of migration to the Americas and elsewhere with the rise of steam travel. Mount Lebanon was one of the earliest and most prolific migrant-producing regions of the late Ottoman period, although return migration was also frequent. See Khater, *Inventing Home*. With the massacres of the 1890s in Eastern Anatolia, many Armenians looked to leave the Ottoman Empire. Armenian migration to the Americas was relatively limited before the 1890s, with only a handful of migrants moving for employment or education, mostly as a result of incorporation into the social world of American missionary communities. By the eve of the First World War, there were an estimated 60,000 Armenians
 illicit emigration, as Ottoman officials feared that such migration would strengthen Armenian separatist activities. In 1893, the Ministry of the Interior warned officials in the Adana region not to allow workers to leave the empire via Mersin.\(^99\) During this same time period, the Ottoman government also became concerned about the security issues caused by migrant workers along their way and in Adana. Reports from this period mention numbers of migrants between 70-100,000 arriving every year in Adana, Kozan, and Cebel-i Bereket. In order to supervise these movements, the government created a mobile (seyyar) gendarmerie of about 50 soldiers to travel with the worker caravans and supervise them.\(^100\) When the CUP took power in 1908, they lifted many restrictions on movement in in the spirit of liberalism and in opposition to the politics of the ancien regime. The magnitude of migrations within the empire thereafter was amplified.\(^101\)

While this level of mobility points to the way in which the social problems of Eastern Anatolia migrated with the workers who came to Cilicia, we should not assume that workers were inherently predisposed towards violent acts any more than another segment of society. Rather, it is worth considering as in the case of the settlers of Çukurova described above the extent to which contention played a major role in the lives of migrant workers. The nature of labor relations reveals in fact that workers were almost constantly fighting — not about religion and ethnicity — but rather about money. Although they arrived to Adana with promises of expected wage ranges, their pay was essentially negotiated on a weekly basis. The value of their

\(^99\) BOA, DH-MKT 19/34, No. 3 (30 January 1893).
\(^100\) BOA, ŞD 2126/7, No. 2, Rıza to Askeri (8 Ağustos 1310 [20 August 1894]); No. 3, Faik to Sadaret, Adana (11 Eylül 1310 [23 September 1894]).
labor was literally determined by the open market, the ırğat pazarı when employers and workers convened weekly in the center of Adana to make arrangements. Arguing with employers, middlemen and other workers was a general feature of live as a migrant worker in Adana.

Terzian described Adana as a place where migrant laborers could work hard during the day and play hard at night. For the single men who stayed in Adana, usually at modest inns, in tents, or in the open air, gambling and drinking were common diversions. For Terzian, figures such as the local tough guy, Kasap Misag or Misag the Butcher, played a crucial role in keeping the peace in the sometimes rowdy Adana nightlife. Misag was known to put other troublemakers in their places, and Terzian mentions that the owners of theaters and taverns would enlist his services to keep everyone else in line. For Terzian, this type of figure was not a source of violence per se; quite the contrary, he was helping to keep the peace in a sometimes contentious urban environment.102

Migrant workers are also relevant for the discussion of intercommunality because of their uniquely fragmentary social formation. They came from a wide variety of towns and villages from different corners of the empire, and aside for their companions from the same region, many had few connections in Adana. The exception to this case are villagers from nearby places such as Hadjin. In either event, communal belonging may have served as a more relevant bond for these workers, who did not maintain sustained interaction with people in Adana throughout the year. Whatever their familial or communal identities were back home, when they came to Adana, they were Kurds from Bitlis, Armenians from Harput, and Nusayris from Lattakia. It is likely that Muslim and Christian workers saw each other’s respective groups as economic competitors.

102 Terzian, Atanayi keankê, 10-11. Kasap Misag was one of the Armenians executed in the aftermath of the 1909 massacres and he became a symbol of injustice for local Armenians, who saw him as a scapegoat. As Der Matossian points out, Artin Arslanian equated this incident with the Dreyfus Affair. Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 496.
1909: Moment of Rupture

Some observers have detected an economic dimension, perhaps even a class dimension, in the events of the Adana massacres. In some cases, the violence included not only killing but also the burning of Armenian farms by Muslim villagers from the Çukurova plain, the vandalizing of agricultural equipment, and the destruction of account books by those who owed money to Armenian shop owners.\(^{103}\) To this effect, Astourian cites the memoirs of Damar Arıkoğlu, who claimed that the sudden wealth of Armenians was the source of outrage for Muslims in Adana.\(^{104}\) When exploring this economic component, we must be mindful of which actors most benefited from the narrative of undeserved Armenian wealth in Adana. Tribal communities in the countryside lost out during the expansion of commercial agriculture in the Çukurova region, as Astourian points out, which may have fostered resentment.\(^{105}\) But at the time of the massacres, the group that would have most benefited from destroying the wealth of Armenian merchants and landowners was likely that of their wealthy Muslim counterparts.

In the city of Adana, notables, officials, and businessmen played a key role in ensuring communal harmony and also in disrupting it. From the 1860s onward, the urban population of Adana and Mersin enjoyed a period of steady prosperity, and Muslims and Christians lived rather well together under the ecology of cotton. During the attacks on Christians that occurred all across Eastern Anatolia during the 1890s, no comparable incidents occurred in the Çukurova plain or in the city of Adana. There were certainly moments of communal tension, and smaller incidents took place, but Muslim notables in Adana played a helpful role in preventing

---

\(^{103}\) Astourian, "The Silence of the Land: Agrarian Relations, Ethnicity, and Power."


\(^{105}\) Ibid., 72-80.
In the years leading up to the 1908 revolution, tensions were fairly low, and Bahri Pasha, the Governor of Adana, was credited with keeping the peace by maintaining good relationships with Armenian leaders. Bahri Pasha was friends with Bishop Mushegh Seropian, who was appointed prelate of Adana and helped open many Armenian schools in Çukurova region.

Terzian wrote that in the city of Adana, the disruption of relations between Armenians and Muslims, who were on the whole like “brothers,” was due to just a few anti-Armenian people. One of the outspoken enemies of Armenians in Adana during the late Ottoman period was Bağdadizade Abdülkadir Efendi, a local notable who apparently saw Armenian merchants as his main economic competition. He had been a tax-farmer, and was involved in numerous business activities in the region. Abdülkadir was wealthy and influential, and he liked to have his way; the British Consul in Adana stated in 1896 that Abdülkadir Efendi was “virtually Governor of the Country, Vali and all officials being in terror of him.” He had usurped the farm of Armenian notable Garabed Gökderelian during the latter’s temporary exile in Akka, and upon the Gökderelian’s return, Abdülkadir’s men beat him severely. As such, the two were archrivals. Abdülkadir was also at odds with the new governor Bahri Pasha, and in 1901, he and a few others were exiled to different provinces by the governor. The official charge was that

106 TNA, FO 195/193, Christie (ABCFM) to Christmann, Mersin (25 February 1896), pg. 27; Terzian, Atanayi keank’č, 31. For more discussion of the 1890s: Miller, “Conjuncture, Contingency, and Interpreting Violence in late Ottoman Cilicia”.
107 Bahri Pasha was the Governor of Adana for twelve years. Terzian said that he was known for taking bribes, but we was also know for kindness to Armenians. According to Terzian’s account, Bahri Pasha was a crude “mountain man” but he knew how to handle politics. Terzian, Atanayi keank’č, 28-30.
109 Terzian, Atanayi keank’č, 31.
110 Tokşöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 143. Bağdadizade Abdülkadir Efendi was the co-owner of a large sugar beet farm, although his attempts at building a factory had failed. Ibid., 155-56.
Abdülkadir was a member of the CUP; however, British Consul Massy thought this accusation to be a fabricated pretext being that Abdülkadir Efendi was an “old-school Moslem.” In fact, he stated that Abdülkadir Efendi was “very fanatical and overbearing towards Christians and being very rich and unscrupulous, he has always been considered a source of great danger in case of any disturbance.”

While European Consuls were not always the most reliable observers of local politics and judges of character, Massy proved to be right on multiple counts. Abdülkadir was not only not a member of the CUP, but in fact, he would return to Adana and become the chief opponent of the CUP after the revolution, even starting a newspaper in direct opposition to the newspaper İtidal, edited by local CUP leader İhsan Fikri. The latter also had a checkered past in the region. Fikri had been a civil servant in Selanik before coming to Adana. He was married to the daughter of Minan Bey, another Adana notable who figured prominently in the Coffing affair for his role in impeding the investigation (see Chapter 2). İhsan Fikri had been imprisoned at one point in Payas but convinced Bahri Pasha to set him free. With the revolution and the removal of Bahri Pasha, İhsan Fikri became a leading figure under the CUP in Adana.

Armenians in the cities of Adana and Mersin had enthusiastically greeted the revolution of 1908, but over the years that followed, the political situation became more contentious. Der Matossian argues that political conflicts that came with the revolution and changes such as the

---

112 TNA, FO 195/2095, no. 28, Massy to Conor, Adana (21 May 1901).  
113 Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire: Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 452.  
114 This being the same Minan Bey is my own inference. Terzian, Atanayi keank’č, 36. Mentioned in Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire: Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 452.  
115 Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire: Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 451. There seems to have been little direct connection between the Fikri-Abdülkadir rivalry and Armenian politics in Adana other than the fact that Armenian notables had maintained good relations with Bahri Pasha, the former Governor of Adana, and that the Catholicos of Sis refused to side with Abdülkadir Efendi against İhsan Fikri. Ibid., 454.
removal of Bahri Pasha as governor damaged the relationship between the local government and the Armenian population, which had been excellent before. Bishop Mushegh, who had been trying to build an agricultural school near Sis (see above), traveled throughout the province in spring 1909 to meet with different officials and Armenian leaders, and reported that the situation was tense and local officials seemed unengaged with the new order of the CUP. On April 13, 1909, the event known as 31 Mart Vakası signaled the beginning of a challenge to the post-revolutionary political system in the form of a counterrevolutionary movement that occupied Istanbul for almost two weeks. The next day, the violence against Armenians in Adana began. While this too was part of a counterrevolutionary backlash, the violence perpetrated against Armenians appears to have arisen from local dynamics as well. Just some days before the counterrevolution began, a skirmish between an Armenian man and some Muslims in Adana resulted in the killing of two Muslims, and the Armenian made fled to Cyprus. This event became a scandal with sectarian overtones. İhsan Fikri had allegedly made an anti-Armenian speech in its aftermath. Therefore, one may argue that tensions were already high before the Adana massacres began on April 14.

The bloodshed appears to have spread entirely due to rumors that Armenians would attack Muslims or vice versa. These massacres lasted three days and they involved all different segments of the population in the city. Abdülkadir Efendi played a leading role in inciting the violence. He claimed that his old rival Gökderelian was leading Armenian fighters to an uprising

---

116 Ibid., 451-56.
117 Ibid., 459.
118 The 31 Mart or “31 March” incident illustrates the issue of dates when trying to study the day by day events of the massacres. In some cases, sources refer to the Rumi calendar used in the Ottoman Empire, which was two weeks behind the Western or “Gregorian” calendar used internationally today. All dates below refer to Gregorian dates.
119 Der Matossian, *Shattered Dreams of Revolution : from liberty to violence in the late Ottoman Empire*, 149-54.
120 Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 465.
in Adana. The chief of the local gendarmerie witnessed Abdülkadir order the killing of an Armenian merchant in the market and immediately resigned from his post. Other notable Armenians were attacked, and in addition, a mob of different elements representing the spectrum of agrarian life in Adana was assembled to carry out attacks on the inns where Armenians lodged. A large swath of the Armenian Quarter was destroyed, and the Seyhan River was teeming with the unidentified bodies of the slain.

In the days that followed, Abdülkadir Efendi’s rival İhsan Fikri published articles in İtidal claiming that the violence was the result of an Armenian uprising. These articles spread rumors about Armenian sedition a fueled second wave of massacres not just in the city of Adana but throughout the countryside. As Der Matossian notes, it is difficult to interpret Fikri’s puzzling connection to inciting the violence, which placed him in the same camp as his rival Abdülkadir Efendi and at odds with the CUP’s Armenian allies. Whatever the case, the rumors of Armenian plots against Muslims gained momentum, and in the days that followed, anti-Armenian massacres occurred in Tarsus and nearly every district east of Adana. In Cebel-i Bereket, where local officials were generally ambivalent towards the revolution, many including the mutasarrif of the district Mehemd Asaf Efendi played a role in spreading the rumor that the Armenians were rising up.

121 Ibid., 461.
122 Ibid., 468.
123 Ibid., 467-71.
124 BOA, DH-ŞFR 413/110, Zihni to Dahiliye, Adana (13 May 1325 [26 May 1909]).
125 This newspaper has been transcribed and published. Ahmet Uçar, Kemal Erkan, and Selman Soydemir, Adana İtidal Gazetesi : (5 Eylül 1908 - 31 Temmuz 1909), vol. 1-2 (Ankara: TTK, 2014).
126 Hagop Terzian noted that Fikri had been inconsistent in his statements about Armenians, sometimes praising them and sometimes defaming them. Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 453.
128 Asaf was accused of distributing weapons and releasing the Muslim prisoners from the Payas jail. Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 486. The Ottoman government conducted a thorough investigation of the
Many of the rumors concerned Bishop Mushegh’s alleged advocacy of an armed struggle against the state.\textsuperscript{129} There is no indication that such an uprising was either imminent or attempted. In most cases, it appears that the Armenians of Cilicia were not armed, despite having been warned of danger by Mushegh and others of the need for self-protection.\textsuperscript{130} In places where they were well-armed, such as Çokmerzimen, Zeytun, and Hadjin, they were able to repel attackers, who do not appear to have been so numerous as to defeat a well-defended settlement.\textsuperscript{131} The CUP investigating commission would ultimately rule that no planned Armenian uprising existed.\textsuperscript{132} Thus, while the rumors of an Armenian uprising in 1909 persisted within some historiography, the evidence overwhelmingly suggests otherwise.\textsuperscript{133} Yet as Owen Miller has noted in his discussion of communal violence in Cilicia, even when rumors are false, it is important to ask why and under what circumstance they may be accepted as true.\textsuperscript{134} The rumors united a diverse group of actors with different grievances against a common other.

There were many more factors involved in the Adana massacres that may be further reflections of broader transformation. For example, in many cases of violence against Christians through massacres in Cebel-i Bereket and Asaf Efendi’s conduct that contains a number of conflicting testimonies by various officials, Armenian residents, and Asaf himself regarding his behavior and his statements about Bishop Mushegh. BOA, ŞD 2138/21.\textsuperscript{129} For İhsan Fikri’s publications of rumors in İtidal, see Uçar, Erkan, and Soydemir, Adana İtidal Gazetesi : (5 Eylül 1908 - 31 Temmuz 1909). Many of the testimonies in the Ottoman investigation of the massacres in Cebel-i Bereket by low-level officials repeated the narrative of sedition, while others emphasized the inflammatory statements of Mehmed Asaf. The Armenian municipal doctor of Erzin testified that Mushegh had said that Prince Sabahaddin was “a man of quite enlightened opinion (gayet münevver fikirli bir adamdır)” and that “we have not yet been able to attain our freedom.” This suggests that the types of political discussions Mushegh was having regarded the situation of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire but the extent of their seditiousness was questionable. BOA, ŞD 2138/21, no. 17.

\textsuperscript{129} Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 459.

\textsuperscript{130} Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)”, 497.

\textsuperscript{131} For Teodik’s account of defense of Çokmerzimen (Dörtyol), see Teodik, Amis mě i Kilikia, 166-93.

\textsuperscript{132} For Teodik’s account of defense of Çokmerzimen (Dörtyol), see Teodik, Amis mě i Kilikia, 166-93.

\textsuperscript{133} For Teodik’s account of defense of Çokmerzimen (Dörtyol), see Teodik, Amis mě i Kilikia, 166-93.

\textsuperscript{134} Miller, "Conjuncture, Contingency, and Interpreting Violence in late Ottoman Cilicia".
during the nineteenth and twentieth century, Muslim notables of the cities and towns emerged as defenders of Christians who were able to curtail the violence. In the case of the 1909 massacres, we find little by way of such notables involved in stemming the rising tide of animosity. Meanwhile, the historiography points to the inefficacy and even instigating role on the part of some local state officials. Unlike the Cilicia of the 1860s, when derebeys such as Mıstık Pasha were able to influence the outcome of moments of tension, no comparable figures appear to have existed in either the city or the countryside. Instead, some of the most heroic feats of defense and protection of Christians can be attributed to symbols of the emergent bourgeoisie in Cilicia, such as factory owners. Teodik noted that the Tripani cotton factory in Adana, owned by a Greek merchant, sheltered 12,000 Armenians during the violence and they used the factory machines to spray hot water at the attackers. Meanwhile, in Ceyhan (Hamidiye), a French woman named Sabatier and her husband, who owned one of the only factories east of Adana, protected hundreds of Armenians who hid amongst the bales of cotton. Rather than hot water, they had used their French flag in order to ward off angry mobs.

The changes in the political economy of Cilicia had left Muslims and Christians overall more divided and more reliant on state officials as opposed to local notables in times of crisis. But the only thing that we can say with certainty about the reasons why Muslims in Cilicia decided to attack nearby Christians in the spring of 1909 is that there was no single reason. Motivation likely ranged from the economic and political to the personal and in some cases even psychological. Sometimes an eruption of a burning hate for the other is hard to explain without a psychoanalytical framework. In the space above, I have attempted to outline some of the ways in
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135 Teodik, *Amis mê i Kilikia*, 57.
which structural aspects of the settlement experience in Cilicia created arenas of contention where disputes could be settled or escalate depending on a variety of factors.

**Conclusion to Part 2**

Although the Adana massacres occurred within the context of a transforming and increasingly uneven plain, there are limits to the extent that the agrarian transformations described above can explain the violence that occurred. There is indeed even danger in over-rationalizing the events in question. However, it is important to emphasize that the Adana massacres did not occur as an outburst of violence between communities with a long history of hatred, nor were they the product of external disruption of an old and static society that existed in perfect harmony. The Çukurova of the 1909 Adana massacres simply did not exist a half-century prior. The communities involved, their ways of life, and their relationships with each other were all novel features of life in Cilicia that emerged from the frontier experience, and the violence that occurred was an indirect result of that experience and the region’s engagement with the larger developments in imperial and global politics. Life in the countryside of the Adana region was not inherently violent, but the constant movement of people and property certainly created more room for misunderstanding, confusion, competition, and conflict.

The Adana massacres occurred during a key period of redefinition and ambiguity within the new government brought to power by the revolution. In the end, order was restored in the Cilicia region through the arrival of military reinforcements. Under the command of Cemal Pasha, who would remain until his appointment as Governor of Baghdad in 1911, the Ottoman military was able to subdue the unrest in a similar fashion to the way in which military had been used in Mount Lebanon and Damascus some decades prior. Many parties would ultimately be dissatisfied with the way in which the matter was resolved. The Ottoman government executed
dozens of Muslims, an unprecedented act that caused outrage from their coreligionists.\textsuperscript{137} Six Armenians also were also hanged for their alleged involvement in the massacres. Many Armenians felt that these executions were carried out merely to appease Muslims, and that the men did not deserve such a fate.\textsuperscript{138} Doughty Wylie noted that even most of the Muslims executed were largely symbolic victims, saying “I regret justice very doubtful in individual cases and all hung are unimportant men.”\textsuperscript{139} By contrast, Bağdadizade Abdülkadir Efendi was censured lightly for his involvement, receiving a sentence of two years in exile.\textsuperscript{140}

The Adana massacres left a deep imprint on life in Cilicia, and lingered at the forefront of the public memory. Yet in the aftermath of the violence, which lasted weeks, people resumed their quotidian affairs with an astonishing quickness. The Armenians of Adana, aided by their broader community, international charity, and even some small assistance from the Ottoman government, immediately set about rebuilding their homes and businesses and caring for the orphans and widows left behind by the massacres.\textsuperscript{141} Economic activity in the region continued, and the fall harvest more or less occurred on schedule. Missionary reports indicated that the relative communal harmony the region had once known was rebounding. By the time that Arhsaguhi Teodik had visited the region in fall 1909, people had gone back to living as normal. Cyril Haas, the head of the new American hospital in Adana that was founded to aid the Armenian community, reported that the hospital had attracted the attention of many Muslims as

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{137}{Yeğenağa, \textit{Ali Münif Bey'in hâtiralari}, 54.}
\footnotetext{138}{Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 496.}
\footnotetext{139}{TNA, FO 195/2306, pg. 414 (15 June 1909).}
\footnotetext{140}{Der Matossian, "Ethnic Politics in Post-Revolutionary Ottoman Empire : Armenians, Arabs, and Jews during the second constitutional period (1908-1909)", 498.}
\footnotetext{141}{There were a number of Armenian orphanages established in Adana. The Armenian Patriarchate had orphanages in Adana, Hadjin, Marash, Antep, Dörtyol, and Hasanbeyli following the massacres. There were thousands of Armenian orphans cared for by Armenian, missionary, and Ottoman state orphanages. Armenian Patriarchate, \textit{Kilikioy Orbakhnam Teghekagir 1909 Ogostos 7-1910 Dektember 31} (Constantinople [Istanbul]: Tparan ew Kazmatun O. Arzuman, 1911), 33. See also Nazan Maksudyan, \textit{Orphans and Destitute Children in the late Ottoman Empire} (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2014).}
\end{footnotes}
well, who were happy to receive treatment for work injuries and other ailments.\textsuperscript{142} There was even some bit of satisfaction with the government of Cemal Pasha and his role in helping to restore prosperity and stability in Adana.\textsuperscript{143} The agricultural economy recovered within a year.\textsuperscript{144} One British traveler who walked across Anatolia after the period of the massacres said that the atmosphere was much more optimistic in Adana than in other Ottoman cities, calling Adana “a throbbing town… with an unmistakable air of prosperity and confidence in the future.”\textsuperscript{145}

Of course, the picture was not as rosy as this. The very fact that the CUP government reasserted control in the region by arresting culprits, dismissing officials, and executing a large number of Muslims and a few Armenians mostly to save face, was a profound expression of its lack of hegemony in Cilicia that would not be forgotten by its detractors. When Cemal Pasha contracted a very debilitating case of malaria in 1911, these voices of discontent began to stir and concerns of further unrest became the talk of the town in Adana.\textsuperscript{146} Meanwhile, a British diplomat in Van reported in spring 1910 that he had heard rumors of the need for “another Adana” in Eastern Anatolia, pointing to ways in which Cilicia was never very distant from political developments elsewhere.\textsuperscript{147}

The overall picture of Cilician society during the years leading up until the First World War is of multiple potentialities and simultaneous forms of convergence and divergence between the empire’s different communities. When economic activity was normal, and the government did its job to uphold its obligations, people lived together quite well and thrived even in the

\textsuperscript{142} Cyril F. Haas, \textit{An International Hospital in Turkey} (Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1913).
\textsuperscript{143} The American missionary William Nesbitt Chambers who worked on relief for survivors in Adana, responded to rumors that Cemal Pasha had been hanged in 1916 saying that “Djemal, you know, was my friend and I could not altogether loose (sic) faith in him” ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 669, No. 298, Chambers to Barton, Philadelphia (11 October 1916).
\textsuperscript{144} Toksöz, \textit{Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton}, 198.
\textsuperscript{145} Childs, \textit{Across Asia Minor on Foot}, 343.
\textsuperscript{146} TNA, FO 195/2366, pg. 9, 38.
\textsuperscript{147} TNA, FO 424/223, pg 115, Morgan to Lowther, Van (25 April 1910).
shadow of horrible violence. When local crisis or larger events such as the Balkan Wars polarized society and old animosity and anxieties returned, the tensions bubbled very close to the surface. Communal harmony depended not only on the quotidian practices of townsfolk and villagers in the Cilicia region but also contingencies dictated by external forces. In some sense, the Adana massacres were something that happened on the imperial stage, and their location in Adana itself was partly circumstantial. Adana was the quintessential interface between the city and the countryside, and Cilicia was at the intersection of the core regions of the Ottoman Empire in Western Anatolia and the imperial borderlands of Eastern Anatolia. The various political tensions that existed in those different spaces converged on the Adana region in a moment of crisis.

As for Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, the Adana massacres shattered their confidence in the new constitutional order. Nevertheless, many places in the empire, such as the capital of Istanbul, continued to be a center of Armenian cultural efflorescence. Hagop Terzian, like countless Armenian intellectuals of the day, left his home in Adana for Istanbul, where he stayed for the years leading up to the First World War. He published a number of works about Adana and the massacres, and he became regarded as an authority on the events that took place and the life of Armenians in his home region. Terzian would be among the Armenian intellectuals and professionals arrested in Istanbul on April 24, 1915, a day remembered as Red Sunday. After being shuffled around Central Anatolia for a few months, he was executed along with a number of his peers that August. As for Krikor Koudoulian, I am not certain where he was at the time of the First World War. However, he turned up in 1928 at the Mesropian Seminary in the neighborhood of Pavlovo in Sofia, Bulgaria as the author of a
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148 See Der Matossian, *Shattered Dreams of Revolution: from liberty to violence in the late Ottoman Empire*.
book about the history and geography of historical Armenia called *The Armenian World* (*Haygagan Ashkharh*).\(^{151}\)

The people of Ottoman Cilicia, who participated in an exciting but sometimes tumultuous experiment of frontier settlement, might have followed various paths together after the massacres. Perhaps, as had occurred in Lebanon some decades prior, they might have enjoyed what Engin Akarlı called a “long peace” together in the prosperous Çukurova plain.\(^{152}\) Or maybe more conflict was to come. The CUP government would ultimately decide for the people of Cilicia whether or not they could live together in the midst of a war that nobody in the region had a hand in starting. In the process, the war years and the socioeconomic conditions it brought would ravage the countryside, bringing displacement, scarcity, and radical ecological consequences. After the war, many of the Cilician Armenians would return for a final attempt to live in their native Cilicia once again, but by that time, there would be little hope of the equilibrium that had defined much of the late Ottoman period.

---


PART 3
(1914-1922)

A community history of the Adana Armenians compiled and published in Beirut contains a number of songs pertaining to life in Ottoman Cilicia. Among them are some lyrics by Movses Hagopyan, a native of Adana who sought to encapsulate the feelings surrounding mobilization for war or seferberlik through a composition called “The Tale of Mobilization (Seferberlik Destani).” He described step by step the impact of the war in the Adana region, an experience that was similar in many provinces throughout empire, and highlighted the grief and anxiety caused by mobilization.¹ The first verse read:

Seferberlik verdi bize çok mihnet
Çekmediğim asla kaldı mı zahmet
Bütün efkârları sardı adavet
Buna karışmadık kaldı mı millet

Mobilization has brought much hardship to us
Is there any trouble that I have not lived?
Hostility has captured everyone’s thoughts
Is there any nation still not part of this?

While many songs were composed about the unique plight of Armenians before, during, and after the war, Hagopyan’s composition referred to a more general crisis.² The devaluation of currency through the introduction of banknotes, the scarcity of the wartime economy, and the general panic created by mobilization dominate the lyrics.³ This was how mobilization affected most Ottoman citizens, who experienced the war as a disruption of quotidian life.

¹ Biwzand Eghiayean, Atanayi hayots’ patmut`ıwn [The History of Adana’s Armenians] (Beirut: Atanayi Hayrenakts’akan Miu’tyan Varch`ut`ıwn, 1970), 821. The poem is recorded in this work in Armeno-Turkish.
² For discussion of history and memory in Armenian laments and lullabies, see Melissa Bilal, “Thou need’st not weep, for I have wept full sore: An affective genealogy of the Armenian lullaby in Turkey” (University of Chicago, 2013).
³ For the interested reader, the complete lyrics transcribed from Armeno-Turkish are as follows:
Seferberlik verdi bize çok mihnet / Çekmediğim asla kaldı mı zahmet / Bütün efkârları sardı adavet / Buna karşımadık kaldı mı millet / Umum milletler bir bir karşıtı / Evlad-ı insan havaya uçtu / Bulutlar üstün hemen kavuştu / Kuş uçmasına hacet mi kaldı / Hacet kalmadı kuş uçmasına / Bak teyyarenin yarışmasına / Usta muvaffik uçurmasına / Bundan acayip sanaat mı kaldı / Acayip teyyare uçuş havada / Mitrayöz gürler, bomba ziyaide / Şehidler bin-bin, cennet ne fayda / Fani dünyada lezzet mi kaldı / Fani dünyada kalmadı lezzet / Her başa gelmİŞ niçe bin zahmet / Harb uzurunda kırdı millet / Telefat verdi, tazat mı kaldı / Telefat verdim, al kan ağlarım /
Çekiğim derdi destan yazarım / Umum dünyaya beyan ederim / Fukara başa mihnet mi kaldı / Asıl fukara çekti mihneti / Enmedi kendinin hiç rağbeti / Kalmadı arîfîn hassiyeti / Cevahir olса kıymet mi kaldı / Cevahir kıymet atılı boşça / Banknot başıla alışverişe / Yüzlük bir kayma onbeş kuruşa / Dini yoluna hizmet mi kaldı / Dini yoluna
As Cilician Armenians wrote songs of sorrow, their Muslim neighbors composed their
own laments. According to a study by Ahmet Özdemir in his native region of Sarız, the Afşars of
the Taurus Mountains still remember the song of “The Seventeeners (Onyedililer’in Ağıdı).” It
told the story of young men born in the Rumi year 1317 or 1901/02. They were as young as 13
when the war began, but as long years of fighting dragged on and the age of conscription inched
down into the teens, these young men became eligible for service. Their song was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mızıkalar çalınıyor</th>
<th>The trumpets sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asker olan gelsin deyi</td>
<td>“Let the soldiers come” they cry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyedili asker olmuş</td>
<td>The “Seventeener” has become a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topluyorlar olsun deyi</td>
<td>They gather them to die</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is scant evidence that those who remember the “seventeeners” who were gathered up to
die tend to equate that history of suffering with the plight of Ottoman Armenians. In the case of
the Afşar communities in Özdemir’s study, numerous songs point to memories of deep-seated
enmity between the Afşars and Armenians of the Taurus Mountains.

Though the late Ottoman period was characterized by a mixture of convergence and
divergence between different religious and ethnic groups (see Chapter 7), the First World War
period represented a categorical rupture. The conflict that shattered the Ottoman Empire into a
number of smaller polities has defined the unique national experiences and identities of the post-
Ottoman world in a fundamental way. Yet at the very core of each of these “national” historical
experiences, Turkish, Armenian, Arab, Kurdish, Greek, or otherwise, we find similar tales of
involuntary motion, wandering, and exile during the war period. This was the common
denominator of the Ottoman experience of *seferberlik*. In Greater Syria and Mount Lebanon in

4 Özdemir, *Öyküleriyle Ağıtlar*, 39-42. Here “seventeener” or *onyedili* refers to someone born in the Rumi year 1317
or 1901/2. These individuals were 13 to 17 years of age during the First World War, and by 1917 or 1918, they had
begun to be conscripted. Yiğit Akın’s doctoral dissertation, which mentions this song and others, contains further
discussion of the memory of conscription within Turkish songs. Yiğit Akın, "The Ottoman home front during World
War I: everyday politics, society, and culture" (Ohio State University, 2011), 227.
particular, the Arabic version of the word *safarbarlik* evokes the story of national suffering.\(^6\) It marks the period when vast swaths of the population starved under the conditions of war and the authoritarian government of Cemal Pasha.\(^7\) For Armenians, *seferberlik* is now inextricable from the memory of the Armenian genocide, a mass expulsion of Anatolian Armenians to the Syrian Desert that through death marches, executions, and various forms of violence killed around half of their population and sent most of the rest into exile. In Turkey, one might argue that the horrors of mobilization are buried a bit deeper beneath “the myth of a military nation” as Ayşegül Altınay has put it.\(^8\) However, Yiğit Akin has shown that songs and stories that lament the hundreds of thousands of conscript soldiers who died and went missing during the war serve as “sites of memory” of mobilization’s hardship in Turkey as well.\(^9\)

Evidence of that shared experience or even solidarity between different communities in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War is usually overshadowed by these national narratives, which are predicated upon an imagined divide between different ethnolinguistic groups inhabiting the same space in regions such as Cilicia. The political developments during and after the war obscured the memory of shared suffering in Cilicia, such as the economic hardship in the fall 1914 when an American missionary in Marash noted that “relations between Christians and Moslems are not strained, in fact their common trouble seems to have drawn them together.”\(^10\) The dominant narratives today emphasize the ways in which the conditions of war

---


\(^9\) For discussion of these songs, see Akin, "The Ottoman home front during World War I: everyday politics, society, and culture”.

\(^10\) ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 672, no. 343, Woodley to Barton, Marash (29 August 1914).
pushed people apart. Such narratives silence deviant examples, especially those that emphasize resistance to polarization. For example, another American missionary in Hadjin, just south of Sarız in the Taurus Mountains, noted that “The Moslems of Fekke and Yerebakan were very much opposed to the sending of the Armenians from those villages. They said they were not guilty of anything, possessed no weapons, lived peacefully, and were friends with them, and were besides their artisans and tradesmen. Through their efforts they put off the deportation about three months, but in the end they also were ineffectual to save them.”¹¹ That same missionary also made the following observation after the Armenians had been deported from Hadjin were replaced with Muslim refugees:

Shortly after the exiling of the Armenian families of Hadjin took place about thirty families of Muhajirs were sent in by the Government to take their place. These unfortunate people were refugees from Roumelia at the time of the Balkan War. For two years they had been wandering, always sent on by the Turkish Government from place to place, and finally placed in the houses just vacated by those who also were to face months of wandering and homelessness. Four families came to live close to our end of the city. We at once decided to show them friendliness. They responded in a touching way, came frequently to call and poured out their over-burdened hearts. When they first came the men were too weak to work, all were subject to chills and fever, and of the whole village from which these people had come only two children were living. One of the women spoke with horror at having to live in a house with such association, saying that only they knew what such suffering meant.¹²

A fuller understanding of the quotidian experience of WWI in the Ottoman Empire entails peeling back the political narratives of the conflict, whether the stories of battles, the machinations of great powers, or the numerous armed conflicts that occurred in its aftermath. Those political events not only tore apart the socioeconomic fabric of Ottoman society but also convinced many descendants of Ottoman Christians and Muslims in Cilicia that their grandparents had been mortal enemies without a shared past. But there is a deeper layer to that history. Beneath the political polarization and fragmentation was an economic and indeed ecological process of devastation that pervaded Ottoman society.

¹² Ibid.
In the following chapters, I will build on an emerging body of scholarship that studies the social history of the First World War, examining the war’s impacts on daily life in the Cilicia region through the lens of ecology. Part 2 of this dissertation explored the theme of transformation in Cilicia and the creation of a new cotton ecology out of the old political ecology of transhumance. Part 3 will focus on moments of rupture and events of destruction in the history of Ottoman Cilicia, studying the local history of the WWI experience and the subsequent French Mandate in the region. As a result of these disruptions, disease and scarcity spread throughout Cilicia, producing a harsh wartime ecology that replaced the comparatively prosperous ecology of cotton. Over almost a decade of upheaval, the commercial economy of the Cilicia region was stalled and hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children were displaced, many on multiple occasions. The Armenians of Cilicia were expelled from homes twice, first under the deportation of the 1915-16 genocide and again with the French withdrawal from Cilicia during 1921-22. Muslim refugees from Eastern Anatolia and elsewhere fled to the Adana region during the war, but as resistance to the French presence escalated, many of those refugees wandered once more in the semi-stateless hinterland of postwar Anatolia.

Understanding the experiences of people who lived in regions like Cilicia that were peripheral to the forces that created the First World War but devastated by its impact requires the intensely local focus employed in this study. However, I also seek to highlight the ways in which Cilicia was very central to the events of the period. Its geographical situation at the juncture of different railroad lines, the various types of movements the region witnessed, and its economic collapse that epitomized the Ottoman experience of war all made Cilicia’s trials a very key component of the global story of the First World War. In emphasizing this fact, I also point to ways in which localized ruptures had far-reaching effects. The Armenian genocide, for example,
devastated that community but also undermined the economy of the Ottoman Empire. Wartime displacement not only killed those were subjected to deportation or expulsion but also spread disease that ultimately attained a much wider impact. The conditions created by the war wrought unanticipated effects, transformation of both society and ecologies, even allowing malaria — a disease which throughout this study has been confined to the plains — to invade the Taurus Mountains and reach the airy plateaus of the Cilician highlands. In this regard, not even Cilicia’s geography remained as it had been in the aftermath of the war.
In late May 1914, a provincial official in Adana telegraphed the Ministry of Interior about the need for immediate action with regard to the annual military draft lottery that was scheduled for the coming summer. “Since it will not be possible to conduct the drawing of numbers in July and August because the inhabitants of Feke and Kars will be at the yayla, and doing it in their absence will be unfair to them,” he reasoned, “this year the drawing of numbers should begin at the beginning of June and next year in early May.” The local government in Adana had grown accustomed to accommodating the annual movement of much of the region’s populations between the villages and towns of the Çukurova plain and the breezy summer homes of the Taurus Mountains. Limiting the movements of hot and bothered Cilicians — whether the seasonal migrations of pastoralists in Eastern Çukurova (see Chapter 4), the settlement process of immigrants, or merely the summer vacations of families (see Chapter 6) — generated discontent and ultimately undermined the function of local governance and economy. And so with military conscription, too, officials provided allowances for migration. In other words, they accommodated local practices even amidst one of the most coercive of all government policies, ensuring, in the process, that movement dictated by the seasons did not impinge upon movement dictated by the state.

1 BOA, DH-İD 206/10, no. 8 (25 Mayis 1330 [7 June 1914]).
The telegram found its place in a file about conducting the draft lottery and inspection of soldiers born in 1310 or 1894/95 throughout the empire during mid-August 1914. By that time, the Ottoman Empire would have already begun mobilizing for what we now know as the First World War. Those who had made it to the yayla before June might have been very lucky to avoid the first round of conscription in a conflict that claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Ottoman soldiers. The fact that this file on the 1914 lottery carried over into the war period was a coincidence; these discussions started well before mobilization was announced. But whether or not Ottoman administrators were as eager for war as their contemporaries in Europe, as the work of Mustafa Aksakal has shown, by 1914 the Ottoman military knew that it had to be prepared for mobilization or be “ready to move” in the wake of the war in Libya (1911) and the Balkans Wars (1912-3).²

A related question regards the extent to which Ottoman society was prepared to handle the material demands of the First World War. While the Ottoman army had proven itself in large-scale mobilizations of the past, it was the great structural outlier among combatant states in the conflict.³ The First World War was a global confrontation between industrialized colonial empires. The Ottoman Empire had undergone significant industrialization over prior decades, but not nearly to the extent of other combatant states. According to the oft-cited data of Ahmet Emin
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² This chapter does not discuss the geopolitical context of the First World War at any great length, but for good discussion of the Ottoman Empire’s positioning in that context, see Mustafa Aksakal, The Ottoman Road to War in 1914: the Ottoman Empire and the First World War (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008). Aksakal cites a peculiar incident that occurred in June 1914 in which sealed envelopes were sent to Tarsus with instructions that they only be opened in the event of mobilization. However, local officials mistakenly broke the seal prematurely, revealing mobilization orders for the villages of the region and leading to a widespread panic about impending war and conscription. Mustafa Aksakal, “The Ottoman Empire,” in Empires at war: 1911-1923, ed. Robert Gerwarth and Erez Manela (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 18-19. The Ottoman Empire began mobilization in August 1914 as preparation for a state of “armed neutrality” before joining the war. M. Şükrü Hancioglu, A Brief History of the late Ottoman Empire (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), 177.
³ This chapter is heavily influenced by my participation in “The World During the First World War” symposium held in Hanover, Germany in 2013, which featured dozens of papers on the First World War experience in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. See Helmut Bley and Anorthe Kremers, The World During the First World War: Perceptions, Experiences, and Consequences (Essen, Ruhr: Klartext, 2014).
Yalman, the Ottoman Empire possessed a fraction of the railway per square km found in Germany and France and several times less than India.\textsuperscript{4} The Ottoman Empire was a very agrarian empire in a very industrial war.\textsuperscript{5} Moreover, unlike other states such as Britain and France (but more like Germany and Russia), it had no colonial wealth or subject population to call upon. The Ottoman state presided over a vast imperial terrain, but almost every person in that space was an Ottoman citizen, meaning that while Britain and France mustered millions of soldiers from their colonies to fight in Europe and elsewhere, the Ottoman army could only draw on its own population.\textsuperscript{6}

The First World War was a total war in the sense that every aspect of the conflict muddled the lines between the military and the civilian. The Ottoman population bore a great economic burden, and civilians suffered from the hunger and disease that affected so many soldiers as well.\textsuperscript{7} In many ways, this put pressure on civilians, especially women, children and men who were not at the fronts, to work harder, produce more, and devote greater household resources to the war effort.\textsuperscript{8} However, in the Ottoman case, as in other parts of the world, the war

\textsuperscript{4} Ahmet Emin Yalman, \textit{Turkey in the World War} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), 85.
\textsuperscript{6} The fact that the two most agrarian empires in the war—the Ottomans and the Russians—could not outsource suffering to East Africa or South Asia is critical to understanding why neither of those states survived the period intact. For comparison, see Michael A. Reynolds, \textit{Shattering Empires: the clash and collapse of the Ottoman and Russian empires, 1908-1918} (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
\textsuperscript{7} There is a strong and growing body of work on the Ottoman military and mobilization during the First World War. See Mehmet Beşikçi, \textit{The Ottoman Mobilization of Manpower in the First World War: between voluntarism and resistance} (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Akin, "The Ottoman home front during World War I: everyday politics, society, and culture"; Edward J. Erickson, \textit{Ordered to Die: A History of the Ottoman Army in the First World War} (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001); Zürcher, \textit{The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey}. Much of the work on the Ottoman wartime experience beyond the battlefield and the effects of mobilization builds on Ahmet Emin Yalman’s work, published in English in 1930, which established a particular national reading and critique of Ottoman involvement in the war its impacts. Yalman, \textit{Turkey in the World War}. See also Maurice Larcher, \textit{La guerre turque dans la guerre mondiale} (Paris: E. Chiron : Berger-Levrault, 1926).
\textsuperscript{8} See Akin, "The Ottoman home front during World War I: everyday politics, society, and culture", 122-79.
caused a dramatic drop in agrarian production. Wartime policies sometimes did more to exacerbate these impacts on local economies than to ameliorate them.

This chapter contributes the global study of the civilian experience of WWI away from the battlefronts, and in particular, the ecological impacts of the war period on the Cilicia region. Mobilization and other conditions related to the war disrupted flows of labor and goods, causing an immediate economic downturn that lingered with the ecology of war. The forced expulsion of the Armenian population doubled the severity of that downturn. Whereas more organic movements such as intercourse between the mountains and the plains were integral aspects of life in Cilicia, the involuntary movements of the First World War devastated the region’s economy and the people who lived there. During the war years, the Ottoman government made efforts to increase agricultural production and improve the distribution of food in the empire, as by 1916, people were beginning to starve in many places such as Adana. However, these efforts fell well short of ameliorating the impact of the war, and on the contrary, the scarcity and starvation that had emerged in Greater Syria as early as 1915 gradually made their way to the Ottoman capital. The last decades of the Ottoman period had been years of rising cultivation in Cilicia, but due to the impacts of mobilization and the war, the period of 1914-1918, especially with regard to cotton cultivation, might be best characterized as fallowed years.

---

9 The concept of an ecology of war is evoked in many different senses, often with regard to war’s impacts on environments and its contribution to ecological degradation. An ecology of war close to my understanding, which is a new relationship between human beings and their lived environments as a result of wartime conditions, is employed in Micah Muscolino’s recent monograph. Micah S. Muscolino, The Ecology of War in China: Henan Province, the Yellow River, and beyond, 1938-1950 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
August 1914: The Mobilizing Empire

The condition of the people is deplorable. They have no money, scant food, and famine looms up ahead. The men have been called out by the stringent new mobilization laws and hardly any are left to gather the standing grain. In a short time much of the harvest will be lost. Trade is at a standstill. Quite half the shops in the Bazar are closed. I could pour out a long tale of woe but do not think that it would be wise to do so in a letter which may be subjected to censorship.  

American Missionary E.C. Woodley in Marash, August 29, 1914

Over the decades leading up to WWI, a new ecology had emerged in the Çukurova plain. Agricultural production was coordinated by an ascendant class of cultivators who commanded vast surpluses of cotton, grain, and sesame, the products of the labors of tens of thousands of annual migrant workers (see Chapter 5). Those workers were transforming swamps into well-maintained agricultural fields, and though the process was very uneven, its trajectory had been firmly established. As one of the great economic powerhouses of the empire, Cilicia might have had much to offer the war effort. But Çukurova’s economy was intensely commercialized, built upon a cotton industry that apparently thrived more on peace than on total war.

Mobilization in 1914 caused economic problems throughout the empire, especially in provinces like Adana. Agriculture in Çukurova was predicated on perennial seasonal movements of laborers, the majority of whom were men of service age conscripted through the mobilization law. The conscription of potential laborers had a tremendously detrimental effect on agriculture, particularly the labor-intensive cultivation of cotton. During the first year of the war, approximately 50,000 of the roughly 200,000 Muslim males (including children) in the Adana province were mobilized. \footnote{BOA, DH-I-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 12-13, Hakkı to Dahiliye (30 Teşrinisani 1331 [13 December 1915]).} Mobilization also stipulated a requisition of all types of draft animals for the war effort. The Adana province contained an estimated 200,000 oxen, horses, mules, donkeys, and camels on the eve of the war, meaning more than one animal per household on

\footnote{10 ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 672, no. 343. Woodley to Barton, Marash (29 August 1914).}
average. These animals were needed for usual agricultural labor and transport in the yet sparsely populated countryside of Ottoman Cilicia. To make matters worse, the Ottoman government placed a ban on agricultural exports and abrogated foreign concessions, meaning that the commercial class of Adana and Mersin was suddenly cut off from important Mediterranean markets.

The cotton industry in Adana and Mersin was threatened by this sudden change in circumstances. Cotton played a disproportionately large role in the economic life of Cilicia (see Chapter 5). Before the war, more than one quarter of all agricultural land in the Adana province was devoted to cotton cultivation, making Adana’s agricultural economy the most heavily commercialized in the empire. Many of the factories and workshops in the towns of Çukurova revolved around the processing of cotton. Cotton had already been planted in spring of 1914 and as the harvest occurred in late August and early September, it was to be gathered precisely at the time that mobilization began. Because of the emergency ban on exports and the loss of labor, local cultivators were hard-pressed to harvest and sell an annual cotton crop that they estimated at a whopping 120,000 bales, arguably the best crop in the region’s history. Though much of the cotton was harvested, by the end of 1914, local cotton prices dropped by 50% due to lack of demand, and commercial revenues plummeted.

12 Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913].
13 Ahmed Emin Yalman referred to these mobilization policies as “militarism gone mad.” Yalman, Turkey in the World War, 107.
14 It is important to bear in mind that irrespective of the province, during the early twentieth century, the overwhelming majority of land in the Ottoman Empire was dedicated to food production.
15 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-yı Osmani Zıraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325].
17 Ibid., 8.
For prices and exports to suddenly decline meant losses not just for landowners but also for workers, whose wages were affected by the market and whose labor was often paid in kind. This was especially true for women and children who cleaned and sorted cotton to supplement household income, and with many households suddenly short on male workers, the blow was even more intense. But the highly influential cultivating class in Adana and Mersin was most outraged by the effects of mobilization policies on the cotton economy, since many were heavily invested and indeed indebted as a result of the engagement in this normally lucrative sector. In response to the livid complaints of Adana and Mersin’s most prominent merchants and cultivators, the Ottoman government lifted the ban on cotton export in November 1914 and allowed for the “unrestricted and unconditional” sale of cotton after the needs of the military were met.

Yet even after the Ottoman government lifted the ban on cotton export, the economic damage of the war could not be fully undone. “As you know, Adana’s principal wealth is cotton,” a group of cultivators wrote in a telegram to Ministry of the Interior in January 1915 that complained about the war’s impact. Less than 10% of the cotton harvest had been exported. “Maybe there are merchants in Istanbul that commit to bringing goods to the country from abroad by land via Bulgaria,” they noted. However, in Adana, conditions were different. The British blockade was in full effect, and no ship captain dared to anchor in Mersin to unload goods like coffee and sugar, the export of which had been prohibited by the Allies. In the end, only about one-third of the cotton produced in the Adana region during 1914 could be exported.

---

18 Families that cleaned and processed cotton bolls were usually paid by being allowed to keep and sell 1/8 to 1/10 of their product. For more, see Chapter 5.
19 BOA, BEO 4340/325451, no. 3 (25 Kanunusani 1330 [7 February 1915]).
20 BOA, BEO 4340/325451, no. 3 (25 Kanunusani 1330 [7 February 1915]).
mostly by land. Roughly 10,000 more bales—about 8-10% of the crop—were purchased by the military.21

The failure to profit from 1914’s bountiful cotton yields amounted to much more than a loss of annual revenue in the case of many cultivators. On the heels of many very good years, ascendant landowners assumed greater risk in order to increase profits. Cotton cultivation required significant investment in seed, machinery, and labor, and because so many cultivated on borrowed money, expenditures were calibrated to anticipated price and demand. For these cultivators to be suddenly unable to reap what they had sown brought a risk of defaulting on loans from Ziraat Bankası, local financiers, or foreign banks. For example, in the winter of 1914/15, the case of eight landowners collectively possessing some 17,000 dönüms of primarily agricultural land came to the Ministry of Interior. The distribution of these lands illustrates where the most aggressive expansion of agriculture and venture capitalism was occurring in Çukurova during the late Ottoman period. As Toksöz has argued, the Ceyhan region east of Adana had become the new area of investment. Of the eight borrowers in question, six possessed lands in Ceyhan, representing 85% of the total property in question (see Table 13). The owners ranged from elite landowning Armenian families of Adana and Marie Sursock22, a member of the Sursock family, to aspiring Muslim landowners of Eastern Çukurova such as Alaybeyzade Mehmed.23 These cultivators had used their lands as collateral on loans from the German Anatolian Cotton Company. When their payments faltered, the company came into possession of the properties.

22 Originally I had thought this might be Donna Maria Sursock, the wife of Alfred Sursock, but it seems that there was another Marie Sursock in the region, married to a man named Vasil Sursock. "Yeni bir iddia: Vasil Sersok ile zevcesi Casus mudur? [A New Allegation: are Vasil Sursock and his wife spies?]," Yeni Adana 31 July 1929.
23 Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 180.
Table 13 Çukurova cultivators indebted to German Anatolian Cotton Company with amount of debt in lira and size of collateral in dönüms (Source: BOA, BEO 4341/325518, no. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Collateral Size</th>
<th>Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agop Bizdigyan and Sons</td>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agop Mangoyan</td>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Sursock</td>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>Factory + 3 dnms</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Sursock</td>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>4035</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaybeyzade Mehmed</td>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mısırlızade Ali</td>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabitzade Ahmed and Hacı Zeydullah</td>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan bin Sadık</td>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>2955</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boğos Hoberyan</td>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17,031</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon understanding the scale of these “huge (cesim)” landholdings, the Ottoman administrators who dealt with the case determined that the German company could not assume ownership of the land as a foreign entity. They ruled that the original owners should maintain control of these lands. In addition, the Ministry of Interior elected in February 1915 to loan Ziraat Bankası in Adana some 50,000 lira in funds in order to prevent widespread bankruptcy among the cultivators of the Cilicia region. This represented a very substantial amount of assistance; when compared with the provincial budget for agriculture and industry in Adana, 50,000 lira was equal to almost 10% of the total expenditures for Rumi year 1330 [1914/15]. The cotton crisis of 1914-15 in Cilicia illustrated the precarious state of the sudden commercial growth in the region, which was tightly bound to foreign markets and credit. Cotton had proven lucrative over prior decades, but a single year of high losses pushed many towards default.

---

24 As I explained in Chapter 5, any parcel of land larger than 100 dönüms owned by a single household was classified as “large” and these lands were all many times larger than this.
25 BOA, BEO 4341/325518, no. 3 (29 Kanunusani 1330 [11 November 1915]); MV 196/135 (13 Rebiulahir 1333 [15 Şubat 1330 / 28 February 1915]).
26 BOA, MV 196/124 (9 Rebiulahir 1333 [11 Şubat 1330 / 24 February 1915]).
27 Adana vilayetinin 1330 senesi muvazene-i hususiyesinin masraf müfredatı, (Adana: Adana Vilayet Matbaası, 1330 [1914/15]), 3.
While the conditions of the war period threatened Adana’s wealthiest merchants and landowners, they had broader impact on the normally bountiful food supply. The Cilicia region, like much of Greater Syria, exported large amounts of grain to other parts of the Ottoman Empire — chiefly Izmir and Istanbul — as well as to many foreign countries during a good year. According to French statistics, the Adana province exported 38,000,000 kg of wheat and barley in 1913, just over 15% of the year’s harvest as reflected in Ottoman reports.\(^{28}\) In fact, this percentage may be low if French statistics did not fully capture intra-Ottoman export, but at any rate, all sources indicate that Adana maintained a major agricultural surplus of grain going into the war.\(^{29}\)

While cotton and its cultivators suffered, grain did somewhat better, mostly due to the prescient policies of Adana Governor İsmail Hakkı implemented in August 1914. He warned the Ministry of Interior that if the harvests of sesame and cotton did not occur, the province would lose around 1.5 million lira. Hakkı reasoned that many of the newly mobilizing conscripts, who ranged from twenty to forty years of age, had received no training yet and were not immediately ready for action anyway. Therefore, their mobilization could be delayed for three months until the completion of the harvest.\(^{30}\) This could not save the cotton trade, which was reliant on export, but it likely offset the war’s immediate impact on the food supply by delaying the departure of villagers involved in the threshing and preparation of wheat and barley. Nonetheless, the grain harvest of 1914 in Cilicia was lower than average. The Adana province, particularly Eastern

---

\(^{28}\) CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304 “Description des produits agricoles et autres produits exportés du Vilayet Adana pendant l’année 1913” (11 April 1919); Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913], 36.

\(^{29}\) Doughty Wylie’s 1909 report on agriculture in Adana indicated that most of Adana’s wheat remained in the Ottoman Empire and that 25% of the barley and 75% of the oats went to the UK. Wylie, Report for the Year 1908, 15.

\(^{30}\) BOA, DH-ŞFR 436/25, Hakkı to Dahiliye (27 Temmuz 1330 [9 August 1914]).
Çukurova, had experienced crop damage due to excessive rain. Even with Hakki’s maneuvering, a shortage of hands ensured that the fall harvest rotted in the fields in the hinterland regions towards Marash. Already harvested grain began to go bad due to lack of means of transport. When evaluated alongside Ottoman and French statistics from before the war, US commercial reports indicate a serious decline in grain production and export. Cilicia produced enough wheat, barley, and oats to meet local demand, but its surplus was comparatively small. When the Ministry of Interior inquired about the amount of grain left in the provincial reserves of Adana in October 1914, the response was that provisions in Adana “did not exceed” 2-3 million kg.

---

31 "Supplement to Commerce Reports," 8.
32 ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 672, no. 343. Woodley to Barton (2 October 1914).
33 BOA, DH-ŞFR 445/25, Hakki to Dahiliye, Adana (7 Teşrinievvel 1330 [20 October 1914]).
34 Raw US figures for 1914’s crop do not appear to be reliable for strict comparison with Ottoman prewar figures. If US numbers are reasonably accurate, the wheat, barley, and oat yields for 1914 were only 10% of the 1913 numbers, with exports declining in turn. This number is far too low, since 1915 was by all accounts a worse year, but Ottoman statistics reported numbers many times higher than the US numbers for 1914. It is reasonable to assume that the US numbers for grain yields were low and unlikely to fully encompass wheat grown for local consumption. For example, 1914 was apparently a good year for sesame in Cilicia according to US reports, but the numbers are only 30% of Ottoman statistics for sesame production in 1913. "Supplement to Commerce Reports," 8; Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913], 315. But the anecdotal observations of decreased export appear accurate, and where they offer comparison, US production numbers for other products such as yarn in Adana reflect a decrease of 60%. "Supplement to Commerce Reports," 8.
35 BOA, DH-ŞFR 46/60 (9 Teşrinievvel 1330 [22 October 1914]). In order to put this number in perspective, I will offer a crude representation of what this would have meant in terms of food supply. Let us assume that 2 million kg of provisions of mostly wheat and barley (these were the main foodstuffs produced in the region) contain roughly 3000 kcal per kg or 6 billion kcal before being reduced to flour and other derivatives (when in the form of flour, about 10% more). An ordinary Ottoman citizen even in times of scarcity might be able to add a few hundred calories to the daily diet using other foods but generally rely heavily on grain-based meals. In order to avoid serious malnutrition, that person would probably need at least 700 kcal per day from the grain. As a low number, let us estimate the population of the Adana province at around 400,000 people. 2 kg provisions x 3000 kcal per kg / 700 kcal per day / 400000 people = 21.43 days, meaning that two million kg of wheat and barley, which sounds like a staggering figure, would therefore be enough to feed the population of the whole province for three weeks or so, depending on the variability of the metrics we are employing here. It is important to bear in mind that this is a calculation purely based on calories and that other factors regarding infrastructure and various impacts of scarcity on markets and distribution would not allow for grain to be distributed in such a strictly even manner. This is only to say that 2-3 million kg of grain was only enough food to feed the entire Ottoman Empire for about a day and not very well at that. The 1914 Ottoman census put the prewar population of the Ottoman Empire at around 18.5 million. Karpat, Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics, 188-89.
Winter 1914: Missed Connections

Small though it was, Adana’s agricultural surplus could help in a number of areas. First and foremost, grain from Adana was essential to provisioning the soldiers and animals of the Ottoman army. Perhaps no less important, however, was export to urban areas in the Ottoman Empire. Alongside the Ottoman capital of Istanbul, the province of Beirut, a highly commercialized region that, like Adana, had strong links to Mediterranean trade, was a major importer of food. The province’s population, which did not include the semi-autonomous district of Mount Lebanon, was about twice that of Adana’s, although its amount of food staple production was significantly lower (see Table 14). In addition to grain from abroad, the port of Beirut had historically received shipments of grain from other provinces of Greater Syria. The rise of Mersin and the constant traffic of steamships and sailing vessels in and out of the port made Adana and Beirut neighboring provinces for all intents and purposes. A train from Adana could reach Mersin in less than 3 hours, and the trip between Mersin and Beirut could be completed within a single day by sea if need be.

---

36 This Beirut comparison has developed in part out of many conversations with my Georgetown colleague Graham Pitts, with whom I have published a short article on food and agriculture in Cilicia and Lebanon during the First World War. Chris Gratien and Graham Pitts, “Towards an Environmental History of World War I: Human and Natural Disasters in the Ottoman Mediterranean,” in *The World During the First World War*, ed. Helmut Bley and Anorthe Kremer (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2014).

37 Mersin and Beirut are separated by roughly 180 nautical miles. A steamship traveling at 15 knots would be able to complete the journey in 12 hours.
Table 14: Mean annual production of five major food staples in Greater Syria, 1909/1913

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beirut</th>
<th>Adana</th>
<th>Aleppo</th>
<th>Syria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>411,000</td>
<td>668,000</td>
<td>918,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize (Corn)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beirut was particularly hurt by the limitations on production and trade due to wartime policies. Its reliance on exports for cash and imports for grain was ill-suited for such conditions. What made matters much worse for Beirut was the Allied blockade. The blockade was implemented by the British and designed to prevent the movement of goods along the Ottoman Empire’s Mediterranean coast. As a result, it had a major impact not just on the Ottoman army but also on the circulation of food and commodities between local populations of the provinces.

For example, in late September 1914, Ottoman ships in the vicinity of Beirut, Iskenderun, and Mersin were being intercepted by the British blockade, disrupting the movement of flour and wheat. The blockade appears to have been very effective in its goals. By November 1914, the Beirut province faced extreme scarcity. In a request to Adana, Aleppo, and Damascus for immediate grain shipments to Beirut, Ali Münif Bey, a high-ranking CUP adviser and soon to be...

---

38 Compiled data from two Ottoman statistical publications. Raw production amounts expressed in bushels converted to kg using the mean kıyye per bushel factors for each province in the publications. Bushel weights varied from province to province. 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-yi Osmani Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325], 4-5; Memalik-i Osmaniye'nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913], 36-39, 52-55; Karpat, Ottoman Population, 1830-1914 : demographic and social characteristics, 188-89.

39 Cyprus had been under British administration for many decades and was formally annexed by Britain during the First World War, making British control of the Eastern Mediterranean much easier. The British operated POW camps on Cyprus that would later become internment camps for illegal Jewish migrants to Palestine. See Ulvi Keser, Kibris, 1914-1923 (Levent, Istanbul: Akdeniz Haber Ajansi, 2000).

40 BOA, DH-ŞFR 442/47, Hakki to Dahiliye, Adana (15 Eylül 1330 [28 September 1914]).
Governor of Mount Lebanon, reported that “famine (kaht) has begun to emerge and hundreds of poor and needy are pressuring the government.” The grain was needed not just for Beirut itself but in Jerusalem as well. The province required a shipment of its daily grain requirements, eight railway cars’ worth, as soon as possible.\textsuperscript{41} If a railway car or \textit{vagon} held 80,000 kg of grain, this meant over 600,000 kg in total, a tall order for any province during wartime.\textsuperscript{42}

İsmail Hakkı reported that Adana could supply the provisions needed by Beirut. However, the blockade made sea transport impossible and the two provinces were not yet connected by rail. Grain in Adana and Mersin could reach İskenderun very quickly. But at the İskenderun railway station, the grain would have to be loaded onto animals — in short supply at the time — and transported some seventy km to Katma (Afrin), from whence it could proceed by rail to Beirut.\textsuperscript{43} This episode illustrated the problems that the blockade and the general wartime conditions would pose to provisioning in the Ottoman Empire, especially in locations such as Beirut.\textsuperscript{44} Both the decline in grain production in Cilicia as well as increased difficulties in moving agricultural produce generated effects that had serious implications well beyond the borders of the Adana province. And because the movement of grain had to be coordinated through state institutions and merchants, passing through multiple stages of transfer, there was no guaranteeing that it would reach markets at a fair price. This is only one example of the

\textsuperscript{41} BOA, DH-ŞFR 47/118, Ali Münif to Adana, Aleppo, and Syria (9 Tişrinisani 1330 [22 November 1914]).
\textsuperscript{42} The amount of food that railway car could hold depended on the type of grain and whether or not it had been processed, i.e. flour would be a denser form of food than unprocessed wheat. Available documentation for the archives regarding shipments reveals an average of around 80,000 kg per car. For example, 6 cars of potatoes and corn sent from Adapazarı to Istanbul in 1915 contained 489,000 kg of food in total. BOA, DH-I-UM 93-2/1-83, No. 7 (4 Ağustos 1331 [17 August 1915]).
\textsuperscript{43} BOA, DH-ŞFR 666/10, Hakkı to Dahiliye, Adana (10 Tişrinisani 1330 [23 November 1914]).
\textsuperscript{44} For more on how the blockade influenced the economy and politics of Beirut and Greater Syria during the war, see Melanie Schulze Tanielian, "Feeding the City: the Beirut Municipality and the Politics of Food During World War I," \textit{International Journal of Middle East Studies} 46, no. 4 (2014); Linda Schatkowski Schilcher, "The famine of 1915-1918 in Greater Syria," in \textit{Problems of the modern Middle East in historical perspective : essays in honour of Albert Hourani}, ed. John P. Spagnolo and Albert Hourani (Reading, UK: Ithaca Press, 1992). Also Gratien and Pitts, "Towards an Environmental History of World War I: Human and Natural Disasters in the Ottoman Mediterranean."
logistical constraints encountered as the Cilicia region sought to export surplus grain to other parts of the empire during the first year of the war.\(^{45}\)

**Spring 1915: The Wartime Ecology**

If economic crisis was beyond the control of individuals, the Ottoman state could do a little more, and, indeed, attempted to accelerate agricultural development. In March 1915, the Ministry of Commerce and Agriculture resolved to adopt measures related to agricultural production. This entailed increased administrative involvement in the agrarian economy of Adana, Aleppo, and Beirut, where the impacts of mobilization and the Allied blockade were particularly pronounced. The principal measure regarding agriculture in Adana concerned support for the cotton industry, namely the extension of more loans to local cultivators, about 25,000 *lira* in total.\(^{46}\) An additional overall concern was labor; head of the ministry Ahmed Nesimi acknowledged that at planting and harvest time cultivators were experiencing “great difficulties” in finding workers. He indicated that everything should be done to ensure that there were enough workers around at these crucial times, which entailed the use of conscript labor battalions when available. However, another aspect of the plan was to offset the labor effects of mobilization through industrializing the empire’s agriculture. This included doubling the number of mechanical reapers in the empire to 500 through imports from the United States and the use of pesticides such as sulfur and copper sulfate or bluestone (*göztaşı*) to ward off plant diseases. It also meant diversifying the food supply to better incorporate foods most useful for emergency provisioning such as potatoes and corn (*mısır*).\(^{47}\) Successful mobilization would have to be more

\(^{45}\) See also: BOA, DH-ŞFR 50/242; 253; 51/61; 99.

\(^{46}\) BOA, DH-SYS 123-09/21-08, no. 30 (18 Mart 1331 [31 March 1915]).

\(^{47}\) BOA, DH-SYS 123-09/21-08, no. 29 (3 Mart 1331 [16 March 1915]). In a short work on the use of chemical fertilizers for potato cultivation from 1915, a certain Kiryako Efendi noted that the Ottomans’ adversaries were trying to “kill them through starvation” and that chemically-fertilized potatoes, which Germany was already producing with dazzling results, could be used to overcome this obstacle. “We must hasten to grow potatoes,” he
than moving troops and ammunition to the front; it would require a comprehensive provisioning and agricultural policy along with a more thorough mobilization of nature. In the Adana region, this entailed the development of a five-year plan involving expenditures in the areas of agriculture and technical training in order to raise Ottoman agriculture “to the level of Europe (Avrupa derecesine).” These plans were signs that Ottoman administrators were beginning to understand that it would be a long war, and that food would play a critical role.

The Ministry of Agriculture struggled to implement all of these imperatives. Warning signs of trouble in Adana came as the grain harvest approached in May. The Ministry of Interior had already missed the chance to send the six labor battalions needed for planting, and in May, it was late in scrambling to send the 15,000 hands that Adana needed for the harvest. For example, a group of eleven cultivators in the Ceyhan region complained to the government that neither funds nor laborers for agriculture were available as promised, and their harvests would go to waste. They said that by request of the government, they had greatly expanded their area of cultivation. 1915 had brought them bountiful harvests. But their annual produce normally relied on some 10,000 migrant workers, and meanwhile the government had not even sent the 5,000 needed for the harvest and threshing. In the case of the Ceyhan cultivators, about two weeks later with the harvest in jeopardy, arrangements were still being made. The results of this harvest (described below) suggest that the policies adopted by the Ministry of Agriculture in spring of 1915 were inadequate or infeasible.

warned, indicating that the war experience should be a hard-learned lesson (ders-i ibret). Kiryako, Patates Ziraati ve Kimyevi Gübre [Potato Cultivation and Chemical Fertilizer] (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Hayriye, 1331 [1915]), 2.
48 More below. BOA, DH-UMVM 82/61, no. 4 (17 Kanunusani 1331 [30 January 1916]).
49 BOA, DH-I-UM 59-1/1-20, no. 4, Ahmed Nesimi to Dahiliye (27 Cemaziyelahir 1333 / 29 Nisan 1331 [12 May 1915]).
50 BOA, DH-I-UM 59-1/1-20, no. 11, Mücteba et al to Dahiliye (26 Nisan 1331 [9 May 1915]).
51 BOA, DH-I-UM 59-1/1-20, no. 9 (9 Receb 1333 / 10 Mayıs 1331 [23 May 1915]).
Even then, there were factors that seemed beyond the realm of agrarian policy. During the spring of 1915, swarms of locusts began to spread throughout Greater Syria. They devoured the crops and orchards of countless villages, wreaking particular havoc in Palestine. By May, they had traveled some 500 km from that region into Cilicia, creating tremendous anxiety about further devastation in Anatolia. While locusts were typically associated with the more sparsely populated and arid expanses of the Jazirah and the Hejaz, the insects were known to rear their heads occasionally in Çukurova during years of unusual swarming. But with measures in place regarding their extermination, damage could be minimized. Locusts could be eliminated fairly easily while in egg or larval form using fire or burial, but they were virtually unstoppable once they sprouted wings.\(^{52}\) These airborne (uçkun) locusts began to appear in the periphery of the Adana province around İslahiye and Marash, soon spreading north towards Elbistan, Sivas, Niğde, and the Cappadocia region by June of 1915. In the interior beyond the Kozan Mountains, they attacked some fifteen villages and destroyed much of the summer crops. While efforts to exterminate the adult locusts were largely ineffective, local inhabitants along with the labor battalions in the region were able to destroy most of the new generation.\(^{53}\) Damage due to locusts along with a wheat fungus (kinacıklık), according to the local government in Adana, did substantial harm to the 1915 wheat harvest.\(^{54}\)

In parts of Anatolia, the Ottoman government was able to mobilize large numbers of people to combat locusts as had been done before, thereby reducing their impact.\(^{55}\) However, in

---

52 See Ertan Gökm, "Bati Anadolu'da Çekirge Felaketi (1850-1915)," Belleten 74, no. 269 (April 2010).
53 BOA, DH-I-UM 56/2, no. 3 (24 Mayıs 1331 [6 June 1915]); 56/4, no. 5 (2 Haziran 1331 [15 June 1915]).
54 BOA, DH-I-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 23-25, Hakkı to Dahiliye (24 Eylül 1331 [7 October 1915]).
Palestine and elsewhere closer to the source of the outbreak, the crop damage was more severe.\textsuperscript{56} 1915 would be remembered in those regions within the popular memory as the “year of the locust (\textit{\'am al-jarrad}),” as locusts were blamed for much of the famine and scarcity that occurred.\textsuperscript{57} Zachary Foster has convincingly substantiated this link, arguing that the locusts may have pushed the agrarian economy of Greater Syria over the brink of starvation.\textsuperscript{58} What remains to be further evaluated, however, is the extent to which the spread of locusts itself was a consequence of the war’s ecological effects. Within the normal practices of agrarian life, farmers would have certainly been on the lookout for locusts and adapted means of dealing with them. Likewise, state approaches to locust control had been formalized by the late Ottoman period.\textsuperscript{59} This does not mean that such approaches were highly effective. But it is certainly conceivable that the removal of large numbers of men from village ecologies due to conscription shifted the balance between the locusts and humans in the Ottoman Empire.

This is the impression one takes from the account of ABCFM missionary Edith Cold, who spent summer of 1915 in Hadjin. She and her colleagues battled the locusts for months. “They first appeared in early June and ravaged the country till September,” she wrote. “They destroyed our vineyards, and we had to fight day after day to keep them out of the Compound. When we destroyed those hatched on our premises, their places were quickly filled by armies coming down the mountain side. When I left many of the villages were suffering for the lack of

\textsuperscript{56} This being said, significant damage from locusts stretched very far into the hinterland region of Anatolia, not only to the Anti-Taurus and Cappadocia regions, but in fact as far the provinces around Lake Eğridir, which reported in fall 1915 that they had no surplus grain to export to Adana, Izmir, and Bursa due to locust damage. BOA, DH-I-UM 89-4/1-47 (25 Teşrinievvel 1331 [7 November 1915]).

\textsuperscript{57} See Salim Tamari, \textit{Year of the Locust: a soldier’s diary and the erasure of Palestine’s Ottoman past} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

\textsuperscript{58} Zachary J. Foster, "The 1915 Locust Attack in Syria and Palestine and its Role in the Famine During the First World War," \textit{Middle Eastern Studies} (2014).

\textsuperscript{59} In 1913, the Ottoman government passed a law regarding the obligations of subjects vis-à-vis the control of locusts, which included notifying the heads of villages and tribes about any locust citing and various extermination measures. \textit{Çekirgenin İlafına Dair Kanun ve Talimat}, (Dersaadet [İstanbul]: Matbaa-yı Hayriye, 1329 [1913/14]).
food due to the locust scourge.”

Locusts could be especially harmful to remote mountain areas like Hadjin with relatively poor access to food from outside and relatively high reliance on orchards and gardens. Yet if Cold and company felt isolated and outnumbered in the battle against the locusts of Hadjin, a town so often remarked upon for its incredible population density, it was in no small part due to human factors. Hadjin and many nearby villages had been emptied of their populations during the summer of 1915 for entirely political reasons. The Armenian inhabitants of Hadjin had been incrementally deported across Çukurova and towards Aleppo and the Syrian Desert, the locusts arriving in wake of their departure. On their journey, the Armenian civilians of Hadjin and the rest of the Cilicia region carried the Ottoman experience of the First World War with them, taking Cilicia’s wartime story on bitter a detour across the empire and indeed the globe.

**Summer 1915: The Armenian Genocide**

Of all the war’s impacts, the event that most contributed to the unraveling of the economy in Cilicia was arguably the expulsion of Armenians from Anatolia, a measure remembered as the Armenian genocide. As Ottoman citizens, most Armenians were in theory to serve in the Ottoman army and labor battalions like all other people in the empire, meanwhile contributing dutifully to the wartime economy. Yet following the arrest, deportation, and subsequent execution of a large number of Armenian intellectuals and professionals in April 1915, the

---


61 There is not space to cover exactly what different historians have meant by the term genocide or how different authors have defined the case of the Armenian genocide, a label that has been much argued and debated. The term genocide was coined by Raphael Lemkin to describe the actions of the Nazi regime during the Second World War, and Lemkin considered the Armenian genocide to be a prior example of that phenomenon. I use the term Armenian genocide in this dissertation as a label for these events overwhelmingly favored by Armenians today and convincingly substantiated by a number of historical works. For a select list of works on the subject in English that address the question of genocide directly, see Kévorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*; Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime Against Humanity*: the Armenian genocide and ethnic cleansing in the Ottoman Empire; Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide*: imperialism, nationalism, and the destruction of the Ottoman Armenians; Üngör, *The Making of Modern Turkey*; Suny, Göçek, and Naimark, *A Question of Genocide*: Armenians and Turks at the end of the Ottoman Empire; Suny, *“They can live in the desert but nowhere else”: a history of the Armenian genocide.*
Ottoman government incrementally organized a series of deportations of Armenians to temporary camps over the course of succeeding months. By September, local officials had begun to remove or attempt to remove resident Armenians in all parts of Anatolia. CUP officials framed this policy as a security measure. They justified the deportations by casting Armenians as a dangerous or disloyal community prone to acts of rebellion and resistance as well as collusion with the Ottomans’ enemies, namely the Russian Empire. However, the measures were not limited to targeting Armenian political or paramilitary groups. They involved the deportation of entire families, not just near the fronts but throughout Anatolia. Upwards of half of the Ottoman Armenian population died of disease, starvation, and outright massacre through deliberate policies implemented by the CUP.62

62 The Armenian genocide was incremental and carried out in different ways in different locations. For a work that attempts to offer a comprehensive overview of these measures, see Raymond Kévorkian’s The Armenian Genocide: A Complete History, which treats the deportation phases in a district by district manner, leading to significant repetition but creating a very thorough catalog of available information about the particularities of each local. Kévorkian, The Armenian Genocide, 265-698. Actual figures regarding mortality of Armenians during the First World War vary widely and have been hotly debated and politicized. The figure of 1.5 million Armenians that is often cited refers to the estimations of the Armenian population of Anatolia that was targeted for deportation, not the number who died per se. Since sources with precise indications of population change and mortality during the war are not available for deported Armenians, historians are forced to rely on estimates and inferences that create room for ambiguity. For example, McCarthy indicates a mortality rate of 40% based on a more or less 1.5 million pre-war population estimate and using data regarding refugee populations outside of Anatolia in 1918. One of the crucial figures that comprise this calculation is an estimate for 400,000 Anatolian Armenian refugee survivors in the Caucasus, a number that has been widely cited in numerous sources including by Richard Hovannisian. However, whereas McCarthy counts all of these as survivors, as Fuat Dündar notes, the starvation conditions in the region at the time meant that many of these Armenian refugees died in a period of very high mortality. In fact, he cites a French source stating that 1000 people per day were dying. This is one example of how definitions of survival and death with regard to the Armenian genocide can result in substantially different calculations of mortality, opening a tremendous arena for interpretation, doubt, and even manipulation. McCarthy, Muslims and Minorities : the population of Ottoman Anatolia and the end of the empire, 130; Fuat Dündar, Crime of numbers : the role of statistics in the armenian question (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2010), 153. Another issue involved in the ambiguity is that of conversion to Islam in order to escape deportation. Some have argued that a significant percentage of the Armenian population, as much as 5-10% converted for that purpose, and that it appears many Armenian soldiers converted during the war for similar reasons. Zürcher, The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey, 173. Kevorkian also mentions mass forced conversion in Syria under the government of Cemal Pasha. Kévorkian, The Armenian Genocide, 681-82. Here, whether or not those conversions “stuck” after the deportations and the war were over becomes a major issue when tabulating the number of survivors. The CUP was concerned that conversion was being used as a survival strategy. For example, Talat Pasha issued a telegram in July 1915 saying, “It is becoming understood that some of the deported Armenians are being left in their places due to their embrace of Islam (ihtida etmeleri)... and that even some civil servants are serving as an intermediary for them.” He stressed repeatedly that “it is absolutely not permissible to make
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At the outset of the war, there were around 100,000 Armenians in Cilicia (includes Marash) along with undocumented residents from other provinces. Over the period between April and October of 1915, most of the Armenians in Cilicia — along with Armenians in nearly all of the other provinces in Anatolia — would be removed from civilian life, deported first to camps along the Baghdad Railway line and eventually into the Syrian Desert towards Zor and Mosul. Cilicia witnessed many phases of the deportation process. The Armenians of Zeytun and Döertyol (Çokmerzimen) were among the first to be deported in Anatolia due to putative security concerns. Throughout 1915 and 1916, Armenians from further west passed through the province en route to Syria. Meanwhile, the Armenians of Adana were among the last to be deported. The Governor of Adana İsmail Hakkı did not wish to carry out the deportation order. Hakkı apparently stalled or ignored deportation orders from the central government in the case of many families in the city of Adana itself. Due to irregularities in the Adana province, Ali Münnif Bey, a native of the Cilicia region, claimed that he was dispatched to Adana to see to the initial deportations personally. Because of the close ties between Cemal Pasha and the Armenians of Adana, some Armenians in Cilicia were able to secure relatively favorable terms, exceptional treatment with regard to converts (mühtediler).”

63 This figure is based on the pre-war Ottoman census and is therefore a conservative estimate. Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics*, 172-73, 86-87. Those who claim somewhat higher population estimates for Armenians in Cilicia prior to the First World War may be justified.

64 The Armenian inhabitants of Zeytun were deported in mid-April after months of tense relations between a hostile local gendarmerie and bands of deserters. However, given that desertion was widespread and the men in question were rather marginal, the relationship between would-be rebels in Zeytun and deportation appears to have been pretextual. Kévorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, 585-89. Similar issues regarding suspicion of loyalty occurred in Döertyol, formerly Çokmerzimen, following Allied attacks there in 1914. Here too Armenians were deported early, some to Damascus and the rest to Northern Syria, in April of 1915. Ibid., 589-90.

65 Ibid., 594. Ismail Hakki had apparently spent the summer in Marash—as Adana governors so often did—where he received a telegram from Talat Pasha in August 1915 requesting again for all Armenians that had not been sent off to be deported. BOA, DH-ŞFR 54A/271 (22 Temmuz 1331 [4 August 1915]).

66 Ali Münnif Bey was exiled for his prominent role in organizing the deportations but was able to return once Turkey gained independence. In fact, he was major of Adana during the 1920s. He gives some rather minimal discussion of the deportations and how he was implicated in his memoirs. Yeğenağa, *Ali Münnif Bey'in hâtilraları*, 77-79. See Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime Against Humanity: the Armenian genocide and ethnic cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*, 19-20.
as many were in permitted to reside in Hama and Damascus for the rest of the war period, as opposed to being marched into the Jazirah.⁶⁷ Around 20,000 Armenians were expelled from the city of Adana in the fall of 1915, and as Adana Governor Hakkı reported, over 50,000 were deported from the province as a whole.⁶⁸

Most Armenians from the countryside in Cilicia were eventually deported to points further east, where thirst, starvation, and massacres affected hundreds of thousands of people.⁶⁹ Hakkı had warned that reserves of provisions provided to Armenian deportees from both Adana and elsewhere, even under perfect conditions, would run out well before the journey was over, exposing large numbers of people to extreme hunger and poverty as they were moved from place to place over the course of the following months and years.⁷⁰ According to the figures in the reports of Talat Pasha that have been published by Murat Bardakçı, almost 40% of the

---

⁶⁷ Some of the most virulently anti-Armenian figures within the local administration of Adana had been removed as a result of the massacres in 1909, and many have referred to Cemal Pasha’s close relationship with wealthy Armenians in Adana as further explanation for how many escaped the worst that deportation had to offer. Kévorkian, *The Armenian Genocide*, 594, 674. The Catholicos of Sis wrote to Cemal Pasha for help as the Cilician Armenians were first being deported in summer 1915. Zâ'aria Pzîkean, *Kilikean kskiçner (1903-1915) [Cilician Sorrows]* (Beirut: Tparan Hrazdan, 1927), 194. American missionaries commented that the Armenians of Adana appeared to be in much better shape than those of most provinces and that there were an unusual number of men in their caravans. ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 670, pg. 145A, “Miss Frearson’s Experience and Observations in Turkey”; Reel 672, pg. 292A, “The Exiling of the Armenians: Adana District.”


⁶⁹ By July 1915, the Catholicos of Sis counted more than 13,000 Cilician Armenians from other rural towns and villages who had arrived in Aleppo as well as Al-Bab and Menbic (Manbij) to the northeast. Among them were over 4000 Armenians from Hadjin alone. Pzîkean, *Kilikean kskiçner (1903-1915) [Cilician Sorrows]*, 193. The incremental deportation of Armenians from the Cilicia region continued over the following months. A rather thorough report on the Christian population of the Adana province and a chart indicating the number of Armenians deported as of September 1915 reflects the state of affairs at that time, although more deportations would occur subsequently. BOA, DH-EUM-2-Şb 73/48, no. 1, Hakkı to Dahiliye, Adana (15 Eylül 1331 [28 September 1915]).

⁷⁰ BOA, DH-İ-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 23-25, Hakkı to Dahiliye (24 Eylül 1331 [7 October 1915]).
Armenians from the Adana province were “missing” by 1917, meaning either dead or unaccounted for.\textsuperscript{71}

The CUP government was aware of the ways in which removing all Armenian civilians from their home provinces would negatively impact the economy.\textsuperscript{72} Some Armenians were able to avoid or delay deportation because they were deemed valuable to the war effort. Most adult males that initially escaped deportation were workers and professionals deemed essential to the war, and these individuals such as railroad employees were in turn able to offer help to other Armenians during or after the deportations, even as the functioning railway played a fundamental role in their removal.\textsuperscript{73} Many Armenians were also part of the conscripted labor battalions and

\textsuperscript{71} Murat Bardakçi, \textit{Talât Paşa'nın evrak-ı metrukesi : sadrazam Talât Paşa'nın özel arşivinde bulunan Ermeni tehciri konusundaki belgeler ve hususî yazışmalar} (Çagaloglu, İstanbul: Everest Yayınları, 2008). Ara Sarafian has published analysis of the figures detailed in Bardakçi’s work in English. For Adana province, see Ara Sarafian, \textit{Talaat Pasha’s report on the Armenian Genocide, 1917} (London: Taderon Press, 2011), 44. In comparison with Eastern Anatolian provinces, where the dead and missing were over 90% of the population or other parts of Anatolia such as Bursa and İzmit where over 70% of the Armenian population fell into that category, Armenians of Adana survived the war at a much higher rate. In 1917, over 10,000 Adana Armenians were in the province and more than 15,000 were in the provinces of Syria and Aleppo; by war’s end around 20,000 Armenians were in the province of Adana, having either escaped deportation or returned after 1917 (more in Chapter 10). Ibid., 44; Vahê Tachjian, \textit{La France en Cilicie et en Haute-Mésopotamie : aux confins de la Turquie, de la Syrie et de l'Irak : (1919-1933)} (Paris: Karthala, 2004), 63.

\textsuperscript{72} One example from the Adana region is a telegram written by Talat Pasha from September 1915. It stated that “because moving (\textit{sevk}) Armenian child laborers working in the filament factory in Adana would cause the factory to shut down, a delay of moving the aforementioned Armenian children along with their families is being announced by the Ministry of War until Muslim children can fill their places.” BOA, DH-ŞFR 55A/230 (30 Ağustos 1331 [12 September 1915]). Given that deportation bore fatal risks, even a short delay might have meant the difference between life and death for these girls and boys. But not all child workers of the region were as lucky; around the same time, an order was issued mandating the deportation of the men and Armenian children working at the Adana silk factory, an enterprise that could be more easily sacrificed. BOA, DH-ŞFR 489/16 (1 Eylül 1331 [14 September 1915]).

\textsuperscript{73} Kévorkian, \textit{The Armenian Genocide}, 580. Kévorkian mentions around 1000 craftsmen and skilled workers who were allowed to stay with their families in Adana. Ibid., 595. As merely one example of an Ottoman Armenian whose profession allowed his family to survive the war, I mention the case for Samuel Jamentz, an Armenian doctor from Hadjin educated in American Protestant institutions. He spent the war as a doctor stationed at military hospital in Bandırma. In the history of Cilicia, there are many stories like that of Samuel Jamentz about Armenians who found a way to avoid and survive deportation and help others escape such a fate. Poghosean, \textit{Hachêni ēndhamur patmut’îvno}, 236. Samuel Jamentz later moved with his family to the United States. Through correspondence with a descendent of Dr. Jamentz named Michael Jamentz, I was able to obtain a photograph of Dr. Jamentz carrying out his medical duties in Bandırma during the war.
continued to work throughout the period of 1915-16, though most of the workers were also eventually deported or killed.\footnote{Zürcher indicates that around 75\% of the men in labor battalions were Armenians, saying that while the battalions were not created in order to aid in the destruction of the Armenian community per se, gathering these large groups of unarmed men under the supervision of the Ottoman military certainly helped facilitate the massacres. Zürcher, The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey, 172.}

The Armenian community of the Adana province was in many ways the keystone of the local economy. On one hand, many of the large landholders and prominent merchants who normally orchestrated agricultural activity in the region were Armenian, and on the other, a substantial segment of the working class, especially the migrant workers who came from other parts of Anatolia, were also Armenian. In the city, Armenians were overrepresented among medical professionals and artisans alike. The deportations targeted entire families and not just men, which further exacerbated the economic impact, as women and children had taken on larger economic roles during the war. In fact, the impacts of the Armenian genocide on the broader population of the Ottoman Empire extended well beyond the economic realm (more in Chapter 9). The seizure of Armenian property may have benefited the Ottoman government or at least certain members of the CUP in particular ways, but removal of Armenians from local economies in places like Cilicia triggered a massive crisis that hampered the war effort. The loss of Armenian families would exacerbate the woes of those who remained in Cilicia for the rest of the war period.

Fall 1915: The Empty Plain

As I explained above, the Ministry of Trade and Agriculture had sought in spring 1915 to prevent a recurrence of the sort of economic crisis that had occurred the prior year due to mobilization. Yet the year of 1915 would be remembered as a time of scarcity, famine, and misery in the southeastern provinces of the empire. In Greater Syria starvation was widespread.
In the most heavily impacted regions such as Mount Lebanon, up to a third of the population would perish during the war. While not a normally a famine-prone region, Cilicia was not immune to the war’s effects. Economic life in Adana was very adversely affected by the forced removal of the Armenian population. ABCFM missionary William Nesbitt Chambers noted that over two-thirds of the businesses in Adana relied on Armenians, and that after the deportation of some 18,000 people, “the city seemed deserted.” Even Damar Arıkoğlu, who in his memoirs blamed the Armenians of Cilicia for the 1909 Adana massacres, did not deny the grave economic consequences of the deportations. “Moving the Armenians to Syria made our Province of Adana a completely empty void (tamtakir bir boşluk),” he would recall.

As the many stories of displacement described above ran their course, the agrarian downturn caused by wartime conditions and the labor effects of the deportations threatened Adana’s economy. Whereas Adana had enjoyed a small food surplus during 1914, by 1915, the food supply was severely jeopardized. The implications of the labor shortage were clear. Even if cultivators could sow enough seed to feed the province, a shortage of hands to harvest grain would prove a tremendous obstacle. The province struggled to find 15,000 hands of conscripted labor for harvest when normal labors flows at harvest time were often many times that number (see Chapter 5). In light of these challenges, Governor Hakkı would warn that the demands of the army upon the grain supply in Adana were dangerously high. The harvest of 1915 was much reduced; when compared with years leading up to the war, grain production was less than half (see Table 15 below). This decline appears to have been much sharper than in provinces closer to the capital, where total production was just 20% lower than prewar averages in 1915 and 27%

---

75 The forthcoming work of Graham Pitts will elaborate further upon the varying estimates of the death toll in Mount Lebanon. See also Gratien and Pitts, "Towards an Environmental History of World War I: Human and Natural Disasters in the Ottoman Mediterranean."
76 ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 669, Chambers to Barton (31 October 1915).
77 Arıkoğlu, Hâtralarım, 69.
lower in 1916.\textsuperscript{78} Adana exported lots of grain during a good year, but the army was requesting over 40\% of the wheat crop and over 55\% of the barley to provision some 20,000 military personnel and 5000 animals. Moreover, Hakkı noted that “while [Adana] is renowned as an agricultural region, that renown is more for cotton than cereals.” The needs of the army were simply more than the province could safely provide.\textsuperscript{79}

\textit{Table 15 Deviation of wartime grain production estimates in Adana}\textsuperscript{80}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in millions of kg.</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1909/1913 Mean</th>
<th>% Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, the wartime conditions that had so angered and worried the cotton cultivators of Adana in the fall of 1914 continued to erode the commercial agriculture of Cilicia that relied heavily on cotton export. Hakkı reported that the year’s crops had not flourished and “due to present circumstances (\textit{ahval-\textit{i hazıra}) and since all of the coastlines are blockaded, the crops that could be obtained cannot be exported and have remained in all the cultivators’ hands.” He added, “because of the loss of commerce, the already present economic crisis in this country

\textsuperscript{78} Pamuk, “The Ottoman Economy in World War I,” 120. The fact that Germany and the other Allies of the Ottomans were experiencing similar agrarian woes may have been a major exacerbating factor. Vedat Eldem, \textit{Harp ve mübareke yıllarında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun ekonomisi} (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994), 39.

\textsuperscript{79} BOA, DH-I-UM-EK 10/28, no. 1 (20 Ağustos 1331 [2 September 1915]).

\textsuperscript{80} This table uses production numbers from two official agricultural statistics reports from Rumi years 1325 and 1329. Overall production of grains for Adana as indicated suggests that 1913 was a bad grain harvest in comparison with 1909, while cotton production was even. British Consul Doughty Wylie referred to the impending 1909 crop as a “bumper harvest,” indicating that perhaps production was especially good that year. Wylie, \textit{Report for the Year 1908}, 8. Thus, I have averaged the two numbers for the purposes of comparison with the statistics reported by Adana governor Ismail Hakki in August 1915. These numbers should only be taken as approximations. The numbers for 1909/1913 are converted from bushels to kilograms, using the appropriate kıyye per bushel factors in the study and converting kıyye as 1.282 kg. Numbers for 1909 are adjusted to remove the İçel district, which was independent of Adana in 1913 and 1915. 1325 \textit{senesi Asya ve Afrika-\textit{\c{y}i Osmani Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325]; Memalik-\textit{i Osmaniye\textquoteleft \textquoteleft\textit{i 1329 Senesine Mahsus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913}. Also BOA, DH-I-UM-EK 10/28, no. 1 (20 Ağustos 1331 [2 September 1915]).
has doubled in severity.” The losses had a particularly adverse impact on heavily indebted cultivators. Unable to make payments on their loans to Ziraat Bankası, more cultivators were once again on the verge of defaulting. In response to the crisis, the director of Ziraat Bankası announced that as had been done during the prior year, the cultivators in Adana who were truly unable to make payments on their loans could delay payment until the subsequent cotton harvest.

This financial shock sent a wave of crisis through the local economy of Cilicia that was reflected in nearly every aspect of life. A close-up view of the Sursock family and its finances in Mersin and Tarsus during the war further illustrates the complexity of the war’s economic effects. The Sursocks were a Greek Orthodox family based in Beirut that owned many properties along the Mediterranean littoral (see Chapters 5 and 6). These included commercial buildings in the port of Mersin and farm lands acquired as “empty lands (arazi-yi haliye).” One of the properties in Ceyhan mentioned above that was threatened by repossession by the German Anatolia Cotton Company belonged to Marie Sursock, the wife of Vasil Sursock in Tarsus. Moreover, in 1915, as the processes of confiscating Armenian property were underway, the municipality in Mersin tried to seize some of their lands on the basis that they were not being maintained and remained in a swampy state. The Sursocks were able to maintain their ownership of the former lands due to the intercession of the Ottoman government on the behalf of local cultivators and the latter through the intercession of their friend Cemal Pasha.

81 BOA, DH-I-UM-EK 10/92, no. 2 (22 Ağustos 1331 [5 September 1915]).  
82 BOA, DH-I-UM-EK 10/92, no. 3 (14 Eylül 1331 [27 September 1915]).  
83 BOA, DH-I-UM-EK 11/65, Hakki to Dahiliye (26 Eylül 1331 [9 October 1915]); The Sursocks protested that the seizure was illegal. BOA, DH-UMVM 104/23, no. 12, Alfred and Michel Sursock to Beirut Vilayeti (21 Mayıs 1331 [3 June 1915]).  
84 USEK, Sursock, 19249/216, to Dikran Durry (5 August 1915).
Even more than their own agricultural land in the Cilicia region, which was a small fraction of the family’s total wealth, the properties of the Sursocks illustrate the gloomy fates of middle class merchants and cultivators in Çukurova, especially Armenians. The Sursocks owned a large amount of real estate in the heart of Mersin, including many shops and properties in the eponymous Sursock Quarter of the city, and as the family itself was largely based in Beirut, these properties were occupied by various tenants. Even though they were offering deep discounts — charging just 20% of rent during wartime — they had trouble collecting on these spaces and agricultural land around Tarsus.85 A frustrated letter to their main intermediary in Mersin, Dikran Durry, complained of the particular trouble in collecting rents there (see Table 16 below), exclaiming that “you have lowered the rents to a very reduced price. Instead of the 4000 lira, which we were collecting before the war, the rents of Mersin have been reduced to 500 lira of which we only collect half!!!!!”86 The names of the tenants that paid reduced rent or failed to pay reveal much about precisely what the war did to commerce in Cilicia. A half-dozen of those tenants who had not paid their rent were Armenians that had been deported from the region.87 Most of the others were prominent financial figures such as Hasan Kırk, a Muslim businessman who was one of the signatories of the original complaint of cotton cultivators of Çukurova in 1914. Mersin was a town built by the Mediterranean cotton trade that thrived on liberal economic conditions and political stability. It had little place in the wartime economy given that the coast was blockaded for much of the war.88

85 USEK, Sursock, 19249/197, to Durry (31 May 1915); 260, to Durry (15 May 1916); 272, to Durry (29 September 1916).
86 USEK, Sursock, 19249/283, to Durry (2 May 1917).
87 The Sursocks would try to collect on these rents from the Ottoman government. USEK, Sursock, 19249/302, to Durry (24 April 1918); 335 (12 September 1918).
88 A map reflecting British intelligence from the period showed three of the four main piers of Mersin destroyed after 1915 due to bombing that occurred. TNA, FO 925/41301.
Table 16 Commercial rents collected by Sursock family in Mersin (in lira)\textsuperscript{89}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>no. of rents</th>
<th>1915/16</th>
<th>1916/17</th>
<th>1917/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sursock Quarter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammadiye Market &amp; Old Bedestan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpacı Han</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rus Pazarı (Souk Roussi)</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{90}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building (Nouvelle Bâtisse)\textsuperscript{91}</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One last financial matter that highlights the unintended consequences of wartime policy concerns the issue of inflation. E.C. Woodley, an ABCFM missionary in Marash, painted a particularly vivid picture of how the behavioral side of economics influenced the result of the introduction of paper money into the Ottoman economy in 1915.\textsuperscript{92} Woodley and other missionaries in Cilicia knew this story well because they were strictly limited to transacting in paper money after this point, which resulted in major complications regarding the devaluing of remittances for Near East Relief aid to Armenians after 1915. Writing in 1919, Woodley explained how the new paper money produced unanticipated results. The Ottoman paper currency was introduced in 1915 as one to one equivalent with the gold lira, but by the end of the war the paper version was worth less than 20% of the coin equivalent. This depreciation occurred in spite of laws and policies encouraging the use of paper money, at certain points even forbidding the use of coin in the markets.

\textsuperscript{89} USEK, Sursock, 19249/295-96 (2 August 1918); 328 (31 July 1918).

\textsuperscript{90} The lists of rents in the Sursock family records normally contain the name of the tenant and the unit number, but for 1915/16 this information is not provided for Rus Pazarı. Thus, this number is extrapolated from subsequent years.

\textsuperscript{91} Apparently constructed during the war period, this building was a fairly high rent place and the Sursocks’ tenants included the Chamber of Commerce.

\textsuperscript{92} While I have narrated this development through the provincial lens of Woodley’s testimony, a short overview of paper money in the Ottoman Empire is available in Sevket Pamuk, A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire (New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 222-24.
Woodley observed that “When the use of coin was forbidden, the merchants displayed their poorest goods and sold them at the highest rates, and the villagers refused to bring their grain and produce to sell. The markets practically closed and people went hungry.” The impact of paper money varied from locale to locale. While that account accurately described Marash, in Adana, for example, paper money took hold but with unusual effect. “The people hid their money and dealt only in paper,” Woodley explained, “but instead of advancing the prices of goods 400% the traders advanced them 1000%.” Inflation and lack of faith in the paper currency were worst in provinces furthest from the Ottoman capital; by August 1917, one gold lira would be worth 430 kuruş in Istanbul and 450 kuruş in Bursa and Izmir. Meanwhile, it was 600 kuruş in Adana, 555 in Beirut, and as much as 766 in Mosul. As the conflict and Ottoman financial woes worsened, the government began to print money ad hoc, creating a risk of further inflating the currency. But here, Ottoman citizens tried to use this state of affairs to their advantage, hoarding their coin while paying their taxes in the much devalued but officially equal paper currency promoted by the government. Even if the government reacted by raising tax rates, this ultimately hurt the treasury and undermined the Ottoman currency. The moral economy within which paper money was introduced in the Ottoman Empire illustrates the grave implications of wartime fiscal policy for people in Cilicia.

---

94 Pamuk, A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire, 223.
Winter 1915-16: “We Cannot Find Bread”

The country became miserable. Starvation, poverty, despair. Huge crowds in front of the bakeries. People fighting with each other to get bread that was like mud, obtained with a ration card. The cries of those who could not get it. People fainting from hunger. It was becoming normal. There was no counting the people begging for bread. The streets had become the realm of the poor and hungry.96


Mobilization and the expulsion of the local Armenian community devastated the economy of the Cilicia region, which would not recover for the rest of the war. As the sagas of the Anatolian Armenians and Ottoman soldiers played out on the margins of the empire, the local situation in Adana and the surrounding area became increasingly dire. The winter of 1915-16 would bring famine to the Cilicia region, not just in the countryside, but even in the once thriving city of Adana. Governor Hakkı declared as early as October that reduced harvests coupled with the demands of the military and the overall impact of the deportations on the region’s food supply could be headed towards “a critical famine (buhranlı bir kaht).” The province did not even have enough seed for the coming year.97 Hunger was spreading in Adana, and the ABCFM hospital reported feeding roughly 150 people per day alone.98 Meanwhile, there were major shortages of items like coffee and salt as well as fuel. One American missionary claimed that people in Adana resorted to using fruit trees — normally held as highly valuable — and the homes of deported Armenians for firewood. One of her Muslim neighbors had “all last winter used the flooring of her [own] house for cooking her food.”99

In the middle of December, Hakkı wrote to the Ministry of Interior to explain the impact of mobilization and the deportation of Armenians on his province. A quarter of the men had been

96 Arıkoğlu, Hâtıralarım, 69. Üngör and Polatel refer to this quotation and provide many other interesting details about the specific economic impacts of the deportation of Armenians on the economy and life of the Adana region. Mehmet Polatel and Ümit Üngör, Confiscation and Colonization : the Young Turks seizure of Armenian property (London: Continuum, 2011), 107-32.
97 BOA, DH-I-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 23-25, Hakkı to Dahiliye (24 Eylül 1331 [7 October 1915]).
98 ABC 16.9.5, Reel 671, pg. 7, Haas to Barton (9 October 1915).
taken away by the war effort, and a similar number of Armenians had been removed from the economy. Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of Armenians passing through Adana and elsewhere had been left to fend for themselves during deportations. He calculated that there were about 100,000 males left in the province, many of whom were children or unfit to work. A similar decline in the animal population had occurred. Moreover, of the 70-80,000 migrant workers that had come from other provinces in recent years, none were coming. The provincial government had up until that point failed to put one or two of the nine labor battalions in the province charged with road and rail construction towards agriculture. These conditions created a situation in which Hakkı noted that the province might not even have two-weeks’ worth of grain left, and the provincial government was scrambling to facilitate whatever planting might be possible.100

As the economic situation worsened, many pleaded for help, positioning their claims on the basis of their family’s service to the nation. By the end of the winter in February 1916, prices of basic foodstuffs in Cilicia spiked to unprecedented levels, and the municipal government in Adana could not procure enough wheat to regulate the supply of bread.101 The treasurer of the Adana province reported that a bushel of grain had reached 6 mecidiyes or roughly 120 kuruş.102 Considering that the going rate for a bushel of wheat in Adana before the war was 20-25 kuruş, this reflected a dramatic rise in the cost of food.103 As a result, the poor simply “could not buy it” and grain was becoming increasingly monopolized by a few merchants and profiteers

100 BOA, DH-I-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 12-13, Hakki to Dahiliye (30 Teşrinisani 1331 [13 December 1915]). During the war period, women took up a larger role in agriculture in order to compensate for the dearth of labor in the villages, however, it is unclear to what extent the government worked to actively mobilize female labor in the Adana region.
101 BOA, DH-I-UM 98-2/1-51, no. 4, Hakki to Dahiliye, Adana (15 Kanunusani 1331 [28 January 1916]).
102 BOA, DH-SFR 667/43 (27 Kanunusani 1331 [9 Şubat 1916]).
103 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-yı Osmani Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325], 14; Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329 Senesine Maksus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913], 36.
In fact, financial stress and hunger had escalated to the point that families began to pressure the government. A telegram from a woman named Ayşe speaking on behalf of “all the military families of Adana” demanded that the government look after their provisioning (iaše). She wrote, “We receive a salary of 30 kuruş [per month] and a bushel of wheat is six mecediye (i.e. 120 kuruş). We and our children are being wiped out by hunger while our men are sacrificing their lives for the sake of protecting the state and religion (din ve devlet).”

Such a frank and desperate message to the Ministry of Interior from an ordinary citizen identified simply as “Ayşe” may sound unusual, but as Yiğit Akın has shown, there are in fact many such telegrams strewn about the various documents and correspondence concerning provisioning in the Ottoman Empire from 1916 onward. Often penned by the wives, sisters, mothers, and daughters of Ottoman military personnel, they consistently assert their basic right to eat as part and parcel of their family’s service to war effort. For example, a telegram to the Ministry of Interior sent within a day of Ayşe’s call for assistance during the winter of 1916 bears the signatures of 15 women from Tarsus who hailed from the families of Muslim soldiers (şehit gazi asakir-i islamiye). They too asked for government intervention in urban provisioning in the Cilicia region, declaring that “The local businessmen do not accept banknotes. We cannot buy the things we need to buy. We will die from hunger with paper in our hands. A bushel of wheat has risen to 100 kuruş. We cannot find bread.”

By February of 1916, it was painfully clear that Ottoman provisioning practices did not meet the needs of civilian populations during wartime. Over prior decades, the government had played little role in the regulation of the food supply beyond sometimes banning export from

---

104 BOA, DH-ŞFR 667/43 (27 Kanunusani 1331 [9 Şubat 1916]).
105 BOA, DH-I-UM 88-3/4-26, no. 10, Ayşe to Dahiliye, Adana (31 Kanunusani 1331 [13 February 1916]).
107 BOA, DH-I-UM-EK 15/51, no. 2, Münire et al to Dahiliye, Tarsus (30 Kanunusani 1331 [12 February 1916]).
regions of scarcity, facilitating the movement of emergency supplies, and implementing price ceilings called *narhs*, which were very difficult to enforce. Early responses to scarcity during the war as described above were improvised and failed to systematically address the issues that gave rise to provisioning issues. For the most part, the Ottoman administration sought to orchestrate the movement of flour and grain to places where it was critically needed. This was the initial response to the looming famine of February 1916 in Adana. The provincial treasurer proposed that the best solution was to sell the 80,000 kg of grain reserves belonging to the 4th Army of Syria led by Cemal Pasha to the local population at a moderate price. After some correspondence with Cemal Pasha and the Ministry of Interior, the provincial government ended up purchasing grain from the Province of Konya — the only region in a position to supply it — allowing residents of the city to purchase a meager two kg each at a reduced price. But such measures were only short-term solutions to the chronic scarcity that was emerging throughout the empire.

The Ottoman Empire did not possess well-defined civilian provisioning practices during the first years of the war. An investigation of the impacts of certain measures on various provinces from 1916 illustrated why systematic approaches were so difficult to adopt. Each province reported different obstacles. Whereas in Beirut, free trade had allowed profiteers to monopolize the grain supply, thereby exacerbating famine, the local government in Adana claimed that measures such as price ceilings were ultimately counterproductive and that trade should be free. In other words, according to these explanations, free trade caused the famine in Lebanon whereas absence of free trade caused famine conditions in Adana. The new Governor

---

108 BOA, DH-ŞFR 667/43 (27 Kanunusani 1331 [9 Şubat 1916]).
109 BOA, DH-I-UM-EK 15/57 (1 Şubat 1331 [14 February 1916]); DH-UMVM 136/20 (3 Şubat 1331 [16 February 1916]).
110 BOA, DH-I-UM 98-2/1-51, no. 31, Azmi to Dahiliye, Beirut (11 Nisan 1332 [24 April 1916]).
of Adana Cevdet Bey (more in Chapter 9) noted that the biggest obstacle to provisioning in the sparsely population Adana province was not so much supply but rather transportation issues, which left producers with grain rotting in their hands.\textsuperscript{111} Beirut and Adana were just two examples of provisioning that the Ottoman government drew on while trying to formulate a more comprehensive approach.\textsuperscript{112}

**Summer 1916: The Refugees**

However grave the situation may have been in Adana, at the margins of the Ottoman Empire, especially Eastern Anatolia, matters were even worse. From 1915 onward, the level of internal displacement in the Ottoman Empire increased not just among Christian populations but also Muslim immigrants and refugees. Some of these refugees were Ottoman Muslims displaced by the Balkan Wars that had yet to settle down after up to two years of itinerancy. In many cases, they were settled in the places of Armenians almost immediately after deportation was carried out.\textsuperscript{113} Others were fleeing the combat zone in Eastern Anatolia, which after 1915, extended well into the Ottoman provinces of Van and Bitlis. The Refugees and Tribes Directorate (\textit{Aşair ve Muhacirin Müdâriyet-i Umumiyesi}) began making arrangements for these people to replace Armenian deportees even before the orders had been implemented in places like Adana.\textsuperscript{114} The

\textsuperscript{111} BOA, DH-İ-UM 98-2/1-51, no. 34, Cevdet to Dahiliye, Adana (17 Nisan 1332 [30 April 1916]).
\textsuperscript{112} For a summary of the experience in each province, see BOA, DH-İ-UM 98-2/1-51, no. 15-17.
\textsuperscript{113} Kevorkian cites this fact as an example of the planning involved in the Armenian genocide, especially in the case of Zeytun, which was exceptionally emptied in April 1915 and where Balkan muhacirs were settled immediately following the deportations. In this way, Zeytun appears as an early model for more universal deportations and settlements over the course of the subsequent year. Kévorkian, \textit{The Armenian Genocide}, 588.
\textsuperscript{114} One plan involved settling refugees that had been settled in Syria in the place of Armenians in Anatolia, in turn settling the many nomadic tribes of Syria in their stead. Such plans reflect the ambition of CUP demographic engineering. For example Ali Münif notified the government in Syria during June of 1915 that “Because the refugees residing in Fiham Çayrgahi and all the others will to be sent to places vacated by Armenians from Aleppo, Adana, and Urfa for settlement, there is no need for them to build houses for themselves. The land vacated by the refugees should be prepared for settlement of tribes.” BOA, DH-ŞFR 54/95, Ali Münif to Suriye (9 Haziran 1331 [22 June 1915]). It does seem that in the end, settlement policies during the war were ultimately limited to refugees and for the most part excluded the longstanding attempts at tribal settlement, but this is a subject that absolutely demands further study, as the relationship between the Ottoman state and tribes in Syria, Iraq, and Eastern Anatolia comprised a very major issue of concern during the war.
fighting in Eastern Anatolia devastated the local communities, which suffered not only from extreme scarcity of food but also threat of violence. An ABCFM report on relief activities for Armenians and Assyrians included these Kurdish refugees in their potential purview, describing their plight in staccato prose: “Kurds - pillaged and plundered - men killed - crops not planted as before - animals taken - destitute.”\textsuperscript{115}

However, the plight of these refugees was not only limited to the effects of war. Yiğit Akın notes that the CUP saw the refugee crisis in Eastern Anatolia as an opportunity for “demographic engineering.” Resettling Kurdish populations in other parts of the empire would facilitate their integration and break up their preexisting socioeconomic and political structures, and the government limited where Muslim refugees could settle.\textsuperscript{116} The Ottoman government deliberately moved these communities further and further westward, transferring them from one location to another. Ümit Üngör refers to the transport of Kurdish populations during the war as an explicit policy of deportation that began in 1916 immediately after the deportations of Armenians had concluded. This policy was in Üngör’s formulation an attempt to bring about further ethnolinguistic homogeneity in Eastern Anatolia by removing other non-Turkish elements.\textsuperscript{117} The removal of large concentrations of Kurdish population that had fled fighting in the east from the Province of Diyarbakır where they had taken refuge did clearly indicate that Ottoman officials were concerned with the ethnic makeup of refugees and the demographics of regions they were sent to.

As a major interface between Eastern Anatolia and the rest of the empire, the Cilicia region played a large role in the movements of refugees throughout the empire. At first, refugees

\textsuperscript{115} ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 670, “Relief Work.”
\textsuperscript{116} See Akçam, The Young Turks’ Crime Against Humanity : the Armenian genocide and ethnic cleansing in the Ottoman Empire, 50-53.
\textsuperscript{117} Üngör, The Making of Modern Turkey, 110.
arrived slowly and under some degree of Ottoman surveillance. For example in the summer of 1916, a telegram from the provincial treasurer in Adana reported the presence of over 500 new refugees (mültreçi) in the province. Most were settled in towns that had possessed large Armenian populations, and while the provincial government sought some 5000 lira for short-term assistance, settlement was carried out with the hopes that many of the refugees would easily find work on the farms and in the factories of Çukurova where labor shortages were acute. These figures for the summer of 1916 did not encompass the size of the refugee population in Adana, but rather demonstrate an instance of how such refugees were settled largely in the countryside.

Refugees were to be settled specifically in the places from which Armenians or Greeks had departed. But as Balkan refugees were settled and the numbers of those coming from Eastern Anatolia grew, the Ministry of Interior became concerned with managing the Kurdishness of many families within the latter group and the influence it might have on their new regions of settlement. In the Adana region, this meant that those refugees from the Balkans and Anatolia who were “Turks” would be permanently settled. Meanwhile, those who were “Kurds” were to remain in Adana to the end of the war and then return to their regions of origin. Most of these refugees fell short of becoming full-fledged settlers and many were unfit to work. As a result, they did not become active members of the agrarian economy. A German officer somewhat appalled with the miserable state of Kurdish refugees at Mamure wondered with a tone of

---

118 BOA, DH-ŞFR 528/31, Ahmed Besim to Dahiliye, Adana (27 Temmuz 1332 [9 August 1916]). Whereas 99 and 69 refugees had been settled in Adana and Tarsus respectively, there were 132 in the much smaller town of Sis, 70 in Hadjin, and 66 in Dörtyol, along with 44 in Bağçe and 40 in Yumurtalık. Thus, roughly half were settled in the three most predominantly Armenian towns of Sis, Hadjin, and Dörtyol. In some cases, the vacated houses intended for muhacirs had already been illegally occupied by others or partially demolished. BOA, DH-ŞFR 528/12 Şükrü General Director of Muhacirin in Adana to Dahiliye, Adana (24 Temmuz 1332 [6 August 1916]).

119 A small number of the refugees from the east were Iranian nationals identified as “Turkish” (Iranlı Türk). BOA, DH-ŞFR 524/100, Tahsin to Dahiliye, Diyarbakır (21 Haziran 1332 [4 July 1916]).

120 BOA, DH-SN-THR 77/47, no. 1, Nüfus to Dahiliye (14 November 1917).
skepticism, “Is really anything going to be organized for their reception in Adana? Will they be
given land, cattle, and tools? Or will they go to pieces in misery?”121

More people would continue to arrive throughout the war, so by the following spring of
1917, the population of refugees in Cilicia had risen tremendously.122 The Governor of Adana
Cevdet Bey reported that there were over 16,000 refugees (muhacir ve mülteci), over 4000 of
whom were in the district of Kozan alone. He requested over one million kurus to provision
these refugees and the other needy people in cities like Adana and estimated that another 500,000
kurus would be needed for further refugees coming from Urfa.123 In the end, those coming from
Urfa would be estimated at almost another 10,000 individuals in need of another one million
kurus for provisions.124 In Urfa, the extreme crowding of refugees was creating major issues in
terms of provisioning, where some refugees had been blamed for petty crimes such as assault and
the theft of cattle and onions.125

Their exodus left these communities in a very precarious situation. By August 1917, the
Adana province had received over 30,000 lira in assistance for refugees and other needs. Yet
they were requesting a much larger number—about 300,000 lira—for the purposes of facilitating
the active participation of refugees in the province’s agriculture. The Ministry of Interior,
however, reported that such an amount was infeasible, deciding that the refugees should be given
“a few dönüms” of land in hopes that they could grow something.126 Though the natural desire
was to make refugees agriculturally productive and self-sufficient, in practice they required a

122 Some files about the muhacirs who came to Adana during the war period may be found in the archives of the
Turkish Republic (BCA). For example, some muhacirs were settled in the predominantly Christian villages near the
city of Adana such as Hristiyanköy, INCIDENT and Şeyh Murad in 1916. BCA, 272-0-0-11 8/6/4, no. 2 Cevdet to
Dahiliye, Adana (23 Mart 1332 [5 April 1916]).
123 BOA, DH-ŞFR 547/7, Cevdet to Dahiliye, Adana (1 March 1917).
124 BOA, DH-ŞFR 549/92, Cevdet to Dahiliye, Adana (28 March 1917).
125 BOA, DH-ŞFR 74/25, Talat to Urfa Mutasarrıflığı (3 March 1917).
126 BOA, DH-ŞFR 79/71, Dahiliye to Adana Province (8 August 1917).
tremendous amount of state assistance. By June 1918, the Governor of Adana Nazım requested approximately 50,000 lira in order to provision a local population of 18,120 refugees.\textsuperscript{127} Much like the deportations of Armenians, this huge problem of internal displacement was singularly detrimental to the war effort in terms of the mobilization of people and resources as well as consumption of finances.

1917: Just Deserters?

Millions of men would be mobilized for the Ottoman war effort. By the end of 1915, around 50,000 men from the Adana province — almost 15\% of the total population and more than 25\% of the male population — had been mobilized.\textsuperscript{128} This conformed to a pattern throughout the empire. The number of Ottoman soldiers who served in the military during the World War I period was estimated at around 3 million. As the hardships of war set in, the condition of Ottoman soldiers worsened. Over 700,000 were reported injured by war’s end; official statistics counted over 500,000 dead, predominantly due to disease.\textsuperscript{129} Conscription sent men from every town and village throughout the empire on arduous long-distance journeys, but no two journeys were the same. For many, the journey ended in the trenches of Ottoman fronts like Gallipoli. The diary of Mehmed Fasih, a native of Mersin, who served as an officer in Gallipoli illustrates the many hazards found there: disease, malnutrition, violence, and anxiety.\textsuperscript{130} Then there were those who were captured in battle. They usually spent the rest of the war as POWs in far-off locations. I cite as one example the case of an Ottoman soldier named Osman from Kars-ı Zülkadiyi, the small town in Upper Çukurova rebuilt through the activities of the

\begin{footnotesize}
127 BOA, DH-ŞFR 587/151, Nazım to Dahiliye, Adana (22 June 1918).
128 BOA, DH-I-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 12-13, Hakki to Dahiliye (30 Teşrinisani 1331 [13 December 1915]).
\end{footnotesize}
Reform Division during the 1860s. A scribbled note in the archives of the Red Crescent reveals that his father Hacı Süleyman went to the post office of Kars to send 160 kuruş to Osman, his captive son, a prisoner in a British camp in Bellary, India.\textsuperscript{131} The hardship of the soldier was never merely a personal sacrifice or loss; the war’s impacts on families, widows, and orphans affected by the departure or loss of a young soldier comprise an extremely critical facet of this story.\textsuperscript{132}

Although many soldiers went dutifully to the fronts to face all the perils that war brought, avoidance of conscription was very widespread. Potential recruits took drastic measures such as maiming their trigger fingers to avoid entering the army ranks. But in the desperate times of the First World War, even a finger was not a fair trade for military service.\textsuperscript{133} Those unfit for battle could still wind up in the equally arduous service within labor battalions, which Zürcher estimates contained between 25,000 to 50,000 individuals during the war. The working conditions of these battalions were usually abysmal, often as bad as or even worse than those of soldiers.\textsuperscript{134} As a result, desertion was extremely common, and the archival record reflects continued efforts by the Ottoman government to track down deserters or “runaways (firari)” as well as bakaya, soldiers who simply did not report for duty. These men were pushed to the margins of society by virtue of the fact that avoiding military service required them to evade the gaze of the Ottoman surveillance apparatus, which despite many gaps, was always roving. In provinces such as Adana, the gendarmerie was locked in an endless game of cat and mouse with men avoiding military service.

\textsuperscript{131} TKA, 817/16, Hacı Süleyman to Hilal-ı Ahmer, Kars-ı Zülkadiye (29 July 1917).
\textsuperscript{132} Again, I refer to the work of Yiğit Akın on women and the politics of provisioning and petitioning during the war. Akın, "War, Women, and the State: The Politics of Sacrifice in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War."
\textsuperscript{133} BOA, BEO 4401/330040 (17 Şubat 1331 [1 March 1916]).
\textsuperscript{134} Zürcher, \textit{The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey}, 171.
The number of deserters rose dramatically in 1917. Zürcher cites the figure of over 300,000 men having deserted by December 1917.135 Again, the Cilicia region was no exception to this phenomenon. From the beginning of the war until July 1917, there were over 20,000 instances of desertion (firari and bakaya), overwhelmingly by Muslims, it would appear, in İçel alone. Over a third had not been apprehended by the gendarmerie.136 Monthly reports by the gendarmerie in Adana reflect a similar and steady rise in the number of outstanding deserters.137 To give a typical example of what desertion looked like on the local level, the table below details the number of deserters from the Adana province and their increase during a particular month in 1917, as well as the number who were captured during that time. The table shows that over 4000 men from the Adana province were registered as deserters as of October 1917, and in the course of a month that number increased by 30%, less than half the total number of deserters apprehended during the same period.138 Given the scale of the numbers listed here, grappling with desertion must have become the primary activity of the Ottoman gendarmerie during the war.

---

135 Ibid., 177. While deserters were seen as disloyal, given the conditions described above, Yalman commented that “without the mass desertions during the last period of the War, the survival of the Turkish nation might have become problematical.” Yalman, *Turkey in the World War*, 253.
136 BOA, DH-EUM-6-Şb 19/64, no. 5 (8 October 1917).
137 BOA, DH-EUM-6-Şb 11/31, no 2 (6 Tişrinisani 1332 [19 November 1916]); 20/10, no. 13 (8 July 1917); 19/64, no. 6 (12 October 1917).
138 BOA, DH-EUM-6-Şb 28/66, no. 5. (9 November 1917).
Table 17 Adana Gendarmerie Runaway Statistics, November 1917 (Source: BOA, DH-EUM-6-Şb 28/66, no. 5.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Runaways as of October 1917</th>
<th>New runaways, November 1917</th>
<th>New Total</th>
<th>Number Caught, November</th>
<th>Number Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>2356</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>3146</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaniye</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Döertyol</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahçe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islahiye</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassa</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadjin</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fekke</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4611</strong></td>
<td><strong>1385</strong></td>
<td><strong>5996</strong></td>
<td><strong>740</strong></td>
<td><strong>5256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since deserters were by definition fugitives who disobeyed the mobilization laws, it is perhaps only natural that some flouted other laws as well. While it is important to note that the vast majority of firaris and bakaya counted in the gendarmerie reports of the Adana province were listed as not having perpetrated any other criminal act, the war period did see an emergence of serious issues regarding state monopolization of violence in the countryside. An American missionary commented already in September of 1914 that the roads of Cilicia were “infested by robbers” who were mainly deserters fleeing military service, forced to live on the margins of society.139 Throughout the war period, and particularly during the last years, the gendarmerie in the periphery of the Cilicia region near Marash and Gavurdağı was confronted by a diverse assortment of armed bands that represented mobilization’s discontents. In some cases, they merely arose from the rebellious ranks of villagers who resisted conscription. One example is the band of Akkaş, who squared off with the gendarmerie in Çerçili and Kayabaşı, the same sites of

---

139 ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 672, pg. 346, Woodley to Barton, Marash (16 September 1914).
battle during the operations of the Reform Division.\textsuperscript{140} The emergence of banditry in Gavurdağı might not have been historically unprecedented, but it reflected the ways in which the war period posed challenges to Ottoman hegemony in the countryside of the home front: organized bands of outlaws in many cases operated in the same geographies that had been the crucible of Ottoman centralization efforts in the nineteenth century.

For example, in 1917, the gendarmerie in the district of Marash was confronted with three different bands or çetes carrying out violence and robbery in the countryside. One was comprised of Kurdish Alevi\textsuperscript{141} based in the Elbistan region led by a deserter named Hasan. They started as just a few bandits who after carrying out an attack on the gendarmerie and killing four personnel, drew over thirty deserters to their ranks, subsequently robbing a local village of a large amount of property and livestock and killing a gendarme who had taken eight bakaya into custody. The second çete of a similar size was comprised of Armenians hiding in the mountains around Zeytun, whose alleged crimes included slitting the throats of two muhacirs. The last çete was also comprised of about thirty Armenians roaming between İslahiye, Maraş, and Pazarcık. Their crimes included killing and dismembering the imam of a village and stealing around 3000 lira from a villager. With regard to the latter two çetes, the investigating Ottoman official made no mention of any political affiliation, only that it was unbelievable how easy it had become for “any old bum or nobody who gets ahold of a weapon (eline geçiren her aciz ve serseri)” to take up a life of brigandage in the countryside.\textsuperscript{142}

In each of these above cases, it is telling that the violence perpetrated by these armed bans contained elements of reprisal. Whether deserters intimidating and attacking the local gendarmerie or Armenians killing an imam, all of these acts of brigandage represented graphic

\textsuperscript{140} BOA, DH-EUM-6-Şb 2/4, no. 8, Adana gendarmerie to Dahiliye (7 Eylül 1331 [20 September 1915]).
\textsuperscript{141} The document states “Şiülmmezheb Kürtler.”
\textsuperscript{142} BOA, DH-EUM-6-Şb 27/25, no. 9, Haleb Mülliye Müfettişi Şekib to Dahiliye (15 September 1917).
expressions of discontent with the wartime conditions or political violence aimed at Armenians. The vast majority of discontents did not express their frustration in such ways, but many of those who did perpetrate brigandage during the war, such as Armenian survivors in Cilicia, did so as a reaction to what the war did to them. Displacement, while a natural outcome of mobilization, deportation, and combat, was a destabilizing force in the provinces in the Ottoman Empire. It was an important aspect of how and why the local economy of regions like Cilicia struggled in the face of the war’s demands, and like the attempted annihilation of local Armenian populations and the ambitious movement of refugees throughout Anatolia, the issue of desertion revealed that the Ottoman government was engaged in internal battles in the midst of a multi-front war against global empires.

Towards a War Ecology?

Mobilization, displacement, and economic disruption fundamentally changed the ecology of the Adana region. The expansion of cotton and cereal cultivation that had continued more or less steadily for several decades witnessed a profound reversal. Much of the Çukurova plain laid fallow during the war. The war changed the relationship between Ottoman citizens and the land, resulting in a crisis of agrarian production, nutrition, and public health. These impacts impelled Ottoman officials to adopt new approaches to the management of resources, orchestrating agricultural production, and the control of disease that may be seen as more interventionist or indicating a form of command ecology. I had hoped to offer more involved discussion of the impacts of the various shifts in policy proposed by the Ottoman administration from 1916 onward; however, I do not have clear evidence of significant impacts with regard to the Cilicia region in particular. We can speak of a shift in the political culture and the development of certain practices and attitudes regarding public health and agriculture that would influence post
Ottoman states but it is unclear if there were actually significant impacts brought about by such policies during the war period.

Figure 29 Ottoman labor battalion on the march in Mamure, near Islahiye (Source: Schilling, "Kriegshygienische Erfahrungen in Der Türkei," 1921, pg. 153)

The most critical disruption caused by mobilization was the damage done to agricultural production throughout the Ottoman Empire, which was especially harmful in regions like Cilicia that relied heavily on migrant labor. In order to compensate for this effect, the CUP more assertively promoted a notion of “war agriculture” from 1916 onward, increasing budgetary allocations in the agricultural sphere and equating agriculture labor with other civic duties such as military service. 143 During the war period, provincial governments became more insistent about military intervention to provide labor battalions for planting and harvest. For example, Governor Hakkı requested that during February 1916, 10-15 labor battalions of workers to carry out the planting and suggested the English, French, and Russian prisoners of war with

143 Yalman, Turkey in the World War, 129-30.
agricultural skills be used to provide further support. By 1917, it had become standard procedure in Cilicia and Syria for the province to request labor battalions upon specific instructions of the Ministry of Agriculture at harvest time. Agricultural manuals such as *Agriculture in a Practical and Modern Army*, published by the military in 1917, emphasized the importance of mechanization and the application of new agronomical techniques in the production of wheat, corn, and other food staples. Meanwhile, the CUP began to promote the cultivation of fairly uncommon but hardy staples towards the end of the war through its agricultural publication *Çiftçiler Derneği Mecmuası* (The Farmers Association Magazine). This publication also featured numerous articles on the importance of agriculture as civic and indeed Islamic duties, stressing the value of women’s labor during wartime.

While attempts to overhaul the agricultural economy of the Ottoman Empire during the war may have had clear results in some provinces, evidence of the actual impact of wartime agrarian policies in the Adana region is difficult to locate. For example, despite ambitious plans to expand the role of the state in agricultural production, a 1917 review of the five-year plan for agriculture in Adana indicated that no significant increase in expenditures for the increased mechanization of agriculture in the region had been made beyond the purchase of a single sprayer (*pülverizatör*) used in protecting orchards from insects and diseases. Nor should the failure to implement these plans be entirely surprising. It is unrealistic to imagine that heavily

144 BOA, DH-UM 59-2/1 39, no. 2 (13 Kanunuevvel 1331 [26 December 1915]).
145 BOA, DH-SFR 76/136, Mustafa Sırrı to Syria, Beirut, Aleppo, Adana, Jerusalem, and İçel (15 May 1917).
146 Mehmed Esad, *Fenni ve Ameli Orduda Ziraat [Agriculture in a Practical and Modern Army]* (Istanbul: Matbaa-ı Askeriye, 1333 [1917]). For more on the translation of “fenni” as “modern,” see Chapter 13.
147 Hüseyin Tayfur, "Patates Ziraatı: Patato Diseases (Potato Cultivation: Potato Diseases),” *Çiftçiler Derneği Mecmuası* (The Farmers Association Magazine) 1, no. 6 (1 March 1917); Y. Sami, "Mısır Ziraatı (Maize Cultivation),” *Çiftçiler Derneği Mecmuası* (The Farmers Association Magazine) 1, no. 6 (1 March 1917).
149 BOA, DH-UMVM 82/61, no. 8 (17 March 1917).
invested and indebted cultivators could radically convert their lands over to new crops, especially given the shortage of local labor and expertise, for which even labor battalions could not truly compensate.

Total grain yields throughout the empire continued to decline in 1917 and 1918. The amount of total land cultivated with wheat in the empire, even when excluding the provinces of that were zones of combat, dropped by more than 25% between 1914 and 1918, and total yields dropped by almost half.\textsuperscript{150} This effect must have been even more pronounced in the Adana province. Based on available correspondence, Cilicia experienced extreme scarcity for the remainder of the war and verged on famine at least twice in 1917 and 1918.\textsuperscript{151} By March of 1918, women in the villages of the vast countryside between Mersin and Silifke complained that they were unable to support their families, the poorest among them having been reduced to eating acorns gathered from the forest.\textsuperscript{152} Clearly, agricultural journal articles meant little for families such as these.

Yet still these sources point toward a cultural and political shift towards different ways of understanding the relationship between the state and society. This phenomenon can be observed in numerous fields, including public health. Constant movement, malnutrition, and transportation issues made Ottoman citizens more vulnerable to a number of diseases during the war period, and supplying the army with fundamental medicines such as quinine sulfate would have put stress on local markets. In regions like Cilicia, malaria was still highly endemic despite improvements in the area of public health and some efforts at swamp drainage in key areas such

\begin{footnotes}
\item[150] Eldem, \textit{Harp ve mütareke yıllarında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun ekonomisi}, 37.
\item[151] Cemal Pasha warned in October of 1917 of impending famine in Adana if a new governor was not sent. BOA, DH-ŞFR 569/42, Cemal to Dahiliye, Adana (22 October 1917). Cemal Pasha and Cevdet Bey had some major disagreements regarding provisioning methods during the prior year. BOA, DH-İ-UM-EK 36/68 (16 July 1917). For mention of seed shortages in Adana and İçel during winter 1918, see BOA, DH-İ-UM 13-1/2-37, no. 2, Mustafa Sırrı to Dahiliye (27 January 1918).
\item[152] BOA, DH-İ-UM 20-02/2-50 (6 March 1918).
\end{footnotes}
the ports of Mersin and İskenderun. As in the case of provisioning, the Ottoman government adopted many policies regarding health and medicine that went beyond securing the well-being of the military. Foremost among them was a quinine law, adopted in 1917, that affirmed the right of all Ottoman citizens to anti-malarial medicines, a policy that had first been articulated following the 1908 Revolution (see Chapter 6). Among the provisions in this law was the stipulation that quinine be purchased by the government and sold to Ottoman citizens with a standard markup of 15%. Even beyond this, the Ottoman government resolved to begin manufacturing its own quinine to make the medicines much more affordable.

Here too, it is clear that the reach of these practices was relatively limited. For example, correspondence between the Red Crescent and the Ministry of Interior reveals that even Ottoman personnel in the Cilicia region did not have reliable access to quinine sulfate during the last years of the war. Yet the very involvement of the Red Crescent in the arena of civilian relief, much like the ascendance of Near East Relief and other international charities in assisting Armenian refugees and other groups in the Middle East, was a fairly novel development and indicative of a trend that would define the postwar period. The very organizations involved in providing relief during the war, supported heavily by donations, would lay the foundation for national health programs in Republican Turkey. Similarly, the Ottoman government’s relative success in selling bonds further proved the potential of civic participation in the war effort.

---

153 BOA, İ-DUİT 81/9, no. 2 (12 Cemazeyilahir 1335 / 4 Nisan 1333 [4 April 1917]).
155 BOA, DH-EUM-SSM 27/36, no. 9 (3 October 1917); no. 2 (1 July 1918).
156 The Ottoman Empire managed to sell 18 million lira in war bonds during 1918. Pamuk, A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire, 223. American missionary in Marash E.C. Woodley offered a somewhat conflicting perspective. Woodley remarked upon how exceptional it was that Ottoman citizens refused to give up their gold, even in exchange for heavily-promoted government bonds, which Woodley judged to be an “inconceivable stretch of patriotism.” ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 672, pg. 394A, E.C. Woodley, “The Currency Situation in Turkey, 1914-1919.”
The emergence of these new approaches to ecology and a changing political culture coincided with the ecological disaster of the First World War. The Ottoman Empire was not alone among combatant states that witnessed agrarian struggles or the spread of disease and scarcity as a result of the war. The First World War revealed the ways in which extra-human factors impinged upon human activity as well as the challenges that state and society faced when confronted by ecological events such as famine or epidemics. Although human decision-making was at the center of the war story, more people were killed by microbes than enemy soldiers during the war period. In the next chapter, I examine one case of a malaria epidemic from the Cilicia region in order to further elucidate the relationship between conflict, displacement, and ecology during the First World War.
In late May of 1918, a Swiss engineer from Basel by the name of Lütneger was eager to leave the Ottoman Empire. He had been employed on the construction projects in Belemedik, the small mountain village where a German company was constructing a railway tunnel through the Taurus region. Lütneger wrote to the Ottoman Ministry of Interior for permission to return home, citing his inability to “adapt to the climate.” This looked like a possible reference to malaria, the type of justification used by countless civil servants and immigrants in the Ottoman Empire who asked for reappointment elsewhere or applied for change of air (see Chapter 6). Of course, change of air was often a good excuse to escape a bad situation, but what made this case unusual was that the region to which Lütneger claimed to be unable to acclimate must have been very similar to his own. Tucked away between mountain peaks, Belemedik’s climate was if anything Alpine, and with average temperatures in June hovering around 20°C (68°F), there was no better time to be in a Taurus Mountain town. How was Lütneger unable to adapt to such a climate?

The answer to this question is found in a paper from a 1925 conference in Lütneger’s home country. Two doctors, Ernest Basso, based in Izmir, and Eugen Bentmann, a German doctor who worked in a tropical disease laboratory in Ankara during the First World War,
presented a study of malaria in Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine to the League of Nations in Geneva, which was in the process of developing a number of global health initiatives.⁴ Basso and Bentmann conceded that there was relatively little scientific data on the subject, and as such, rather than being a comprehensive overview of malaria in the Middle East per se, their contribution was comprised of a series of scattered observations from various published reports including their own experiences as doctors.⁵

Bentmann had spent the last part of the war in Belemedik, the same place where Lütneger reported being unable to adapt to the climate. During WWI, Bentmann was part of a team of tropical disease specialists who conducted tests and administered treatment in the military hospitals of the Ottoman Empire. Their laboratory, which had been originally based in Ankara, was moved to the Taurus Mountains in 1917 with the expressed purpose of studying a devastating and strange malaria epidemic there.⁶ In the summer of 1916, doctors in and around Belemedik were dismayed as soldiers and workers died under their care in large numbers from what by that time was a treatable disease. What made the malaria epidemic all the more peculiar is that its epicenter was very atypical. Belemedik was a picturesque village in the mountains that before the arrival of railway construction crews and military personnel had served mainly as a summer pasture for local pastoralists. It was a yayla, the very place that one might go to escape summertime afflictions such as malaria. An outbreak of the disease at this location defied

---

⁴ I located this report in the files of the famed parasitologist Dr. Emile Brumpt at the Pasteur Institute archives in Paris. IP, BPT-G1, SDN/OH CH 275, “Deux rapports sur le paludisme en Asie Mineure, en Syrie et en Palestine.” However, the report was also published at the time and is available in a few libraries. See Ernest Basso and Eugen Bentmann, Deux rapports sur le paludisme en Asie Mineure, en Syrie et en Palestine [Two Reports on Malaria in Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine] (Geneva: League of Nations, 1925).

⁵ Ralph Collins consulted this essay in his report on public health in Republican Turkey, filed to the Rockefeller Foundation in 1926, but considered the report of Basso and Bentmann somewhat inadequate and did not make much mention of the incident I am about to discuss. See RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 64-65. More in Chapter 12.

⁶ RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 64-65.
conventional medical wisdom of the time, making the temperate Taurus Mountains the unlikely fixation of tropical disease researchers from Europe.

Following the war, Bentmann and his colleagues hypothesized various causes for the epidemic. Some reasoned that there was a unique species of malaria or mosquito in question. But when weighing the handful of articles in German published on the subject, Bentmann ultimately concluded that environmental factors were at the heart of the epidemic. Countless people passed through Belemedik during the war, and many of them arrived with sicknesses contracted elsewhere. When coupled with other ecological conditions, this movement facilitated a malaria outbreak. For Bentmann, there was nothing so special about the malaria of the Taurus Mountains; rather, the conditions of war were exceptional. These conditions made the year of the epidemic — 1916 — “a year the mosquitoes swarmed (une année où les moustiques pululaient).”

In fact, as I explain in this chapter, Bentmann’s description of the Belemedik malaria epidemic only scratched the surface of factors contributing to a wartime ecology that fostered disease and famine throughout the empire, even in regions as far from the fighting as Taurus Mountain villages. The movement of troops, internal displacement, and relocation of prisoners of war all contributed to the spread of disease in the empire. The malaria epidemics were in part and expression of how the hardship of the road affected various communities with different circumstances, from Ottoman soldiers and Allied POWs to Armenian deportees and Muslim refugees. However, once the impacts of these wartime dislocations unfolded, malaria did not neatly differentiate between distinct groups of people. In the end, everyone would be touched by the rise of malaria during the war, a disease that due to ecological conditions of the period, succeeded in conquering the slopes of the Taurus range even faster than the Baghdad Railway.

---

7 Basso and Bentmann, *Deux rapports sur le paludisme*, 19.
Anopheline Frontiers: the Mountains and Malaria

Mobilization triggered an economic decline, displacement fueled the spread of poverty and suffering, and the war conditions created a climate of tremendous scarcity, even famine, in some regions of the Ottoman Empire. These factors converged to create what might be labeled an ecology of war (see Chapter 8). A staggering amount of land in Çukurova — perhaps even a majority of the land that was under cultivation on the eve of the war — lay fallow during the war years or was planted only for crops to rot in waste without sufficient labor for the harvest. According to a postwar Armenian medical report discussing the widespread malaria in the Cilicia region, around one-seventh of the agricultural land in Çukurova was cultivated as of 1919. That same report, as all postwar accounts and reports did, referred to epidemic levels of malaria affecting the population, citing the lack of cultivation as a contributing factor. In other words, the fallow lands proved fertile ground for malaria. Indeed, residents of Çukurova perceived the rise in cultivation and the proper maintenance of fields as one of the main vehicles driving improved health conditions in the region over the last decades of the Ottoman period. But even more crucially perhaps, the level of displacement and involuntary movement, which had often made people more susceptible to disease (see Chapters 1, 4, 5, and 6), combined with a general state of malnutrition, made Ottoman citizens vulnerable to the impact of normally more manageable ailments such as malaria as well as typhus, the great killer of starving bodies.

During the First World War, the Ottoman Empire witnessed a significant rise in epidemic disease. Ahmet Emin Yalman indicated that the Ottoman military reported more than 400,000

---

9 For the correlation between typhus and other disease during war, see Smallman-Raynor and Cliff, War Epidemics: an historical geography of infectious diseases in military conflict and civil strife, 1850-2000, 6-7.
cases of malaria alone during the war and over 20,000 malaria-induced deaths.\textsuperscript{10} Beyond army statistics, there is a paucity of quantitative data regarding malaria rates and mortality among Ottoman civilians before and during the war. The Ottoman Ministry of Health claimed that it had succeeded in bringing about a significant decline in malaria deaths across the empire due to the dispensation of quinine during the early twentieth century (see Chapter 6). Many sources note that wartime movement, as it did in other regions of the world, brought more virulent strains of malaria to Anatolia, and it is clear that malaria was very rampant in Anatolia after the war (more in Chapter 12).\textsuperscript{11} Even if quantitative assessment remains murky, what cannot be denied is that a qualitative shift in the malaria ecology occurred during the war. This is perfectly reflected in a case from the Pozanti district of the Taurus Mountains of the Cilicia region. Amidst all of the upheaval of the period, this development may seem trivial, but it is truly momentous in light of the material presented in the previous chapters. During summer 1916, malaria came to the yaylas of the Taurus Mountains, one of the few locations considered safe from its reach.\textsuperscript{12}

I was unable to find much mention of the malaria epidemic that occurred in Belemedik and the Pozanti region of the Taurus Mountains during the war in the Ottoman archives; however, due to the presence of German doctors in that region, the event is fairly well-documented. The district of Pozanti is located about 80 km north of Tarsus. The small village of Belemedik, the stated epicenter of the epidemic, is some 12 km from the town of Pozanti.\textsuperscript{13} Before the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the site of Belemedik was the secluded yayla of local Tahtacis, transhumant pastoralists that moved between the Taurus Mountains and the coast west of Mersin,

\textsuperscript{10} Yalman, \textit{Turkey in the World War}, 253.
\textsuperscript{11} See Kyle T. Evered and Emine Ö. Evered, “Governing population, public health, and malaria in the early Turkish republic,” \textit{Journal of Historical Geography} 37, no. 4 (2011): 475-76.
\textsuperscript{12} See Chapter 1 for a complete discussion of the relationship between the yayla and malaria.
\textsuperscript{13} Bentmann had published an article on the subject a few years prior. Eugen Bentmann, "Kriegsärztliche Erfahrungen in Anatolien [Military Medcial Experiences in Anatolia]," \textit{Archiv fuer schiffs-und tropen-hygiene} Vol. 27(1923).
residing in permanent villages near the coast and taking up residence in tents during the summer.\textsuperscript{14} They supplemented their livelihood through forestry, using the well-wooded slopes of the Cilician highlands.\textsuperscript{15} Belemedik was a good place to spend the summer. It has an elevation of around 700 meters and was surrounded by forested mountains and plateaus. Though the Çakıt River flowed through the area, there was no place for swamps and no significant irrigated agricultural activity that might allow mosquitoes to breed in large numbers. As I have emphasized throughout this study, these types of areas were if anything regions where the local population of Cilicia would go to escape the malaria of the plains during the summer.

Belemedik had virtually no permanent population before the twentieth century. In fact, it does not seem that a place called Belemedik existed before the beginning of a railway through the region.\textsuperscript{16} Its name, according to legend, derived from the frequent confused utterances of “bilemedik” or “we couldn’t get it” among Turkish workers during the challenging construction of an elaborate system of railway tunnels by the German company Holzmann beginning in 1911. The town grew with the influx of railroad workers and employees involved in the construction of the tracks that would connect to the Adana line and from there to the Baghdad Railway or Baghdadbahn. The construction project, which involved tunneling through the valley of the Çakıt River to connect the Taurus Mountains to the Çukurova plain below, was ambitious to say the least. Due to the difficult working conditions, the tunnels were not complete at the outset of

\textsuperscript{14} Admiralty, A Handbook of Asia Minor, 43.

\textsuperscript{15} This particular region was viewed by Ottoman administrators as remote and until the activities of the Ministry of Forestry increased very late in the Ottoman period, there was relatively little direct contact between the Tahtacıs in the Taurus Mountains and the local government. With the rise in construction and trade through the port of Mersin, Tahtacıs who migrated between the Taurus Mountains and the Eastern Mediterranean littoral became involved in selling lumber to businessmen and smugglers of the coast, who according to one report from the 1870s, offered goods to the Tahtacıs at exorbitant prices. BOA, ŞD 2117/1, no. 1 Naşid to Sadaret (27 Safer 1289 / 24 Nisan 1288 [6 May 1872]). During the First World War, the Ministry of Interior became more interested in the Tahtacıs and Çepnis of the Taurus Mountains as distinct ethnic groups. See BOA, DH-ŞFR 87/350 (30 May 1918).

\textsuperscript{16} I could not find a reference to Belemedik in any Ottoman sources from before the construction of the railroad, but this does not absolutely mean that the name did not have a prior origin.
the war. The tunneling operations at Belemedik themselves were not even completed until 1915, at which point work crews could complete construction of the railway.\textsuperscript{17} Throughout the war period, the village was inhabited by a large number of workers and German military personnel.

Worker health had been an issue at Baghdad Railway construction sites, but not so much in Belemedik. In fact, during the first year of construction in the Cilicia region in 1911, disease had ravaged the ranks of the German railroad workers in Çukurova in June. As a result, they retreated into the Taurus Mountains to begin tunnel construction not far from Belemedik in order to find refuge from the summer scourge and salvage the lost work time.\textsuperscript{18} Thus, when a malaria epidemic broke out at Belemedik in the summer of 1916, it came as a shock to the German doctors who treated the soldiers and employees there. Bentmann’s report indicated that in August of 1916, “mortality caused by malaria at the hospital in Belemedik” was over 50% and remained above 20% until December.\textsuperscript{19} This does not mean that malaria mortality in the entire area was 50% but rather solely among the patients who were taken into care at the special military hospital in Belemedik. This fact made the epidemic all the more anomalous given the medical treatments for malaria available at the time. A number of German doctors were stationed in the Pozantı region at some point during the war. Some doctors reported that the malaria parasite was demonstrating an unusually high resistance to quinine. One doctor reported that as many as 95% of the soldiers and workers he was responsible for had malaria.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} McMurray, Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway, 118.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 88-89.
\textsuperscript{19} Basso and Bentmann, \textit{Deux rapports sur le paludisme}, 21. I have not conducted complete research in German, as I lack the linguistic ability to do so; however, I was able to track down some of the other articles about the malaria epidemic in Belemedik written by German doctors because Bentmann cites them in his French-language article presented to the League of Nations. Helmut Becker also refers to some of these publications in his dissertation. Helmut Becker, "I. Dünya Savaşında (1914-1918) Osmanlı Cephesinde Askerî Tababet ve Eczacılık (Alman Kaynaklarına Göre)" (Istanbul University, 1983).
\textsuperscript{20} H. Flebbe, "Ueber die Malaria im Taurus (Kleinasian) [Malaria in the Taurus (Asia Minor)]," \textit{Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift} 45, no. 5 (April 1919): 126.
Malaria came back strong the following summer. Between August 1917 and July 1918, the hospitals in the region recorded 2,798 cases of malaria, almost 7% of which were fatal — a very high rate for malaria in the Mediterranean context.\(^{21}\) During that time, 36.9% of the blood samples at the German laboratory in the Taurus Mountains tested positive for malaria, a figure that was equal to immediate postwar malaria rates for the plain (see Chapter 12).\(^{22}\) An exceptional number of German personnel died and were buried in the quiet mountain villages of the area during the war.\(^{23}\) As malaria began to cut through the ranks of German personnel and take on the form of an epidemic, it attracted more attention.

In 1917, the German laboratory in Ankara where Dr. Bentmann was employed moved to the Taurus Mountains to better study the perplexing malaria outbreak.\(^{24}\) Bentmann said he was motivated to go to the Taurus by idea that the malaria of each area needed to be studied separately in accordance with its local conditions and particularities.\(^{25}\) Because of its geography, the Pozantı region became the improbable focus of a team of German tropical disease specialists.\(^{26}\) During the years following the war, a number of German doctors who worked along the Baghdad railway had published their findings on malaria in journals such as *Archiv für schiffs- und tropen-hygiene* and *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift*, debating the complex causes of the epidemic of Belemedik and similar cases in the Amanus region. Dr. Flebbe, assuming that malaria could not be present in a location such as Belemedik, had originally

---

\(^{21}\) Becker, "I. Dünya Savaşında (1914-1918) Osmanlı Cephesinde Askerî Tababet ve Eczacılık (Alman Kaynaklarına Göre)", 51.

\(^{22}\) Basso and Bentmann, *Deux rapports sur le paludisme*, 21.

\(^{23}\) To this day, there is a small German cemetery in the nearby Tahtacı village of Çamalan.

\(^{24}\) RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 64-65.

\(^{25}\) Basso and Bentmann, *Deux rapports sur le paludisme*, 25.

\(^{26}\) Becker, "I. Dünya Savaşında (1914-1918) Osmanlı Cephesinde Askerî Tababet ve Eczacılık (Alman Kaynaklarına Göre)", 49-54.
characterized the epidemic as an unknown fever before discovering that it was malaria.\textsuperscript{27} Recognizing the unusually intense symptoms and high rate of mortality, some hypothesized that an especially virulent or quinine-resistant variety of malaria was at work due to the high inefficacy of medicines in Belemedik.\textsuperscript{28}

Suspicion of a novel disease was certainly warranted given the exceptional circumstances. But in his presentation to the League of Nations, Bentmann argued that “it would be better to study the question of the causes of the increase of intensity in the context of a general survey of all the causes that have transformed endemic malaria to epidemic malaria in the Taurus.” In his closing remarks, he reiterated that while it may have been possible to identify a quinine-resistant malaria parasite, “Personally, I am drawn to a different point of view in determining the cause of the exceptionally serious epidemic that raged during the summer of 1916 in the Taurus and spread with extraordinary rapidity.” Arguing for more emphasis upon epidemiological analysis, he advocated considering all the environmental factors that contributed to the epidemic before accepting the hypothesis of a special quinine-resistant strain of malaria.\textsuperscript{29}

For Dr. Bentmann, the primary cause of the epidemic was not a super species of malaria but rather that the conditions in 1916 were right for mosquitoes to thrive and prey on the people at Belemedik.”\textsuperscript{30}

Conventional wisdom about the mountainous geography of Belemedik would have judged it an unlikely location in which to encounter malaria. But malaria is a parasite that lives in human blood and is transmitted between humans by anopheles mosquitoes. Therefore, any place

\textsuperscript{27} Viktor Schilling, "Kriegshygienische Erfahrungen in der Türkei (Cilicien, Nordsyrien)," \textit{Archiv fuer schiffs-und tropen-hygiene} 25, no. Supplement 1 (1921): 121.
\textsuperscript{28} Viktor Schilling, "Ueber relativ chininresistente Malaria im cilicianen Taurus und Amanus [Relatively Quinine-Resistant Malaria in the Cilician Taurus and Amanus]," \textit{Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift} 45, no. 17 (April 1919): 463-64; Flebbe, "Ueber die Malaria im Taurus (Kleinasian) [Malaria in the Taurus (Asia Minor)]," 126-28.
\textsuperscript{29} Basso and Bentmann, \textit{Deux rapports sur le paludisme}, 27.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 19.
with people and a place for mosquitoes to breed could potentially witness a malaria outbreak. As was noted by a number of German travelers who passed through the Taurus Mountains during the late Ottoman period, there were some traces of endemic malaria in this region, though this was seen as malaria imported from the lowlands of Çukurova.\textsuperscript{31} By corroborating with the observation of a doctor named Doflein who worked in the mountainous regions of Macedonia, Bentmann identified what he believed to be the vector for the 1916 epidemic: \textit{anopheles superpictus}, a species of mosquito that “one hardly meets on the plain.”\textsuperscript{32} While a vector of malaria, \textit{superpictus} was not known as the most common in Cilicia.\textsuperscript{33} But the most important aspect of \textit{superpictus} for our purposes is that \textit{superpictus} females can survive in cold climates and remain active feeders during the winter or in relatively cool locations like Belemedik.\textsuperscript{34} As Adana Malaria Institute director Ahmet Rafet Pek would explain in his 1945 work \textit{Sıtma Notlari}, \textit{superpictus} was a mosquito that could “reach distances eight or nine kilometers from its home by scaling mountains and hills.”\textsuperscript{35} In the words of Bentmann, “in the Taurus, there is a special mosquito that only thrives in mountainous regions. This fact is proof of the existence in the Taurus of a special form of malaria distinct from that of the plain.”\textsuperscript{36} It was possible if not normally likely for malaria to occur around Belemedik under the right ecological conditions.

\textbf{The Ecology of Rail}

\textsuperscript{31} Bentmann, "Kriegsärztliche Erfahrungen in Anatolien [Military Medical Experiences in Anatolia]," 19.
\textsuperscript{32} Basso and Bentmann, \textit{Deux rapports sur le paludisme}, 24.
\textsuperscript{33} The more common malaria vectors of the Çukurova region according to studies during the 1920s were \textit{Anopheles maculipennis} or \textit{Anopheles eletus}. RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926); Ekrem Tok, “Adana mıntakasında Sıtma mücadele [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region],” \textit{Sıhhiye Mecmuasi} 5, no. 31/32 (November 1929): 1302.
\textsuperscript{34} Becker, \textit{Mosquitoes and Their Control}, 185.
\textsuperscript{36} Basso and Bentmann, \textit{Deux rapports sur le paludisme}, 24.
In general, infectious disease was common at construction sites in the Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{37} Yet with no swamps or important sites of intensive agriculture, the Pozanti region did not possess many of the environmental conditions typically associated with malaria. However, the construction of the railroad through that area began to cause rapid ecological transformation. Even a small amount of human activity was capable of creating a mosquito-friendly environment. According to Bentmann, “the considerable number of trees felled during the war” in the well-wooded Taurus region triggered sudden erosion and provided more spaces for mosquitoes to breed.\textsuperscript{38} The puddles that would have begun to form on treeless ground or at the bottom of eroded slopes would have been perfectly adequate sanctuary for mosquitoes. The construction activities themselves, which required the hollowing of trenches and constantly working in holes where mosquitoes were sure to thrive also added to this effect. One of the best places for mosquitoes to breed and attack may well have been the under-construction railway tunnels themselves.

German doctors also referred to the possibly poor placement of certain encampments in the Belemedik area. Bentmann referred to the location of the German automobile corps camp, which while located a hilltop some 800-900m in elevation, was nonetheless vulnerable to wet, mosquito prone terrain nearby.\textsuperscript{39} As an ad-hoc settlement of construction workers and military personnel in which many people lived in tents of hastily-built structures intended for temporary residence, the village of Belemedik may have contained a landscape more vulnerable to malaria than other longstanding villages of the Taurus Mountains region.

\textsuperscript{37} McMurray, \textit{Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway}, 88.
\textsuperscript{38} Basso and Bentmann, \textit{Deux rapports sur le paludisme}, 24.
\textsuperscript{39} Bentmann also highlighted the poor placement of an encampment for the large German automobile corps in a location particularly susceptible to mosquitoes. Ibid., 19. However, as Dr. Schilling noted, they had parked on a hilltop at an altitude of about 800-900m, which must not have seemed particularly malarial at the time. Schilling, "\textit{Kriegshygienische Erfahrungen in der Türkei (Cilicien, Nordsyrien)}," 121.
In addition to changes in the landscape initiated by construction activities, the railway contributed to the ecological conditions that created the malaria epidemic in the Taurus Mountains by bringing more potential victims of mosquitoes to the area. In fact, as mosquitoes were perfectly capable of riding railway cars, the railroad may have even transported malaria vectors in the same cars that carried the hosts.

The Taurus region served as a convergence between Anatolian railways coming from the west and the Adana railway that led towards the Baghdad and Hejaz railways. As a result, the Pozanti-Belemedik area became a central stopping point. For most of the war, the Taurus Mountains were one of the primarily impediments to the Ottoman railway system. At the outset of 1916, a 37km stretch of rail between Belemedik and Dorak remained incomplete.\(^40\) That line, which connected Pozanti in the Taurus Mountains and Yenice in the Çukurova plain below

\(^40\) McMurray, *Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway*, 118.
through the rail tunnels at Belemedik was not completed until 1918. This meant that the transfer between these two lines consisted of several kilometers crossed on foot or on animals. Moreover, as the map from Bentmann’s report below shows (see Figure 31), a form of rail called Decauville, which was of a lighter gauge than the railways to which it connected, completed the gap between the Taurus Mountains and the main line of the Adana railway. This further complicated transfer. Belemedik was situated at the intersection of regions that innumerable passengers were not only obliged to pass but also where they were forced to linger during a complex transfer from the plains to the mountains of inner Anatolia and vice versa. From grains and lemon to camels and humans, the combination of speedy rail leading to a brutal bottleneck led to all sorts of accumulation.\footnote{See BOA, DH-ŞFR 459/57, Hakkı to Dahiliye, Adana (15 Kanunusani 1330 [25 January 1915]); 484/105, Hakkı to Dahiliye, Adana (7 Ağustos 1331 [20 August 1915]); DH-İ-UM-EK 21/84, Trabluşşamlı Hacı Ahmed Şakir to Dahiliye, Dersaadet (24 Eylül 1332 [7 October 1916]).} All transport at sites between Belemedik and the plain was carried out by animals.\footnote{McMurray, \textit{Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway}, 121.}

The large number of hosts for malaria parasites who additional provided meals form mosquitoes was clearly a crucial factor in the malaria epidemic that prevailed in the Taurus Mountains during the First World War. Bentmann argued that malaria must have gained a foothold slowly from the beginning of railway construction in 1911, and that with the immense amount of traffic during the war “from 1915 onward,” the number of hosts began to grow rapidly. As I will illustrate below, people came to Pozantı from near and far. Their movements were the very movements that defined the war period, and their convergence at Pozantı was what made that region the center of a moment in history in which mosquitoes won the day.
Figure 31 Map of rails in Pozanti region (Source: Basso and Bentmann, Deux rapports sur le paludisme, 1925)
Malaria and Movement

In his study, Bentmann indicated that there was a general outbreak of tropical malaria in Anatolia during the year of 1916.\textsuperscript{43} The Belemedík epidemic did not occur in isolation but rather as an extension of the general heightened risk of malaria that came with the war. The timing of the epidemic and its climax in the summer of 1916 were not accidental. That year witnessed peak levels of movement in Anatolia. The movements, which made people vulnerable to disease environments and facilitated the spread of infection, had a disastrous impact on public health just as they had devastated local economies (see Chapter 8).

Malaria was one of the principal afflictions affecting Ottoman soldiers during the First World War. The disease was endemic to most of the major fronts such as Gallipoli, Syria, Yemen, and Mesopotamia. Even the journey to the fronts posed the risk of malaria. As Zürcher notes, almost all the soldiers headed to the Syrian and Mesopotamian front had to pass through Adana and İskenderun, the most malarial regions of the empire during the summer, so many were likely sick on arrival.\textsuperscript{44} Even if malaria was not highly endemic in the Taurus Mountains, from all sides soldiers arrived sick and hungry from regions in which epidemic rates of malaria existed. Thus, even without a trace of endemic malaria in Belemedík itself, there would have been thousands of men with malaria passing through on a continual basis. Bentmann argued that the rail workers, military personnel, and various people at or passing through Belemedík created the critical mass of human blood necessary for mosquitoes to feed and for parasites to proliferate, and similar epidemics occurred during the war on the other side of Cilicia around the Amanus.

\textsuperscript{43} Basso and Bentmann, \textit{Deux rapports sur le paludisme}, 22.
\textsuperscript{44} Zürcher, \textit{The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey}, 176.
tunnels were proof of that as well.\textsuperscript{45} As many as 100\% of the workers there were affected by a wartime malaria epidemic.\textsuperscript{46}

Bentmann noted that by 1916, it was clear that the Ottoman army was having serious issues with the supply of quinine, which could only be an effective suppressant of malaria if administered regularly to all the troops. This contributed to a rise in cases of malaria among Ottoman and German soldiers in the empire. At the Taurus military hospital, formations of soldiers with malaria continued to arrive even before summer hit, and according to a German doctor Flebbe, the vast majority of soldiers who passed through the Taurus region in July and August of 1916 suffered from malaria (see Table 18).\textsuperscript{47}

\textit{Table 18} Formations of soldiers and their malaria rates at Taurus hospital (Source: Flebbe, “Ueber die Malaria im Taurus,” pg. 126)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formation Number</th>
<th>Number of Soldiers</th>
<th>Date of Arrival</th>
<th>% with Malaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>February 19, 1916</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>February 20, 1916</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>February 27, 1916</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>February 25, 1916</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>February 29, 1916</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>April 21, 1916</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>July 14, 1916</td>
<td>93.0% (97.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>July 14, 1916</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>August 10, 1916</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>August 21, 1916</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>September 4, 1916</td>
<td>33.3% (64.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soldiers at the various Ottoman fronts of the war were prime targets for mosquitoes, and it is little surprise that such high malaria rates were to be found among the soldiers who passed through Pozantı during the summer of 1916. But epidemic disease in the empire was not limited to military personnel, and there is no reason to assume that soldiers were the sole or primary

\textsuperscript{45} Basso and Bentmann, \textit{Deux rapports sur le paludisme}, 25.
\textsuperscript{47} Flebbe, "Ueber die Malaria im Taurus (Kleinasian) [Malaria in the Taurus (Asia Minor)]," 126.
carriers of malaria or the principal population affected by the disease. Soldiers were the main group treated by Bentmann and the other doctors in the Taurus Mountains, and therefore, these groups comprised the main focus of their articles. However, an expanded view of movement in the empire throughout the war as expressed in the Taurus Mountains bottleneck reveals a much wider phenomenon of displacement contributing to the spread of infectious disease throughout Ottoman society.

Amidst the malaria epidemic of 1916, three partially-overlapping groups continued to move in and out of Pozantı and the village of Belemedik in particular. These were Armenian deportees and laborers, Muslim refugees from Eastern Anatolia, and Allied prisoners of war (see Chapter 8 for context). While such groups were to be found in many parts of Anatolia, as a region of railway construction and major transfer point, Pozantı became a place where tens of thousands of displaced people congregated in makeshift shelters throughout the war period.

Non-Muslims conscripted into labor battalions were present at construction sites in Pozantı from the beginning of the First World War and remained there throughout. With the beginning of deportations in 1915, the Armenian population of that region to swell. The Baghdad Railway played a fundamental role in the systematic deportation of the Armenian population of many parts of Anatolia. Armenians from the Western region of Anatolia, from Bursa and Izmit to Ankara and Konya, were deported along the rail line between Istanbul and the Adana region during the summer of 1915. The last stop on this route was the Pozantı train station. According to Kevorkian, the number of deportees who followed this route either by train or by foot totaled

48 In this regard, Hilmar Kaiser’s chapter on the Baghdad Railway and the Armenian Genocide is a good companion to this section. Kaiser, "The Baghdad Railway and the Armenian genocide, 1915-1916: a case study in German resistance and complicity." McMurray’s study of the Baghdad Railway by contrasts makes little mention of the connection between the Armenian genocide and the railway, although he notes in an endnote that “Witnesses of the massacres reported that the railway played a central role in facilitating the deportations and murders of much of the Ottoman-Armenian population. The Germans used many of the same methods, albeit on a grander scale, to achieve similar results in the Second World War.” McMurray, Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway, 133.
as many as 400,000.$^{49}$ If this is the case, during the 1915-16 period, the number of Armenians who passed through Pozantı was probably comparable to the number of soldiers if not more, and their condition was even worse.

While under ideal conditions, a train from Istanbul to Pozantı could arrive in less than 24 hours, the break in the rail line complicated the process of these deportees’ journey onward to Adana and from there to Syria and beyond, and as a result, large camps formed in the train stations between Konya and Pozantı.$^{50}$ These weary travelers, much like the passing soldiers, could potentially bring the ailments of the lowlands with them into the Taurus Mountains during the initial phase of deportations, which were carried out during the summer and fall of 1915.$^{51}$

An extreme example of some of the malarial geography Armenian encountered during this process involves the 4000 residents of Zeytun who were expelled towards Central Anatolia from Zeytun in April 1915. They passed through Pozantı during their forced march from their mountain village near Marash through the Çukurova plain and past Tarsus up into the Taurus Mountains, where they continued onward to Konya.$^{52}$

During 1915, the camps between Konya and Pozantı saw famine and disease begin to spread throughout the Armenian population. Kevorkian states that as many as 10,000 Armenians died in the Pozantı camp during the summer and fall of 1915.$^{53}$ While subsequent deportations to Syria were well under way by September 1915, they were carried out very gradually. An extra military detachment was sent to Pozantı in the fall of 1915 solely for the purpose of maintaining order there due to the numbers of people in the camps.$^{54}$ The movement of Armenians towards

$^{50}$ Ibid., 580.
$^{51}$ Ibid., 977.
$^{52}$ Ibid., 571.
$^{53}$ Ibid., 977.
$^{54}$ BOA, DH-ŞFR 488/52, Hakkı to Dahiliye, Adana (27 Ağustos 1331 [9 September 1915]).
Pozanti continued over subsequent months. In October 1915, there were more than 20,000 Armenian deportees in the railway stations between Eskişehir and Pozanti. But Cemal Pasha recommended they not be sent onward to the “desert (çöl)” until the spring due to transport issues in the Taurus Mountains during winter. In a prior telegram he had warned that there were already 200,000 Armenians in Aleppo and that if an outbreak of infectious disease among the Armenians emerged, “it will be difficult to protect the 4th Army.” An inspection soon after revealed that there were about 6,000 Armenians around the Pozanti station, many of whom had infectious diseases, and that they had been living in stables and tents “like gypsies.”

Meanwhile, in December 1915, the Governor of Konya wrote to the Ministry of Interior saying that the Armenians being sent from his area to Mosul would be moved to Pozanti. A similar scenario unfolded in the Osmaniye region on the other side of the Çukurova plain where the Amanus tunnels were being constructed. In January 1916, Talat inquired about the reported 20,000 Armenians congregated in the Pozanti region. The military was reporting “the necessity of their being sent to the places they are to go caravan by caravan, stating that their provisioning in homes will not be possible, just as

---

55 For example, the Governor of Konya reported sending 1050 Armenians in 14 train cars in October 1915. BOA, DH-ŞFR 494/57, Samih to Dahiliye, Konya (10 Teşrinievvel 1331 [23 October 1915]).
56 BOA, DH-ŞFR 495/45, Cemal to Dahiliye, Kículus (17 Teşrinievvel 1331 [30 October 1915]).
57 BOA, DH-ŞFR 493/119, Cemal to Dahiliye, Kículus (3 Teşrinievvel 1331 [16 October 1915]).
58 BOA, DH-ŞFR 496/21, İsmail to Dahiliye, Adana (23 Teşrinievvel 1331 [5 November 1915]).
59 BOA, DH-ŞFR 502/81, Samih Rıfat to Dahiliye, Konya (12 Kanunuevvel 1331 [25 December 1915]).
60 In November of 1915, Fethi Bey, the mutasarrıf of Osmaniye, reported that in the span of a few days, trains had brought some 40,000 “Armenian deportees (Ermeni muhacirin)” to the plain of Osmaniye where they had begun to “accumulate,” and that “because [he] did not view this as befitting the interests of the state and nation (menfaat-i devlet ve milletine muvafık görmediginden),” military personnel were used to bring the Armenians past Islahiye into the Aleppo province for further relocation. BOA, DH-ŞFR 496/75, Fethi to Dahiliye, Osmaniye (26 Teşrinievvel 1331 [8 November 1915]). Fethi Bey was describing Mamure, the end of the Adana railway, where missionary Elizabeth Cold reported that a camp of over 60,000 “refugees” was gradually broken up over the course of winter 1915/16. ABC 16.19.5, Reel 672, pg. 292A, “The Exiling of the Armenians: Adana District.” Kevorkian refers to 40,000 people dying at the camp in Mamure during the summer and fall of 1915. Kévorkian, The Armenian Genocide, 977.
their transport by rail is not presently possible.”

Throughout the governorship of Hakkı Bey, large numbers of Armenians had been able to take refuge in the Cilicia region, especially in areas of railroad construction. In the early months of 1916, a second exodus of Armenians — this time out of the Pozantı region — commenced. By the end of January, Hakkı notified the Ministry of Interior that there were reportedly no Armenian deportees (muhacir) between Pozantı and Gülek or Gülek and Tarsus, although this may not have been the case. Kevorkian indicates that the appointment of Cevdet Bey, Enver Pasha’s brother-in-law, as the new Governor of Adana in February 1916 facilitated a more aggressive removal of Armenians from Cilicia and the resolution of irregularities such as the ballooning Armenian population of labor battalions.

However, it would appear that some Armenians were able to remain in the Pozantı region even after this due to the importance of the construction projects. Armenian experts and laborers were critical to the construction of the railway. Thus, while the Armenian workers at Belemedik were supposed to be deported, an Armenian doctor named Boyajian stationed in the area along with the aforementioned Swiss engineer Lütneger convinced the Ottoman military official responsible for the deportations to allow the Armenians to stay. Talat telegraphed Adana in June 1916 informing them that it was not possible for deported Armenian railroad workers to return to their original construction sites, however, in order to ensure that the construction continue quickly and without interruption, the government would be cautious about deporting

---

61 BOA, DH-ŞFR 60/69, Talat to Adana, Konya, and Niğde (7 Kanunusani 1331 [20 January 1916]).
62 BOA, DH-ŞFR 506/115, Hakkı to Dahiliye, Adana (13 Kanunusani [26 January 1916]).
63 Kévorkian, The Armenian Genocide, 688. Kevorkian calls Cevdet Bey “a radical partisan of the regime,” noting that his governorship in Van provoked, perhaps by design, the revolt that was used as a main justification for the deportation orders. Ibid., 231. The Armenians lingering in the Cilicia region included the labor battalions around the Amanus tunnels, where Cevdet reported that around 10,000 Armenians were present and that while prior estimates may have been exaggerated, he believed that there was “a further number of Armenian families that have taken refuge in various places with the protection of railroad officials and are still hidden from the sight of the police.” BOA, DH-ŞFR 521/31, Cevdet to Dahiliye, Adana (15 Mayıs 1332 [28 May 1916]).
64 Ibid., 689.
Armenian workers henceforth. Only a small portion of the Armenian workers in Pozanti were deported in the end, and there were around 3000 Armenians working on the Belemedik connection between Pozanti and Dorak well into the last year of the war. In other words, both the deportation of Armenians as well as the ability of Armenians to resist deportation in Pozanti added to an unusually high conglomeration of people, many of whom suffered malnutrition and sub-standard living conditions, in the Taurus Mountains around Belemedik during the war years.

The multitudes of Armenian deportees who passed through Pozanti during 1915-16 were not the only large group of probable malaria sufferers conspicuously not mentioned in the reports of the German doctors and the presentation of Dr. Bentmann at the League of Nations. Grigor Balakian, an Armenian Bishop, took refuge in the Belemedik region throughout 1916 under the false identity of Herr Bernstein, a German machinist. That December, he encountered a few hundred Turkish and Kurdish refugees from Bitlis who had fled the Russian advance. They were in desperate condition and their “camels, horses, mules, and donkeys — all reduced to skin and bones.” It was not just displacement due to fighting that brought Muslim refugees to the Taurus region. Muhacirs from the Balkan Wars and more recent refugees were dispatched to the Pozanti station for transfer elsewhere, such as many of those settled in Adana during the course of the war. Since these transfers occurred in the wake of the deportations of Armenians, large numbers of refugees were passing through Pozanti and Belemedik throughout 1916 and 1917 precisely as the malaria epidemic was taking place.

65 BOA, DH-ŞFR 65/59, Talat to Adana (9 Haziran 1332 [22 June 1916]).
66 Kévorkian, The Armenian Genocide, 687.
68 In fact Balakian stated that they were fleeing the armies of Andranik Pasha, referring to Andranik Ozanian, the Armenian military commander who led a regiment of Armenian volunteers in the Russian army.
69 Balakian, Balakian, and Sevag, Armenian Golgotha, 335.
70 BOA, DH-ŞFR 68/159, Talat to Adana (19 Eylül 1332 [2 October 1916]).
There was yet another group of very sizeable population that participated in the peculiar cosmopolitanism that took shape in Belemedik during the war. It is hard to find a complete estimate, but there must have been thousands of Allied POWs in Pozanti and Belemedik during the last years of the war. The POWs were sent there from the beginning of 1916 onward largely in order to replace deported Armenian workers. For example, men from the large POW camps in Afyonkarahisar and Çankırı were sent to work in Belemedik in February 1916.\textsuperscript{71} One source mentions around 1600 British and Indian soldiers alone sent to work in Belemedik following the deportation of the Armenians from the area in June 1916, just as the malaria epidemic was beginning to escalate.\textsuperscript{72} They had been captured at Kut-el-Amara, 100 miles south of Baghdad and marched all the way to the Amanus Mountains.\textsuperscript{73} Jonathan McMurray indicates that some 13,000 such soldiers had been captured at Kut-el-Amara and sent towards the Taurus and Amanus construction sites.\textsuperscript{74}

As for the living conditions of these POWs, there is a number of sources comprised of recollections of Allied soldiers, especially Australians and New Zealanders who spent time in Belemedik. These sources indicate that aside from the rigors of forced labor, the POWs enjoyed a fair amount of freedom, allowing them to organize football matches, briefly publish a newspaper called the \textit{Belemedik Bugger} in 1916, hold memorable drinking sessions filled with \textit{raki} and wine, and even to carouse with women in the nearby area.\textsuperscript{75} Yet many of the soldiers

\textsuperscript{71} BOA, HR-SYS 2221/4, Besim Ömer to Hariciye (20 Kanunusani 1331 [2 February 1916]).
\textsuperscript{73} Kaiser, "The Baghdad Railway and the Armenian genocide, 1915-1916: a case study in German resistance and complicity," 89. There were also many Italian prisoners working on the tunnels. BOA, DH-EUM-5-$\$b 49/24 (25 November 1917).
\textsuperscript{74} McMurray, \textit{Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway}, 122.
\textsuperscript{75} Kate Ariotti, "Australian Prisoners of the Turks: Negotiating Culture Clash in Captivity," in \textit{Other fronts, other wars? : First World War studies on the eve of the centennial}, ed. Joachim Bürgschwentner, Matthias Egger, and
brought to Belemedik would have been captured in Syria or Mesopotamia, and if they had not contracted malaria at the front, would certainly have been exposed to malarial environments on the long journey across the empire. There were also Russian POWs in Pozantı and Belemedik, already 748 by April 1916.\textsuperscript{76} It is possible that Russian POWs were treated more harshly in response to treatment of Ottoman prisoners in Russia, and there were a large number of attempted escapes by Russians in Pozantı and Belemedik during the war.\textsuperscript{77} In the end, many POWs died of illness in Belemedik from 1916 onward, and their presence must have increased the possibility of a malaria epidemic.\textsuperscript{78} British correspondence from the war period reveals a spate of POWs who died of sickness, mostly in Cilicia, during 1916, including those who died inBahçe and Bor in the Amanus and Taurus Mountains respectively.\textsuperscript{79}

The final factor fueling the malaria epidemic in the Pozantı region was the critical shortages of provisions and inadequate housing in the Taurus Mountains. The difficulties of supplying tens of thousands of people with food, clothing and shelter imperiled the health of people at remote sites like Belemedik. Those settlements were kept afloat only by emergency purchases carried out by the German military convoy, which drove as far as Konya to obtain foodstuffs from the villages. By winter of 1916, the Baghdad Railway company would report that at many work sites as many as 80\% of all workers were ill.\textsuperscript{80}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
BOA, HR-SYS 2221/8, No. 1, Bauer to Hariciye (4 Nisan 1331 [17 April 1916]). See also BOA, HR-SYS 2221/4.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
BOA, HR-SYS 2221/8, No. 3, Cevad to Harbiye, Stockholm (24 Kanunusani 1331 [6 Şubat 1916]). For different instances of Russian runaways from the Taurus region during the war, see BOA, DH-EUM-5-Şb 31/37; DH-EUM-6-Şb 16/13; 17/63; 20/35; DH-EUM-SSM 11/7; DH-ŞFR 79/248.
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TNA, FO 383/456/13209 (21 January 1918); 40368 (29 January 1918).
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McMurray, Distant ties Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway, 124.
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Figure 32 Allied prisoners at camp in Belemmedik (Source: Australian War Memorial, H19412)

Figure 33 Grave of officer Stephen John Gilbert, died in Belemmedik in October 1916 from "malaria and typhus" while working on the railway (Source: Australian War Memorial P01645.004)
Mosquitoes, Locusts, and People

Until the very end of the war, the bouts with malaria in Belemedik recurred. They appear to have continued even after. In November 1918, a French civil prisoner in Aleppo en route to Istanbul and from there to France fell ill in Belemedik and died at the local hospital.81 As I will highlight in Chapter 10, malaria lingered among displaced populations in the Taurus Mountains during the French Mandate period.82 Even the hapless Tahtacıs, who had for long relied on their quiet mountain environs as a refuge from disease and outsiders alike, would ultimately fall victim to a deadly malaria epidemic; half of the Tahtacıs examined in Çamalan during April 1918 tested positive for the parasite, meaning that by the end of the war, malaria was widespread among a population that might normally have enjoyed malaria free summers.83 The transhumant mode of existence that defined their way of life was to a large extent an outgrowth of a desire to avoid the summer malaria of the Mediterranean coast of İçel between Mersin and Silifke. Yet as the war’s impact in terms of hunger, disease, and poverty reached its peak in 1916, malaria overcame the mountainous geography to find them in their last refuge: the yayla.

The other side of this story of human suffering was the mosquito’s triumphant conquest of Cilicia’s mountain landscape. While Dr. Bentmann was certainly correct in emphasizing the unique conditions that contributed to the malaria epidemic, it was equally remarkable and surprising that malaria could spread in the time and place that it did. The 1916 Taurus Mountain malaria epidemic was certainly a reminder of the adaptability of both vectors and parasites to the conditions created by humans. Yet it would be misleading to attribute too much causation to random or static environmental factors. The malaria epidemic was caused by the railroad, the war, and all that came with it. Mosquitoes capitalized.

81 BOA, HR-SYS 2249/57, no. 2, Légation des Pays-Bas to Hariciye, Pera (8 November 1918).
82 TKA, 1123/16.5.
83 Basso and Bentmann, Deux rapports sur le paludisme, 22.
Although this chapter has focused on the circumstances surrounding one specific epidemic in one region of the Ottoman Empire during the First World War, there are undoubtedly many stories like Belemedik’s. Indeed, a similar account could be written about the construction sites in the Amanus Mountains, which also witnessed the rampant spread of malaria in 1916. A more thorough examination of malaria during the war utilizing German sources\(^\text{84}\) may reveal that 1916 was truly the year of the mosquito for much of the empire in the way that 1915 was remembered as “the year of the locust” in Greater Syria (see Chapter 8). These phenomena may be fruitful starting points for understanding the environmental history of the First World War in the Ottoman Empire, which would ultimately have much to contribute to the global story of the war period. Just like the global flu pandemic of 1918, which killed tens of millions of people, these events must have been shaped by the conditions of the war, although in the end, they took on a life of their own.\(^\text{85}\)

In this regard, it is striking that in his detailed presentation to the League of Nations about the various hypotheses of predominantly German doctors regarding the spread of malaria in the Ottoman Empire and in the Taurus Mountains in particular during the First World War, Dr. Bentmann did not elaborate upon all of the factors I have pointed to here. Although he made the case for an environmental basis for the 1916 malaria epidemic rooted in wartime conditions, he did not so much as mention the presence of a large number of hungry and sick Armenians at

---

\(^\text{84}\) I say German sources because I have been unable to fully evaluate them in this study. The German articles cited in this chapter indicate however that German doctors and researchers were very involved in matters of public health in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. As of my latest research at the Ottoman archives in spring of 2015, I can say that the available material related to disease and public health in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War is not as rich as one might expect, and it does not appear that the records of the Ministry of Public Health have been systematically opened or catalogued as of yet. However, the catalog of the Ottoman archives is receiving more and more documents as new collections are added. More detailed research or the subsequent release of more documents may reveal a larger degree of documentation that what I have encountered in my study of Cilicia.

\(^\text{85}\) For some discussion of diseases such as measles and influenza during the First World War situated within a broader context of disease in military history, see Smallman-Raynor and Cliff, *War Epidemics: an historical geography of infectious diseases in military conflict and civil strife, 1850-2000*. 
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ground zero of the epidemic in question or for that matter the Muslim refugees and Allied prisoners of war.\textsuperscript{86} Was he self-censoring in order to avoid creating controversy out of what was meant to be a presentation of German medical research in the Middle East during the First World War and the future of anti-malarial campaigns in the region?

Bentmann was not alone in his silence. The publications about these malaria epidemics that appeared in the German medical journals during the postwar period appear to have little to say about these issues. But the comments of Viktor Schilling, a German doctor who published on the spread of malaria in the Taurus Mountains, are rather revealing in this regard. Though he made no mention of the tens of thousands of displaced people around Pozantı and Belemedik, he did reference the ways in which Armenians suffered from typhus and cholera during the deportation eastward. Towards the end of his article, he also made some remarks about the cruel treatment inflicted on the Armenians. “Almost as miserable” were the Muslim refugees of Eastern Anatolia.\textsuperscript{87} Yet his footnote to this section also defended the German army against allegations of having participated in “atrocities” against the Armenians, saying that the Germans simply could not intervene and that some did what they could to help. The last line of his footnote was perhaps most vexing: “one must also concede to the Turks self-defense as a

\textsuperscript{86} Here I should note that I found little reference to these articles on the malaria epidemic on the Taurus Mountains outside the group of German scientists who wrote and cited them. The discussion was largely a self-referential one in this regard. Bentmann’s study was briefly mentioned in an Anglophone medical review. “Malaria,” \textit{Medical science abstracts & reviews} 2, no. 4 (July 1920): 320. British Naval Intelligence from the WWII period had apparently made use of Bentmann’s studies as well. \textit{Turkey}, vol. 1, Naval Intelligence Handbooks (Oxford: (British) Naval Intelligence Division, 1942), 257. I found a handful of historians, who are cited above, that refer to these studies in some capacity. Becker, "I. Dünya Savaşında (1914-1918) Osmanlı Cephesinde Askeri Tababet ve Eczacılık (Alman Kaynaklarına Göre)"; Kaiser, "The Baghdad Railway and the Armenian genocide, 1915-1916: a case study in German resistance and complicity."; Özdemir, \textit{Salgın hastalıklardan ölümler, 1914-1918}. I am incapable of speaking authoritatively on historiography in German.

\textsuperscript{87} Schilling, "Kriegshygienische Erfahrungen in der Türkei (Cilicien, Nordsyrien)," 140.
mitigating circumstance (*Man muß aber auch den Türken Notwehr als mildernenden Umstand zubilligen*).”

The understandably defensive and equivocal reaction of this German doctor goes a long way towards explaining why it was easier to omit issues that complicated the presentation of medical research in the postwar context. Sociopolitical contexts disrupt the flow of a sanitized scientific narrative. Yet the forgotten story of Belemedik might have had a valuable lesson to impart about total war. The epidemic embodied the ecology of war in the Ottoman Empire. The sometimes haphazard, sometimes orchestrated movements of people created fertile ground for the spread of disease, causing extraordinary ecological upheavals, and even helping malaria — against all odds — to climb mountains. This episode also illustrated how particular aspects of the war such as the Armenian genocide, just as it had economic impacts that stretched well beyond the Armenian community and harmed the war effort, triggered broader suffering throughout the empire. In the case of Belemedik, Turkish officials and personnel along with German soldiers, workers, and experts got sick and died in consequence of the displacement of Armenians and others.

The past two chapters have examined the ways in which the war years brought ecological changes to Cilicia, a region situated at the center of many important tensions and issues that emerged from Ottoman war experience. These changes were ultimately destructive, as they resulted in economic collapse and loss of life due to disease and hunger alongside the violence of the war. With the Armistice of Mudros on October 30, 1918, the fighting ended. But the war would cast a very long ecological shadow. In fact, for Cilicia the war period was not yet over. The establishment of a French Mandate, which promised to restore prosperity, would in the end prolong the years of upheaval and conflict in the battered Cilician countryside.

88 Ibid., 140.
CHAPTER 10
THE SICK MANDATE OF EUROPE: FRANCE
IN CILICIA, 1918-1922

The end of the First World War resulted in an influx of former soldiers and civilians into Anatolia. They came especially from Greater Syria where some had served in the Ottoman military and others had lived as exiles. The latter group, Armenian survivors of the genocide, sought to return home or at the very least to a region that they could call home. Tens of thousands of Armenians ended up in Cilicia, and by January 1919, some 35-40,000 Armenians were gathered in Pozantı, relegated to the margins of the province out of concern that their return might be met with violence by locals.¹ They waited in the very district that had played such a critical role in wartime mobility and the deportation orders and had as result seen one of the most peculiar malaria epidemics on record (see Chapter 9).

Events unfolded rapidly over the subsequent months. France assumed control of Cilicia, Armenians were able to return, a host of new civilian and government institutions set about rebuilding the economy and government of the Çukurova plain. Yet by 1920, French hegemony in the region was being challenged in dramatic fashion, and the military conflicts that unfolded in the months that followed sent thousands of Muslim refugees running for the Taurus Mountains, where they took refuge in places like Pozanlı, Belemedik, Ereğli, and Gülek. Living under the constant fear of bombardment by French planes, these refugees received treatment for widespread malaria from the Red Crescent, which had become the backbone of the Turkish Independence movement.² A newspaper called Yeni Adana, founded during the First World War,

¹ Kévorkian, The Armenian Genocide, 746.
² TKA, 1123/16.5.
moved its operations to Pozantı and became the mouthpiece for anti-French and indeed anti-Armenian politics.³

As France lost control of the hinterland, tens of thousands of Armenian repatriates became internally displaced within the shrinking Mandate of Cilicia. Agricultural production plummeted and infectious diseases spread through the ranks of refugees and orphans cared for by Armenian and international charities. With the Kemalists approaching Adana, France signed the Ankara Agreement in October of 1921, ceding most of the Mandate of Cilicia to what would become the Republic of Turkey. By January 1922, the French presence in Cilicia was brought to an end, and with it, the Armenians of Cilicia were evacuated to France’s other territories in Greater Syria. The First World War had turned Cilicia upside-down, and under the France Mandate, Cilicia would see a few more revolutions throughout a tumultuous extension of the war period. Not only did the mandate period bring many experiences analogous to those of the First World War; it also witnessed a condensed reiteration of many of the themes that defined the ecology of Cilicia during the late Ottoman period: settlement, migration, attempts at expanding agriculture, malaria, and contention of geography and land.

To conclude this discussion of the long First World War period, this chapter examines these themes under the short-lived French Mandate of Cilicia. France occupied the region primarily in order to pursue economic interests, specifically to capitalize on the agricultural wealth of the Çukurova plain. But ultimately, the mandate government’s inability to control the countryside hindered the restoration of agricultural prosperity. As a result of the turmoil, internal displacement, scarcity, and disease spread in and around the French Mandate of Cilicia, and various charity organizations emerged to provide relief to Christian and Muslim refugees in the

region. When the French left, little remained of late Ottoman Adana, but the ecological transformations that had begun during the late Ottoman period endured.

**Another Granary of Rome?**

In the fall of 1918, France occupied Cilicia, which became the center of a sovereign state — albeit a French mandate — for the first time since the Ottoman conquest of the sixteenth century.\(^4\) French claims on Cilicia dated to the Sykes-Picot agreement, and interest in the region was explicitly colonial, founded on notions of French superiority and Cilician economic utility. The French agronomist E.C. Achard argued in his study of agriculture in Greater Syria that Çukurova could fully meet the demands of the French textile industry, which was heavily reliant on American cotton at the time.\(^5\) A military officer in Cilicia named Pierre Jean André, writing under the pseudonym Pierre Redan, referred to the region as a “Granary of Rome (Grenier de Rome).”\(^6\) The same notion had been used as an ecological justification for French settlement in Algeria over decades prior, and the Cilicia experience was readily grafted onto the orientalist tropes of French colonialism in the Middle East.\(^7\) In Cilicia, France was to revive a region that had long lived under a Muslim yoke and make it, and France, prosper.\(^8\)

---

\(^4\) This section is based heavily on the administrative records of the French Mandate of Cilicia, which are part of the larger collections covering the French Mandates in the Levant, namely Syria and Lebanon, held at the Center for Diplomatic Archives in Nantes (CADN). Among the many archives and series used in this dissertation, the records of the Mandate of Cilicia are comparatively disorganized, and it is sometimes only possible to provide a reference to the box number, the folder number within the box, and the date of the document. Folders are usually organized roughly in chronological or reverse chronological order. These records also reveal that many of the administrative affairs of the mandate were carried out by local authorities, as there is a very large number of translated and untranslated documents in Ottoman Turkish and to a lesser extent Armenian and Arabic.

\(^5\) Achard, *Le coton en Cilicie et en Syrie*, 1. An article in the *New York Times* about the economic prosperity that peacetime would bring stated that “Asia Minor and Mesopotamia could grow enough cotton to supply the world.” "Good Turkish Prospects: Best Among them is said to be the Growing of Cotton,” *New York Times* 22 September 1918.


\(^7\) See Davis, *Resurrecting the Granary of Rome*.

\(^8\) Added to this argument was the idea that Cilicia was an integral part of historical Syria. Tachjian, *La France en Cilicie et en Haute-Mésopotamie : aux confins de la Turquie, de la Syrie et de l'Irak : (1919-1933)*, 27.
The French occupation of Cilicia came with a moral argument as well. France would allow Armenians, who had been ruthlessly expelled from their ancestral lands by the CUP government during the war, to build for themselves a state. Even if France was not seriously committed to helping Armenians realize their national goals, many Armenians took this commitment very seriously, and the international Armenian community became involved in establishing an Armenian political presence in Cilicia under the French.\(^9\) The initial landing of the French occupation mainly included Armenians who had been deported from the Cilicia region.\(^10\) In total, the French Mandate brought in around 100,000 Ottoman Armenian repatriates hailing not only from the Cilicia region but also other parts of Anatolia in a span of less than two years. They joined a population of around 20,000 Armenians who were already in Adana at the end of the war.\(^11\) France was able to rely in part on Armenian military units alongside its Senegalese and Algerian regiments. Some of the civil administration of the French Mandate of Cilicia was in the hands of Armenian officials, and in addition, medical missions headed by Armenian charities provided much of the public health assistance and medical relief in the Adana region.

---

\(^9\) Ibid., 97-105.
\(^10\) BOA, DH-EUM-5-Şb 76/36 (21 December 1918).
By the time the writings of Achard, André, and company actually made it to publication, the French administration of Cilicia would already be losing its hold on the hinterland, popular support for the venture would be waning in France, and life in the short-lived mandate would return to wartime levels of panic and scarcity among a once-again internally displaced Armenian population. Robert Zeidner has referred to French governance in Cilicia as a reflection of the “arrogance of power,” a foolhardy colonial project the dire consequences of which had not been properly evaluated. While in this study I have endeavored not to overstate the role of imperial powers in the history of Cilicia during the late Ottoman period, it is worth considering the ultimately destructive impact of French rule in Cilicia no matter how ephemeral France’s

---

12 Robert F. Zeidner, *The tricolor over the Taurus: the French in Cilicia and vicinity, 1918-1922* (Istanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 2005), 1. Antipathy for the French Mandate is a rare point of convergence between Turkish and Armenian national narratives. For Turkey, France arrived as a colonial occupier determined to dispossess the Muslim majority that lived in Cilicia before the war. For Armenians, the French Administration’s very hasty abandonment of the mandate project and its various broken promises are remembered with great disappointment. The mandate had assumed a tremendous responsibility in repatriating tens of thousands of Armenians. France’s immediate withdrawal further burdened and impoverished a population that became three times displaced, expelled from Cilicia to Greater Syria only to return to Cilicia once against and then be expelled a second time. Another interesting critique of French policy in Cilicia comes out of the historiography of Soviet Armenia, where the French were sometimes portrayed as self-interested capitalist imperialists. For example Ruben Sahakyan’s study of the mandate period describes French policies as essentially “Turcophile (turkamol)” on economic grounds. In this view, an ultimate Franco-Turkish alliance was the result of France’s economic interests in Turkey, particular with regard to the railways French companies had built during the Ottoman period. Ruben Sahakyan, *Turk-Fransiakan Haraberyumner yev Kilikian (1919-1921)* (Yerevan: Haykakan SSH GA, 1970).
There is no question that the French politicians who promoted the invasion had been unrealistic in their visions of what would result, but because the partition of the Ottoman Empire was taken for granted at the time, the occupation itself was hardly a surprise. It is telling, however, that the French Mandate of Cilicia failed especially in the one realm where it was touted as sure to succeed: the arena of agrarian revival. This failing was essentially the result of an inability to establish political equilibrium in the countryside.

France assumed control of Cilicia, a region known for its agricultural wealth, in the midst of a serious economic panic. General Taillardat, the Governor of Kozan during the French Mandate period, declared that Cilicia was a “rich but ravaged and depopulated country” and that the first goal of the French administration would be to repopulate the countryside and save the inhabitants from famine. The war had eroded the prosperous commercial economy of the Adana province, and the Ottoman defeat exacerbated the region’s economic woes. In December 1918, not long after the French arrival, the Governor of Adana Nazım wrote to the Ottoman Ministry of Interior in recently occupied Istanbul. He demanded that something be done to help the civil servants in Adana, who due to the continuous escalation of an “extraordinary scarcity

---


“(gala-ți fevkalade)” were in dire financial straits. That same month, E.C. Woodley of the ABCFM said that the price of grain had increased to roughly fifteen times the prewar value by 1918, and though it had moderated a little with the armistice, it was still very high. Citing the mismanagement of the Ottoman government, a doctor with the Armenian Medical Commission (Hay pjshgagan arakełutyune) in Cilicia lamented the malarial wasteland that was Çukurova. The extreme decline in commerce, particularly the sale of cotton, the deportation of Adana’s Armenians, and the general disappearance of laborers during the war had scaled back the extent of agriculture to the state of many decades prior. The low point of cotton production during the war, which seems to have hovered around 20-30,000 bales for at least three years (see Figure 35), was by all estimates significantly lower than figures from the 1880s and indeed equivalent to figures for year two of the Civil War cotton boom: 1862.

Throughout the short period of the French Mandate of Cilicia, the promise of agricultural prosperity dominated the rhetoric that justified the colonial venture among French audiences and sought to bolster the confidence of Cilician Christians as well as Muslims that were heavily invested in the agricultural sector. Contrary to this agricultural triumphalism, Turkish nationalist writers when discussing the impact of the French occupation in the 1924 Adana Commerce Guide (Adana Ticaret Rehberi) would implicate the French in absolutely ruining the

16 ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 672, pg. 372, Woodley to Barton (22 December 1918). Bread was almost 12 kuruç per kg in the countryside as of March 1919, and a kg of wheat was 10 kuruç. CADN, 1SL/1/V, 204, Vol. 2 Adana – affaires économiques, 29 March 1919.
17 Ghazarosyan, Teğekagir hay bžškakan arak’elowt’ean, 36.
18 CADC, Correspondance commerciale et consulaire, 1793-1901, Alep 33 (1863-1866), pg. 61, Bertrand to de Lhuys (20 July 1864). Colonel Brémond described cotton as having been “partly abandoned” during the war. CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 22 August 1919.
19 For example, the French administration organized a fair in Adana during 1920 to showcase agricultural machines and the potential of the Cilician agriculture. Remarkably, it was held just weeks after the French were forced to vacate Sis, thereby relinquishing their presence in much of Upper Çukurova. See CADN, 1SL/1/V, 204. See also Bernard, Six mois en Cilicie, 48.
agriculture of the Adana region.\textsuperscript{20} In fact, the truth was somewhere in between. Clearly, the First World War period reflected the nadir of agricultural production in Cilicia, and in the very statistics of the commerce guide, we see a modest rebound of cotton production to roughly half the prewar figures under the French, followed by another sharp decline as the political situation began to deteriorate. In other words, the French Mandate began but ultimately failed to restore agricultural prosperity in Cilicia.

\textsuperscript{20} Remzi Oğuz, \textit{Adana Ticaret Rehberi} [\textit{Adana Commerce Guide}] (Istanbul: Cihan Biraderler Matbaası, 1340 [1924]), 57.
Please note that these are production estimates and do not reflect the amount of cotton sold, used, or exported in the Adana region. For certain years, especially 1914 as I explained in Chapter 8, exports may have been greatly lower than production. The same is almost certainly true for 1920. These estimates were derived using data from four different sources with various degrees of completeness in their coverage of the period in question. The first is a set of figures from the Adana Chamber of Commerce found in file belonging to the French consulate in Adana. They were not printed/published but rather anomalously written on loose leaf paper in red ink, accompanied by some comments. These numbers differ, but generally very little, from Achard’s study of cotton in Greater Syria, which comprise the second set of statistics. The third set of numbers comes from the Adana Ticaret Rehberi prepared by Remzi Oğuz, a writer and educator from the Adana region. His figures come from various sources, one of them clearly being Achard, but in certain instances they diverge, and they cover years not covered by the first two sets of statistics. The last set of numbers comes from is a publication by the Adana Cotton Congress during the early Republican period. Being that there are very few points of wide divergence in these numbers, which are nearly identical for certain years, I have simply derived the mean of the available data for each year to arrive at an estimate. Even when one source had potentially taken data from another for a particular year, I have counted both figures on the basis that the later source affirms the estimates of the earlier. Sources: CADN, 8PO/1, Adana/Mersin Consulate, Vol. 46 Coton, “La Culture de coton par la Chambre Agricole à Adana, 1341”; Achard, Le coton en Cilicie et en Syrie, 9; Oğuz, Adana Ticaret Rehberi, 56; İkinci Adana Pamuk Kongresi Zabıtnamesi [The Proceedings of the Second Adana Cotton Congress], (İstanbul: Matbaa-yi Amire, 1925), 163-64. There are also figures similar to these numbers based on the Adana Cotton Congress statistics featured in Üngör and Polatel’s work on the confiscation of Armenian properties. Polatel and Üngör, Confiscation and Colonization, 128.
Figure 36 Scene from the Adana Fair (Foire d'Adana), summer 1920 (Source: CADN, 1SL/1/V, 204.)

Figure 37 Scene from the Adana Fair (Foire d'Adana), summer 1920 (Source: CADN, 1SL/1/V, 204.)
The French occupation of Cilicia was an attempt to reestablish normalcy and productivity in the agrarian sphere and successfully settle Armenian repatriates in Adana and their former homes in the countryside. Provisioning the army and droves of repatriates was an important goal of the French administration, and the occupation of Cilicia was predicated on its agricultural wealth; from very early on, the mandate government was providing free provisions to over 100,000 people throughout Cilicia.\textsuperscript{22} Thus, the French administration carefully monitored the agrarian situation in Cilicia. But according to the reports of Colonel Brémond, the harvest of 1919 in the Cilicia region came up short of expectations. In the Mersin district of the more densely cultivated portion of the plain, just under 90\% of the land normally available for grain and wheat was cultivated and less than 2/3 of barley land was planted.\textsuperscript{23} By January 1920, local mutasarrif of Mersin would also report that the supply of sheep and goats was critically low, asking for a halt on export to protect the supply of meat and milk.\textsuperscript{24} Though the return to agriculture by some had contributed to a degree of stabilization for the food supply, wheat was still over three times its prewar price and the prices of many other items were even higher in towns like Tarsus.\textsuperscript{25}

Matters were worse further out in the countryside due to the limitation of French authority. The Ottoman government had struggled to control the hinterland of the Adana region, particularly the mountains surrounding İslahiye and Marash, during the war period. The margins of Cilicia became the refuge for armed bands of military deserters as well as impoverished Armenian and Kurdish refugees (see Chapter 8). By the fall of 1919, French authorities were confronted with the issue of armed bands or çetes comprised of former soldiers and generally

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{22} This included 30,000 members of the central administration. CADN, 1SL/1/V, 208, Vol. 3 – Santé, “Ravitaillement Gratuit.”
\textsuperscript{23} CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 22 August 1919.
\textsuperscript{24} CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 26 January 1920.
\textsuperscript{25} ABC, 16.9.5, Reel 670, pg. 452, Christie to Peet (30 August 1919).
disaffected men carrying out acts of brigandage in the countryside. The French controlled the towns of the plains, but could not maintain any strategic advantage in the mountains. As these armed bands coalesced around a more organized resistance movement, the violence of guerrillas seeking to test the resilience of French rule caused a panic among the local Armenian population, resulting in the flight of cotton cultivators from the villages to the city.\textsuperscript{26} They joined the ranks of what one Armenian missionary estimated was 10-15,000 people in Adana living in tents (see Figure 38).\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure38.jpg}
\caption{Armenian Refugee Camp in Adana, 1919 (Source: AGBU - University of Michigan Expedition, George R. Swain, Ann Arbor, Michigan No. 156 - https://www.flickr.com/photos/agbu/)}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Conflict in the Countryside}

Colonel Brémond was optimistic that the 1920 harvest would be much better than in 1919 and that agricultural prosperity would return.\textsuperscript{28} But this did not come to pass. 1920 was not a year of low rainfall, flooding, or a disruption of this variety, as the crops that were planted

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26} ABC 16.9.5, Reel 669, pg. 408, Chambers to Peet (23 October 1919).
  \item \textsuperscript{27} ABC 16.9.5, Reel 669, pg. 410, Chambers to Barton (29 September 1919).
  \item \textsuperscript{28} CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 22 August 1919.
\end{itemize}
promised a strong harvest.\textsuperscript{29} The chief reason for the agrarian trouble in Cilicia during the year of 1920 was that the French Mandate was losing its grip on the area immediately adjacent to the Taurus and Amanus Mountains, making it impossible for the agrarian economy to function properly. Following the Ottoman defeat, occupying the towns of the plain such as Mersin and Adana was relatively easy, but no entity — neither the occupied Ottoman government nor a foreign army — held much sway in inner Anatolia, where the Turkish independence movement would first gain momentum.\textsuperscript{30} The first victory of that movement and the first major blow to the French hold on Cilicia came when Turkish nationalist militias succeeded in wrenching the city of Marash from French control in winter 1919-20. The nationalists had begun their approach on Marash in November 1919, and during two-week siege at the end of January, the small militia of a few thousand fighters supported by some local notables in Marash was able to effect a French retreat. The sudden French withdrawal left the Armenians of Marash, who were subject to acts of mass violence throughout the siege, in an extremely vulnerable position.\textsuperscript{31} Most of the Armenian population fled Marash on foot, and the majority of those who left with the French died during a three-day march through the snow towards İslahiye. Armenian civilian casualties as a result of this siege numbered in the thousands.\textsuperscript{32}

The Battle of Marash was by far the most violent conflict to visit the Cilicia region throughout the First World War period. The resounding defeat of the French army emboldened resistance groups and brought into question France’s overall commitment to the occupation of

\textsuperscript{29} Bernard, \textit{Six mois en Cilicie}, 30.
\textsuperscript{30} Tachjian suggests that the extending the French occupation beyond the Çukurova region may have been a strategic error that contributed to instability. Tachjian, \textit{La France en Cilicie et en Haute-Mésopotamie : aux confins de la Turquie, de la Syrie et de l’Irak : (1919-1933)}, 107-09.
\textsuperscript{31} The exact course of events in Marash is much debated and in particular, the question of why the French army decided to evacuate, resulting a colossal number of casualties among soldiers and Armenians, is one of the principal areas of debate. For more see ibid., 117-30.
Cilicia. The Armenians of Marash, most of whom were repatriates who arrived with the French occupation, became part of a growing number of internally displaced Armenians in the Mandate of Cilicia, which with the loss of the mountainous hinterland, appeared much less like a refuge to the tens of thousands of Armenians who lived there.  

In June 1920, the French administration evacuated Sis as well, and the Armenian population of between 4000 and 7500 inhabitants left with them. In part because of this, the inhabitants of Hadjin, estimated at around 9000 individuals, were left isolated in their Taurus Mountain villages, surrounded by rebels and brought to the brink of starvation. The local militia defended the town for a few months, but when Hadjin fell in October 1920, it was the site of a terrible massacre. Zeytun would fall in similar fashion the following summer.

On top of this, interethnic conflict emerged in a number of forms. Reverberations of the wartime violence inflicted against Armenians emerged as the Armenian legionnaires in French service were accused of retaliatory violence against Muslims, and in turn there were acts of intimidation and violence committed against Armenians in the countryside of regions such as Ayas. Meanwhile, the French administration pursued conspicuous practices of divide and rule. But perhaps the greatest source of conflict was the repatriation of Armenians to their

---

33 As Keith Watenapaugh argues, the expulsion of the Armenians of Marash also radically shifted the focus of Near East Relief, the main international organization assisting Armenians in Cilicia, which was confronted with the reality of assisting not an Armenian nation under American tutelage but rather a permanently displaced people. This event was fundamental to the development of humanitarianism. Ibid., 91-123.
36 Ibid., 137.
37 Ibid., 41.
38 The essential policies of French governance in Cilicia gave rise to conflicts over territory and resources and played local populations off of each other by design. Within the post-WWI political climate that created the League of Nations, the notion of self-determination was held above all, and for a nation to defend its right to self-determination, it had to substantiate its claim to a significant demographic majority in a given geographical space.
native villages, which was an integral aspect of restoring life in Cilicia. Muslims notables enriched by the deportations of Armenians during 1915 would have been predisposed to resist the repatriation movement and support rebellion against the French Mandate.\textsuperscript{39} Many houses and properties of Armenians had been taken over by Muslim inhabitants, some of them refugees settled after the deportations who had been placed there by the Ottoman government, and when the original owners of these lands sought to extract those newcomers, hostility and violence were only natural outcomes.\textsuperscript{40}

For example, large numbers of Armenians had been repatriated to Dörtyol, where conflicts over land ensued. Hand-written letters in Armenian from residents in Dörtyol highlighted some of the problems. Some returning Armenians found their old land occupied by new Muslim inhabitants, many of whom had themselves migrated to Adana from other regions during the war. The region’s famous orange groves, which had been expanded by Armenian landowners for commercial export during the late Ottoman period, were taken over and planted

\begin{flushright}
\\textsuperscript{39} Tachjian, \textit{La France en Cilicie et en Haute-Mésopotamie : aux confins de la Turquie, de la Syrie et de l'Irak : (1919-1933)}, 45.
\\textsuperscript{40} Tachjian notes that there were still 4500 Kurdish refugees and 2740 Balkan muhacirs in Cilicia circa 1919. Ibid., 64.
\end{flushright}
with more traditional food crops such as grapes and olives by new Muslim stewards seeking to
grow food. The sudden and unstructured movement of people throughout the Ottoman Empire
during the war period had not only disrupted local labor regimes but also resulted in large
amounts of land changing hands. While not all land disputes were the result of communal
conflict, the issue of property would only exacerbate the increasingly tense relations between
Armenians and Muslims in the Cilician countryside during the French Mandate period.\footnote{41} These
destabilizing factors brought evacuated, expelled, and fleeing Armenian civilians to the center of
the mandate in Adana. At one point during 1920, the Armenian population of Adana was
appraised at around 60,000 — more than double the prewar figure — as the towns of Cilicia
swelled with refugees from the hinterland.\footnote{42} A French newcomer to the region remarked that it
was impossible to find a room because the hotels were already full of evacuees.\footnote{43}

After the loss of Marash at the beginning of 1920, there was little hope of a return to
normalcy in the French Mandate of Cilicia. A French observer noted that life was so disrupted
that people could not even sleep as customary on their roofs under the comfort of a mosquito net
to escape the miserable and muggy summer nights for fear of shelling during the night.\footnote{44} The
government did persist in trying to normalize agricultural activities, arranging the distribution of
over 75,000 kg. of seed for cotton planting in the spring of 1920 (this being only a fraction of the
seed required for a normal year as over 7 million kg of seed was planted in 1913).\footnote{45} But by the
end of March, Brémond reported that the sowing of cotton had already halted at half of the

\footnote{41} CADN, 1SL1/V, 277, Vol. 1 - Finance, Djebel Bereket, Köşkeryan to Bremond, Dörtyol (30 June 1919);
unidentified to Bremond, Dörtyol (10 November 1919).

\footnote{42} Tachjian, *La France en Cilicie et en Haute-Mésopotamie : aux confins de la Turquie, de la Syrie et de l'Irak :
(1919-1933)*, 139.

\footnote{43} Bernard, *Six mois en Cilicie*, 61.

\footnote{44} Ibid., 63.

\footnote{45} CADN, 1SL1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 6 March 1920; *Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329
Senesine Mahsus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913]*, 240.
anticipated capacity due to labor shortages.\textsuperscript{46} As he would explain a few weeks later, French cotton prospects in Cilicia were not panning out due to the sudden break in the normal labor migrations that the Ottoman government had long facilitated from the Kurdish regions of Eastern Anatolia provinces to the north. The political situation had cut off the flow of around 30-40,000 migrant workers.\textsuperscript{47} The situation was even more pitiful with regard to the food supply, as political upheaval ensured much reduced figures when compared with 1919. “The grain harvest is very compromised,” Bremond warned. “Meanwhile, Anatolia, which every year furnished several thousand tons of grains, will not give any, as it was not cultivated and the harvest cannot be made.”\textsuperscript{48}

**Public Health in the French Mandate of Cilicia**

Cilicia was not becoming the thriving cotton colony that some French proponents of the occupation had anticipated. The Mandate of Cilicia was becoming the site of a major public health crisis, and while the government sought to alleviate shortages of grain, medical relief was provided mainly by charity organizations.\textsuperscript{49} The Armenian Medical Mission, which operated a hospital in Adana and had medical staff in all of the areas inhabited by Armenians, treated about 25,000 patients in Cilicia during the summer of 1919, about half in Adana and the rest in the other towns of the region.\textsuperscript{50} Between July 23 and August 31, 1919, ten doctors of the mission operating in the different districts of Cilicia recorded their patient numbers and the type of ailment they had. Over 11,000 people, meaning more than one-tenth of the total number of

---

\textsuperscript{46} CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 30 March 1920.
\textsuperscript{47} He hoped that this deficit could be overcome in the future using workers from Northern Syria paid at set rates, with women receiving wages half of men’s. CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 16 April 1920.
\textsuperscript{48} CADN, 1SL/1/V, 304, Vol. 3 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 1 August 1920.
\textsuperscript{49} It is rather telling that despite my best efforts, I was unable to find a single published report on public health in Cilicia in French, and the French archives are generally scant on material related to health. However, there are multiple medical reports published in Armenian by the various Armenian charities in the Adana-Tarsus-Mersin region.
\textsuperscript{50} Ghazarosyan, Teğekagir hay bžškakan arak’elow’ean, 28.
Armenians in Cilicia, obtained medical treatment from those ten doctors and their staff during that month. Malaria was by far the most common ailment at 35% of all cases, ranging from almost 30% in Adana and Marash to nearly 50% in Tarsus and a full two-thirds in Hadjin. The staggering malaria rates in Hadjin were a sign that the malaria that had worked its way into the Taurus Mountains during the war did not retreat with the coming of the French (see Chapter 9). Almost half of the patients of the Adana hospital itself had malaria. Meanwhile, the Armenian Red Cross operated a hospital in Tarsus from 1919 onward as well, which assisted the Armenian legion and treated over 7400 patients by the end of 1920. The Armenian Red Cross also had a team in Dörtyol that treated an additional 3000 patients. Almost half of its budget was sustained by local donations. As in the case of the Armenian Medical Mission, the Red Cross report indicated that the principal disease treated in Cilicia was malaria; over half of the patients in Tarsus had contracted it.

51 The Armenian Medical Mission reported to the mandate administration, but appears to have operated semi-independently.
52 Ghazarosyan, Teğekagir hay bžškakan arak'elow'tean, 31. Dr. Chamaryan in the Ceyhan-Osmaniye area reported treating over 2400 patients but only recorded those who had syphilis. This large figure is double the number of Armenians living in the region according to the mission’s statistics.
53 Ibid., 32.
54 Hay Karmir khach’è Kilikioy mēj [The Armenian Red Cross in Cilicia], (Istanbul: Tpagrut’iwn H. M. Aznavor, 1921), 30, 71-73.
55 Ibid., 89-92.
56 Ibid., 29-32.
Figure 39 Armenian Medical Mission in Adana (Source: Տեղեկագիր հայ բժշկական արակելութեան Կիլիկիա)
Top row left to right: Ms. S. Selyan, Mrs. Türkyan, Ms. Masehyan, Ms. Ghazarosyan, Ms. Karamyan, Ms. A. Selyan
Bottom row left to right: Dr. Mnatsaganyan, Dr. Krikoryan, Dr. Hayranyan, Dr. Ghazarosyan, Dr. Kachperuni, Dr.
Damlamayan, Dr. Vartanyan)

Figure 40 Maternity Ward of Armenian Medical Mission Hospital (Source: Տեղեկագիր հայ բժշկական արակելութեան Կիլիկիա)
Malaria was highly endemic to most of the towns in the Cilicia region, and as a result, people preferred to spend the summers in the mountains or orchards where cooler climates prevailed. As this was not possible for most of the Armenians residing in places like Adana and Tarsus, medical treatment for malaria or prophylaxis with quinine would be of certain necessity each summer. Coupled with the hard journey of many repatriates, refugees, and orphans and the inadequate living conditions of the area, it is no wonder that malaria was so pervasive during the French Mandate period.\(^{57}\) Meanwhile, the Muslim population was faced with its own unique wartime problems regarding malaria. A doctor named Cemal Bey who filed a report on the health situation in Çukurova for the mandate noted that malaria was especially rampant in the Ceyhan region, stating that many soldiers had returned from Yemen and elsewhere after the war with new strains of the parasite.\(^{58}\) Whatever the disease’s impacts on people in the towns, the

\(^{57}\) Other factors might have added to malaria in Cilicia, which as usual, was especially rampant in the eastern part of the province. Noting the ways in which rice cultivation had exacerbating the effects of malaria in Eastern Çukurova, a French doctor Dornier commented that it would be wise to prevent rice cultivators in Marash and İslahiye from cultivating rice within five kilometers of the city, a measure previously adopted by local Ottoman officials (see Chapter 6). Oversight of this practice must have ceased during or after the war. CADN, ISL/1/V, 304, Vol. 1 - Mersin – Affaires économiques, 8 February 1920.

\(^{58}\) CADN, ISL/1/V, 208, Vol. 3 – Santé, “Rapport de M. le Docteur DJEMAL Bey, Médecin Chef du Vilayet d’ADANA concernant l’état sanitaire dans le Vilayet.”
health situation in the hinterland, especially Eastern Çukurova, was much worse.\textsuperscript{59} Over the course of 1920, Armenian inhabitants fled this part of Cilicia (with the exception of Dörtyol), bringing medical care with them. Reports by local officials in Ayas and Ceyhan indicated that there was just one doctor in the vicinity by spring of 1921, and diseases such as malaria and syphilis were widespread.\textsuperscript{60} The situation worsened as the French withdrawal became increasingly likely. In June 1921, the kaymakam of Ayas asked the French to supply quinine and other medicines that had become completely absent in the area. It seems that no quinine arrived, although the mandate government oversaw some smallpox vaccinations in the villages.\textsuperscript{61} The French governor of Ayas declared that every group in the area was against the French, including the Armenians who no longer felt supported by the mandate government.\textsuperscript{62}

By 1921, the French administration was having its own problems regarding the procurement of medicines, especially quinine. The French command issued quinine to its soldiers and personnel along with propaganda emphasizing that malaria and mosquitoes were the “enemies” in the Levant.\textsuperscript{63} But convincing personnel to take malaria as seriously, given the economic conditions of the region, posed challenges. During the fall of 1921, as the mandate was beginning to dissolve, the French administration conducted an investigation of quinine supplies in Cilicia on the suspicion the military personnel and soldiers were selling their quinine on the black market. The interrogation of a number of pharmacists in Adana revealed why. Quinine was extremely difficult to obtain in Cilicia, and the pharmacists all reported that they essentially scraped together supplies however they could by purchasing from travelers from Istanbul and

\begin{itemize}
\item In June 1919, Dr. Krikorian of the Armenian Medical Mission treated 60 cases of malaria in İslahiye, with a third of the patients still remaining hospitalized at the end of the month. CADN, 1SL/1/V, 208, Vol. 3 – Santé, Rolland to Service de Santé (5 July 1919).
\item CADN, 1SL/1/V, 287, Vol. 5.
\item CADN, 1SL/1/V, 287, Vol. 5, 2 June 1921
\item CADN, 1SL/1/V, 287, Vol. 5, 16 April 1921.
\item CADN, 1SL/1/V, 208, Vol. 2 – Santé, “La Paludisme voilà l’ennemi.”
\end{itemize}
Izmir. A certain Mr. Nassibi purchased his quinine from an Indian doctor, and Sarkis Karayan simply reported that “we buy a little medicines from here and there on random occasions.” Pharmacists bought quinine for 40 lira to the kg. In such conditions, it was difficult for ordinary inhabitants of the region to purchase quinine for prophylaxis, and they were thus relegated to contracting malaria and seeking aid from the hospitals, clinics, and dispensaries of charity organizations that were aligned along communal lines. This contributed to the displacement of Muslims in Cilicia, many of whom entered the care of the Red Crescent in neighboring areas beyond French control.

---

As Armenian refugees flocked to the city, another refugee relief crisis unfolded on the other side of the Taurus Mountains. During the summer of 1920 as the Kemalist militias approached the plain, around 25,000 Muslims, especially Nusayri Arabs, fled the Cilicia region to areas beyond French control. The Red Crescent, which increasingly fulfilled the health and public relief needs of the nationalist movement, became the primary provider of aid for these refugees, forming a network of hospitals and dispensaries under the banner of the Adana Health

---

Relief Commission (*Adana İmdad-ı Sıhhi Heyeti*). Its area of operation was the neighboring provinces of Konya, Ereğli, Niğde, and the mountain districts of Adana that were beyond the pale of the French Occupation. The refugees were spread mainly throughout these regions and numbered over 30,000. Their populations included both residents of the Çukurova plain as well as refugees from Eastern Anatolia that had fled to Adana. Among the former group, many were recent migrants from the Balkans and Crete.

A description by Dr. Haydar, head of the relief commission, related how the crisis precipitated. “Early last July, Adana’s Muslim inhabitants abandoned Adana in one day fearing for their lives, leaving behind all their wealth and belongings.” They spread out first in the gardens surrounding the city and then moved into the mountains. Those from Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin who had *yayla* homes in Gülek, Namrun, and Mersin took refuge there. Others found help from their “corracialists (*irkdaşlar*)” in the villages. The poorest segment had taken refuge in caves and mountain dens. With the onset of winter, severe hardship came. Haydar noted that “since most of the population that fled are plains people (*ova efradi*), they are not able to adapt to the weather in the mountains or the harsh climate of Konya, Bor, and Niğde.” The exodus from Adana took a heavy toll on these families, whom Haydar repeatedly describes as having made the journey “bare (*çıplak*),” exposed to the elements of the Çukurova plain and the mountainous hinterland.66 Aside from hunger, the most common affliction of these refugees was malaria, followed by typhus, trachoma, and numerous other diseases.67

Due to the nature of their exodus, it is no surprise that these refugees were initially plagued by malaria and typhus. A report of the AHRC stated that 85% of those who came to one

---

66 TKA, 1123/15.5.
67 TKA, 1123/16.1.
of the dispensaries had malaria.\textsuperscript{68} Also noting that some 80\% of patients had malaria, a doctor at Ereğli remarked upon the staggering amount of quinine the Red Crescent was expending.\textsuperscript{69} These figures suggest that the Taurus Mountain malaria epidemic that prevailed during the last years of WWI continued during the French Mandate period (see Chapter 9).

While this sudden dislocation brought yet another experience of displacement and suffering to a segment of the local population in Cilicia, the response of the Red Crescent reflects the ways in which relief organizations began to effectively rise to the aid of vulnerable civilian populations during times of conflicts. The hospitals and dispensaries of the Red Crescent (just as those of the Armenian Medical Mission and the Red Cross) helped tens of thousands of individuals obtain clean clothes, food, and medicine during this period. Though the need was great, the Red Crescent’s operations were rather effective. For example, of the 227 civilians who entered the Konya and Bor relief hospitals from December 1920 onward, only 10 had died and only six had not been fully treated and discharged by October 1921. The dispensaries in Konya, Ereğli, Bor, Belemedik, and Namrun were visited by almost 20,000 patients during that time.\textsuperscript{70}

\textbf{Conclusion to Part 3}

As the French government lost its grip on the hinterland, negotiations with the Kemalists about an inevitable French withdrawal led to an official agreement called the Treaty of Ankara (20 October 1921) in which France relinquished its claims to territory in Turkey. By this time, the conditions of the war years coupled with drought conspired to create massive food shortages. The 1921 harvest was less than half of what it needed to be due to continued displacement.\textsuperscript{71} An

\textsuperscript{68} TKA, 150/84.60. See also TKA, 150/83.
\textsuperscript{69} TKA, 150/84.42 (30 July 1921).
\textsuperscript{70} TKA, 1123/16.5.
\textsuperscript{71} CADN, 1SL/1/V, Cilicie, 204, Vol 2 - \textit{Affaires économiques}, No. 36 Dufieux to High Commission (1 September 1921).
inspector of the French Bank in Syria called it the “the ruin of all the small cultivators.” In September 1921, emergency shipments of grain — 1.6 million kg. of wheat and over 500,000 kg of barley — from Beirut were needed to feed the civilian population of the moribund French Mandate of Cilicia. More refugees, including 17,000 Armenians fleeing violence and starvation, flocked to Adana on the eve of their departure with the fleeing French. Among them were thousands of orphans spread across a wide array of organizations operating in the cities and camps (see Table 19). The French administration incrementally began evacuating the Armenian population of Cilicia on the understanding that they would starve or face violence once the region was handed over to the new Turkish government. In the end, about 90% of the Armenian population elected to leave. Most were initially brought to either Dörtyol, Istanbul, or Beirut.

*Table 19* Christian Orphan Population of Cilicia, September 1920 (Source: CADN, 1SL/1/V, Cilicie, 326)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orphanage Name and Location</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana Orphanage</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana - Camp Gouraud</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana - Camp Picot</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana - Faubourg Rolland</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Catholic Orphanage</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Orphans in Families</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage of ACRNE</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRNE in Hristyanköy</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRNE in Nacarlı</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin - Temporary Orphanage</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGBU</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dörtyol - Kelekian Orphanage</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dörtyol - Kranian Orphanage</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misis-Incirlik, currently in Adana</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassa and Hadjin</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana - Assyrian Orphanage</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana - Chaldean Orphanage</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4067</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

72 CADN, 1SL/1/V, Cilicie, 204, Vol 2 - Affaires économiques (15 August 1921).
73 BOA, DH-I-UM 3-3/1/03, no. 5 (22 September 1921); CADN, 1SL/1/V, Cilicie, 204, Vol 2 - Affaires économiques (25 August 1921).
74 CADN, 1SL/1/V, Cilicie, Vol. 164, “Statistique de la Population (21 November 1921)”.
75 CADN, 1SL/1/V, Cilicie, 326, Vol. 1.
The forced transfer of an autochthonous population in Cilicia by the French administration was a controversial move, and although much of the Armenian population left voluntarily, many of them felt that they were being forced out by a unilateral French decision. Dörtyol was the last region of the French Mandate in Cilicia to be evacuated. Its Armenian population grew during the last year of the mandate as France lost other territories, and the Armenians there had continued to obtain arms in hopes of building a last stronghold in Cilicia. After the Treaty of Ankara, they considered launching resistance but were ultimately dissuaded by Armenians in Adana. In December 1921, there were still thousands of Armenians in Dörtyol, whom the French ultimately forced to migrate to Syria, namely Iskenderun.76

Since the fall of Marash in January 1920, it had been clear that France might lose Cilicia. Yet if many Cilician Armenians held on as long as they could, it may be because they knew what awaited them in exile. In an era of rising nationalism, there could be no place like home. In October 1922, the New York Times ran an article on the economic impact of Armenian refugees in Syria and the strain it put on Near East Relief. “Forty-five thousand refugees already have established themselves in economic life in this territory where they are undercutting Syria in prices and accepting wages lower than that reckoned by Syrians to be a basic living wage. As a result the refugees are about as popular among the Syrians as 60,000 price-cutting Japanese would be if suddenly dumped in California.”77 For most, the process of integration into a new home would be anything but smooth, and for many, the French Mandates of Syria and Lebanon would not be the last stop on a journey of repeated emigration to places like Soviet Armenia, the Americas, and France. This point is underscored by the provenance of three different memory

76 Tachjian, La France en Cilicie et en Haute-Mésopotamie : aux confins de la Turquie, de la Syrie et de l'Irak : (1919-1933), 173-75.
books that this dissertation has consulted. Authored and funded by the former residents of three different Armenian towns of Cilicia — Hadjin, Sis, and Zeytun — between 1940 and 1960, they were published in Los Angeles, Beirut, and Buenos Aires respectively.\textsuperscript{78}

The story of Cilicia’s Armenian communities and their many dislocations during the First World War period represented the most extreme manifestation of the late Ottoman phenomenon of displacement and forced resettlement, along with the hardship, disease, and mortality that it entailed. Here, one cannot help but recall Ahmed Besim Atalay and his history of Marash, completed in 1916 and published after the war (see Chapter 4). He critiqued the Reform Division with the phrase “raw settlement means annihilation (kuru iskân imhâ demektir).”\textsuperscript{79} Did this staunch Turkish nationalist — perhaps the first Ottoman author to criticize forced settlement in the Cilicia region on these grounds — not make any connection between the iskân that was carried out against the tribes of his region some decades earlier and the iskân that the Ottoman state carried out against the Armenians of Marash and many other places precisely as he wrote? It is hard to say. His brief discussion the Armenian history of Marash, somewhat tellingly, concluded in 1854 with the arrival of Protestant missionaries.\textsuperscript{80} Whatever the case, iskân, whether carried out against pastoralists or Armenian villagers and townsfolk, brought another kind of imhâ in the sense of erasure. By the time in which Atalay was writing, the traditions and identities of Cilicia’s forcibly settled tribes were already beginning to fade.\textsuperscript{81} As will be discussed later, new erasures came as Atalay and the nationalists that inherited the region with the foundation of the Turkish Republic. Along with markers of cultural identity, resettlement

\textsuperscript{78} Poghosean, Hachêni ēndhamur patmut’wnê; Keleshean, Sis-Madean; Miowtiwn, Zêytowni patmagirk [The History of Zeytun].

\textsuperscript{79} Atalay, Maraş Tarihi ve Coğrafyası, 72.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 78-80.

\textsuperscript{81} Partly for this reason, Atalay’s history of Marash contains extensive documentation of various folk songs of the region. Ibid., 96-126.
erased the ways of life of these communities, facilitating a radical transformation of local agrarian economy and ecology.

The First World War period disrupted the nascent ecology of cotton in Cilicia, derailed economic production, and ultimately displaced a staggering percentage of the individuals who lived there. Malaria by contrast thrived on the unrest. The war period changed Cilicia so much that it was in many ways barely recognizable thereafter. Most authors might therefore be tempted at this juncture to conclude what has certainly been a long study of late Ottoman Cilicia through the end of the First World War to the declaration of the Republic of Turkey. The Ottoman Cilicia found throughout this study no longer existed after the war. This was the case for Movses Hagopyan in his “Tale of Cilicia (Kilikya Destani)” that chastised the French administration for abandoning Cilicia. “Burn the Armenian-less Adana (Ermenisiz Adana’yi yakın)” he declared.  
For the Armenians of Cilicia, who regrouped elsewhere, Adana would endure only as a tragic memory.

Meanwhile, the Turkish Republic promised a new Adana divorced from the Ottoman past. The names of many places associated with Armenian life were changed: Hadjin became Saimbeyli, Zeytun became Süleymanlı, Sis became Kozan, and Ayas became Yumurtalık. Çokmerzimen had already become Dörtyol. Meanwhile, Marash became “Kahramanmaras,” earning the title of “hero” for the role the city played in the Turkish Independence movement. Adana was to be a place of a promising future, not of the troubled past. In an article for the Adana Commerce Guide in 1924, local educator İsmail Habip described Adana as a city for which the past had little meaning, creatively deemphasizing history through the language of national renewal and vitality. “Adana is very old (çok ihtiyaç), but neither in its people nor its town is there any sign of old-age (ihtiyarlık),” he said, later adding that “here you meet more

---

82 Eghiayean, Atanayi hayots’ patmut’ıwn [The History of Adana’s Armenians], 822.
smokestacks than minarets and more large, sturdy buildings than domes. It is not a city that gets lost in the idle talk of ghosts (ruhların mavrası). It is a city that gives life to the commerce and wealth of the time — not new — but a town that does not belong to yesterday.”

The war had destroyed much, and much would change in the decades after. But the Cilicia of the Republican period was by no means divorced from the ecological legacy of the late Ottoman period. Meltem Toksöz concluded her study of late Ottoman Çukurova with a few remarks about how her period of focus laid the foundation for the agricultural economy that came to define the Adana region in modern Turkey. The sheer magnitude of the wartime disruption, particularly the expulsion of a huge number of cultivators from the region, might on the surface bring that claim to continuity into question. However, despite all of the changes that the war brought, it did not fundamentally alter the ecological trajectory that had been set during the Ottoman period. There was no going back to a world in which pastures rather than plantations dominated the geography of Çukurova. Republican Adana inherited many features from the Ottoman past, perhaps most notably the structures that facilitated commercial agriculture along with the pervasive endurance of malaria as a fundamental issue that impinged upon agrarian life in the countryside of Çukurova.

In the final part of this dissertation, I will continue to explore the agrarian transformation of the Adana region, focusing on the demographic, economic, and cultural shifts that occurred throughout in the realm of ecology and the seemingly never-ending confrontation with malaria. The story will pass through the establishment of the Turkish Republic, the early Republican making of the modern villager, the medical activities of the interwar period, and a discussion of changing sentiments about the environment, concluding somewhat ambivalently in the 1950s

---

83 Oğuz, Adana Ticaret Rehberi, 165-66.
84 Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 189-204.
with the declaration of the Anthropocene, a proposed period of geological time in which human activity has come to define the environment as opposed to vice versa. While this study will neither affirm nor reject the notion of the Anthropocene outright, I will offer some remarks on the ecological continuities between pre- and post-Anthropocene Cilicia and what they mean for the history and memory of the modern Middle East.
PART 4
(1923-1956)

Standing in a swamp outside the village of Mercin, a row of boys peers out with puzzlement at a strange visitor. Their distended bellies, which hold back severely enlarged spleens, are visible markers of the disease they carry. Malaria — the parasite poisoning the blood of the new nation — is their affliction, and only the man in the suit, a doctor who like them braces against the bright Çukurova sun, can provide the cure. His promise is to make them healthy and productive citizens of the new Turkish Republic.

The historian immediately recognizes the trope from a long lineage of colonial photographic motifs. The image has been staged. The thick tan-lines on the boys’ necks reveal that they have been disrobed for the purposes of representation. The image appears in a report written by Dr. Ralph Collins, an American health adviser in Turkey, in 1926. It details for the Rockefeller Foundation the impacts of its charitable activities and the reestablishment of public health services in the new Turkey. For the foundation, these public health activities were rooted in humanitarian ideals and the quest to end suffering. As for the boys, they are nameless sufferers, “examples of splenomegaly from malaria.”¹ It does not presumably matter who they are. Perhaps this is both the virtue and vice of what Keith Watenpaugh has dubbed American humanitarian exceptionalism.²

¹ See RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926).
² Watenpaugh, Bread from Stones: the Middle East and the making of modern humanitarianism.
Turkish health officials are willing participants in this spectacle, which in the end, reflects a vision not so far from their own. But their participation means something slightly different. In their language, these boys are the stuff of the nation, and in the wake of a fallen empire, rejuvenated and civilized bodies are what the republic promises. The poster boy of this project is the third from the left, who cups his genitals to shade them from the camera’s burning gaze. The other older boys wear pants, but because of his unusually distended belly, he is made the exception. If not for the participation of Turkish health officials, we would have never known his true identity. He is Ramazan, the son of Mahmut, and he is not a boy in the strictest terms. He is twenty-three years old. His picture and story appeared in an article about the progress of anti-malarial campaigns in Adana from the *The Public Health Journal (Sıhhiye Mecmuası)* published by the Turkish Ministry of Public Health a few years after the visit of Collins and company. In the eyes of Turkish doctors, Ramazan’s exceptionally swollen spleen stood between his body and proper manhood. Malaria prevented him from working enough to feed a family and impeded his
ability to even reproduce. His life was frozen in a feverish stasis by the parasite that paralyzed his muscles.

Figure 44 At left: Ramazan in Mercin, unnamed in report of Rockefeller Foundation by Ralph Colliins; at right: Ramazan in Mercin, named in Ekrem Tok’s report from Sıhhiye Mecmuasi.

According to Adana region malaria specialist Ekrem Tok’s triumphant report, Turkish doctors delivered on their promise to make Ramazan a man and an example of the potential effects of antimalarial campaigns. A photograph taken just three years after Collins’ visit shows Ramazan standing on the dry land of a newly drained swamp, fully-clothed and proudly clutching an infant. Tok indicates that the child is Ramazan’s two-year-old son. The transformation of the sickly Ramazan and his no less sickly village is complete, and it is only the beginning of what is to come for the Çukurovan countryside.

---

RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926); Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sıtma mücadeleşi [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region].”

Ibid., 1298.
Not far west of Mercin in the bustling city of Adana, one of Ramazan’s peers was already on a different kind of journey to manhood. Just as Ramazan, he had been too young to serve in the First World War, and having lost his father in 1920, this young man now sought to make his fortune in the commercial capital recently vacated by the French. Like many of the businessmen who made their fortunes in Çukurova during the late Ottoman period and beyond, he was a native of the Kayseri region. He had come to Çukurova after hearing in the words of one biographer “that there was much bread to be had in Adana” following the hurried departure of the Cilician Armenian population. Hacı Ömer Sabancı, an imposing and serious village boy, would be transformed not by medicine but by the economic opportunities the new nation offered. After the First World War, Adana had been invaded by France, but in the end it was colonized by Kayseri. As the agrarian economy of the Adana region continued to grow, Hacı Ömer and many other men from Kayseri built small commercial kingdoms for themselves. Sabancı would use his capital, experience, and savvy to build his kingdom into one of Turkey’s wealthiest business

---

5 Tanju, Hacı Ömer, 4.
empires during the ascendance of capitalist industry following WWII. His journey would end not on the banks of the Seyhan but rather at his family’s large estate in Emirgan on the Northern Bosphorus of Istanbul’s European side.

The two very different metamorphoses of Ramazan and Hacı Ömer represent two interrelated aspects of Cilicia’s transformation during the first decades of Turkey’s history. Hacı Ömer Sabancı would make his fortune from the agrarian resurgence in Çukurova over the early decades of the Republic. Ramazan was cured, at least initially, by an ambitious program to eliminate one of the oldest features of life in Cilicia, the endemic malaria of the Çukurova plain. Their stories embodied the spirit of rejuvenation and healing in the young Republic, within which youth and indeed the image of the child were extremely central. Turkish nationalists saw their nation as young and new, portraying the Republic as a growing child. Even if that child was entering a brand new phase, it was still ultimately conceived and born, much like Mahmutoğlu Ramazan and Hacı Ömer Sabancı, during the last years of the Ottoman period. But for every villager like Ramazan who was cured of malaria and for every migrant like Hacı Ömer that struck it rich in Adana, there were many more villagers who continued to suffer from malaria well into the 1950s, and there were many more migrants who assumed their place at the bottom rather than the top of the social hierarchy of Adana’s commercial economy.

Part 4 of this dissertation focuses on such stories through the continuities born out of late Ottoman transformation. As local administrators and businessmen sought to rebuild the agrarian economy of the Cilicia region that was so badly damaged by the war years, strong echoes of Adana’s past — especially the cotton boom of the 1860s — were everywhere to be heard. Just as land reforms and other administrative changes of the Tanzimat and post-Tanzimat era were

---

6 See Yasemin Gencer, "We Are Family: The Child and Modern Nationhood in Early Turkish Republican Cartoons (1923-28)," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 32, no. 2 (2012).
aimed at increasing agricultural production, the early republican government sought an overall agrarian revolution through the promotion of village life and increased involvement in the lives of Anatolia villagers. This entailed the settlement of immigrants, the continued sedentarization of pastoralists, and the expansion of public health apparatuses in the villages. Thematically speaking, life in Cilicia was very much what it had been during the late Ottoman period for decades into the Republic.

The interwar period in Cilicia did bring major shifts as well. Agriculture moved towards mechanization, and by the end of the 1930s, the government presided over a program to overhaul and harness nature. This program included ambitious anti-malaria campaigns, which despite their limitations, established the foundation for further anti-malaria efforts following WWII. Amid these changes, the population, which was increasingly concentrated in the Çukurova plain, continued to practice transhumance for the purposes of health and comfort. But the form of this transhumance changed due to developments in transportation technology and new ways of living in the region that were detached from pastoralism and incompatible with seasonal migration. With the technocratic overhaul of agrarian life in Çukurova during the post-WWII period, the yayla simultaneously became a symbol of the endurance of geography and the lifestyles embedded in that geography within the Cilicia region as well as the profound transformation that had occurred over the course of a century.
CHAPTER 11
EXCHANGING PEASANTRIES: CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN EARLY REPUBLICAN CILICIA

Given the centrality of commerce, agriculture, and industry in the region, it is fitting that one of the first major books about the history, geography, and economy of the Cilicia region to be written in Ottoman Turkish after the withdrawal of the French was a business directory called *The Adana Commerce Guide (Adana Ticaret Rehberi)*. The guide was the earliest published work of Remzi Oğuz Arık, a Turkish archaeologist who would go on to study Hittite settlements in Anatolia and serve as a founding member of the Türkiye Köylü Partisi in 1952, a short-lived political party that advocated the issues of Turkish villagers. An epigraph in French and Ottoman that adorned its first page embodied the nationalist sentiments of the work’s authors: “Cilicia is such an inalienable region of the Turkish homeland, it is the very heart of it (La Cilicie, est la patrie la plus inaliénable de la patrie turque, elle en est le coeur même / Kilikya Türk vatanının koparlamaz bir parçası; hatti o vatanın bizzat kalbidir).”¹ The author of the quotation was Pierre Loti, a French orientalist poet who penned many romantic words about the Ottoman capital and supported the Turkish cause for independence after the First World War. The quotation was likely pulled directly from the cover of a 1920 publication in French about the Adana province written by Niyazi Ramazanoğlu, a native of the Adana region who lobbied for Turkish Independence during the postwar period (see Chapter 10).²

The guide was a medley of elements drawn from Ottoman-era sources, translated works produced during or by the French Mandate, and various local contributions from the professionals and civil servants of the Adana province. As such, it contained numerous

¹ Oğuz, *Adana Ticaret Rehberi*.
² Ramazanoğlu, *La Province d’Adana*. 
inconsistencies even on the level of naming its region of study, and indeed, even in the spelling of the name “Adana.”³ In this regard, the most intriguing linguistic trace on the veritable palimpsest that was The Adana Commerce Guide was the name “Cilicia (Kilikya)” that remained as a geographical toponym synonymous with the Adana province, despite its recent use by Armenians in their own national claims and despite France’s decision to officially change the name of Adana to Cilicia during the Mandate period.⁴ In fact, the guide recognized the utility of the name Cilicia for its historical continuity, indicating that “we use the name Cilicia in place of the Adana province (Adana vilayeti) because political configurations are always changing.”⁵

This chapter is the story of how the enduring geography of Cilicia was incorporated into the new Turkish nation-state and how physical ruptures created thematic continuities in the region’s history. It is concerned with the issue of frontier settlement, a process that had made settlers out of immigrants and nomads and had begun to transform the ecology of the Çukurova plain during the late Ottoman period, creating new socioeconomic trajectories and raising new questions for public health that centered on the various seasonal and diachronic movement of people into, out of, and within the Cilicia region. I examine this point of continuity between the Ottoman and Republican periods primarily through the movements of some of the principal groups that served as foci of the nation-building process: immigrants, peasants, nomads, and Kurdish communities from Eastern Anatolia.

Given the muddy terrain that the Turkish Republic was founded upon, it is hardly surprising that the conventional history of Turkey focuses on the making of the Turkish state and

³ Whereas the official spelling of Adana adopted during the late Ottoman and early Republican periods “Aṭana (اًطنة)” (which had once replaced the earlier spelling of “Adana (اًدنة)” appeared throughout the text, Remzi Oğuz seems to have adopted his own modified spelling at times, using “Adânâ (اًدانا).” Oğuz, Adana Ticaret Rehberi, 8. The original spelling had been changed in 1873 due to the rising frequency of Adana’s mentioning in official documentation and its frequent confusion with the spelling of Edirne. BOA, A}-MKT-MHM 463/14 (11 Receb 1290 [4 September 1873]).
⁴ BOA, DH-SFR 668/68 (19 Kanunuevvel 1334 [19 December 1918]).
⁵ Oğuz, Adana Ticaret Rehberi, 18.
the principles embodied, envisioned, and implemented by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. However, the experiences of the marginal groups that in many ways served as the main actors in the resettlement of the Anatolian countryside and the expansion of agricultural activity reveal that the processes shaping modern Turkey were more complex. Their movements reflected wide divergences from some of underlying policies of the Republic government, and their hardships pointed to the intransigence of social hierarchies embedded in the Anatolian geography.

The history of the early Republican period also reveals that the First World War effected a profound reversal in terms of demographic growth and agricultural expansion that was not fully countered for many years. At the time of Turkey’s first census in 1927, the population of the Adana province was scarcely higher than it had been before the war, and in many regions that had held large concentrations of non-Muslims, depopulation would be a lingering outcome. Similarly, despite relatively sustained agricultural growth from the 1920s onward, cultivation in the Çukurova region did not truly surpass prewar levels before the implementation of Turkey’s first five-year plan in 1934. But at the same time, the Republican period brought a recurrence of the frontier settlement process with the arrival of new Muslim migrants, further efforts at village-making and tribal settlement, the resumption of seasonal labor movements, and the agricultural transformation of Çukurova. In this regard, the war can be understood as a rupture that did not undermine the overall continuities between the late Ottoman and early Republican periods.

**Postwar Demographics of the Adana Region**

Before examining some of the experiences of migrants, pastoralists, and seasonal workers in Çukurova during the interwar period, I would like to present a brief overview of the demographic impacts of the war and the shifts that occurred in its aftermath. The case of the Adana province is not exceptional in that the decade of demographic flux during the war
negatively impacted population figures. The war itself was a powerful force of mortality, reduced birthrates, and displacement. Moreover, roughly 20% of the total population of the region had been Christian before the war, and few remained thereafter. Muslim migrants came to the Adana province during and after the war, but decidedly fewer than the number of Christians who departed or were forcibly uprooted over the decade prior. According to official statistics from 1930, which encompassed the exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece (more below), the number of migrants who came to the Adana region during the 1920s was significantly less than planned at first and much less than the number of Christians lost. The Adana, Cebel-i Bereket, Mersin, and Marash provinces received a combined 14,808 migrants.\(^6\) Other official figures placed the number for those four provinces at around almost 21,000.\(^7\) These “exchanged people” or mübadils joined the extant populations of prior muhacirs from the Balkans and Eastern Anatolia that had arrived on the eve of the First World War or had been settled in the Çukurova region during it.

The demographic impact of the war, particularly with regard to regional distribution of population, can be observed to some extent through a comparison of late Ottoman and early Republican census figures. The 1927 census reflected a population roughly 11% higher than the population of Adana, Cebel-i Bereket, and Mersin in the 1914 census (see Table 20), but given the fact that Ottoman censuses tended to underrepresent population figures, we might guess that

\(^7\) Ashlı Emine Çomu, "The Exchange of Populations and its Aftermath in Ayvalık, Mersin and Trabzon," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 18, no. 1/2 (2012): 24. The reason why so relatively few mübadils settled around Adana appears to have been that most ultimately settled in the Greater Marmara region in provinces closest to their original homes or likewise, regions that had possessed the largest Rum Orthodox populations before the war. For example, over 140,000 were settled in and around Edirne, Tekirdağ, Kırklareli, and Istanbul, the European provinces of Turkey. McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities: the population of Ottoman Anatolia and the end of the empire*, 190-91. More below.
there was little change in total population. In short, it is possible that the Adana region experienced no significant net growth in population between 1914 and 1927 despite high growth rates before the war, and depending on interpretation of the statistics, may have even experienced demographic decline. My goal is primarily to compare local population of different districts of the region in relative terms.

Çukurova remained an important destination for migrants, who during the interwar period came to the region from every direction, from Greece, Romania, and Yugoslavia in Eastern Europe to Algeria, Libya, and Syria in the increasingly colonized Arab Mediterranean to Kayseri and other parts of Anatolia. The war had produced marked shifts in the demographic makeup of historical Cilicia. The settlement of many migrants in cities along with the flight of villagers to urban areas during the war period had led to significant increases in population within districts that contained an urban center. Between 1914 and 1927, the district surrounding the city of Adana (urban population 72,652) grew by 17%, that of Mersin (urban population 21,765) and Tarsus (urban population 22,058) by 49% and 12% respectively, and Ceyhan (urban population 7,317) by as much as 62%. Even if these numbers may have reflected some redistricting, a clear trend of relative growth around urban areas of the plain between 1914 and 1927 was evident. This is not to say that those cities themselves grew substantially; in fact, Adana and

---

8 The 1914 census, like all Ottoman censuses, was widely assumed to be low and while there were likely irregularities in the 1927 census as well, the general undercounting of rural populations, especially Christians, in the Ottoman Empire may have influenced the overall difference in these numbers. The population of Adana in the 1927 census was essentially the same as the official 1919 figures from Ramazanoğlu’s book, although given the contested nature of demography at the time, it is also hard to understand how accurate those figures were. These should probably be taken as an approximation of the prewar estimate. A government report on the province of Çebeli-Bereket from 1925 for example estimated that the population was around 64,000 but that as much as a quarter was of the population was not registered. Çebeli-Bereket Vilayeti’ne ait coğrafi, iktisadi, ictimai, tarihi idari malumat ihtiva eder bir takaddümé, (Adana: Türk Sözü Matbaası, 1341 [1925]), 17. However, the 1927 census put the population of that province at over 100,000, meaning that the problem of unregistered population must have been resolved or the aforementioned estimate had been somewhat incomplete. Umumi Nüfüs Tahriri, 28 Teşrinievvel 1927 [General Census, 28 October 1927], (Ankara: Türk Ocakları merkez heyeti matbaası, 1927), 8.


10 See Türkiye Nüfüsü (1928) for a complete list of urban areas in Turkey and their populations. Türkiye Nüfüsü [The Population of Turkey], (Ankara: Türk Ocakları merkez heyeti matbaası, 1928).
Mersin had been roughly the same the size if not a bit larger before the war (see Chapter 5). However, as districts, their populations grew much faster than the more remote parts of the Cilician countryside during the first years of the Turkish Republic. Yet the other districts of the plain, Kars (Kadirli) and Osmaniye, much like Ceyhan, grew even faster than Adana, increasing in population by roughly a third.

*Table 20 Population change in the Adana, Mersin, and Cebel-i Bereket Provinces as reflected in official statistics of Ottoman and Turkish censuses, 1914-1927*\(^\text{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District (Kaza)</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1919</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>% Change (1914-1927)</th>
<th>% Christian c1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>93,217</td>
<td>102,492</td>
<td>108,957</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadjin (Saimbeyli)</td>
<td>30,522</td>
<td>30,756</td>
<td>18,633</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feke</td>
<td>17,989</td>
<td>18,701</td>
<td>10,495</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaisalı</td>
<td>27,791</td>
<td>29,221</td>
<td>39,224</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sis (Kozan)</td>
<td>24,833</td>
<td>28,763</td>
<td>26,881</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars (Kadirli)</td>
<td>18,212</td>
<td>19,726</td>
<td>23,462</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaniye</td>
<td>13,968</td>
<td>14,301</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islahiye/Hassa</td>
<td>21,764</td>
<td>23,471</td>
<td>18,752</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahçe</td>
<td>18,934</td>
<td>20,164</td>
<td>15,540</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan/Yumurtalik</td>
<td>23,812</td>
<td>28,135</td>
<td>38,517</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dörtyol</td>
<td>22,842</td>
<td>23,939</td>
<td>17,002</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>31,434</td>
<td>33,782</td>
<td>46,831</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>65,701</td>
<td>72,274</td>
<td>73,680</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>411,019</td>
<td>445,725</td>
<td>456,220</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above statistics indicate that regions which were predominantly Muslim during the late Ottoman period witnessed considerable population growth, or at the very least, suffered much less demographic impact due to the war. Karaisalı, which had virtually no non-Muslim population before the war, grew statistically by 41%. However, in regions that had been more than 20% Christian, there was a staggering decline. The district of Saimbeyli (formerly Hadjin),

---

\(^{11}\) Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: demographic and social characteristics*; Ramazanoğlu, *La Province d'Adana; Umumi Nüfüs Tahriri, 28 Teşrinievvel 1927 [General Census, 28 October 1927]*.
which had been officially 44% Christian before the war, reflected an overall decline of 39%. The town of Hadjin had once teemed with a population of several thousands (see Chapter 2), yet it had under 500 residents after the destruction of the war period.\textsuperscript{12} The population of Feke, which had been around one-quarter non-Muslim and had held a large number of Rum Orthodox villages, dropped by 42%. Bahçe and Dörtyol exhibited similar net losses in population roughly equal to their prewar non-Muslim populations.\textsuperscript{13} But given that the other districts had exhibited considerable rise (at least on paper), I believe that these statistics show the extent to which the loss of Christian population also precipitated a general depopulation that extended to the Muslim population in such regions.

Further comparison between 1927 and 1935 confirms these trends. Between those years, all of the districts in the Adana province (which encompassed Cebel-i Bereket) experienced some population growth in official statistics. Adana, which continued to receive migrants, grew steadily, as did the other districts of the plain like Ceyhan, Kozan, Kadirli, and Osmaniye. Saimbeyli, Feke, and Bahçe grew too, but much less so. Their 1935 populations still fell short of prewar figures. The growth of Karaisalı, a partially mountainous district, likewise slowed tremendously. Meanwhile, the coastal town of Dörtyol, which had been utterly depopulated by the French withdrawal, experienced population growth rivaled only by the district of Ceyhan. In short, the war and its effects had intensified the shifts of the late Ottoman period (see Chapter 5), and the population exchanges meant that on the whole, expelled Christian populations were not replaced in their original area of settlement by an even remotely similar number of new migrants.

\textsuperscript{12} Türkiye Nüfusu [The Population of Turkey], 17.
\textsuperscript{13} The lack of population growth in these districts, which with the exception of Dörtyol were the most mountainous in the Cilicia region, might have also reflected a broader shift in settlement in the area as a result of economic and possibly ecological change in mountain landscapes that were less supportive of increased population. John McNeill notes that in mountain landscapes of the Mediterranean “both population growth and population loss put strains on the physical environment and raise the risk of rapid soil erosion, whereas greater population stability minimizes that risk.” McNeill, The Mountains of the Mediterranean World : an environmental history, 147.
in mountain regions. Instead, population rose in the areas that had been expanding during the late Ottoman period: the Upper Çukurova region centered on the town of Ceyhan, the old cities of Adana and Tarsus, and the Mediterranean littoral. A trend of comparative depopulation in the mountain regions of Cilicia was fully entrenched and accelerated by the expulsion of Christians, whose former villagers would never really be rebuilt.

*Table 21* Population change in Adana and Cebel-i Bereket as reflected in official statistics of Turkish census, 1927-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District (Kaza)</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>% Change (1927-1935)</th>
<th>% Change (1914-1935)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>108,957</td>
<td>130,243</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saimbeyli</td>
<td>18,633</td>
<td>19,990</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feke</td>
<td>10,495</td>
<td>12,074</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaisalı</td>
<td>39,224</td>
<td>42,462</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozan</td>
<td>26,881</td>
<td>34,189</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars</td>
<td>23,462</td>
<td>27,985</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaniye</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>23,027</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahçe</td>
<td>15,540</td>
<td>17,840</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan/Yumurtalık</td>
<td>38,517</td>
<td>54,373</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dörtyol</td>
<td>17,002</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may seem rather obvious that regions containing large numbers of Christians would undergo massive depopulation within this historical context. However, this piece of information exhibits one way in which forced displacement, even within the framework of an exchange of population, does not lead to the direct substitution of one population for another in their precise location. In fact, an uneven geography was only one of the issues impinging upon the smooth implementation of the population exchanges and the pursuit of government settlement policy during the 1920s. A complex matrix of economic interests and logistical impediments stood in

---

the way of the complete control of migrant movement and the controlled distribution of the large amount of “abandoned property (emval-i metrue)” in the new Cilicia.

A Messy Exchange: Migrant Settlement in Early Republican Çukurova

The experience of the migrant offers one means of understanding how postwar nation-building played out in provincial settings. The postwar treaties between Turkey and neighboring states finalized on paper the incredible displacements that were already taking place, masking them with a veneer of order under the exchange of populations (Turkish: mübadele). The process by which millions of Anatolian Christians were replaced by Muslims from outside the borders of modern Turkey from 1915 onwards was incremental and violent for all those involved. Roughly 1.5 million Armenians from Anatolia were expelled during the war, resulting in hundreds of thousands of deaths. Although some returned, especially those who came to Cilicia with the French after the war, they too would be forced out during the Turkish War of Independence. Similarly, as many as one million Rum Orthodox Ottoman subjects departed for Greece during the war and especially after the end of the Greek occupation of Anatolia. Throughout this period, Muslims from the Balkans and Eastern Anatolia were moved around from province to province through a nebulous resettlement process (see Chapters 8 and 10). After the war, most of the remaining Rum Orthodox Christians in Anatolia and most of the Muslims in Greece would become part of a formal agreement to an exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece.

With that agreement, hundreds of thousands of Muslims, some of whom had already begun to leave the Balkans after the First World War but most of whom had remained, would become permanent citizens of Turkey. These individuals, referred to as exchanged people or mübadils, were to be settled throughout Anatolia usually in large clusters based on place of origin. Populations from different regions of Greece were designated for implantation in specific
regions of Turkey. The Adana region was slated to receive the first major wave of migrants came from Serez or Serres in Greek Macedonia, which numbered around 40,000 at the time of the exchanges.\textsuperscript{15} Other important regions of origin for mübadils in Adana included Demirhisar (modern-day Republic of Macedonia), Crete, and especially Alasonya or Elassona in Greece.\textsuperscript{16} As stated above, the final number of migrants who arrived in Adana during the 1920s was on paper only about 20,000.\textsuperscript{17}

As one might expect, the process of substituting large numbers of people for others sometimes became messy. The following story from the Adana region reveals many of the legal ambiguities that the population exchanges created. Mehmet Recep, an immigrant from the town of Elassona in Greek Macedonia, settled in Adana sometime after the exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece began in 1924. In June of 1929, he sent an open letter to the local newspaper \textit{Yeni Adana} relating the bizarre story of two men he knew before the exchanges brought him to the Çukurova region.\textsuperscript{18} They were a Bosnian named Tahir Agha from Berkovici in the former Ottoman province of Shkodra (İskodra) and his son-in-law Bedrettin from town of Leskovik in the former Ottoman province of Yanya. At the time of the exchanges, they had both been living in Elassona. Mehmet Recep represented himself as a dutiful, new citizen of Turkey attempting to prevent an extravagant fraud by the son-in-law Bedrettin, who by 1929, was also living in Adana. Bedrettin had recently managed to register at a bargain price some 9000 dönüms of land already claimed by another pair of migrants in the village of Sırınsı (Çakırören) near Karataş in the Ceyhan delta — land that had formerly belonged to the wealthy Greek resident of

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{İskân Tarihçesi}, (İstanbul: Hamit Matbaası, 1932), 18.
\textsuperscript{16} Aslı Emine Çomu, \textit{The Exchange of Populations and Adana, 1830-1927} (İstanbul: Libra, 2011), 94.
\textsuperscript{17} Çomu, "The Exchange of Populations and its Aftermath in Ayvalık, Mersin and Trabzon."
\textsuperscript{18} Some of the specific background information in this section regarding the history of the population exchanges is not explicitly stated in Mehmet Recep but rather is implied or inferred from the context of his story. Mehmet Recep, "Dahiliye vekâletine: iskân işleri çok ciddi bir tahkikata lüzum göstermektedir [To the Ministry of Interior: the settlement activities require a very serious investigation]," \textit{Yeni Adana} 20 June 1929.
late Ottoman Cilicia Kosmo Simyonoğlu, who like the other Christians in the region, had lost his property as a result of the population exchanges.

Recep’s letter, narrated through the daring exploits of two unscrupulous tricksters, highlighted the complexities of the population exchanges. The trouble started with the ambiguities and chaos created by the terms of the population exchanges in the politically shifting Balkans. The “Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations” signed at Lausanne sanctioned and accelerated the already ongoing exodus of Christians from Anatolia and Muslims from the Balkans, but it only applied to nationals of Turkey and Greece. While Tahir Agha and his son-in-law Bedrettin had been living in the Greek city of Elassona, Tahir’s hometown of Berkovici had become part of the newly-formed Kingdom of Yugoslavia\(^{19}\) and Bedrettin’s Leskovik part of Albania. The two men were able to gain nationality of those respective states, thereby becoming exempted from the terms of the exchanges and maintaining control of their property in Elassona. As local Muslims were being deported, they joined the Greeks who mocked their former neighbors, according to Recep’s letter, at least, saying “look, the donkeys are being exchanged.” The pair remained in Elassona as the Rum Orthodox peasants from Anatolia arrived in the stead of the Muslim émigrés and were settled into their former homes. The two bragged of how they could go wherever they liked with their pockets full of money, as they were able to sell their properties for a good price rather than lose them in the exchange.

A few years later in 1926, Tahir Agha traveled to Turkey as a refugee (mülteci) using his Yugoslav (Srpski) passport. He went first to Izmir and finally to Adana, which was a settlement area for exchanged persons or mübadils from Elassona. In Adana, he was taken for a mübadil

\(^{19}\) Known as the “Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovences” until its name was changed to Yugoslavia in 1929, this state was formed in 1918 in the aftermath of the First World War. In his letter, which was written in 1929, Recep refers to the place as Yugoslavia but also refers to Tahir Ağa carrying a “Serbian” passport.
from Elassona and was able to obtain the document (beyanname) necessary to verify his mübadil status, even though he had been exempted from the population exchanges in Greece by virtue of his Yugoslav nationality. This gave him special legal rights to obtaining property that formerly belonged to Christians. Tahir was eventually detected by a secretary of the population exchange commission and his story was printed in the local newspaper Türksözü in January of 1929. Realizing he would no longer be able to obtain property in Adana, he moved to Konya and later to Ankara, where he passed away soon after. Meanwhile, his heir and son-in-law Bedrettin had also come to Turkey as a refugee in 1926 and found himself a home in Göztepe, the “choicest (en mutena)” neighborhood of Izmir and former Greek suburb of Enopi. Upon news of his father-in-law’s death in 1929, Bedrettin went to Adana and was somehow able to obtain a document of testimony (şahadetname) to his mübadil status from some “gullible” people that had known his father. He had used that testimony to acquire a mübadil document that would give him the right to obtain property. At the time of Recep’s letter, Bedrettin was in the midst of acquiring a massive tract of land that was meant to be the rightful property of mübadils seeking to build a new life in Turkey, and Mehmet Recep had no doubt that Bedrettin would immediately resell the land for hundreds of thousands of lira and take his ill-gotten gains back to Albania “with a clean conscience.”

The open letter of Recep from Elassona contained all the types of intrigue that Yeni Adana loved to publish. Tahir Agha and his son-in-law Bedrettin were the exact opposite of the stereotypically simple-minded, passive peasants who were swept up in the tumultuous exchanges that fundamentally changed the social fabric of Anatolia and the Balkans. With an impressive display of forum-shopping, they had profited from what was supposed to be the tragedy of their people. In trying to have their cake and eat it too at the table of postwar national politics, they
had betrayed the trust of their fellow Muslims and the Turkish state. *Yeni Adana* published quite of few stories of this variety dealing with a whole range of irregularities and corruption regarding the settlement of new migrants and the distribution of land.\(^{20}\) The mübadils and other immigrants in these stories appeared at times as helpless victims and at others cases as scheming swindlers seeking to capitalize on a unique historical opportunity.\(^{21}\) While some of these rumors smacked of spite for newcomers, all evidence suggested rampant abuse of the system on the part of every class of individual involved and many unresolved ambiguities.\(^{22}\)

The discussion of opportunistic corruption regarding the registration of and distribution of property to mübadils must have been reminiscent of a similar process that started nearly a decade before the population exchanges began in 1924, a process that involved many of the very nationalist politicians and businessmen that thrived in early Republican Adana. Immediately after the deportation of Adana’s Armenians in 1915, the Ottoman government had begun to confiscate Armenian properties; according to Talat Pasha’s notebook, almost seven hundred buildings and adjacent properties were confiscated during the war.\(^{23}\) These houses, shops, factories and farms were part of the “abandoned properties (*emval-i metruke*),” which with the

---

20 There were other alleged cases of some migrants maneuvering at the expense of others that attracted attention. In 1930, *Yeni Adana* cited a typical case in which Salıhoğlu Mustafa, a migrant from Serez who had been working formerly Armenian lands given to him as a mübadil since 1923, was somehow usurped by an Alasonya migrant holding documents of ownership for the same piece of land. "Karışık bir mesele: Yedi senedir verilmiş olan bir tarla nasıl geri alınıyor?," *Yeni Adana* 4 June 1930.

21 For example, an article from summer of 1929 in *Yeni Adana* discussed some of the rumors regarding the level of corruption involved in ongoing settlement matters. On one hand, some people used fraudulent testimonies to their mübadil status or old tapu documents with no legal relevance to the issue of ownership to claim land intended for mübadils. On the other hand, individuals such as Albanians and other Muslims from the Balkans who had arrived to Adana even before that had legally become mübadils were using that position to unrightfully come into possession of large properties, even allegedly dispossessing other local Muslims. "İskan İşleri [Settlement Activities]," *Yeni Adana* 18 June 1929. In some cases, wealthy businessmen bought up the yet unused documents of mübadils in order to accumulate property and benefits. "Bu nasıl iş? [What Is This?]," *Yeni Adana* 28 August 1929.

22 An article in *Yeni Adana* featured an announcement from Finans Bank clarifying that land deeds for immigrants did not feature the small logo of an airplane, presumably in an indication that fraudulent documents were being produced. "Göçmenlerin tapu senetleri [The Land Deeds of Immigrants]," *Yeni Adana* 9 July 1935. In newspapers like *Yeni Adana*, the local government routinely advertised large plots of land made available for settlement that were to presumably be claimed by qualified immigrants but in practice may have found all sorts of new owners.

establishment of the Republic were to be land distributed to mübadils in addition to that which was left behind by their Rum Orthodox counterparts headed to Greece. But by the time mübadils began to be formally settled, much of this property had already been claimed by new owners. For example, Üngör and Polatel have translated a document from the Republican Archives (BCA) indicating that a large number of houses in and around the city of Adana from the abandoned properties were by 1924 in the possession of civil servants and military personnel, from teachers and doctors to policemen and army officers.

Whether the elaborate and cavalier conniving of Tahir Agha and his son-in-law or the bottomless question of what happened to Armenian and Greek properties after the French and Greek withdrawals, issues regarding the large scale movements of people and property in Çukurova reveal the messiness of the exchange process that laid the foundation for the reconstruction of provincial societies and economies in Anatolia. A further barrier to implementing the exchanges according to plan and a likely motivating factor in why so many eventually sold their lands was the nature of the local ecology. For example, a few thousand mübadils from the Balkans refused to settle in regions like Kozan (Sis) because of an inability to adapt to the climate, a familiar reference to the malarial environment of the plain. Mübadils, much like immigrants from the Caucasus and the Balkans who had come to Çukurova during the Ottoman period, suffered from the ever-unkind disease environment. On top of issues of acclimation, the agricultural economy of the Adana region differed significantly from that of the home regions of most Balkan immigrants, where orchards and tobacco farming were the most

24 Ayhan Aktar states that “Between September 1922 and the middle of 1924, most of the abandoned property belonging to the Greeks in Turkey was either looted or occupied, or both.” Ayhan Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation, Turkifying the Economy: The Turkish Experience of Population Exchange Reconsidered," in Crossing the Aegean: an appraisal of the 1923 compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey, ed. Renee Hirschon (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), 86.
25 Polatel and Üngör, Confiscation and Colonization, 175-80.
26 Ibid., 126.
common forms of commercial agricultural production. The exchange commission was mindful of sending immigrants to regions where they could easily fit into the local economy. For example, migrants from Crete were given vineyard land in keeping with their general way of life back on the island. But in the case of Adana, much of the land confiscated from Armenians that became part of the settlement policies had been used for growing cotton.

These issues complicated the task of settling mubahils into villages, which was an important goal of the overall settlement policy and the centerpiece of the general concern with the countryside, village production, and education during the early Republican period. With the ascendance of interwar peasanthood among many nationalist thinkers in Turkey, new emphasis on rural spaces not just as integral areas of economic production but also as cultural units that could serve as the target for broader political projects brought new attention to the village, the villager, and its others.

**The Villager, the Nomad, and the Making of the Rural**

The roaming of itinerant tribes (seyyar aşiretler) such as these within Turkish society resembles a rheumatic ache in the human body. Taha Toros, *Village Economies in Çukurova and the Taurus* (1939)

The interwar period was in some ways the heyday of the Anatolian peasant, although Turkey would remain a majority rural country for many decades to come and the rural population would continue to increase. Early Kemalist ideology was formulated by self-described enlightened (münevver) and generally bourgeois politicians largely hailing from cities

---

whose understanding of the life in rural villages was not necessarily sophisticated.\textsuperscript{30} The Turkish national project of the early Republican period was nonetheless intensely rural in that it was concerned with securing the participation and cooperation of Anatolian villagers from an early stage. From 1927 onward, the rural population of Turkey increased slightly more rapidly than the urban population, so that 76.5\% of the country was rural by 1935.\textsuperscript{31} The growth of villages in Çukurova between 1927 and 1935 significantly outpaced the growth of cities. Even though the district of Adana grew by 20\% over that time period, the official population of the city itself only grew by a few thousand; the cities of Mersin and Tarsus showed no significant growth during that period.\textsuperscript{32} Meanwhile, all of the districts of the Upper Çukurova plain grew as much as or more than the district of Adana (see Table 21 above). Ceyhan grew by over 40\%. Some of the lagging growth in cities may have been attributed to the fact that many people likely resided in the city but remained officially registered in their native villages. But available anecdotal sources reflect no different population estimates other than sometimes accounting for seasonal population change (more below). Slow economic growth might have also contributed to the halted growth of cities in Çukurova that had been so rapid during the last decades of the Ottoman period. In either case, the early Republican period saw a slowdown in the trend of urbanization, not just for structural reasons, but because of the special political emphasis placed on the village and the villager.

\textsuperscript{30} For an overview of Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu’s incisive literary take on this phenomenon, see Karaömerlioğlu, \textit{Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta: erken Cumhuriyet döneminde köyü söylem}, 153-61.
\textsuperscript{31} Toros, \textit{Çukurova ve Toroslarda Köy İktisadiyatı [Village Economies in Çukurova and the Taurus Mountains]}, 3.
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Adana Cumhuriyetten Evvel ve Sonra [Adana Before and After the Republic]}, 49.
Integrating villages into the body-politic of Turkey was a critical component of the nationalist project from the beginning of the Republican period. For example, Dr. Muhittin, the Red Crescent inspector in the Adana province during the late 1920s, insisted on the value of visiting “even the villages” to solicit donations and membership.34 “I will try to go, even if by

Table 22 Rounded Estimates of Urban Populations in Cilicia, 1864-1935

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>1864</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marash</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

33 Especially in the case of Adana, these numbers refer to official “permanent” population and do not consider floating population or seasonal fluctuations. Most sources distinguish between these two categories. It is not possible to rely on a single source when estimating urban populations for a given year during the period in question. Authors often get it wrong, badly, and sometimes based their estimates on old sources. Some are consistently high or consistently low. These estimates are derived from a massive body of narrative and official sources that when read alongside each other, provide a fairly accurate picture of relative population. For published works, especially the following: 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, by John Macdonald Kinneir; Davis, Life in Asiatic Turkey; Favre and Mandrot, Voyage en Cilicie; Gould, "Pashas and Brigands : Ottoman provincial reform and its impact on the nomadic tribes of southern Anatolia, 1840-1885", 199; "The Mersina, Tarsus and Adana Railway: reprinted from the Times, May 19th, 1884."; Vidal Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie (Paris: Leroux, 1890-4); Mağmuni and Kayra, Bir Osmanlı doktorunun anıları; Ziya, Tapsıra yahut Adana Temaşası; Terzian, Atanayi keankʻě; Childs, Across Asia Minor on Foot; Admiralty, A Handbook of Asia Minor; André, La Cilicie et le problème ottoman; Gabriel Bie Ravndal, Turkey : a commercial and industrial handbook (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1926); Türkiye Nüfusu [The Population of Turkey]; Adana Cumhuriyetten Evvel ve Sonra [Adana Before and After the Republic]; Çukurova Bölgesi: bölgesel gelisme, şehirleşme ve yerlesme düzeni; Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton. Ottoman salnames also sometimes contain population estimates for cities and towns. For archival sources, TNA, FO 222/8/2; FO 371/3418; BOA, HR-SFR (3) 282/31 (20 October 1881).
34 TKA, 210/166, Muhittin to Riyaset, Adana (29 January 1927). A very idiosyncratic but thorough map of Muhittin’s extensive travels in Çukurova indicates each and every village and town that he visited. TKA, 210/359.
animal,” he declared at one point, when the small and muddy roads in Eastern Çukurova prevented passage during his tour. At times, his interest in the villages was more ideological than practical. Among the struggling rural communities of the Çukurova region, he was often met with optimism if not sizeable donations. In the village of Mercimek near the Ceyhan River (see Chapter 1), he encountered a village of migrants from Rumeli who reacted warmly to his solicitations, saying they had always seen kindness from the Red Crescent. But beyond enlisting the support of villagers, Dr. Muhittin’s reports called on the Red Crescent to hitch itself to the agrarian economy of the Çukurova region. He suggested raising money by mandating stamps on major agricultural produce: 5 kuruş on every bale of cotton, 1 kuruş on every sack of grain, and a stamp on every orange.

Early Republican politicians affirmed both the economic and the cultural value of the village, which rose in discursive significance within the politics of early Republican Turkey as well as many other parts of the world, especially during the 1930s in the wake of financial crisis. Peasantism in Turkey grew in part out of the populism and romanticism that took hold among nationalists from the late Ottoman period onward, notably Ziya Gökalp, who saw

---

35 TKA, 210/44, Muhittin to Riyaset, Misis (7 January 1927).
36 TKA, 210/131, Muhittin to Riyaset, Istanbul (26 October 1927); 210/133, Muhittin to Riyaset, Karaisalı (12 October 1927); 210/137, Muhittin to Riyaset, Kozan (10 October 1927); 210/144, Muhittin to Riyaset, Karaisalı (16 November 1927).
37 TKA, 210/382, Muhittin to Riyaset, Adana (11 October 1927). However, in much of Cebel-i Bereket, the Red Crescent was not well-liked, especially in Bahçe, where it had developed a reputation for corruption. TKA, 210/383, Muhittin to Riyaset, Cebel-i Bereket (7 October 1927).
38 TKA, 210/58, Muhittin to Riyaset, Mersin (27 February 1927).
39 TKA, 210/187, Muhittin to Riyaset, Mersin (7 January 1927); 210/193, Muhittin to Hilal-i Ahmer Müfettişliği, Mersin (2 January 1927).
peasants as the repository of national culture. According to Asım Karaömerlioğlu, the cult of the peasant in Turkey assumed the form of concrete policies aimed at reaching out to and educating peasants by the 1930s. The creation of the People’s Houses (Halk Evleri) in 1932 and the beginning of the short-lived but highly influential Village Institutes program during the late 1930s were two important examples. A wide array of public health programs (more in Chapter 12), including those aimed at village midwives, also became part of this project. As Sibel Bozdoğan has shown, architects claiming to be “agents of civilization” even designed model villages aimed at projecting modernity into agrarian spaces, as an interest in modernist architecture grew throughout the 1930s.

Building villages, even less modernist ones, was no small task for local governments. For most of the 1920s, many of the villages that had been ruined in the war had not yet been put back together. The Republican government set aside one million lira to rebuild villages in the east in order to facilitate the return of refugees who had fled westward during and after the war, and in June 1929, the parliament authorized the dispensation of about 50,000 lira to rebuild villages in Adana. Throughout the process of the population exchanges, repairing old abandoned houses and villages was seen as the most expedient way of carrying out the settlement process.

However, in many parts of Çukurova that served as sites for mübadil settlement, there were scarcely any houses to repair, as these lands had previously been the large farm estates of wealthy landowners. Aslı Çomu’s research in the Köy Hizmet Genel Müdürlüğü archives reveals that many migrants were settled onto former farmlands in large huts called huğs built from cane

41 Karaömerlioğlu, Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta : erken Cumhuriyet döneminde köycü söylemi, 70.
42 Ibid., 88-91.
44 Bozdoğan’s work includes many fascinating plans and diagrams for modernist village architecture from the 1930s. Sibel Bozdoğan, Modernism and Nation Building : Turkish architectural culture in the early republic (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), 100-05.
45 BCA, 30-18-1-1 7/23/7 (28 June 1929).
and reeds or common houses called *iktisadihanes* that held up to four families.\(^{46}\) The Turkish Republican archives reveal a much greater demand for the construction of *huğ* settlements in Çukurova than supply. In September of 1924, a decision signed by Mustafa Kemal indicated that due to the large amount of destruction in the countryside during the French occupation of Cilicia, most of the houses were uninhabitable and that an order for the construction of 808 *huğs* had been issued. However, constructing the *huğs* was proving costly. Each set of huts cost around 1000 lira, and so the order was for them to be built section by section and “through bargaining” for a good price.\(^{47}\) As Çomu points out, *huğs* built at an average price of 167 lira apiece could not be seen as an overall viable expense in most cases.\(^{48}\) Ultimately, many settlers would have to shoulder the financial burden of their own settlement.

Anxiety about the vitality of villages and the economic and moral ills of urbanization that fed interwar peasantism extended into discussions about the enduring “nomadic” practices of pastoralist communities in Anatolia. The Republic of Turkey inherited an Anatolia geography in which pastoralism was still very widespread; as Kasaba notes, into the 1940s a majority of land in Turkey was used for raising animals.\(^{49}\) Throughout the Republican period, the official view regarding nomadism was that it was essentially forbidden and that whatever their source of income, pastoralist communities should be settled and registered in villages. In practice, the series of “settlement laws (*iskân kanunu*)” varied greatly in their implications. When applied to migrants or small pockets of Turkish pastoralists in Western Anatolia these laws appeared more as attempts at repopulating certain regions, facilitating economic integration, and pursuing

\(^{46}\) Çomu, *The Exchange of Populations and Adana, 1830-1927*, 100. For example, migrants were settled into 35 huts constructed on the former Bedros Farm near Yumurtalık. Huts for migrants were also built on the formerly-disputed Taylan Farm near Sis (see Chapter 7). Ibid., 101.

\(^{47}\) BCA, 300-18-1-1 10/42/16 (7 September 1924).


certain goals regarding demographic engineering. But in other cases, settlement policy also served as an umbrella for acts of repression, relocation, and expulsion. The 1934 Settlement Law, for example, which championed resettlement as means of effecting homogenization in Anatolia, led directly to the Dersim Massacres of 1937-38, during which extraordinary military force was used to squash resistance to government policies in the mountainous, predominantly Kurdish Alevi region of Dersim. The repression, which included the use of aerial bombing, killed thousands of civilians and displaced most of the people in the region. 50

During the early Republican period, there were still many pastoralist groups in Çukurova that would have qualified as nomadic to the Turkish government in that they did not settle in villages or own property there. In the 1930s, these communities were subject to the same settlement laws that targeted Kurds in Eastern Turkey throughout the interwar period. 1931 brought the largest attempt to settle tribes in the Çukurova region. Segments of the Aydınlı, Karakeçili, Horzun, Sarıkeçili, and Tekeli tribes — about 210 families representing about 1500 people — were placed in villages in the Niğde province, far from Çukurova, in the location of their summer yaylas. 51 Settlement at the yayla was a clear indication of a more accommodating policy, as this type of highland settlement usually occurred at the request of pastoralist groups (see Chapter 1 and 4). In 1934, with the promulgation of the infamous 1934 Settlement Law, more members of these communities were given land in Çukurova. 62 families representing 280 individuals from the Karatekeli tribe were given land, some 2750 dönüms, at their winter quarters near Kadirli. 52 Members of the Tekeli and Horzun tribes — 179 households of 988

51 BCA, 30-18-1-2 22/57/2 (2 August 1931); 30-18-1-2 23/68/12 (4 October 1931).
52 BCA, 30-18-1-2 45/37/3 (26 May 1934); 30-18-1-2 45/36/20 (26 May 1934).
people — were given land in more hilly regions of Karaisalı and Feke, while another 79 people of the Tekeli were settled on vacant lands at Deveciüşağı near Yumurtalık.\textsuperscript{53}

These settlement orders likely had a gradual impact, and while the communities in question may have taken to a degree of village life, they doubtlessly continued their summer migrations for the better part of a generation. I found no evidence of any means of repression to keep these communities in their settlement areas, in stark contrast with measures taken in Eastern Anatolia. As I will explain in Chapter 13, this basic difference had to do with a restructuring of the civilizational hierarchy in Turkey, a reconceptualization of pastoralism and transhumance, and a reimagining of Anatolia’s nomadic past. Indeed, some peasantist authors welcomed people who might have previously been considered nomadic into the settled fold through a redefinition and diversification of the types of villages. In his 1939 study of villages in Adana, Taha Toros listed three types of villagers: the inhabitants of Çukurova, the inhabitants of mountain villages, and “\textit{yörüks} and itinerant (\textit{seyyar}) tribes.” I translate \textit{seyyar} as itinerant to distinguish it from the concept of nomadic (\textit{göçebe}), which Toros does not apply to these tribes mentioned above. Toros, who would go on to become one of the most prominent historians of the Adana region, referred to the pesky endurance of their mobile ways despite attempts at forced settlement during the Ottoman period. In his framework, the itinerant pastoralists appeared to be more of hypothetical villagers in that they did not own land, showed little desire to, and derived most of their livelihood from the milk of their animals.\textsuperscript{54} But for Toros, they were ultimately rural because like other villagers they were \textit{not urban}, and as such, would gradually become more and more like the prototypical villager. This suggested the emergence of a new dichotomy within

\textsuperscript{53} BCA, 30-18-1-2 45/31/1 (26 May 1934); 30-18-1-2 45/31/6 (12 May 1934).
\textsuperscript{54} Toros, \textit{Çukurova ve Toroslarda Köy İktisadiyati} [\textit{Village Economies in Çukurova and the Taurus Mountains}], 13.
civilizational thought in Turkey wherein the urban was juxtaposed with the rural rather than the settled with the mobile.

As for the other groups in Toros’ study, they, like the fading tribes of old, represented different periods of the region’s history. The mountain villagers, who comprised a majority of settled rural inhabitants in Cilicia as late as the mid-nineteenth century, had become the less prosperous and more marginal group. They often owned property collectively and supplemented their relatively meager incomes with other economic activities. Toros portended that “it would not at all be realistic to imagine the coming economic development of the plain occurring for these mountain villages.”55 The mountain villages belonged to the past; the villages of Çukurova, which had emerged mainly during the late nineteenth century, were the future of Turkey. They were prosperous, expanding, and their land was bountiful. According to Toros, 93% of the villagers in Çukurova owned land.56 This statistic in isolation made the plains village almost the ideal of interwar peasants. The Çukurova plain appeared as a giant village where everyone had a share of the wealth.

The only caveat was that much like the itinerant pastoralists of the region, this landowning majority did not farm in the strictest sense. “The 93% of villagers that own property employ a large number of laborers to plow, sow, and harvest their land,” Toros remarked.57 And the labor was not supplied by that small 7%, who were “also increasingly tending towards becoming landowners,” but rather workers who came from “the Eastern provinces (şark vilâyetleri)” to work in Çukurova every year.58 The villagers of the early Republican period in Çukurova made their livings just as the plantation owners of the late Ottoman period. Çukurova

55 Ibid., 10.
56 Ibid., 5.
57 Ibid., 5.
58 Ibid., 5.
was no longer a plain of nomads, but the livelihood of its villagers was predicated on the seasonal migrations of workers from regions that possessed a different political ecology that made the hard life of a Çukurova farmhand seem relatively profitable.

**Migrant Workers in Early Republican Çukurova**

The headline in *Yeni Adana* read “It seems he wanted to kill himself.” In a desperate moment on a sweltering summer day in June 1929, Rızaoğlu Kâmil plunged into the well near the fortress gate at the end of the Stone Bridge over the Seyhan River.\(^{59}\) He was an unemployed migrant worker from the Elazığ (formerly Harput) region that had long supplied labor to the expansive farms of Çukurova.\(^{60}\) Bystanders quickly scrambled to pull Kâmil from the well, saving him to live another day that he would likely pass searching for employment in a city where the whims of the market dictated whether one would prosper or perish on the fertile soil.\(^{61}\)

Two Junes later on the other side of the Stone Bridge, another man like Kâmil died under the shade of the tree in the Karşıyaka neighborhood where laborers often lodged. The cause of death was reportedly “poverty (sefalet).” “Because it was not known who or from where he was, his friends will be found and his identity will be ascertained” was all the information the article in *Yeni Adana* provided.\(^{62}\) Ten days earlier, the headline “Farmers are unable to pay the cost of labor” had adorned the front page of the same newspaper. Due to low prices in the grain market, many employers had remained indebted to their workers as they were unable or unwilling to sell

\(^{59}\) “Kendini öldürmek istemiş [It Seems He Wanted to Kill Himself],” *Yeni Adana* 12 June 1929.

\(^{60}\) See Chapters 5 and 7 for discussion of Armenian laborers from Harput as well as Gutman, “Sojourners, smugglers, and the state: transhemispheric migration flows and the politics of mobility in Eastern Anatolia, 1888-1908”.

\(^{61}\) “Kendini öldürmek istemiş [It Seems He Wanted to Kill Himself],” *Yeni Adana* 12 June 1929.

\(^{62}\) “Bir amele sefaletten öldü [A Laborer Died of Poverty],” *Yeni Adana* 25 June 1931.
their produce.\textsuperscript{63} But even a week was too long to wait for the unidentified worker who had died because he simply had nothing left.

These scenes could have been pulled directly from \textit{Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde}, a novel that provided a realistic glimpse into the lives of migrant workers written by Orhan Kemal, who worked intermittently as a wage laborer in Adana during the 1930s and 40s.\textsuperscript{64} But the stories of death and despair above were real illustrations of how at the heart of the complex and fast-paced economy of Çukurova was the cold commodification of human labor in its absolute form. Everyone involved in the market-oriented agricultural economy bore risks. But when revenues failed to meet expectations, it was ultimately the seasonal workers and their families who stood to lose the most.

The Çukurova region has gained a reputation for the harshness of its labor conditions. Gisela Prochazka-Eisl and Stephan Prochazka wrote in their study of Nusayris in Çukurova that it seemed “Ibrahim Pasha’s labor regulations [during the 1830s] were the first and last ones” in reference to prevailing labor practices.\textsuperscript{65} But workers in Çukurova did appear to wield some clout regarding the terms of their employment. One of the first organized labor strikes in the history of the Turkish Republic occurred in 1927 with the Adana Railroad strike, during which the \textit{New York Times} reported at one point that “sixty Turkish women, wives or sweethearts of the strikers, stretched out on the rails in front of the engine,” exoticizing them as “the hardiest of all Amazons.”\textsuperscript{66} In times when labor was scarce, the wages of ordinary farmhands could nearly double, and though employers ultimately had the upper hand, the scarcity of labor in Çukurova

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{63} "Haftanın Vaziyeti: Çiçinin tarladan kaldırılmakta olduğu mahsul amele ücretini ödemiyor [This Week: the yield the farmer pulls from the field does not pay the cost of labor]," \textit{Yeni Adana} 15 June 1931.
\textsuperscript{64} Kemal, \textit{Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde}.
\textsuperscript{65} Procházka-Eisl and Procházka, \textit{The Plain of Saints and Prophets}, 40.
meant that seasonal work on farms or in factories was one of the quickest ways for a young man from a small village somewhere in Eastern Anatolia to put money in his pocket.\textsuperscript{67} 

In fact, during the early years of the republic, labor was even scarcer than during the Ottoman period. The number of seasonal workers who came to the Adana region during the first years of the Republican period seems to have been significantly less than the prewar figures. During the First World War, the Governor of Adana estimated prewar labor flows at around 70-80,000 workers per year, in other words, a number as large as the population of the city of Adana at the time (see Chapter 5 for extensive discussion of estimates).\textsuperscript{68} By contrast, Governor of Adana Hilmi Uran estimated around 30,000 migrant workers annually a decade later in 1925.\textsuperscript{69} 

In 1930, Çukurovada Memleket indicated that while the official population of Adana was 72,000, it would be 100,000 if the census were conducted at harvest time.\textsuperscript{70} Other estimates from the period point to a similar figure of 30,000.\textsuperscript{71} This fact may have been somewhat influenced by inconsistent production during the 1920s (discussed below), and mechanization may have played an additional role. But moreover, it was also a product of the ways in which the postwar map constrained labor movements. Most of the tens of thousands of Armenian and Assyrian laborers that used to come to Çukurova had been expelled from the borders of Turkey if they even survived the war. The nearby town of Hadjin, which had once supplied thousands of workers to the Çukurova plain had been wiped off the map. Furthermore, the Adana province was now separated from Northern Syria, including the Antakya region, by a new political border that

\textsuperscript{67} “Dün amele gündeliği fazla idi [Yesterday the Daily Wage of Laborers was Too Much],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 21 June 1935; "Köylü ve Müstahsil [The Villager and the Producer],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 3 June 1931.

\textsuperscript{68} BOA, DH-I-UM 59-2/1 31, no. 12-13, Hakkı to Dahiliye (30 Teşrinisani 1331 [13 December 1915]).

\textsuperscript{69} Uran, \textit{Adana Ziraat Amelesi}, 6.

\textsuperscript{70} “Adana pamukcelülü [Cotton Cultivation in Adana],” \textit{Çukurovada Memleket} 15 January 1930.

\textsuperscript{71} “Çukurova Hastahane,” \textit{Yeni Adana} 20 December 1939; Cavit Oral, "Pamuk Ekiminin Başında [At the Start of Cotton Planting],” \textit{Bugün} 17 March 1942.
made it more difficult for Nusayri peasants to engage in a system of seasonal labor that stretched back at least as far as the eighteenth century (see Chapters 1 and 5).

In order to regulate the volatile labor market that created issues for both producers and workers, a labor commission was created to negotiate and manage the relationship between employers and agricultural workers. The head of the commission was chosen by the Agricultural Society (Ziraat Odası) in Adana, and the other members included two representatives of producer interests from the Society, two worker representatives elected by a committee of fifteen elçibişis, a gendarme officer, the police commissioner, and two government representatives. While the employer side hoped the commission would ensure easier access to labor, the main issues of workers concerned minimum wage set at 4 lira per week, limitation of work hours, and access to medical care in the likely event of falling ill. Meanwhile, local law enforcement was concerned with regulating and monitoring the movement of workers and issuing ID cards to men and women employed on farms in the Adana region during the agricultural high seasons.

The labor commission, which had precedents during the Ottoman period, represented an important point of continuity in the relationship between employers and labor and a form of acknowledgement regarding the needs and concerns of all parties involved in the elaborate structure that orchestrated agricultural production in the Çukurova plain. However, it must have been limited in terms of its effectiveness regarding securing labor during times of scarcity or ensuring that the rights of workers were upheld. Even if labor was contracted on specific terms, the actual working conditions of migrant laborers were placed in the hands of the staff that

---

72 The elçibişis led the migrant worker caravans and served as middlemen between laborers and landowners. For more, see Chapter 5.
73 Uran, Adana Ziraat Amelesi, 20.
74 Orhan Kemal depicts the predicament of one such sick worker in Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde, who is faced with the prospect of spending some of his very meager savings on a dose of Gripin, a pain-killer and antifever medicine introduced in Turkey during the 1930s that was often sold with quinine added to treat the symptoms of malaria. Kemal, Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde, 77.
75 Uran, Adana Ziraat Amelesi, 21-23.
managed the large farms far from the gaze of the city and often even the “farmers” who owned the land. Moreover, if information from the Adana press is any indication, there was little solution to chronic labor shortages. For example, during the cotton harvest of 1929, as cultivators in the rapidly growing Ceyhan region struggled to find migrant workers, they were obliged to go to the local villagers of the nearby Cebel-i Bereket province and pay them a high wage in order to carry out the harvest.\textsuperscript{76} This pointed to another issue regarding the profitability of the seasonal labor regimes for Çukurova producers. They were contingent on the sustained underdevelopment of the agrarian economies of Eastern Anatolia and Northern Syria that served as a perennial source for labor outflows.

Hilmi Uran noted this issue in his 1925 report on agricultural labor in Adana, saying that since work opportunities were set to rise in regions where workers came from, it would be harder to find people that would come to Çukurova “just to earn 3-5 kuruş.”\textsuperscript{77} However, the economic disparity between provinces further east and the highly commercialized and increasingly industrialized Çukurova region did not fade with time. Throughout the Kemalist period, the Turkish military was involved in a number of military campaigns against Kurdish leaders in Eastern Anatolia that targeted broad swaths of population, forcing dramatic displacement and disrupting the local economies in many of the parts of that region.\textsuperscript{78}

During the early Republican period, the nature of migrant labor in Adana likely exacerbated an emerging social divide between local “Turks” and the non-Turkish migrants who worked in Çukurova. Many of the seasonal laborers were Arab or Kurdish, while the urban

\textsuperscript{76} “Ceyhanda Amele buhranı mı var? [Is there a labor crisis in Ceyhan?],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 14 September 1929.
\textsuperscript{77} Uran, \textit{Adana Ziraat Amelesi}, 22.
\textsuperscript{78} Üngör, \textit{The Making of Modern Turkey}, 122-68.
residents of the area were (are least culturally) Turkish. Beginning in the mid-1920s, *Yeni Adana*, which had normally focused its disdain on Armenians and the French, began to run pieces demanding that Arabic not be spoken in the public places of Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin and calling the residents of the region to speak only in Turkish. This conformed to the broader language policy of the Republic, including “Citizen! Speak Turkish (Vatandaş! Türkçe Konuş)” campaign that sought to enforce linguistic homogeneity in Turkish and even made speaking other languages a punishable offense.

Of course, many of the residents of the region likely had “non-Turkish” origins in that their parents or grandparents were Arab, Kurdish, or belonging to any number of immigrant groups. Indeed, mübadils were also a source of linguistic anxiety for the nationalist government. Most of these migrants spoke a language other than Turkish natively, and many of the migrants from Crete even spoke the Greek of Turkey’s closest rival. As Soner Çağaptay has shown, the anxiety over culturally, linguistically, or racially non-Turkish immigrants was an extremely important factor in determining where and how mübadils and other immigrants would be allowed to settle. But mübadils were given homes and even enrolled in courses for Turkish language to facilitate their social integration. Migrant laborers meanwhile resided in the most underserviced provinces of the Republic, some of which even remained sites of contestation of state hegemony. In regions such as Adana, linguistic difference would come to represent not so

---

79 I say culturally Turkish because in Adana, Mersin, and especially Tarsus, a substantial subset of the urban middle class and elite would have traced their ancestry to Arab families from other parts of Northern Syria.

80 This comes from the extensive press summaries of the French consulate in Mersin. CADN, 8PO/1, Adana, Vol. 13.

81 Çağaptay, *Islam, secularism, and nationalism in modern Turkey*, 25. The campaign involved speeches as the local Türk Ocağı as well as announcements in local newspapers. See "Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş [Citizen, Speak Turkish]," *Yeni Adana* 30 April 1936.

82 Çağaptay, *Islam, secularism, and nationalism in modern Turkey*, 82-86.

83 "Muhacirler Türkçe öyrenecekler (sic) [Immigrants Will Learn Turkish]," *Yeni Adana* 4 June 1930.
much divergent ancestral or racial origins but rather social class, as assimilation and economic integration were intertwined with the use of Turkish.  

In this regard, the experience of muhacirs and mübadils in Adana is worth studying in tandem with that of migrant laborers. The former group of migrants much like the latter was inserted into a complex socioeconomic hierarchy in which a certain ethnolinguistic identity was a prerequisite to social mobility. It is telling that while most of the farmhands in Çukurova during the early Republican period were Arab and Kurdish, many of the various farm managers, overseers, café owners and cooks who were charged with the daily management and supervision of workers were themselves muhacirs or mübadils who while by no means economically privileged, occupied a higher rung on the social ladder by virtue of their being perhaps “more Turkish.” This dynamic, which is undoubtedly observable in Izmir, Ankara, Istanbul, and the other growing cities of modern Turkey may serve as one fruitful course of inquiry into the often ignored class dimensions of a history that is usually discussed in terms of ethnicity, identity, and the clash of political ideologies.

During the late 1930s, the Governor of Adana Tevfik Hadi Baysal, who had previously served as Governor of Mardin, abolished the labor commissions, bringing an end to a labor regime that had persisted in a similar form for almost a century. Of course, this did not mean that migrant labor ceased to play a role in the economy of Çukurova. Indeed, as the economy continued to grow, so did the number of migrants. Yet the dissolution of the commission heralded a new way of doing things in the Çukurova plain as the government and increasingly large companies moved to manage people, resources, and even nature by different methods

84 Orhan Kemal depicts a humorous scene in Berektli Topraklar Üzerinde in which a worker when berated by a factory accountant who corrects his pronunciation, pretends that he is incapable of uttering the phrase “I’m freezing” in proper Turkish. Kemal, Berektli Topraklar Üzerinde, 62.
85 Arıkoğlu, Hâtralarım, 16.
(more in Chapter 12 and 14). Çukurova’s wealth would still be in agriculture; cotton would still be regarded as “white gold.” But the techniques by which it was produced were set to change.

**Changes in Çukurova’s Agriculture**

Late Ottoman and early Republican statistics regarding population and agriculture are difficult to observe over time. Tracking the change in a particular figure across a number of years is complicated by the inconsistency of units of measure as well as the almost perennial redistricting of administrative units throughout the period in question. Thus, while we may generally know that people perceived a decrease in economic activity after the war, it is hard to quantify this perception. In this section, I will attempt to address the quantitative and qualitative changes in the agrarian economy of the Adana region based on a careful evaluation of the data that is available.

During the war and the French Mandate period, cultivation in Çukurova was only a fraction of what it had been before the First World War (see Chapters 8 and 10). With the establishment of the Republic, some were quick to claim that agriculture had fully rebounded, but the overall evidence is conflicting.\(^{86}\) Any author who argues that Çukurova quickly surpassed its Ottoman era agricultural vitality under the Republic or conversely that the commercial economy of the region was absolutely devastated will have overstated their case. The general picture is one of significantly reduced cultivation in the years after the war with rising but very inconsistent production throughout the early Republican period hurt by the global financial crisis. Life went on in the countryside of the Adana region, but there was little sense of prosperity for most of the 1920s and 30s.

---

\(^{86}\) This was the claim of Remzi Oğuz in the *Adana Ticaret Rehberi* from 1924, and American commercial reports express similar sentiments regarding cotton in Çukurova in 1926. Oğuz, *Adana Ticaret Rehberi*; Ravndal, *Turkey: a commercial and industrial handbook*, 97.
The most straightforward comparison that one may make between the late Ottoman and early Republican period is in area of cultivation. District by district agricultural surveys offer uniform data regarding how many dönüms of each region were cultivated in a given year. This data unquestionably points to a decline in overall cultivation between the high point of Ottoman agriculture in the 1910s and the first agricultural census in 1927. The principal crops in the Adana region did not change from that period and would not for decades to come. They were in order of total area occupied: wheat, cotton, barley, oats, and sesame. On the level of the Adana province of the Ottoman period (Adana, Mersin, and Cebel-i Bereket in the early Republic), this hierarchy almost never wavered. Roughly a third of the Çukurova plain was devoted to cotton, and most of the rest to grain in both the late Ottoman period and the Republican period (more below).

A district by district comparison of wheat and barley cultivation strongly suggests an overall decrease in the cultivated area of the Adana region in the war’s aftermath. The average area of wheat cultivation for the Ottoman province of Adana (minus İçel87) during the two Ottoman years for which data is available was 120,000 hectares, roughly 20% greater than the 1927 number. The area of barley cultivation in 1927 for the same districts that made up the province of Adana meanwhile was roughly 76% of what it had been during the last years of the Ottoman period. The combined yield of wheat and barley in the 1927 numbers is extremely low at roughly 115 million kg as opposed to as much as 303 million in 1909 and 186 million in 1913, but this disparity may have been influenced by differing methods of measurement.88

87 Districts of Silifke, Anamur, Mut and Gülnar.
88 I have converted these figures from bales, which in the case of wheat averaged about 24 kıyye and for barley 20 kıyye. Due to the potential issues in converting for an imprecise measure such as the bushel to a unit of mass, we must hold these figures as very approximate estimates.
Table 23 Estimated Area of Grain Cultivation in Adana region for 1909, 1913, and 1927 (in hectares)³⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District (Kaža)</th>
<th>Wheat 1909</th>
<th>Wheat 1913</th>
<th>Wheat 1927</th>
<th>Barley 1909</th>
<th>Barley 1913</th>
<th>Barley 1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000⁹⁰</td>
<td>7,900⁹¹</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaisali</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sis (Kozan)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadjin (Saimbeyli)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feke</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars (Kadirli)</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan, Osmaniye, Islahiye, Bahçe, Hassa, Yarpuz, Dörtyol, Yumurtalık⁹²</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>19,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>140,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning cotton, the keystone crop of the Çukurova economy, we find a similar result. The area registered as under cotton cultivation in 1927 was only about two-thirds of the area devoted to cotton in 1909 and 1913 (see Table 24). While this is a conspicuous difference given the relative lack of change in population, the figure is supported by other pieces of evidence. On the eve of the First World War, the stated estimates for the Adana cotton crops were routinely in excess of 100,000 bales. Available data from the early republican period, both anecdotal and statistical, indicates estimated production of roughly 50-60,000 bales per year for much of the

³⁹ Original data in dönüms, converted to hectares at a standard rate of 10/1. Numbers rounded to nearest thousand dönüms or nearest hundred hectares. 1325 senesi Asya ve Afrika-ya Osmanlı Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of Ottoman Asia and Africa for Year 1325]; Memalik-i Osmaniye’nin 1329 Senesine Mahsus Ziraat İstatistiği [Agricultural Statistics of the Ottoman Empire for Year of 1913]; 1927 senesi ziraat tahriri neticeleri [1927 Agricultural Census Results], (Ankara: İstanbul Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1928).

⁹⁰ The original book reads 43,000 dönüms for this number but this is plainly an error, most likely the omission of a digit. This would have given Adana a wheat production of nearly 25 bushels to the dönüm during that year, which was 3-6 times higher than the average and essentially beyond what was feasible. I could not decide where the missing digit was, and so in recognizing that Adana’s wheat 1913 production was roughly 2/3 of the 1909 figure, I simply multiplied the area of cultivation by the same factor to create a safe figure, which is overall consistent with the other statistics. This does generally point to the hazards of relying too heavily on a single figure within these data sets to say something significant.

⁹¹ It is reasonable to assume that some of the areas that had been counted for Adana during the Ottoman period are in the numbers for the district of Tarsus here.

⁹² There was a continuous redistricting in Cebel-i Bereket, with kazas disappearing and changing from every new set of data to the next. For example, Ceyhan moved from the sancak of Adana to be the center of the vilayet of Cebel-i Bereket during the early Republican period. As a result, I have lumped together all of the districts that were east and south of Adana.
The official agricultural census statistics of the Adana province indicate 48 million kg of cotton for 1909, which amounted to roughly 120,000 (200kg) bales.\(^9^3\) The same exact calculation for 1913 reveals a total of 135,000 bales. These numbers are similar to the anecdotal estimates of the period (see Chapter 5 and 10). The total cotton production recorded for Adana, Mersin, and Cebel-i Bereket in 1927 was 27.6 million kg, a number essentially equal to the 1913 numbers minus the districts of Tarsus and Mersin.\(^9^5\) Further evidence of reduced cotton cultivation, as mentioned above, are much lower estimates of migrant labor flows from the early Republican period, which were about half of what was commonly cited during the late Ottoman period. This conforms to a disproportionate decline in cotton cultivation, which was more heavily reliant on migrant labor as a strictly commercial crop.

Table 24 Estimated Area of Cotton Cultivation in Adana region for 1909, 1913, and 1927 (in hectares)\(^9^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District (Kaza)</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>37,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus</td>
<td>48,900</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaisalı</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sis (Kozan)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadjin (Saimbeyli)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars (Kadirli)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan, Osmoniye, Islahiye, Bahçe, Hassa, Yarpuz, Dürt yol, Yumurtalık</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9^3\) Ziraat vekaleti mütehassıs raporları: ziraat kism [Agriculture Ministry Special Reports: Agriculture Section], (İstanbul: İkdam, 1927), 81; Çukurovada Memleket 15 February 1930, 3.

\(^9^4\) One encounters a staggering degree of ambiguity in what exactly this figure refers to, as if it is rarely clear whether individuals are referring to the crop of just the Adana province (the boundaries of which constantly shift), the greater Çukurova region, or simply the amount of cotton that flowed through Mersin, which by the Republican period was not official part of the Adana or Seyhan province.

\(^9^5\) The Ottoman Ministry of Agriculture recorded cotton production numbers in kıyyes, which I have converted at 1.28 kg to the kıyye.

\(^9^6\) See Table 22 for sources.
From this preliminary data, we may infer that as of the 1920s, the overall agrarian economy of the Adana region was much reduced in comparison with that of the early 1910s. This was the result of a combination of factors. The expulsion of wealthy Christian landlords left large swaths of the countryside fallow, and even if immigrants were settled on those lands, it would take several years for them to return to their normal productivity. In addition, the economy of Çukurova likely suffered from an overall lack of capital and the economic woes of some of its prewar trade partners such as Germany. These above findings lend some statistical basis to the general observation that the war impacted agricultural production in Çukurova for years. Yet the region remained one of the most important centers of agriculture in the new republic of Turkey. In 1927, about 70% of the cotton produced in Turkey came from Adana, Mersin, and Cebel-i Bereket.97

Over the course of the late Ottoman period, agriculture in Cilicia became increasingly tied to foreign markets. Historiography of the early Republican period tends to emphasize that the global economic crises of the interwar period also impacted Turkey’s economy and hampered agricultural and industrial expansion. Whether in years of prosperity or want, during the early Republican period, the pull of the world economy intensified, prompting producers in Çukurova to modify their practices. In the 1920s, Italy emerged as a major trade outlet for Turkish goods and former Anatolian Greeks who settled in Trieste helped forge new connections with the textile factories there.98 Frustrated French diplomats in Mersin and Adana watched as other countries such as the Soviet Union, Spain and Germany also increased their share of the Adana cotton market.99 By the mid-1930s, Germany was far and away the leading importer of Çukurova cotton. In a 1935 article, Hilmi Ozansoy declared that Germany “would always be”

97 *1927 senesi ziraat tahiri neticeleri [1927 Agricultural Census Results]*, x.
99 CADN, 8PO/1, Adana Vol. 13, Ronflard to Daeschner, Mersin (18 May 1926); (15 December 1926).
Adana’s foremost trade partner, indicating that Bremen and Hamburg imported 63,475 and 47,457 bales of their cotton respectively while the next biggest foreign buyer was Trieste at 4,108 bales.\footnote{Hilmi Ozansoy, “Pamuklarının en büyük müşterisi Almanyadır ve daima da Almanyaya olacaktır [The Biggest Buyer of our Cotton is Germany and It Always Will Be],” \textit{Adana Tecim Gazetesi} 1 November 1936.}

The destination of cotton leaving the region was rather variable and, as always, contingent on the ever-shifting needs of the market. By the 1930s, Adana had its own business periodical entitled \textit{Adana Ticaret Gazetesi}, later \textit{Adana Tecim Gazetesi}, published three times a month with information about the latest trends in cotton cultivation not only in the region but across the world, as well as other matters of economic importance. Just as the other newspapers in Çukurova, \textit{Adana Tecim Gazetesi} reported on the continually shifting prices so that cultivators could calibrate their planting of various crops and time their release to the market based on the best anticipated demand. \textit{Adana Tecim Gazetesi} and its editor Hilmi Ozansoy regularly published the figures of the Adana Chamber of Commerce concerning production in the region, which are the most complete statistics regarding the agriculture of Adana during the interwar period.

Ozansoy’s figures are different than the official census statistics and refer to a less well-defined area. We can tentatively infer that his statistics are restricted to the province of Adana itself, which became a larger province of Seyhan that incorporated Cebel-i Bereket including the rapidly-growing district of Ceyhan in 1933. It seems that during the 1930s when these statistics were compiled, Ozansoy deliberately bent the truth on production by not accounting for this significant change in the boundaries of the Adana province. This means that the numbers for 1933-1936 are higher than they should have been had only the original Adana province been counted, and given that these years matched up with the first two years of the first five-year plan and were published in a special issue of \textit{Adana Tecim Gazetesi} for the twelfth anniversary of the
Republic, this imprecise representation of the statistics may not have been unintentional.\textsuperscript{101} I do not wish to replicate any errors or misrepresentations of the statistics, and so I will proceed carefully through the most precise analysis of the available data that I can provide.

According to Ozansoy’s numbers, 1929 was better for agriculture than the preceding years in Çukurova (see Table 25 and Table 26). This was a year mentioned above in which acute shortages of labor occurred. 1930 was even stronger, and given that the area of cultivation was about 175\% of what it had been in 1927 and 1928, we can say that in 1930, the Adana region was probably more densely cultivated than it had been on the eve of the First World War. Ozansoy’s data is backed up by remarks in Çukurovada Memleket about particularly strong harvests.\textsuperscript{102} The numbers further indicate that much lower amounts of cotton and other crops were planted and harvested in 1932 and 1933, likely due to the severity of the global economic crisis. Ozansoy’s numbers begin to include Cebel-i Bereket in 1933 (evidenced by his other publications and the major uptick in rye cultivation). For this reason, the 1933 numbers are higher than they should be, and it is possible to say based solely on cotton figures that 1932 and 1933 were quite possibly the worst years for agricultural production since before 1927.\textsuperscript{103} In other words, agriculture in Çukurova dipped once again below prewar levels. In 1934, Turkey implemented its first five-year plan policy, which either had the impact of stimulating agriculture or at the very least, stimulating agricultural statistics.\textsuperscript{104} According to the official numbers, Adana enjoyed a harvest of around 100,000 bales once again and harvests grew for the remainder

---

\textsuperscript{101} I was only able to discern this fact due to another article written by Ozansoy in which he compared cotton production numbers across a number of years and made note of how these changes in the boundaries affected the statistics, offering both versions. "Adananın Ökonomi Durumu [Adana's Economic Situation]," Adana Ticaret Gazetesi 21 May 1935.
\textsuperscript{102} "Adana pamukculuğu [Cotton Cultivation in Adana]," Çukurovada Memleket 15 January 1930; , Çukurovada Memleket 15 February 1930.
\textsuperscript{103} "Adananın Ökonomi Durumu [Adana's Economic Situation]," Adana Ticaret Gazetesi 21 May 1935.
\textsuperscript{104} Shaw and Shaw, Reform, Revolution, and Republic, 391.
of the decade. If the data for 1936 is accurate, that year represented a level of agricultural production that was unprecedented during the late Ottoman period.

Table 25 Estimated area of cultivation devoted to all crops in Adana province, 1927-1932 (in hectares)\textsuperscript{105}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1932</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>57,990</td>
<td>61,274</td>
<td>84,807</td>
<td>85,972</td>
<td>88,248</td>
<td>44,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>29,167</td>
<td>30,517</td>
<td>41,645</td>
<td>60,789</td>
<td>61,809</td>
<td>40,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>13,071</td>
<td>10,464</td>
<td>15,576</td>
<td>6,237</td>
<td>31,440</td>
<td>23,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>3,578</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Bean</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>63,213</td>
<td>69,267</td>
<td>92,633</td>
<td>123,375</td>
<td>109,359</td>
<td>74,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesame</td>
<td>14,418</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>10,174</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>16,722</td>
<td>9,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>7,209</td>
<td>6,627</td>
<td>3,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Beans</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>6,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickpeas</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentils</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onion</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-eyed Peas</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetch</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdfeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,377</td>
<td>186,831</td>
<td>259,634</td>
<td>293,941</td>
<td>327,428</td>
<td>214,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{105} Hilmi Ozansoy, Adana (Adana: Adana Ticaret ve Sanayi Odasi, 1935).

\textsuperscript{106} Ozansoy’s publications contain divergent totals for the area of cultivation, which I infer was the result of miscalculation. These totals are the sums of the amount of area for each crop listed in each column.
Table 26 Estimated Total Agricultural Production of Adana province, 1927-1932 (in metric tons)\textsuperscript{107}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1932</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>80291</td>
<td>99263</td>
<td>75563</td>
<td>8035</td>
<td>75196</td>
<td>35520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>96921</td>
<td>63280</td>
<td>70957</td>
<td>94383</td>
<td>68354</td>
<td>30073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>43435</td>
<td>24410</td>
<td>64597</td>
<td>20745</td>
<td>23769</td>
<td>16071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>2698</td>
<td>2983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Bean</td>
<td>2584</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>10504</td>
<td>11490</td>
<td>15006</td>
<td>22630</td>
<td>20976</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesame</td>
<td>6232</td>
<td>3461</td>
<td>4398</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>7228</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>6248</td>
<td>7009</td>
<td>13714</td>
<td>17129</td>
<td>11451</td>
<td>2977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>17579</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>25232</td>
<td>4152</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Beans</td>
<td>5054</td>
<td>3906</td>
<td>6315</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>2927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickpeas</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentils</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>2245</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onion</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>2330</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2771</td>
<td>2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td>4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-eyed Peas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>703</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdfeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{107} Ozansoy, Adana.
**Table 27** Estimated area and yield of cultivation for all crops in Seyhan (Adana) province, 1933-1936\(^{108}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1933 hectares</th>
<th>1933 tons</th>
<th>1934 hectares</th>
<th>1934 tons</th>
<th>1935 hectares</th>
<th>1935 tons</th>
<th>1936 hectares</th>
<th>1936 tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>78,704</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>104,479</td>
<td>119,608</td>
<td>137,376</td>
<td>110,215</td>
<td>60,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>32,408</td>
<td>53,590</td>
<td>58,605</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>89,622</td>
<td>81,728</td>
<td>80,361</td>
<td>50,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>23,148</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>35,400</td>
<td>62,943</td>
<td>63,760</td>
<td>45,336</td>
<td>28,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>12,662</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>15,970</td>
<td>16,970</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td>17,495</td>
<td>12,265</td>
<td>9,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Bean</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>94,432</td>
<td>10,596</td>
<td>113,287</td>
<td>19,950</td>
<td>121,713</td>
<td>22,584</td>
<td>191,459</td>
<td>31,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesame</td>
<td>16,976</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>10,297</td>
<td>4,438</td>
<td>16,491</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>6,631</td>
<td>3,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>11,612</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>2,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>7,689</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>3,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Beans</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickpeas</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentils</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onion</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>3,491</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>6,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-eyed Peas</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetch</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdfeed</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanuts</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor Oil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaxseed</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of what they were planting and how much, local cultivators continued the trends in production that had been established during the late Ottoman period. The most important crops remained cotton, wheat, barley, oats, sesame, rye, and corn. The published statistics on local commerce reflect the relatively steady annual expansion of cultivation for many crops,

---

\(^{108}\) Hilmi Ozansoy, "Cumhuriyetin 10 uncu yıldönümünden bu yila kadar ekilen arazi ve alınan mahsul," Adana Tecim Gazetesi 1 November 1937, 8.
especially grain and cotton. The ratio of food staples to commercial crops was remarkably consistent over this period. A comparison of annual change in land devoted to grain and cotton illustrates that while the overall preponderance of various crops and the general level of agriculture could vary from year to year, almost every year between 1927 and 1936, 52-57% of land was devoted to wheat, barley, oats, and rye and a third was devoted to cotton. Only twice in two years of unusually high output—once in 1930 and again in 1936—was more than 40% of annual planting dedicated to cotton, and only once in 1935 did that percentage drop below 30%. That same year, 65% of all land was devoted to grain.

Another important piece of evidence of ecological continuity between the late Ottoman and early Republican period in the Cilicia region was the recovery of the citrus industry during late 1920s and 1930s. Citrus production in Çukurova had exploded during the last decades of the Ottoman period due mainly to the expansion of groves by Armenian villagers around Dörtyol (formerly Çokmerzimen). The town had its own variety of orange, and Bahçe native Krikor Koudoulian claimed that Dörtyol citrus rivaled the oranges and lemons of Jaffa, which had risen to international renown during the early twentieth century. By the end of the Ottoman period, the area exported around 60 million oranges, but those groves went untended after the evacuation of Dörtyol Armenians with the French in 1921, and cultivation was not revived until the end of the 1920s. However, by 1935, citrus production around Dörtyol had more or less returned to prewar levels.

109 Koudoulian, Hay leṛë, 12. Arshaguhi Teodik marveled at the orange groves of this region during her visit to Cilicia as a native of Istanbul, saying that she had never been to a place where oranges grow. Teodik, Amis mê i Kilikia, 163. Jaffa oranges were known throughout the world, but their success rested not so much upon a particularly delicious flavor per se, but rather especially tough peels that made them well-suited for long-distance travel. Shafir, Land, labor, and the origins of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, 1882-1914, 29.
110 BCA, 30-10-0-0 80/529/18, no. 3 (17 March 1925).
Population growth was certainly a key factor in rising agricultural numbers, but the overall increase in production and cultivation was also aided by mechanization that was occurring in Çukurova throughout the early Republican period. Beginning in 1924, experimentation with machines such as mechanical seeders allowed farmers in Çukurova to plant more and faster, facilitating the additional cultivation of some 15,000 dönüms in that first year.\textsuperscript{112} An article discussing the mechanization of agriculture from Çukurovada Memleket from 1930 commented on the sharp rise in the number of machines.\textsuperscript{113} In 1927, Turkey had 15,711 agricultural machines in operation and over 2000 of them were in the Çukurova region (Adana, Mersin, and Cebel-i Bereket).\textsuperscript{114} In 1931, the director of the Adana Cotton Breeding Station (pamuk ıslâh istayonu) in Taşçı Köyü described the use of Fordson tractors in plowing as a standard operating expense of the region’s cultivators.\textsuperscript{115} Although studies form the 1950s would regard mechanization during the interwar period as rather marginal (more in Chapter 14), the growing interest of cultivators in machinery was an important feature of early Republican agriculture in Adana.

**New Strains of Cotton**

Cultivators in Çukurova continued testing the emerging techniques of commercial agriculture, and during the mid-1930s, committed to growing cotton in a manner that more closely resembled the cultivation of the American South. However, into the 1930s, no strain of cotton had been able to replace the local variety.\textsuperscript{116} Although local cultivators had experimented with Egyptian and American strains of cotton during the late nineteenth century, no other species

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{112} Uran, Adana Ziraat Amelesi, 25.
\item \textsuperscript{113} Çukurovada Memleket 1 May 1930.
\item \textsuperscript{114} 1927 senesi ziraat tahriir neticeleri [1927 Agricultural Census Results].
\item \textsuperscript{115} Kemal, Pamuk Ziraati [Cotton Cultivation] (Istanbul: Hilâl Matbaası, 1931), 24.
\item \textsuperscript{116} As of 1931, the cotton strains used in some capacity in the Adana region included yerli, iane or Upland, Lightning Express, Rowden, a number of variations on Cleveland, and Batr. 508, a drought resistant cultivar from the Caucasus. Ibid., 5-7.
\end{itemize}
offered a better advantage in terms of cost-effectiveness than the yerli cotton developed in Çukurova soil over the course of centuries.117 Throughout the entire Ottoman period, whatever cotton had been grown at various times was predominantly of the yerli variety. This situation lasted into the late 1930s, when the American Cleveland cotton variety finally began to outstrip the Çukurova yerli.118

The switch to Cleveland reflected a qualitative shift in how cultivators were thinking about their product and how institutions were able to influence the decisions of those cultivators. Changing the dominant cultivar in Çukurova required a coordinated effort by local government and trade organizations.119 In 1937, the secretary of the Adana Commerce and Provisions Exchange (see Figure 46) explained the thinking behind this major shift. The iane variety of cotton brought from Egypt had degenerated in Çukurova. Then, after some experimentation, the Adana Breeding Station chose the Lighting Express variety as the new cultivar of choice, but after a few seasons of growing, that crop began to change as well. In 1933, Cleveland, a high-yield variety, was accepted as the new foreign favorite, and in the cotton plantations between the Seyhan and Ceyhan rivers, other strains were forbidden in order to maintain the quality of the seeds going forward.120

117 Early Republican sources variously refer to the yerli cotton of Çukurova having either come from India a millennia prior or from Central Asia. Süleyman Sergici, "Adanada Klevland Pamuğu [Cleveland Cotton in Adana]," Adana Tecim Gazetesi 1 November 1937; Kemal, Pamuk Ziraati, 3.
118 NARA, RG 166, Box 436, Keld Christensen, Iskenderun, “Agriculture on the Cilician Plain” (5 July 1944), 16-19.
119 “Ovada Ziraat faaliyeti [Agricultural Activities in the Plain],” Yeni Adana 9 July 1937; “Bu yıl Çukurova kâmilen klevland ekecek [This Year all of Çukurova will plant Cleveland],” Yeni Adana 10 October 1936.
120 Sergici, "Adanada Klevland Pamuğu [Cleveland Cotton in Adana]," Adana Tecim Gazetesi 1 November 1937.
Just a few years after Cleveland cotton had been introduced in Çukurova, the local variety struck back with a vengeance. Within a few years, the areas planted with Cleveland cotton began to show diminished returns as the seed had become cross-pollinated with the stubborn yerli cotton of the Çukurova plain. Planters completely abandoned Cleveland cotton during the Second World War and only planted yerli. In response, the government policy shifted towards promoting the Acala/Upland variety of cotton and imposing stricter regulations on planters. By 1944, Cleveland was out and 80% of the cotton fields in Adana were sowed with Acala seed.\footnote{NARA, RG 166, Box 436, Keld Christensen, Iskenderun, “Agriculture on the Cilician Plain” (5 July 1944), 16-19.}

This episode involving the increasing experimentation with new cultivars reflected several realities. Local cultivators had long showed commitment to yerli despite the constant
arrival of alternatives, and so the cultural shift towards Cleveland among Çukurova cotton producers was indicative of a broader restructuring of the economy in Turkey during the mid-1930s, the period sometimes referred to as the era of “High Kemalism,” during which statist policies prevailed. The Turkish government had developed a much greater capacity to influence agricultural decision-making and dictate the nature of production in local economies, and to a large extent, the ascendant Muslim bourgeoisie in Çukurova must have seen their interests as aligned with the program of agricultural expansion and all that it entailed. Yet at the same time, the older cotton ecology, which had always drifted back towards the yerli variety, endured. This endurance in turn was not the product of resistance to change on the part of local cultivators so much as the reality that the local strains of cotton, which were ultimately more well-suited to the ecological conditions of the Çukurova plain, continued to resurge on their own through cross-pollination.

**The Winners**

Throughout this discussion of immigrants, workers, villagers, pastoralists, and plants in the Çukurova region during the early Republican period, the one group of actors that has been conspicuously absent is that of the businessmen, bankers, and industrialists like Hacı Ömer Sabancı (see Part 4 Introduction) who made their fortune off the region’s transformation from the 1920s onward. While this chapter has focused on the more intimate aspects of agrarian life, these businesses and their growth are another important part of the story. By 1937, the city of Adana alone was home to dozens of factories and large workshops (see Table 28), and industrial ventures were the ultimate goal of businessmen seeking to expand their profits and economic profile. Yet, although their pathways to prosperity are often explained as the product of individual heroism, their road to riches, as the structure of this chapter insists, were actually
enabled by a moving ecology of resettled refugees, sedentarized tribes, migrant labor, and different strains of cotton. Among all the groups of people working, maneuvering, and struggling in early Republican Adana, the ascendant Muslim capitalists were only one small part of a complex equation.

Table 28 Industry in Adana, circa 1937

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factory/Workshop Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Press and Ginning Mill</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour, Ice, and Ginning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread and Cloth Factories</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Oil and Soap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaroni</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco and Cigarette</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boğma (alcoholic beverage)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakı (alcoholic beverage)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber and Woodworking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Repair Shop</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, it is worth commenting briefly on the origins of this class to the extent they can be defined. After all, Hacı Ömer Sabancı was scarcely less a peasant than an immigrant from Elassona or a migrant worker from Elazığ when he arrived in Adana during the early 1920s. In their different examinations of late Ottoman and early Republican transformation of the Adana region, Toksöz, Üngör and Polatel, and Çomu all conclude with some discussion of who ultimately capitalized on the agrarian transformation of Çukurova. They share the view that those who benefited most from the rise of commercial agriculture and industry in Çukurova during the Republican period were those who succeeded in replacing the large non-Muslim bourgeoisie of

---

122 *Adana Cumhuriyetten Evvel ve Sonra [Adana Before and After the Republic]*, 57.
late Ottoman Adana and Mersin. For Toksöz, these figures were those who took the reins of an economic beast born out of the Ottoman period, the deeply entrenched cotton ecology that I described in Chapters 5 and 8. In Çomu’s work, it was certain newcomers who were most “adjusted” to the socioeconomic environment of the Adana region who prevailed.\textsuperscript{123} For Üngör and Polatel, the beneficiaries of the early Republican transformation of Çukurova were not only those who seized upon the former properties of Armenians but also the ascendant business families who enjoyed relatively little competition due to the elimination of a vast swath of potential Christian competitors.\textsuperscript{124} They describe the early Republican period as a continuation of the process of “colonization” that was initiated in 1915.\textsuperscript{125}

Data from the 1950s seems to confirm what each of these authors indicates about the origins of the winners of these processes. Most Christians were not able to maintain their wealth in Adana, although a few families such as the Sursocks maintained some property during the early Republican period. What Christians remained in Cilicia were eventually excluded from the upper echelons of local business. Likewise, neither Muslim migrants (\textit{muhacirs} and \textit{mübadils}), nor the descendants of tribal communities settled in Eastern Çukurova, nor migrant workers from the east appear to have primarily benefitted from the creation of vast, long-term business ventures.

A combination of migrants from nearby regions, especially the small province of Kayseri, along with the older landed Muslim elite are the ones who ultimately built economic empires on the fertile soil of the Çukurova plain. Çomu notes that during the 1920s, a large number of Kayseri businessmen that were generally inclined to work with others from Kayseri expanded

---

\textsuperscript{123} Çomu, \textit{The Exchange of Populations and Adana, 1830-1927}, 124.  
\textsuperscript{124} Polatel and Üngör, \textit{Confiscation and Colonization}, 131-32.  
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., 126.
their commercial activities in the Adana region. Of the five major businessmen in Çukurova that American officials saw as potential partners for industrial development during the 1950s, three — Hacı Ömer Sabancı (Sabancı Holding), Emin Ö zgür (Milli Mensucat), and Ömer Başeğmez — had been born in Kayseri and were not yet adults at the time of the First World War. The other two, Şadi Eliyeşil (founder of Çukurova Holding, 1923) and İsmail Sürmeli, were from notable families of Tarsus that expanded their wealth immediately following the war period. Although some may have attributed it to the business savvy of the people from those regions, what the natives of Kayseri and Tarsus shared was an advantage that their counterparts in similar and nearby cities such as Adana, Hadjin, Marash, and Antakya had also enjoyed during the late Ottoman period. They were from old towns with longstanding connections to the existent mercantile networks of the Çukurova plain, and their families were able to navigate the business environment that emerged with the rise of commercial cotton cultivation. For migrants from far afield or pastoralists gradually transitioning to village life and their descendants, economic integration would naturally involve a much longer process.

Within the broader historical consciousness of modern Turkey, this creation of a class of business tycoons commanding small agrarian kingdoms supported by a seemingly inexhaustible supply of good soil and migrant labor has defined the story of modern Çukurova. These economic processes are fundamental to historical experience of the region. However, in the remaining chapters of this dissertation, I will examine less visible but equally pervasive ecological transformations that accompanied changes in economy and settlement in the Adana region. As outlined in the earlier chapters of this dissertation, the process of frontier settlement

---

128 For more on the Kayseri connection, see Toksöz, Nomads, Migrants, and Cotton, 165.
that began in the post-Crimean War context had major ramifications for human relationships with the environment in Cilicia, creating new confrontations with malarial disease environment that endured well beyond the Ottoman period. Chapter 12 examines how early Republican state and society in Adana grappled with malaria in new ways, and how the program framed as a “war on malaria” was part and parcel of a transforming dynamic between not only the state and citizens but also the emerging concepts of “civilization” and “nature.” Chapter 13 follows this thread towards a cultural study of transhumance and the mountain summer home of the yayla, which endured as a meaningful space but took on a new practical and economic function. Chapter 14 concludes with a brief look at how the technological transformation of agrarian production and ecology in Çukurova had major implications for the human relationship malaria and the mosquitoes that spread it, while also pointing to some of the limitations of technocratic approaches to the environment in terms of their capacity to fully alter longstanding ecological norms.

But first, a few jokes for the weary reader relevant to the subject of agrarian change in Çukurova during the 1920s, courtesy of Çukurovada Memleket, the official publication of the education ministry in Adana:

There are some real dandies out there who see villagers as poor and vulgar. One day, one of these types of dandies was reading the newspaper in a café when an old villager came and sat at the table beside him. Our dandy was annoyed by this and began to mock the villager. “Hey uncle, what separates you from an animal?” he said. Seems the villager was a clever and quick-witted one. Pointing to the space between him and the dandy, he responded, “only about three handspans!”

We all know how our Adana-Mersin train moves at a turtle’s pace. Well yesterday something funny happened. A woman along with a little kid get on the train. She buys a full ticket for herself and a half for the kid. Who knows how long after, as they approach Mersin, the controller is collecting the tickets and says to her, “Your child isn’t that little, so how’d you get on by buying him only a half ticket?” Turns out the woman had a graceful wit: “Yes, you’re right, when my kid

129 Çukurovada Memleket (15 May 1928), pg. 8.
was getting on the train he was little, but your train goes so slow that he grew up before we got off!”\textsuperscript{130}

The rivers normally flow powerfully, and then when there is a little drought, we go to do a rain prayer beside the mighty rivers. Since children are innocent, they usually make young school children line up and bring them to the rain prayers on the belief that the prayers of the innocent will be answered. An intellectual type (\textit{münevver}) who was puzzled by this said to one of the staff going to the rain prayer, “Why are you bringing these kids? Their prayers won’t work.” “Why not?” he responded. “Because if their prayers were answered, there wouldn’t be any more schoolteachers!”\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Çukurovada Memleket} (15 March 1928), pg. 18.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Çukurovada Memleket} (15 May 1928), pg. 12.
CHAPTER 12

NATURAL ENemies: ÇUKuroVA
AND THE WAR ON MALARIA

When establishing the institutions of the new republic, Turkish officials were obliged to accommodate local practices. As such, the census was carried out at the end of fall, when people could be expected to have returned from their summer residences at the yayla.¹ This was also the time of year when during the 1920s, Turkish doctors began testing villagers for malaria infections in the countryside of places like Çukurova, where much of the population was transhumant.² In order to carry out the measures necessary to control and monitor malaria, the doctors first had to wait for people to return from the places where they already sought refuge from the disease. This seasonal ritual of migration and testing in the fall carried on for decades, as the public health apparatus of the Turkish government extended its reach in the countryside. When anti-malaria efforts were reinvigorated following the Second World War, the practice was still the same.³

The apparent intransigence of malaria in the Adana region and the endurance of seasonal migration (more in Chapter 13) do not mean that absolutely nothing was being accomplished. But the struggle to contain malaria, which set an ambitious goal of elimination, faced a long

¹ Türkiye Nüfüsü [The Population of Turkey].
² Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sıtma mücadeleşi [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region]." 1291.
uphill climb against millennia of ecological precedent. But beyond this, the agriculture
development of the Çukurova plain and the settlement, migration, and labor patterns it entailed
placed the region’s rural inhabitants at greater risk of contracting the disease.

Malaria was the primary public health issue of the young Republic of Turkey. At the time
of its foundation in 1923, it was not uncommon for 80% of the people in a particular region,
from Ankara and Bursa to Adana and Mardin, to suffer from malaria during the summer.\(^4\) The
war period left Anatolia with serious malaria epidemics (see Chapter 9), and on top of this, it
would seem that soldiers returning from the southern fronts brought with them tropical strains of
the malaria parasite *plasmodium falciparum*, a more deadly and virulent variety of the disease. In
addition, the large numbers of “exchanged” Muslims from the Balkans, about 500,000 people,
who replaced an even greater number of Christians that were sent to Greece and elsewhere in the
population exchanges, began to settle in the countryside (see Chapter 11). Immigration would
continue during the early decades of the Republican period. Even the new capital of Ankara was
a profound symbol of the centrality of malaria in the national project. Immediately following the
war, Ankara was a small town surrounded by many marshes where malaria was prevalent.\(^5\)

Few provinces suffered more from malaria than Adana. The first postwar study of
malaria in the Çukurova region, carried out in 1925, revealed that 85-90% of the villagers around
Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin had enlarged spleens and even in the city of Adana, around half of
the people had the disease.\(^6\) In other words, it was strange *not* to contract malaria in early
Republican Çukurova. Over the next decade, the malaria control facilities and research institutes
in Adana provided medical care to hundreds of thousands of individuals, combating the
pervasive risk of malaria that accompanied new settlements and agricultural labor. Malaria rates

\(^5\) See Evered, "Draining an Anatolian Desert: overcoming water, wetlands, and malaria in early republican Ankara."
\(^6\) Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sıtma mücadelesi [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region]," 1288.
and especially malaria mortality declined, but the disease lingered. In fact, the various statistics of the Ministry of Public Health (Sıhhiye Vekâleti) and the malaria institute in Adana all suggest relatively steady rates of malaria during the interwar period. The measures taken by the malaria control team in Adana, while certainly saving lives and helping people manage their ailments, could not wipe the malaria parasites or their anopheles vectors from the landscape.

Anti-malaria efforts of the Turkish Republic exhibited a purpose beyond the improvement of public health. As in many regions of the Mediterranean, the elimination of malaria was taken up as a national project. Public health and nationalism became mutually reinforcing ideologies, and the language of a struggle against nature buttressed a wide range of ecological interventions from mosquito extermination to swamp drainage. The fight against malaria in Turkey also became a means of educating peasants, making citizens, and forging new kinds of state involvement in quotidian life. As the work of Emine Evered and Kyle Evered has shown, Turkish antimalarial campaigns were inextricable from a broader political project that wielded a civilizational discourse and often employed patronizing language that emphasized the extent to which the problem of malaria was embedded in the life and lifestyles of Turkish peasants. These discourses also blamed nature itself for disease, even when the ecological factors influencing malaria had anthropogenic aspects.

In this chapter, I will examine the development, implementation, and impacts of Turkey’s “War on Malaria” in one of its main fronts: the province of Adana. Establishing the malaria control apparatus of the new republic required the instrumentalization of global knowledge about
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8 Evered and Evered, "State, Peasant, Mosquito: The biopolitics of public health education and malaria in early republican Turkey."
9 Alongside Adana, Ankara, which was being developed as the new capital of the republic, was a very important area of malaria control and research. See Evered, "Draining an Anatolian Desert: overcoming water, wetlands, and malaria in early republican Ankara."
malaria within a national framework. This project brought about a multifaceted collection of practices that pitted human society against nature and advocated radical environmental changes in the name of fighting malaria. Although doctors did not attempt to prevent seasonal migration, rather than a change of air, Turkish citizens were expected to change their bodies, environments, and habits in response to malaria. In turn, the Turkish health apparatus also became involved in an information campaign that utilized the press and various forms of propaganda to make citizens active participants in the struggle and indeed the war against one of the most intractable diseases in Anatolia. The war on malaria was part of a larger discourse of war on nature that emerged throughout this period. Yet if nature was the enemy, human activity bore a share of the blame for the fact that despite the partial successes of public health campaigns in Turkey, malaria would not only endure but in fact resurge in epidemic form during the late 1930s and especially throughout the Second World War.

**The Making of National Medicine**

The periods of the First World War (1914-18) and the French Mandate (1918-1922) represented bad years for public health in the Adana region. Health services did not function as they had before the war, and widespread displacement and scarcity fueled the spread of infectious diseases. In the Cilicia region, new international charities such as Near East Relief and proto-national charities such as the Armenian Medical Mission, the Armenian Red Cross and the Turkish Red Crescent emerged to provide some relief to civilian populations during the war period (see Chapters 8 and 10). After the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, it would take a few more years for the new government to restore a fully-functioning health service. But when they did, they created ambitious nationalist and state-centered health projects that represented unprecedented involvement and intervention in the lives of citizens.
During the first years of the Republic, the government in Ankara established an agenda for improving public health and combating the effects of malaria in particular.\textsuperscript{10} The organizations that laid the groundwork for reestablishing a health service in Turkey were some of the same types of aid institutions that had risen during the late Ottoman period and became the lifeline of millions of refugees and POWs during the First World War. The earliest institutional health activities in the Adana region were carried out by the Red Crescent, which had become the main provider for Muslim refugees from the Adana region during the French occupation. In 1926, the Rockefeller Foundation, a philanthropic partner of Near East Relief, which was one of the main institutions caring for displaced Armenians in the Middle East, conducted a detailed study of health programs in Turkey as a potential donor and logistical partner for the health ministry of the Turkish government. The report written by Ralph Collins, a graduate of Johns Hopkins University who had worked on the issue of malaria in Florida and would eventually return to Ankara to teach at the School of Public Health in 1935, devoted considerable space to the Adana province, which was becoming a major center of public health efforts in Turkey.\textsuperscript{11} During 1927-28, the Red Crescent also performed a thorough inspection of a large number of provinces in Anatolia with a special emphasis on the Cilicia region in order to solidify the networks of fundraising and relief in the countryside.\textsuperscript{12} In all these cases, the importance of malaria as the most widespread and serious health issue in Turkey was affirmed.

From the beginning, the Ankara government was preoccupied with ensuring that it maintained a high degree of medical sovereignty, balancing its needs for funding and expertise

\textsuperscript{10} Evered and Evered, “Governing population, public health, and malaria in the early Turkish republic,” 476-82.
\textsuperscript{11} RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926). For biographical detail, see "Dr. Collins," Türk Hıfzıssıha ve Tecrübi Biyoloji Mecmuası 2, no. 2 (1940).
\textsuperscript{12} TKA, 210/44-210/477.
from abroad with its own control of the programs at home.\textsuperscript{13} Republican officials were willing to receive aid from donor institutions; in 1926 they asked the Rockefeller Foundation for $79,000 in assistance that would cover 20\% of the costs of a new public health institute in Ankara.\textsuperscript{14} However, they also wanted to prevent the heavy involvement of foreign organizations in the operation of medical institutions in order to develop a self-reliant national program. Ralph Collins remarked in 1926 that even though its policies resulted in a tremendous shortage of doctors, the Turkish government did not allow foreigners to practice medicine in Turkey unless they were licensed before 1915.\textsuperscript{15} Yet at the same time, the Turkish medical establishment eagerly engaged with global debates and developments regarding medicine and public health, and Turkish doctors frequently received special training abroad. The \textit{Public Health Journal (Sıhhiye Mecmuası)}, released by the Ministry of Public Health, featured official announcements, nationwide statistics, and an array of articles written by Turkish doctors sometimes reporting experiences in their local districts but often reporting recent findings from English, French, or German publications. Malaria experts would be periodically sent abroad for additional training throughout the interwar period.\textsuperscript{16}

When it came to malaria, Turkish doctors often looked to the major European experts in parasitology and the implementation of new methods in diverse regions such as South Asia, Palestine and the United States. As the colonial world continued to serve as a medical laboratory in the global war on malaria, many Turkish medical professionals were especially interested in what was occurring in some of the countries that more closely resembled Turkey. In fact, one of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{13} For a study on sovereignty and medicine in Ottoman and French Mandate Syria, see Robert Ian Blecher, "The medicalization of sovereignty : medicine, public health, and political authority in Syria, 1861-1936" (2002). Also Philippe Bourmaud. ""Ya doktor" : devenir médecin et exercer son art en "Terre sainte", une expérience du pluralisme médical dans l'Empire ottoman finissant (1871 - 1918)" (Université de Provence, 2007).
\textsuperscript{14} RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Gunn to Russel, Paris (14 September 1926).
\textsuperscript{15} RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 46.
\end{flushright}
the early models for Turkish malaria programs was that of Italy, which built a full-fledged national antimalarial campaign during the decade leading up to the First World War. ¹⁷ Early issues of Sıhhiye Mecmuası featured articles about malaria in the Mediterranean, including a translation of an article by Lucien Raynaud, a health inspector in Algeria, about malaria control efforts in Italy. ¹⁸

Adana would become the center of the Turkish national response to malaria that brought together international expertise with local initiative. In the summer of 1925, a special malaria commission was established in Adana to treat and test the blood of the local population. It was led by Ekrem Tok, a young doctor who had trained with one of Europe’s premier parasitologists, Professor Emile Brumpt, who worked with the Rockefeller Foundations and the Pasteur Institute in Paris. Brumpt devoted a considerable portion of his career to researching the spread of malaria in the Middle East.¹⁹ The specific Italian connection of these efforts was underscored in September 1925, when Ekrem Tok was issued a diplomatic passport so that he could attend the First International Malaria Conference in Rome.²⁰ Over the subsequent years, Tok and his commission worked to test and treat as many malaria patients in the Adana province as they could, leading up to the 1928 establishment of the Adana Malaria Institute (Adana Sıtma Enstitüsü), an institution which Tok would head.

¹⁷ For more on the emergence of Italian antimalarial campaigns, see Snowden, The Conquest of Malaria : Italy, 1900-1962, 53-86.
¹⁸ Lucien Raynaud, “İtalya'da Sıtma Mücadelesi [The Fight Against Malaria in Italy],” Sıhhiye Mecmuası 1, no. 3 (1341 [1925]).
¹⁹ Professor Brumpt and Ekrem Tok remained in contact and maintained a friendship over subsequent decades, even exchanging holiday salutations. IP, BPT-B14, Ekrem Tok, R30/12 Tok to Brumpt, Anakara (25 December 1937); Brumpt to Tok, Paris (7 April 1933). Ekrem Tok even accompanied Brumpt’s wife on a trip to then-disputed Syrian border in 1937. IP, BPT-D13, Tok, Tok to Brumpt, Ankara (1 July 1937). Brumpt’s files at the Pasteur Institute Archives in Paris reveal that alongside Ekrem Tok, he maintained continual contact with a number of doctors not only in Adana and Turkey but also other countries of the Middle East. See IP, BPT-B13; B14; D13; G1.
²⁰ BCA, 30-18-1-1 15/55/10 (9 Eylül 1341 [9 September 1925]).
Adana epitomized the malaria problems in Turkey. As Dr. Tok explained throughout an extended report in the Public Health Journal from 1929, malaria dominated the landscape of the region. “In the year we began the campaign and the years leading up to it, malaria had truly come to be the most important problem of the country in the Adana region,” he remarked. “In the cities and the villages, there were thousands of people with malaria who lay in the shade of every tree.”21 In 1925, over 50% of the people tested in the city of Adana turned up positive for malaria. The problem was even worse in the villages, where over 90% of the villagers had malaria in the Adana district and about 85% in the villages around Mersin and Tarsus. Meanwhile, the spleen indices for districts of Eastern Çukurova such as İslahiye and Payas reflected a level of malaria so deeply-entrenched that Tok referred to it as “hyperendemic.” All in all, over 30,000 people in the Adana province were examined for malaria, with about 2/3 receiving some kind of treatment — mainly with quinine — for the parasite.22

While early examination and treatment efforts were more pragmatic than systematic, by the establishment of Adana Malaria Institute in 1928, a standardized approach to monitoring and controlling malaria infections was in place. The most important part of this process was a general examination carried out by local doctors in malaria control areas every spring and again in every fall following the return of local inhabitants from the yayla.23 Unfortunately, the statistics produced by these general examinations did not record whether patients who had been at the yayla for part of the summer exhibited lower rates of malaria. However, they did ensure a more representative sample size for calculating endemicity, as the patients examined were not limited to those who were already complaining of some sort of ailment.

21 Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sıtma mücadelesi [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region]," 1286.
22 Ibid., 1286-89.
23 Ibid., 1291.
The Adana Malaria Institute was founded not only for the purpose of treating and examining malaria cases in the region but also for the broader development of the national public health apparatus. During the early establishment of medical institutions throughout Turkey, a critical aspect of public health policy was the mandatory two-year service of all medical school graduates for the purpose of guaranteeing health services in rural regions. Every fall, as the Adana Malaria Institute began a new round of examinations, medical students and doctors from throughout the country would flock to the region in order to participate. In 1929, for example, they included some around fifty military and civilian doctors in training from every corner of Turkey who arrived for over a month of classes and activities. By 1939, the number of interns at the malaria institute rose to one hundred. Especially during the fall, the villages of Çukurova became the laboratories of the new nation.

| Table 29 Adana Malaria Institute Staff, 1938 |
| (Source: TBMM, 5. Dönem, Vol. 25, pg. 667) |
| Director | 1 |
| Laboratory Chief | 1 |
| Chemist | 1 |
| Assistant | 1 |
| Secretary | 1 |
| Druggist | 1 |
| Servants | 2 |

**Quinine Tablet Production Facility**

| Director | 1 |
| Technician | 1 |
| Secretary | 1 |
| Servants | 2 |

**Short-Term Staff**

| Intern Doctors (three-month) | 61 |
| Temporary workers (four-month) | 30 |

24 RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 46.
25 "Sitma enstitüsü bu sene 23 Eylül'de açılacaktır [The Malaria Institute will be opened this year on September 23]," Yeni Adana 30 August 1929; "Sitma enstitüsü [The Malaria Institute]," Yeni Adana 10 September 1929; "Sitma enstitüsü [The Malaria Institute]." Yeni Adana 18 september 1929; "Tıp enstitüsü: evelki gün açılan enstitüde ikinci sitma tatbikat derslerine başladı," Yeni Adana 26 September 1929.
Another critical component of the national health apparatus established in the Çukurova region was the institution of the traveling doctor (seyyar tabip), which had emerged during the late Ottoman period (see Chapter 6). These doctors were employed in a host of activities ranging from the treatment of syphilis and trachoma to the vaccination of humans and animals. A significant component of the traveling doctor’s work was not just treatment but also surveillance. With regard to malaria, the traveling doctors kept detailed records of malaria cases in their region of activity and reported on the presence of potential mosquito breeding grounds along with the rates of malaria in the regions visited.\(^{27}\) In addition to local villagers, the traveling doctor was required to monitor the health situation of migrant laborers, especially those working in the rice paddies.\(^ {28}\) In this regard, the traveling doctor’s work involved not just the treatment and observation of villagers but also the extension of a civil state presence in distant rural or village settings.

The medical establishment of the late Ottoman period had recognized the need and indeed demand for medical solutions to malaria, which included the procurement and distribution of affordable quinine in the provinces. During the early Republican period, this impulse transformed into a more proactive and perhaps invasive approach to malaria control. Anti-malarial efforts were part and parcel of a broader village-centered project aimed at making villages more productive and better integrated in the national body politic (see Chapter 11). Within this context, malaria, like syphilis, trachoma, and many other ailments, was increasingly

\(^{27}\) “Seyyar tabip talimatname,” *Sıhhiye Mecmuası* 10, no. 70 (October 1934): 316-17, 23. For a sample of the traveling doctor’s notebook, see ibid., 338-39.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., 320.
cast as a rural disease. The conscious reinforcement of the link between disease and the countryside thus served as a means of legitimizing the various state involvement in the lives of rural villagers.

**The Biopolitics of Public Health**

During the Ottoman period and the First World War, public health institutions were concerned with providing health service and medicine as a type of public relief. During the early Republican period, the same health professionals that first worked in late Ottoman institutions built on those notions to emphasize the role of citizens, particularly peasants, in eliminating disease through their enlistment in public health policies. There was a strong practical component to this mission. Villagers did not have sufficient access to medical care and would therefore be entrusted with administering treatment for malaria or the regulated ingestion of quinine medicines for the purposes of prophylaxis. The goal of reducing malaria rates also required peasants to become the consenting allies of state health officials in order to carry out medical tests and anti-mosquito activities in villagers. This was also a political goal, however, and although it appears that peasants in Çukurova were skeptical of medicine during the 1920s, by the 1930s, the came to demand and expect medical treatment.

From 1925 onward, the doctors of the malaria control centers, particularly after the establishment of the Adana Malaria Institute in 1928, became involved in general surveys of the spleens and blood of the Adana region. Throughout the interwar period, the malaria status of more than 10% of the population of Turkey was recorded on an annual basis with hopes that

---

29 See Evered and Evered, "State, Peasant, Mosquito: The biopolitics of public health education and malaria in early republican Turkey."
every citizen would be tested at least every few years.\textsuperscript{30} Between 1925 and 1929, almost half of the population in the Adana province was tested for malaria either by spleen measurement or blood sample.\textsuperscript{31} From April 1934 to the end of March in 1935, over 300,000 examinations were carried out in Adana.\textsuperscript{32} From August 1935 to the end of July 1936, that figure was almost 400,000.\textsuperscript{33} These numbers clearly included people being tested more than once but nonetheless reflect a sampling of people equal to or greater than the population of the Adana province within a given year (see Chapter 11).

After taxation, military service, and school enrollment, medical examinations for malaria and other diseases were probably the most common form of state-society interaction in the early Republican period and certainly the most intimate. A doctor in Adana who worked in the villages of Çukurova during the 1920s said that when he first arrived, the people “wanted to stone” him, as he was equated with tax collectors and the like. The gendarmerie was used to compel peasants to attend the annual examinations for malaria, and those who did not comply were threatened with punishment.\textsuperscript{34} Given the challenges of even conducting a complete census during the late Ottoman period, this level of surveillance represented a dramatic shift in the relationship between state officials and village populations. In this way, the ambitious anti-malarial campaign rendered local populations more legible and inculcated certain practices that accustomed peasants to not only trust medical and state officials but also submit to official requirements.

Perhaps the most invasive measure carried out by health officials was the inspection of homes and extermination of mosquitos. The malaria control efforts in Adana included teams of
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medical personnel armed with Paris Green who went house to house spraying for mosquitoes. Between 1926 and 1929, an average of over 17,000 houses per year in the province of Adana were inspected and treated for mosquitoes in such a way. While framed as merely efforts to root out insects, these inspections required the anti-malaria teams to scrutinize the darkest corners of the domestic sphere where mosquitoes might lurk, forcing Turkish citizens to open their homes to the gaze of state officials. The monitoring of citizens and malaria were entirely intertwined.

Compulsion was not the only means of expanding the medical apparatus in Adana that was employed by local officials. Women played an important role in examining patients for malaria as they were able to gain better access to the women and children within rural families. The malaria control team employed a number of female nurses who participated in every aspect of the examinations and treatment. Since half of the population was after all female, the participation of women who would be allowed more intimate access to other women was critical. According to the aforementioned malaria doctor of the region, many of these women were literate and visited families, instructing them about necessary precautions for malaria and helping those families understand the contents of the treatment instruction cards that were distributed throughout the countryside. Other officials such as the muhtar and teachers also played a role in disseminating information about malaria (see chapter appendix).

In addition to cultivating a habit of consent within Turkish peasants in their interactions with state medical officials, health policies were also aimed at inculcating an appreciation of medicine and its proper administration. To this effect, a number of dispensaries providing medicines and basic care to local populations were opened in Adana, Tarsus, Mersin, and Ceyhan (see Figure 47). These dispensaries were devoted primarily to the distribution of quinine;

35 Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sıtma mücadele [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region]," 1306.
in Adana, two of the three dispensaries were solely for malaria, and the same was true for Tarsus.\textsuperscript{36} The dispensary in Mersin, which Dr. Ralph Collins referred to as the finest in the country, dealt with a wide range of ailments and was used by more women than men (see Table 30).\textsuperscript{37} In 1929, the Red Crescent in Adana reported that 95% of the “hundreds” of people who came to its dispensaries each day had malaria.\textsuperscript{38} Quinine medicines were employed for two complementary purposes by the malaria control team, both to treat those suffering from malaria and as prophylaxis during peak malaria seasons.

Yet the function of the dispensaries, malaria clinics, and hospitals run by the health ministry in the Adana region was not only to provide treatment but also to teach the local population about the correct use of medicine and thereby enlist them in a program of self-treatment. One of the frequent complaints of doctors was that people did not take their medicines at proper intervals or did not complete courses of quinine once their fevers subsided.\textsuperscript{39} While quinine may have had a relatively quick impact in terms of alleviating the symptoms, completion of a weeks-long treatment regimen was necessary to ensure the complete elimination of parasites. Similarly, prophylactic use of quinine required taking medicine at three-day intervals throughout a months-long malaria season that began in April and sometimes lasted through to November. To facilitate the self-administration of these complicated treatment regimens, the malaria commissions issued cards for both prophylactic and curative quinine regimens that patients could use to keep track of the daily progress of their treatment and ensure that their medicine was taken at the proper interval (see Figure 48 and

\textit{Figure 49}). These cards served not only as means of encouraging proper quinine use but also as didactic tools that engendered a sense of self-discipline, as they gave specific instructions about how to properly use the medicine and on which days. One might presume that a majority of people did not use them, but adhering to quinine prophylaxis regimen would have certainly been an entirely novel form of discipline within most families.

All of these measures were on some level matters of practical necessity for implementing a successful campaign against malaria, methods that were being developed and tested in many

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{36} RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 78, 163.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 165.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} “Kırmızı ay: Adanada nasıl çalışıyor Sıtma ile mücadele? [The Red Crescent: How is the Fight Against Malaria working in Adana?],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 5 February 1929.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 73.
\end{itemize}
countries. However, medicalized forms of interaction between the peasant and state health officials occurred with a sociopolitical context as well. The activities of malaria commissions reinforced the “biopolitics of public health education” during the early Republican period described by Emine Evered and Kyle Evered in their work on malaria policy. The examination of spleens, blood, and homes by medical officials fostered a habit of consent that would render rural populations more receptive to both ideas and policies regarding health and citizenship. Evered and Evered have emphasized the didactic aspects of the anti-malaria campaigns, which were conceived of as a struggle not just against disease but also the ignorance of the populace. Embedded within the health ministry’s sometimes patronizing rhetoric was a clear civilizational dichotomy between the urban, modern republican and the backward peasant. An explicit component of the malaria campaigns throughout Turkey was propaganda aimed at eliminating the factors of “ignorance” that impinged upon public health.

Table 30 Patients at Mersin dispensary and purpose of visit, 1925 (Source: Collins, "Public Health in Turkey," pg. 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynecology</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's diseases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otolaryngology</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous Disease</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genito-urinary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2513</td>
<td>2959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 47 Adana Health Officials (Ekrem Tok at Left), circa 1925. Sign above reads “Free quinine (sulfato) distributed here (burada parasız kinin (sulfato) dağıtılır).” (Source: Collins, “Public Health in Turkey,” pg. 78)
| 1. | هر قارئ بیشتر از این بداند. |
| 2. | هر خانه باید کونا خصوصی داشته باشد. کنین پر از کونا کل کنین آن جهت |
| 3. | روش اولان کناره آنها بیابند. |
| 4. | کنین کناره قبیل قومی یه آن دیده ادیانت از آن دیده ادیانت اعدمه |

*Figure 48 Quinine Card for Prophylaxis, circa 1924 (Source: BCA, 490-1-0-0 1464/6/1, pg. 78)*
Instructions read: “1. Every card is for one person. 2. Each box is designated for one day. On the days where “Quinine” is written, quinine is to be taken. On the empty days, it is not to be taken. 3. On quinine days however many tablets will be taken, on that box that many lines are to be drawn. 4. In the empty box on the week line the date of the first day of the week is marked.”
A corollary to the measures described above was the use of propaganda in order to inform villagers about how to protect themselves from malaria and establish the hegemony of the knowledge and methods of the health ministry. Public discourses about malaria, while dominated by the propaganda of the health ministry, were not entirely limited to a state-sponsored message. Numerous advertisements for medicines or consumer insecticides such as Flit were common in the newspapers and medical journals of Turkey during the interwar period. Not all of the products marketed to malaria sufferers conformed to the health ministry’s general stance on how to approach the disease. An advertisement in 1929 for Sıhhat brand rakı, the new alcoholic beverage of choice for the Republic, declared that “Those who fear malaria should drink Sıhhat rakı regularly.” The brand name of Sıhhat may have meant “health,” but the Ministry of Public Health would have likely disagreed with this prescription. In fact, doctors regularly warned that drinking alcohol would actually impede the recovery of patients. Nevertheless the fact that this particular rakı brand sold itself on the basis of malaria prevention attested to a significant degree of concern about malaria among the general public and a willingness to consume substances other than quinine to fight the disease.

While never going so far as promoting alcohol for malaria prevention, the early Republican government did utilize the press as well as more creative methods for disseminating their message. Throughout July of 1929, for example, instructions about avoiding malaria and

---

41 "Flit bayıltmaz, öldürür! [Flit Doesn't Stun, it Kills!]," Yeni Adana 3 May 1935.
43 Hamdi Dilevurgun, Sitma (Istanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1948), 18. The practice of drinking alcohol to cope with or ward off malaria was apparently widespread during the Ottoman period. (Aras), Sitma'ya Karşı Muharebe (The Battle Against Malaria), 4. An interesting op-ed in Yeni Adana that described partaking in a drinking session with Ekrem Tok and the other doctors of the Adana region criticized the doctors for being overly tame drinkers who took a half-hour to finish a tiny glass of watered-down rakı. "Doktorlarla içmek belâ imiş: Küçük bir kadeh rakıyı yarım saatta içiyorlar [Drinking With Doctors is Trouble: They Take a Half-Hour to Finish a Small Glass of Rakı]," Yeni Adana 8 March 1929.
the danger of mosquitos graced the front page of Yeni Adana. The press also served as a place for the Ministry of Public Health to announce its latest activities and the developments in the anti-malaria campaigns throughout the country. These articles often served to illustrate that the health ministry was at work, and that the policies adopted by the republican government were being implemented and creating tangible results. In general, the early Republican period witnessed a steady stream of publications about malaria and public health aimed at providing accessible information to broad audiences. A 1927 publication by the Ministry of Public Health offered advice about how to avoid malaria. It was likely intended to be read aloud in rural settings, as the text began with the salutation of “Villagers! Fellow Countrymen! (Köylüler! Hemşeriler!)” It warned villagers to use quinine (sulfato) in order to ward off malaria and to protect their homes from mosquitos by installing screens or sleeping under mosquito nets. Aside from print, state officials organized lessons on malaria in classrooms as well as organized events such as “malaria theatre” using the popular folk puppet-characters Karagöz and Hacıvat. As a 1928 manual with instructions about health for village teachers noted, dealing with malaria required not only spreading basic information about how the disease functioned but also raising awareness about the very real dangers of malaria. “The biggest harm is that we consider malaria to be an unimportant disease. When we hear that someone we know has caught a feverish illness, this wish immediately flies to the tip of our tongue: ‘hopefully it is malaria, it will come and pass (inşallah sıtmadır, gelir geçer)’.” While malaria might have been less fatal than other diseases, for it to be eliminated, the public would have to take treatment and

44 “Sıtmadan kurtulunuz [Be Rid of Malaria],” Yeni Adana 3 July 1929; “Sıtmadan kurtulunuz [Be Rid of Malaria],” Yeni Adana 7 July 1929; “Sıtmadan kurtulunuz [Be Rid of Malaria],” Yeni Adana 24 July 1929; “Sıtma mücadele(sinin) öğütleri [The Anti-Malaria Campaign's Recommendations],” Yeni Adana 1 August 1929.
47 Reşit Galib, Köy Muallimleriyle Sıhhi Musahebeler [Talking Health with Village Teachers] (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1928), 107.
prevention seriously. Early republican health education stressed the importance of combating ignorance surrounding malaria, thereby establishing the supremacy of expert knowledge about disease.

Dr. Fehmi, the head of the Adana malaria control staff during the 1930s, articulated this view clearly in a conversation with Lilo Linke during her travels in Çukurova (see chapter appendix). Claiming, according to Linke, that he had won over the people and was now regarded as a “demi-god,” he explained his method of convincing villagers of the necessity of modern medicine. “I talked with them in their own language;” he said. “I asked them what they did when a dog attacked them, and when they answered: ‘We throw stones at it and run for a stick,’ I said: ‘Well, and what is malaria but a million mad dogs raging in your blood, and what is quinine but a stick to beat them?’ — And when they hesitated, I said: ‘Can’t Allah make animals of any size he pleases? Or are you so blasphemous as to doubt because your stupid eyes can’t see them?’”

Appealing to faith in order to convince patients of the power of medical knowledge was not unusual; a similar approach can be found in a book from the 1920s containing model sermons for explaining religion to villagers. That work explained the existence of microbes through the language of divine mystery, and used a metaphor about different types of peppers to illustrate the distinction between benign and harmful bacteria.

In this regard, knowledge about mosquitoes played a critical role in the demonstration of science’s superiority. All publications about malaria shared an emphasis on the mosquito being the primary cause of the disease. The same manual indicated that “there is a mistaken belief and opinion that has settled and taken root not only among our villagers who remain ignorant (cahil kalmış) but also among those who are rather literate about malaria being transmitted by air or

49 Vahid, *Köylü İlim-i Hali* (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Amire, 1922), 108.
water.” The manual goes on to declare that even someone who has been explained how malaria is transmitted “five minutes earlier” will go on to say “the air of such and such village is malarial” or “of course someone who drinks any old water they encounter will get malaria.” As the aforementioned 1927 publication emphasized, “malaria is only transmitted by mosquitoes. That which causes malaria in humans is neither the impact of air (hava çalmasi), nor bad water, nor junk food (abur cubur yemek).” The anopheles mosquito is indeed the vector of malaria, but in highlighting the ways in which local experiential understanding of and responses to were illegitimate, doctors also hoped to solidify a hierarchy of knowledge that placed medical professionals and their scientific knowledge above traditional means of coping with disease.

The fixation on the figure of the mosquito as the vector of malaria also served another purpose. It personified the disease. In their article entitled “State, Peasant, Mosquito,” Evered and Evered showcased a number of provocative images used in propaganda regarding malaria during the interwar period. In many of these illustrations, published in brochures that often advertised anti-malarial medicines, a large, menacing mosquito looms over vulnerable peasants or villages, poised to strike. The 1948 image below (see Figure 50), for example, authored by Ferit Apa, a Turkish painter who had studied in Germany during the Second World War, depicts
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50 Galib, Köy Muallimleriyle Sıhhi Musahebeler [Talking Health with Village Teachers], 109.
51 Ibid., 109.
52 Sıhhiye nezaret-i celilesinin ısıtmaya tutulmamak için öğütler [The Ministry of Public Health's Recommendations for Not Contracting Malaria]. There is substantial consistency in the simplified language and advice of these publications aimed at health education, especially when highlighting common superstitions. For example, a malaria brochure from 1948 used almost the exact same formulation: “In the past, some people thought that malaria happened because of eating junk food (abur cubur şeyler) like raw fruit, green salads, melon and watermelon on an empty stomach. Some also believed that the bad odors coming from swamps or the jinns and fairies found in swampy areas brought malaria. Even now there are people who believe such things.” Dilevurgun, Sitma, 9.
mosquitoes almost as dive bombers swooping in on Turkish peasants. Early Republican publications on malaria all share a fixation on the different types of mosquitoes that transmit malaria and their habits. This was a sort of “know thy enemy” logic in the formulation of one Adana Malaria Institute director, Rafet Ahmet Pek.

Given the scientific climate of the period, the shift in focus made sense, but what it became in many cases was literally a microscopic fixation on the mosquito and every aspect of its life cycle and habits, along with the difference between various species. That fixation stood in stark contrast to comparatively scant discussion of broader issues influencing malaria’s impact such as nutrition and less invasive methods of prevention such as seasonal migration. Although the Turkish medical establishment recognized that people migrated during the summer to escape malaria, the solution to the disease was more explicitly interventionist: attack the mosquito and attack every aspect of the environment that allowed it to thrive. The demonization of the mosquito was one example of an emergent militant discourse regarding nature, and specifically a firm divide between an unruly environment and human societies that might act upon it. In turn, this discourse encouraged Turkish citizens to enlist as soldiers in a war against disease and indeed a war against nature in order to transform the Anatolian countryside.

---

56 Pek, Sıtma Notlari, 15.
Figure 50 Cover of *Sitma* by Hamdi Dilevurgun (1948). Illustration by Ferit Apa. This brochure was printed in 25,000 copies. The stamp in the upper-right corner reveals that this particular copy had once belonged to a middle school. (Source: my collection; also cited in Evered & Evered, “State, Peasant, Mosquito”)
The War on Nature

The secret to success in the fight with malaria: First and foremost, to know the adversary, to understand its way of life, its temperaments, its friends and its enemies.

Rafet Ahmet Pek, Sitma Notlari (1945)\textsuperscript{57}

One day in late spring 1929, a strange rain fell on the Adana region. When the clouds dispersed, people began to report that it had “rained fish.” Indeed, small fish were found in holes and puddles throughout the city, evoking alarm among local inhabitants as rumors spread. But Adana Malaria Institute director Ekrem Tok explained the phenomenon during an interview with Yeni Adana. Fish had been “thrown” into small bodies of water all over the province so that they might eat the mosquito larvae that inevitably formed in the wake of rainstorms during the warm months of the year.\textsuperscript{58} He had recently written an article on the uses of such fish like the gambusia, pioneered in part by his mentor Professor Brumpt, as well as the presence of some local species of mosquito-eating fish in the irrigation canals and small bodies of water in Osmaniye and İslahiye. The Adana aquarium was working hard to study and develop these magical fish.\textsuperscript{59} They had been transplanted to many bodies of water on purpose, and perhaps the means by which they found their way to some of the smaller puddles was explained by hungry birds having dropped their unfortunate prey mid-flight.\textsuperscript{60}

Mosquitofish were not the only foreign entity to turn up in the waters of Adana that year. As Ekrem Tok also explained, the malaria control centers throughout the province had begun oiling even the smallest ponds and puddles with the arrival of the spring rains. Between April and June of 1929, 8060 kg of diesel oil — that is almost 2400 gallons — were poured into

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{58} “Ekrem Tok Beyin Beyanatı: Dünden itibaren su birikintilerine Mazot dökülmeye başlandı [Mr. Ekrem Tok's Announcements: pouring of diesel into puddles began yesterday],” Yeni Adana 5 June 1929.
\textsuperscript{60} “Ekrem Tok Beyin Beyanatı: Dünden itibaren su birikintilerine Mazot dökülmeye başlandı [Mr. Ekrem Tok's Announcements: pouring of diesel into puddles began yesterday],” Yeni Adana 5 June 1929.
various bodies of water to prevent the development of mosquito larvae on the water’s surface.\textsuperscript{61} This represented a major increase when compared with the roughly 3000 kg used for the same purpose in 1925.\textsuperscript{62} Whether using invasive species or poisonous liquids, the health ministry was prepared to fight mosquitoes at all costs.\textsuperscript{63} But much more ambitious interventions were promised in the years to come. As Tok indicated, significant amounts of wetland drainage had already occurred in the area around Mersin, and more were promised in the east of the province around Osmaniye and İslahiye, where swamps had defied previous attempts at elimination.\textsuperscript{64}

While led by physicians trained primarily in medicine, the campaign against malaria was becoming an environmental struggle through the expanding arena of public health. I have referred thus far to anti-malarial campaigns or forms of malaria control, but the official state discourse regarding malaria in Turkey was more explicitly militant. The standard name for the antimalarial campaigns was the \textit{Sıtma Mücadelesi}. In the early republican context, the word “mücadele,” which means “combat,” “fight,” or “struggle,” had a clear association with the \textit{Milli Mücadele} or “National Struggle” that led to the foundation of an independent Turkish state following the First World War. Not only malaria, but in fact a number of diseases, namely syphilis, tuberculosis, and trachoma were also the targets of an official \textit{mücadele}. Later, the term would become \textit{Sıtma Savaşı}, meaning “War on Malaria.” Particularly in official documentation and the press, malaria control as well as many other public health and social welfare programs were represented in this way. Much like national malaria programs elsewhere, the militant

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{62} Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sıtma mücadeleşi [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region]." 1308.
\textsuperscript{63} I have not found any literature on mosquitofish as an invasive species in Turkey, though studies show that their populations are found in Çukurova today in places such as the waters of the Seyhan Dam. S. A. Erguden, "Age, growth, sex ratio and diet of eastern mosquitofish Gambusia holbrooki Girard, 1859 in Seyhan Dam Lake (Adana/Turkey)," \textit{Iran. J. Fish. Sci. Iranian Journal of Fisheries Sciences} 12, no. 1 (2013). The role of mosquitofish in Australia as an invasive species has been noted. Graham Pyke, "A Review of the Biology of Gambusia affinis and G. holbrooki." \textit{Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries} 15, no. 4 (2005).
\textsuperscript{64} “Ekrem Tok Beyin Beyanatı: Dünden itibaren su biriktilerine Mazot dökülмиye başlandı [Mr. Ekrem Tok's Announcements: pouring of diesel into puddles began yesterday],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 5 June 1929.
language of anti-malarial campaigns mirrored a broader pairing of citizens and soldiers that emerged in the interwar period in Turkey. Yet not all national malaria programs evoked an identical rhetoric. Perhaps it was with conscious recognition of this difference that Seyfettin Okan’s bilingual work on anti-malaria activities in Turkey was published in 1949 as “Türkiye’de Sıtma Savaşı” or “The War on Malaria in Turkey” in Turkish but under the title of “Malaria Control in Turkey” for its otherwise identical English-language section.

Antimalarial efforts were framed as attacking the mosquito wherever it might be found. Oiling or petrolage, for example, which entailed pouring massive amounts of diesel and raw

Figure 51 Anti-malarial medicines depicted as cannons destroying plasmodium. Illustration by Adana Malaria Institute Chief Rafet Ahmet Pek. (Source: Rafet Ahmet Pek, Sıtma Notları (1945), pg. 48)

Oiling or petrolage, for example, which entailed pouring massive amounts of diesel and raw
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65 See Altınay, The Myth of the Military Nation: militarism, gender, and education in Turkey, 30-32. Research on other cases of other national cases of malaria control reflect somewhat different language. For example, in the work of Sandra Sufian there are occasional references to war with malaria in the case of Zionist settlements in Mandate Palestine; however, this does not appear as a significant part of the discourse. Sufian, Healing the Land and the Nation: malaria and the Zionist project in Palestine, 1920-1947. Similarly, Margaret Humphries research on malaria in the United States during the Interwar Period contains little indication of such a militant discourse surrounding malaria. Humphreys, Malaria: poverty, race, and public health in the United States.

66 Okan, Türkiye’de Sıtma Savaşı. Here, Turkey’s anti-malarial efforts might most closely resemble those undertaken under by Mussolini in Italy, who — much like the Turkish public health and public works officials did in Ankara — waged an intense war against the marshes surrounding the capital. Snowden, The Conquest of Malaria: Italy, 1900-1962, 149. This is to say that if malaria control efforts in Turkey were on the whole similar to other global attempts at combating malaria within a national framework, the national malaria program in Turkey was discursively uniform with the specific nationalist vocabulary that prevailed in the country during the interwar period.
petroleum into puddles, ponds, and swamps was effective in reducing the mosquito population to the extent that it eliminated spaces where mosquitoes could breed. A thin layer of oil on the surface of water prevents mosquitoes from laying eggs and suffocates newly hatched mosquito larvae. However, this method was fairly costly and required constant labor. In the Adana province, the malaria control teams in theory carried out petrolage every 15 days during the spring and fall and every 10 days during the peak mosquito breeding periods of the summer.67 The use of highly toxic Paris Green was another method used to kill mosquitoes in the region.68 Paris Green released from airplanes over swamps, a method of mosquito control that the early Republican government experimented with, could also be effective at killing mosquitoes and their larvae, as well as many other living things in the vicinity.69

Another example of fighting mosquitoes through broader ecological interventions was the drainage of sitting water. The practice of desiccating wetlands was a state policy that emerged during the late Ottoman period, often phrased as “cleaning (tathir)” on the basis that swamps fostered disease because they were unclean. Drainage was conceived of as an intrinsic public good in that it increased agricultural production while simultaneously improving public health. Drainage activities were overseen by the Ministry of Public Works or local government administrations and contracted to companies tasked with overseeing the activities (see Chapter 6). In the Republic period, however, responsibility for drainage activities shifted somewhat in that it included the newly formed malaria control organizations. Each year, the Sitma Mücadelesi oversaw numerous drainage projects throughout Turkey (see Figure 52).

67 Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sitma mücadelesi [The anti-malaria campaign in the Adana region]," 1307.
68 "Ekrem Tok Beyin Beyanatı: Dünden itibaren su birikintilerine Mazot dökülmeye başladı [Mr. Ekrem Tok's Announcements: pouring of diesel into puddles began yesterday]," Yeni Adana 5 June 1929.
69 BCA, 30-10-0-0, 185/277/8 (16 December 1926).
As a complement to swamp drainage, the spread of eucalyptus in Turkey towards the end of the interwar period provides a vivid illustration of how the war against the mosquito and its habitats created a space for a new ecological interventions. The planting of eucalyptus trees became an important complement to swamp drainage in Çukurova. Some eucalyptus trees were already planted in the Adana region and other parts of the Ottoman Empire as early as the late nineteenth century (see Chapter 6). The French company that built the Adana railway during the 1880s planted trees at each station for decorative purposes. But more intensive efforts at expanding eucalyptus forests in Turkey would only begin during the late 1930s. As in many places throughout the world, the eucalyptus was touted as a healthful tree that would assist in draining marshy land and afforestation. The first and largest eucalyptus plantation created by the Ministry of Forestry would be a eucalyptus forest developed on the site of the Karabucak
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70 Niyazi Okay, Okalptüs Nasıl Yetiştirilir [How to Grow Eucalyptus] (Tarsus: Gülek Basmevi, 1947), 9.
swamp just south of Tarsus, a region long blamed for the area’s particular malaria issues (see Figure 53).

The cultivation of the tree greatly expanded over the course of the 20th century. The decision for eucalyptus planting at Karabucak was signed by Atatürk in December 1937.72 The initial plans projected some 30 km² of trees to replace largely uncultivated marshes.73 Large numbers of local women were employed on the eucalyptus farm to raise young trees that could be implanted in the swamp. The final form of Karabucak eucalyptus forest occupied 855 hectares or 8.55 km² roughly halfway between Tarsus and the sea.74 The Karabucak forest immediately became a laboratory for eucalyptus planting in other parts of Turkey; the first practical manual on growing eucalyptus in Turkish was published by the Eucalyptus Region Chief of Tarsus in 1947.75 By the 1950s, eucalyptus was spread widely throughout the Çukurova region. Mary Gough, an American who traveled in the area during the 1950s, remarked upon the commonness of eucalyptus trees on farms and throughout the countryside, as well as along the railway where she remarked “the eucalyptus trees could almost, in Cilicia, be called station fittings.”76 A map in Saatçioğlu and Pamay’s 1958 study of eucalyptus in Karabucak and the rest of Çukurova listed over 60 sites of eucalyptus cultivation scattered throughout the Adana-Tarsus-Mersin region as well as surrounding the cities of Ceyhan, Kozan (formerly Sis), Kadirli (formerly Kars-ı Zülkadiye), Bahçe, Osmaniye, Dörtyol, Payas, İskenerun, Kırıkhan, Reyhanlı, Antakya, and Arsus.77

72 BCA, 30-18-1-2, 80/99/13 (10 December 1937).
73 “Ovamızda okaliptüscülük,” Türksözü 27 August 1937.
75 Okay, Okaliptüs Nasıl Yeteştirilir [How to Grow Eucalyptus].
76 Mary Gough, Travel into Yesterday (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1954), 27, 81, 141.
77 Saatçioğlu and Pamay, Tarsus-Karabucak Mintkasında Okaliptüs, 2.
Figure 53 "Karabucak swamp is living its last moments. The total amount of land desiccated in one month is 7000 dekar. The remains of old civilizations are being found in the digging of the Deep Canal." Images: 1. Karabucak Swamp, 2. Machine Opening the Canal, 3. Women Working in the Eucalyptus Garden (Source: Yeni Adana 11 August 1939)
The war against the mosquito in all its forms prompted ecological interventions that contributed to an emerging notion of the “war on nature.” A growing number of facets of the natural world were presented as threats, adversaries to be fought and indeed conquered. Much of this discourse centered on pesky animals, from mosquitoes and locusts to pigs and dogs, and their extermination. But the war on nature also extended to less animate forces. On 6 December 1936, the headline of Türksözü, a major newspaper in Adana, read “Adana Has Suffered a Great Disaster (felâket).” After a few days of heavy rain in Çukurova and the Taurus Mountains, the Seyhan River had, as was so often its wont, broken the dams and overflowed into the city. The flood lasted for days. In the countryside, torrents had engulfed the agricultural spaces of the Yüreğir Plain. The waters of the Seyhan mixed with the overflow of the Ceyhan, reenacting a scene of carnage reminiscent of what Arshauki Teodik reported when she toured the Adana region less than three decades prior. A Seyhan River flood was nothing out of the ordinary, but the scale of this disaster was particularly devastating. As usual, the comparatively poor neighborhood of Karşıyaka, located on the lower eastern banks of the river was hit the hardest. In one gruesome accident, eighteen people drowned under the debris of their collapsed house. In and around the city, over 1000 such buildings were toppled, and in addition over one hundred people, 891 animals, including 419 goats, perished in the turbid waters.

78 See “Çekirge afeti: Tehlikinin önüne geçmek için fedakârlık lazım [The Locust Disaster: In order to prevent this danger sacrifice is necessary],” Yeni Adana 25 May 1930. See also “Çekirge Kıskık boğazında Asker ve ehali tarafından imha ediliyor [In the Kıskik pass, locusts are being eliminated by the soldiers and inhabitants],” Yeni Adana 21 May 1930; “Kozan’dая çekirge, halk ve memurların iştirâki ile imha ediliyor [In Kozan, the locusts are being eliminated through the cooperation of the people and officials],” Yeni Adana 25 May 1930; “Çekirge dağı kısmına fazla hücûm ediyor [Locusts attack the mountains more],” Yeni Adana 25 May 1930; “Tren çekirgeden tehüra uğradı [The Train was delayed because of locusts],” Yeni Adana 25 May 1930; Enver, “Çekirge Fekeye nasıl geldi,” Yeni Adana 1 May 1930; Teyfik, “Çekirge [Locusts],” Yeni Adana 27 May 1930; “Kadirlide mücadele [The Fight in Kadirli],” Yeni Adana 27 May 1930; “Osmaniye de bütün köpekler zehirlendi [In Osmaniye, all the dogs have been poisoned],” Türksözü 4 September 1936; “Tarsus haberleri [News from Tarsus],” Yeni Adana 27 March 1937.

79 “Adana büyük bir felâkete uğradı [Adana has suffered a great catastrophe],” Türk Sözü 6 December 1936.

80 Mentioned in Chapter 6.

81 “Sular çekildi, felâkentin büyükülüü heran biraz daha meydana çıkıyor [The waters have subsided, the magnitude of the disaster is emerging a little more every moment],” Türk Sözü 8 December 1936.
There had been numerous floods in the past years, though none of the same magnitude as the flood of 1936. For the press in Adana, which had warned of the dangers of the frequently flooding rivers in the past, the 1936 flood was a moment of trepidation but also vindication. Ahmet Remzi Yüreğir, the editor of *Yeni Adana*, had published multiple articles on the “harms (zararlar)” of rivers, saying that “while in other countries, a great benefit is obtained from rivers, our rivers merely bring great damages.” Not to be outdone, *Türksözü* scolded past naysayers with the headline “What will those who disclaimed us saying ‘there is no danger from the Seyhan’ say now?” Many articles followed in the weeks after the flood. One author likened the flood to the French occupation of Cilicia, saying “a comprehensive plan is necessary for Adana’s second liberation.” Another labeled the flood just the latest assault by nature (*tabiatın bu yeni tecavüzü*). The national press in Turkey had a similar reaction. Writing in *Ankara*, Kâmuran Bozkır declared that “Adana has suffered an attack of nature (*tabiat hücumu*)”. Ahmet Emin Yalman, the writer whose English-language history of the Ottoman experience of the First World War has so singularly influenced the historiography (see Chapter 8), expressed a similar
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82 For examples of the impacts of and responses to significant flooding in Çukurova during the early republican period from the archives, see BCA, 30-10-0-0 6/36/2, Zamir to TBMM (14 April 1924); 30-10-0-0 117/818/22, no. 2; 30-18-1-1 8/43/11; 30-10-0-0 117/818/38, no. 2 (15 December 1930); 30-10-0-0 117/821/17, no. 2, Baysal to Dahiliye (3 March 1935). In newspapers, see "Seyhan Yine Taştı: Karşıyaka’nın bir çok yerleri sular altında kaldı," *Yeni Adana* 5 February 1929; "Amik Ovası sular altında kaldı [The Amik Plain is Underwater]," *Yeni Adana* 27 January 1935; "Seyhan setleri yıktı. Ekili tarlalar su altında kaldı. Zarar büyük [The Seyhan broke the dams. Planted fields are underwater. The damage is very great]," *Yeni Adana* 18 February 1935; "Seyhan, Ceyhan ırmakları dört metreye kadar yükseldiler [The Seyhan and Ceyhan rivers have risen up to four meters]," *Yeni Adana* 5 March 1935; "Seyhan ırmağı taştı [The Seyhan River Overflowed]," *Yeni Adana* 2 November 1935; "Seyhan Ceyhanla ovada birleşti [The Seyhan and Ceyhan merged in the plain]," *Yeni Adana* 3 April 1935.

83 Ahmet Rezmi Yüreğir, "Irmakların zararları [The Harms of Rivers]," *Yeni Adana* 5 April 1935. See also Ahmet Remzi Yüreğir, "Fayda yerine zarar [Harm Instead of Benefit]," *Yeni Adana* 5 November 1935.

84 "Uğradığımız son felâketin vukuu ihtimalini on ay önce gazetemiz haber verdiği zaman ‘Seyhandan bir tehlike gelmez’ diye bizi tezkir edenler şimdi ne diyecek?," *Türksözü* 13 December 1936.


86 Nevzat Güven, "Felâketler karşısında Çukurovalı [The Çukurovan Faced With Disasters]," *Türksözü* 15 December 1936.

87 Kâmuran Bozkır, "Bayram yapmadım [I Did Not Celebrate the Bayram]," *Türksözü* 23 December 1936.
sentiment: “We have lost a decisive battle in our fight with nature (tablätel mücadelemizde bir meydan muharebesi kaybetmiş bulunuyoruz).”

The Turkish press almost unanimously called for a retaliatory response to this “assault of nature.” Falih Rıfkı Atay wrote in Ulus that the Seyhan River had killed people and destroyed their homes, and that “we will take revenge on it with dams and barrages and all the weapons of concrete and steel.” For these authors, fighting nature was part and parcel of civilization. Yalman wrote that “the most unambiguous measure of civilization (medeniyetin en sarih ölçüsü)” was success in the fight with nature. In similar fashion, Kâmuran Bozkır stated that “a civilized human is a human that can harness nature (medenî insan tabiata gem vurabilen insan demektir).” Nevzad Güven of Türksözü commented that “nature, in the hands of civilization, gradually takes on the friendliness of a domesticated animal.” A writer named Suat Kırış even published a poem in Yeni Adana warning the Seyhan River that it would soon be put in its place:

Don’t be wild, Seyhan! We will tie you down
We brand the hearts of those who breed injustice
We are they who emerged victorious from the independence struggle
Don’t leave your bed, know your limits

These commentators anticipated the comprehensive attempt to rein in the water of the Adana region that was emerging in part out of the Sitma Mücadelesi and other national programs likes it. In the wake of the flood, politicians and journalists called for large-scale irrigation strategies, better and bigger dams, and any measures that could tame the wild waters of Çukurova and make
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89 Ibid.
90 Ibid.
91 Bozkır, "Bayram yapmadım [I Did Not Celebrate the Bayram]," Türksözü 23 December 1936.
92 Nevzad Güven, "Nehrîlerimizin taranması ve etrafîndaki arazînin sulanması için 30 milyonluk bir proje hazırlanıdı," Türksözü 22 December 1936.
93 Suat Kırış, "Güzel Adanaya [For Beautiful Adana]," Yeni Adana 9 February 1937.
the region safe for the widespread cultivation that had sprung up over the course of less than a century.

The flood, which occurred in the midst of Turkey’s first five-year plan (see Chapter 11), stirred a growing excitement within the Adana press surrounding ambitious public works ventures that had not been widely discussed since the period of CUP rule on the eve of the First World War. In particular, the construction of a large irrigation network in Çukurova, which began in 1938, was touted with great optimism. The plan involved eventually raising the level of the Seyhan River above Adana to 30.25 m using a dam that could be used to regulate water flow and irrigate the surrounding areas. The irrigation works were set to provide water to a large swatch of agricultural space to the west of Adana. The construction of a 16 km irrigation canal required the expropriation of properties on the left (west) side of the Seyhan River. The highly involved construction was still ongoing with the outbreak of the Second World War in fall of 1939. With the canals complete work for the mechanical regulator of the barrage, the construction of which had been contracted to a German company for 2.4 million lira, began in October of 1939. The project was set to be completed during the 1941 fiscal year. The barrage was completed in June 1942.

The Seyhan Barrage was not the first and would not be the last of its kind. It was the latest iteration at attempts to control the waters of the Seyhan River that stretched back into the Ottoman past (see Part 2 Introduction). In this case, the Çukurova region would have to wait to reap the economic benefits of expanded irrigation for a few more years. Economic growth in
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95 “Seyhan sulama işleri ne safsada? [At What Stage are the Seyhan Irrigation Works?],” Yeni Adana 12 January 1939.
96 “Sulama işleri faaliyet [Irrigation Works Activities],” Yeni Adana 16 January 1939.
97 “Seyhan Sülama [Seyhan Irrigation],” Yeni Adana 2 October 1939.
Turkey faltered during the Second World War due to disruption of global markets. In fact, throughout many parts of Anatolia, the war period brought severe scarcity, despite Turkey’s remaining neutral for most of the conflict (more in Chapter 14). As a result, the full impacts of the technocratic transformations devised during the late 1930s cannot be evaluated. Turkey emerged from the war period into a world with a much different technological and financial context, and much of the large-scale transformation that had been talked of during the 1930s was realized in the 1950s. However, the cultural shift towards a new understanding of technocratic ecology, and the emergence of a notion of a divide between a human society and a variously hostile or docile “nature” was well under way (more in Chapter 14).

Yet when it came to issues like floods or malaria, these bold threats against nature remained mostly threats. In fact, if the early Republican period revealed anything, it was that attempts to fight “nature” in part or in whole could prove surprisingly futile. The reaction to the Seyhan flood revealed an important tension within the war on the nature discourse. The would-be nature that the Turkish journalists mentioned above declared was on was largely a product of human ecology. As some authors were quick to note, the devastation caused by the flood was to a large extent the result of the dams on the Seyhan River bursting open, possibly due to inadequate construction. Meanwhile, the massive annual damage to agriculture in the Ceyhan and Yüreğir regions, where the Seyhan and Ceyhan were known to meet during years of significant flooding, was a natural consequence of the establishment of new agricultural settlements in regions that were once swamp. Similarly, while ignorant peasants and nefarious mosquitoes were often blamed for the prevalence of malaria, commercial activity and settlement also were important factors that explained why malaria did not disappear but in fact made a resurgence in the years leading up to the Second World War.
Early Republican malaria control efforts were a major affair. The Turkish government spent a tremendous amount of energy and resources on various anti-malarial projects during the interwar period. The budget of the malaria control centers throughout Turkey rose considerably; the overall increase in allocations had risen from 576,000 TL in 1925 to 808,000 TL in 1936.\(^9\) Between 1925 and 1937, over 18 million medical examinations were conducted. More than 62,000 kg of quinine were distributed throughout the country.\(^{100}\) From August 1935 to July 1936, over 1700 kg were dispensed in the province of Adana alone.\(^{101}\) About 1100 km of drainage canals — more than the distance between Istanbul and Adana — were opened throughout Turkey in a decade between 1927 and 1937. In that same time frame, 300 km\(^2\) of swamps and wetlands were drained.\(^{102}\) In the process, untold numbers of eucalyptus trees, mosquitofish, and Anatolian villagers were mobilized in the fight against the country’s most intractable disease.

There is no question that increased access to medical treatment bettered the lives of many and helped fuel the much sought out process of population growth in Anatolia during the early Republican period. However, statistics from the interwar period also reflected ambiguous results regarding the actual reduction of malaria rates throughout the country. In fact, they demonstrate a rise or resurgence of malaria over the course of the 1930s. While overall malaria rates for the year in Turkey dipped to around 15% during the last years of the 1920s, they rose a few points during the 1930s and 1936 and 1937 were above 20% (see Table 31). The graph below, which exhibits data from Adana during certain years of this period, reflects the annual fluctuations

\(^9\) The budget had reached a maximum of 885 in 1930 but then witnessed a significant decline, perhaps due to the 1929 financial crisis, followed by a gradual rebound. Tekeli and İlkin, "Türkiye'de Sıtma Mücadelesinin Tarihi," 255.

\(^{100}\) Aksu, Malarya (Sıtma), 28.

\(^{101}\) See Sıhhiye Mecmuası, Vol. 11, No. 76 – Vol. 12, No. 83.

\(^{102}\) Aksu, Malarya (Sıtma), 28.
behind the numbers. From July through October of most years, it was routine for more than 30% of individuals examined in Adana to exhibit the presence of a malaria infection in their spleen (see Figure 54). For the Adana region, available discussion from local newspapers confirms that this trend was not the result of statistical inconsistencies. Between 1935 and 1937, a number of articles referred to the perception that malaria was on the rise. In September 1935, Türksözü reported that malaria had spread to “every home,” and that in comparison with the few years prior, had become “more virulent (daha salgin).” Even at the yayla of Bürücek near Pozanti, many suffered from the disease. Malaria was worse in summer 1936. During July, 90% of the people who went to the doctors of Adana were found to have malaria. In the villages, malaria devastated local populations, proving especially lethal for children and preventing agricultural workers from carrying out their normal tasks. An article in Yeni Adana reported that one farmer had fled to the city of Adana, bringing sixteen of his own malaria-stricken workers in a single truck. The article noted that given the development of the malaria control apparatus in the Çukurova region, “it is a very strange thing for this disease to show this much fierceness.”

For the officials involved with malaria control in Çukurova, the resurgence of malaria must have been somewhat disconcerting. Yet there was no clear explanation for why Turkish antimalarial efforts during the interwar period, whatever their successes, did not decrease the overall rates of malaria among the civilian population. One of the most important factors must have been the continued rise in agricultural activity and in particular, the movements of seasonal

103 “Ceyhanda sıtma mücadeleşi çok işçenlik gösteriyor [In Ceyhan, the malaria fight is showing much vigor],” Türksözü 17 August 1935; "Adana ve köylerinin sihhi durumu pek normal görünüyor! [The health situation of Adana and its villages looks quite normal!]," Türksözü 2 September 1936; "Sıtma çoğalıyor [Malaria is Increasing],” Türksözü 20 July 1935.
104 “Mersin Halkı soruyor: Sıtma her evi sardı. Bataklıklar neden kurutulmadı? [The people of Mersin are asking: Malaria has spread over every home. Why weren’t the swamps desiccated?]," Türksözü 24 September 1935.
105 “Sıtma çoğalıyor [Malaria is Increasing],” Türksözü 20 July 1935.
106 “Her tarafta sıtma salgını var [There is a malaria epidemic everywhere],” Yeni Adana 7 July 1936; "Sıtma salgını devam ediyor [The Malaria Epidemic Continues],” Yeni Adana 23 July 1936.
laborers who were especially vulnerable to malaria infections. After all, the malaria epidemics of the late 1930s coincided precisely with a sharp increase in cultivation in part with due to the five-year plan implemented in 1934. The amount of cultivated area in Çukurova was significantly greater than what it had been in 1927 (see Chapter 11). This might have cleared swamps, but it put more people in contact with agricultural spaces.

As a writer named Tevfik opined in *Yeni Adana*, rampant malaria was natural among workers who spend the summer in the fields exposed to the elements and working in “80 degree” weather under the hot sun. The rise of rice cultivation in particular may provide one vivid example. In the lowlands near Marash, Osmaniye, Kozan, and İslahiye, cultivators during the early Republican period began to exploit the swampy and indeed malarial geography of the Çukurova plain by developing lucrative rice plantations throughout the countryside. Between 1932 and 1935, the number of hectares planted with rice in Çukurova more than tripled. During the late 1930s, the press in Adana commented on the promising prospects of rice paddies in the region. In order to offset the impacts of rice cultivation, in 1936, a new regulation regarding rice paddies was passed that sought to ensure more proper drainage and the maintenance of proper distance between rice cultivation areas and significant settlement areas. These laws also included certain regulations about the working conditions of rice laborers such as forbidding work before sunrise or after sunset.
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108 Tevfik, “Adananın sıhhî vaziyeti [Adana's Health Situation],” *Yeni Adana* 17 September 1929.
109 For example, rice plantation in Kadirli was said to have begun during the late 1920s. See Evered, “A Conquest of Rice: Agricultural Expansion, Impoverishment, and Malaria in Turkey.”
111 “Çeltiklerin vaziyeti çok memnuniyet verici [The situation of rice paddies is very satisfactory],” *Türksözü* 5 August 1937; “Maraş Çeltikçileri [The Rice Cultivators of Marash],” *Türksözü* 12 September 1935.
112 “Çeltik ziraatı için bir talimatname hazırlandı [A Regulation for Rice Cultivation has been prepared],” *Yeni Adana* 2 June 1936.
While these factors might have exacerbated the risk of malaria in the face of control efforts, occasional references from letters to the Adana press also offer clues about slippages in malaria policy. The government may have handed out large quantities of free quinine, but that does not mean it always reached everyone when necessary. An anonymous letter to *Yeni Adana* in August 1929 claimed that for all the antimalarial efforts in Adana, the people of remote villages — 80% of whom suffered from malaria — did not have access to quinine. They were too poor to afford the medicine and the local dispensaries in their regions reported that they had run out of supplies.\(^{114}\) The work of Taha Toros on villages in Adana during the mid-1930s confirmed that villagers had trouble accessing and purchasing medication.\(^{115}\) Medical care remained unevenly distributed throughout the Çukurova region, with those most in need often least likely to have access. Similarly *Yeni Mersin* newspaper reported in September 1935 that despite denizens of the city having gladly paid one lira each for drainage efforts that year, drainage work had never begun.\(^{116}\) Rising budget allocations did not guarantee that funds would be used in a productive manner.

The final set of factors that may have influenced the malaria epidemics of the mid-1930s in Adana were the environmental factors emphasized throughout this dissertation. 1935 and 1936 were exceptionally rainy years, and water — particularly the water left behind by frequently overflowing rivers — was always one of the main contributors to relative prevalence of malaria.\(^{117}\) After all, during his inspection in 1925, Ralph Collins had commented upon the low rates of malaria due to an originally dry season that yielded a remarkable scarcity of

\(^{114}\) “Sitma tahribatı [Malaria's Devastation],” *Yeni Adana* 1 August 1929.

\(^{115}\) Toros, *Çukurova ve Töroslarda Köy İktisadiyatı [Village Economies in Çukurova and the Taurus Mountains]*.

\(^{116}\) Mentioned in "Mersin Halkı soruyor: Sitma her evi sardı. Bataklıklar neden kurutulmadı? [The people of Mersin are asking: Malaria has spread over every home. Why weren't the swamps desiccated?]," *Türksözü* 24 September 1935.

\(^{117}\) “Sitma çoğalıyor [Malaria is Increasing],” *Türksözü* 20 July 1935; "Her tarafta sitma salgını var [There is a malaria epidemic everywhere],” *Yeni Adana* 7 July 1936.
Perhaps a letter to *Yeni Adana* from a resident of Ceyhan praising the antimalarial efforts of the local health ministry had best summarized the situation. The letter claimed that the situation in the Ceyhan region was much improved, and that malaria had been significantly reduced. But in acknowledgement of the still widespread impact of malaria in Çukurova, the writer asked rhetorically, “Is it feasible for there to be no malaria on a summer day? (yaz günü sıtma olmamak kabil mi)” \(^{119}\) In a region where the geography and climate were so fundamentally conducive to the proliferation of anophelines, malaria could be contained, but any hopes for total elimination of the disease were likely to be met with disappointment. In the case of the 1936 epidemic, the government response was to show renewed vigor with regard to the standard antimalarial activities such as examinations, dispensation of quinine, and drainage during the subsequent year. \(^{120}\) However, as an article in *Yeni Adana* had predicted during the summer of 1935, “more radical and more decisive measures” would be necessary to actually eliminate malaria as hoped. \(^{121}\) More radical solutions to malaria were indeed on the way, but only some years later. In fact, during the Second World War, Turkey experienced a severe resurgence of malaria (more in Chapter 14).

The efforts of early Republican health ministries and the Adana Malaria Institute were not without tangible impacts for villagers. They established networks of dispensaries and clinics that provided more access to medication that often meant the difference between surviving a malaria infection and not. These activities were critical to the overall policy of continued settlement, the expansion of agricultural production, and the increase of the rural population in

---

\(^{118}\) RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 77.

\(^{119}\) “Ceyhan Mektubu [Letter from Ceyhan],” *Yeni Adana* 10 September 1929.

\(^{120}\) “Bölümizde Sıtma Mücadelesi Teşkilâtı Büyük hazırlıklara başladı [The Malaria Struggle Organization has begun major preparations in our region],” *Yeni Adana* 24 March 1937; “Sitma hastalıklarına karşı yapılan savaş [The War Being Waged Against Malarial Diseases],” *Yeni Adana* 7 April 1937; "Sıhhat Vekâleti: Salgın hastalıklara savaşa hız verildi [From the Health Ministry: the war with epidemic diseases has been accelerated],” *Yeni Adana* 21 May 1937.

\(^{121}\) "Sıtma çoğalıyor [Malaria is Increasing],” *Türksözü* 20 July 1935.
the Çukurova plain. But so long as malaria remained an integral part of the summertime experience in the Adana region, the original summer refuge, the yayla, would endure as a space of immense importance. In fact, despite major transformations in the socioeconomic life of the region and the twilight of nomadic pastoralism, the summer pasture would take on a new importance in early Republican Çukurova as the transhumant lifestyle of subsistence farmers and pastoralists gave way to a new form of transhumance in the form of the bourgeois summer vacation.
Table 31 Malaria surveillance in Turkey, 1926-1937 (Source: Lutfi Aksu, *Malaria* (1943), pg. 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of examinations</th>
<th>% enlarged spleen</th>
<th>Kg. of quinine dispensed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>488079</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>2497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>704615</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>769970</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>2847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1100719</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1438044</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>4535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1666915</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>6447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1677908</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>5754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1758767</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>4832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1934990</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>5356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2036945</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>6217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>2167999</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>8061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2440446</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>8483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 54 Estimates of annual fluctuation of malaria rates in Adana based on examinations by health personnel (Source: *Sıhhiye Mecmuası*, Vol. 4 No. 21 through Vol. 12 No. 83)122

---

122 This data is compiled from frequent monthly reports of the *Sitma Mücadelesi* published in *Sıhhiye Mecmuası* during the 1920s and 1930s. Unfortunately, I could not locate enough contiguous data for all of the years in
CHAPTER 12 APPENDIX

Lilo Linke’s account regarding malaria in Çukurova

Lilo Linke was a German reporter residing in London as an exile during the 1930s. In 1937, she published an account of travel in Turkey entitled Allah Dethroned that offered coverage of some of the changes taking place in Anatolia at the time. She spent a considerable portion of her journey in Adana, and wrote the following section on malaria in the region, excerpts of which I have reproduced below. Linke’s account gives some color to the encounter between the Turkish medical establishment and people in the countryside and offers a sense of how early Republican doctors understood their efforts and how they were viewed by outsiders.123

Looking back, I feel a little astonished about it. Large parts of Turkey through which I travelled, were infested with malaria, trachome, and venereal diseases. I could never be unaware of their existence because in all hospitals and government konak hung a beautiful map on which coloured hatchings marked the “special area” where the high percentage of the population affected had caused the Government to carry out an organized fight.

I had always wanted to learn more about these campaigns which belong to the most meritorious enterprises of the Republic, but so far I had had little occasion. Now I had the good fortune of meeting Dr. Fehmi, the president of the Adana anti-malaria service. He had the second largest malaria area under his direct control and the Government underlined the importance of his position by granting him the use of a motorcar, a very exceptional favour.

I joined Dr. Fehmi at the central office, an old wooden house whose inside was scrubbed to the very bones. I had to wait for him because he was just sending off his fortnightly report to the Ministry of Health. A young woman in a white overall, a muslin kerchief laid loosely around her face, brought me the cup of Turkish coffee. She watched me sipping it, her arms crossed over her chest, a timid smile hovering over her face. To entertain me she led me to the projecting window, the typical feature of all old houses, often completely covered by tendrils of vine and wisteria.

“Seyhan!”, she said pointing down to the river which flowed lazily past. No boat stirred the unrippled surface. At first rushing through the wild Taurus Mountains, the Seyhan gets so laden with yellow earth that it grows shallow in the plain and finally loses its way in the wide marshes which obstruct its entrance into the sea. In spring it floods the surrounding country like its brother Ceyhan. Thus they become the chief sources of the region’s fertility and its great scourge — malaria.

question, but these charts are based on the examination of data available for over 50 different months throughout the 1928-1936 period.
123 Linke, Allah Dethroned: a journey through modern Turkey, 242-57. For more, see Zürcher, The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk’s Turkey, 259-70.
“Formerly dozens of people dropped dead in the streets, whole villages were depopulated by malaria,” Dr. Fehmi said, with an unfriendly glance at the river. “And now?” I asked settling down in the car beside him. “In the town itself we have almost no malaria at all.” — “And in the country?” — “Wait and see,” he shouted back, trying to overcome the rattling of the engine and hooting wildly to disperse the crowd around us.

...  

It was a great relief to reach Gokceli, a rich village south of Adana, imbedded in so dense a mass of trees that they almost formed a little wood. There were planes and oaks, and some decorative date-palms and agaves, but also the overwhelming variety of Mediterranean fruit-trees, bearing olives, mulberries, oranges and lemons, medlars, almonds, and many others which I did not know.

The houses, two stories high, looked smooth and prosperous though they were made of the same material which elsewhere had given huts the appearance of dire poverty — a mixture of mud and straw. Here it had a colour warm and rich like fertile earth and breathed an air of rural dignity. Mud was also used to make the high walls built as a protection against the sun around the little gardens, and through the open gates, in passing, I could see bushes crowded with red and white and yellow and pink roses, creeping up the walls, hanging down from pergolas, cramming the flower-beds and leaving only little room for jasmine bushes, pomegranate and acacia-trees. In some way, I felt, this was the setting for one of those Persian songs in which nightingales and roses are the incarnations of love and tenderness.

It was just in front of a garden like this that Dr. Fehmi stopped the car. “There we are — that's where the examination is taking place.” From behind the wall the murmur of many voices and the whining of a child could be heard. An elderly man came rushing out to greet the doctor who introduced him to me as the muhtar. Reverently he complimented us towards the house. About thirty to forty children were waiting for their turn and that of their friends, some leaning against the wall, some sitting on the wooden staircase leading to the verandah around the second floor, others squatting in a corner of the verandah itself, and a few — the smallest — clinging to the back of their mothers and elder sisters who supported them on their crossed arms.

Stepping over a heap of sandals and down-trodden shoes which the children had taken off and left in a wild jumble at the bottom of the stairs — it is impolite to enter a house in dusty footgear — we pushed up the steps to the verandah where the “consulting-room” had been set up.

“Dr. Hamit, chief of our sector three, Faruk Bey, his assistant — and Muharrem Bey, the teacher of Gokceli,” said the doctor, pointing to one after the other of the three men who bowed politely, once towards me and once towards the doctor himself. He was obviously a most venerated person because the mothers and elder children moved timidly towards him and tried to kiss his hand.
“They think me now a demi-god,” laughed the doctor, “and ten years ago, when we started the campaign, they wanted to stone me.” – “Stone you?” – He smiled a little contemptuously: “Well, up to then only the recruiting-officer and the tax-collector had been sent to them by the Government, and they wondered what I wanted to get out of them. When they found out, they were annoyed just the same. Was I not interfering with Almighty Allah who can strike a man with any disease he chooses?”

“And how did you persuade them?” — “Oh, I talked with them in their own language. I asked them what they did when a dog attacked them, and when they answered: ‘We throw stones at it and run for a stick,’ I said: ‘Well, and what is malaria but a million mad dogs raging in your blood, and what is quinine but a stick to beat them?’ — And when they hesitated, I said: ‘Can't Allah make animals of any size he pleases? Or are you so blasphemous as to doubt because your stupid eyes can't see them?’ And that was the argument that finally convinced them.”

In the beginning they had to be fetched by the gendarmes to attend the mass examinations. Many of them had even to be fined or put into prison to make them submit to the rules. Now they came voluntarily and were most indignant if the doctor did not think it necessary to give them a free supply of quinine.

The quinine was administered in three different kinds of tablets, distinguished by different colours, for persons over ten, younger children, and babies, and all the tablets were made in special laboratories of the Ministry of Hygiene.

It was the muhtar's duty to hand out the fortnightly rations and to keep account of them in a special register, corresponding to the one of the health agent or doctor's assistant. I could see how seriously the muhtar took his obligation. No sooner had he ceased bowing, than he slipped back on his chair and bent over the table covered with card-indexes, documents, large bottles full of tablets, glass-slides for the blood-tests, and medical instruments. He picked up the pen with such eager expectation as if he were waiting for the signal to start a race.

Most of the children were well-trained through previous experiences. Twice a year, in April and November, every living soul in the malaria-area had to turn up at the mass examinations. The more important one was in spring when most of the blood-tests were taken. But since this was one of the worst regions where about a fifth of the population was actually affected by the disease, the doctor used the height of the slack time, the month of July, for another general look round.

I had thought it quite easy to recognize a malaria patient by sight, but I found it now impossible to distinguish clearly between the healthy and the sick. Even Dr. Hamit needed more than a mere look for his diagnosis. In most of the cases it was sufficient to press the belly of the child in order to detect any enlargements of the spleen, and he could quickly dismiss the child with a slight slap on its bottom. But a few of the children, to the extreme envy of their friends, had to give a drop of their blood. It was then put on a glass
slide to be sent away to the Adana laboratory. These children who had thus suffered were clearly the heroes of the day.

When Fatma, a slender girl of about nine, lay down on the bench, she had apparently made up her mind to be one of them. After the doctor's slap she refused to move.

“Tamam, Fatma, tatnam — finished,” said Dr. Hamit a little impatiently, already waiting for the next child. Fatma began to sob:

“Doctor bey, efendim, please — why don't you prick my finger?”

“There's nothing wrong with you!”

“Oh, yes — I am very ill!”

The teacher came forward to drag her away, but she screamed so loud that Dr. Fehmi intervened: “I think Fatma should have her blood tested.”

She looked at him as grateful and delighted as if he had given her happiness for the rest of her life. When Faruk Bey took a drop of her blood, she kept so quiet and the children watched her in such admiring silence that in that moment of tension nothing but the loud baa of a sheep from the stable downstairs could be heard. After she had made sure that she got a glass-slide all to herself, she shot off to inform her mother of the honour she had received, not bothering about the further formalities and quite oblivious of the desperate crying of her younger sister whom she had left behind.

This two-year old plump baby possessed nothing of Fatma's Spartan spirit and changed her protest to an infuriated yelling as Dr. Hamit lifted her up to examine her. Unperturbed he went on with his work, and then began to whisper to Dr. Fehmi who had watched the scene with growing interest. The child was very ill and had a high temperature. Her wild cries almost burst her head. Dr. Fehmi himself gave her an injection whilst Dr. Hamit held the kicking body down, and then Muharrem Bey, the teacher, took her up in his young arms, full of motherly tenderness — he was not married himself — and promised to take her home until the doctor himself would take her in the evening to the nearest dispensary.

“Are these women capable of nursing even the less severe cases?” I asked Dr. Fehmi doubtfully, looking at the mothers on the verandah. Some of them had sharp Mongolian features, others the dark brown skin and fat nose of the Arabs, and one the flat round face with the large eyes of the Near Eastern women — this corner of Turkey has had from old a racially extremely mixed population. Some of the women and many I saw later in the village were wearing men's clothes — a cotton shirt tucked into the waist-band of baggy black trousers. None of them had ever moved far from Gokceli.

But it seemed that I had underrated them. The doctor, in his moderate way of speaking, explained that he was quite satisfied. Many of them were able to read and write and to
follow the instructions which in simple language were printed on special cards handed to each person under treatment. The health-agents visited each village about once a week, going round from house to house, the doctor came frequently, the muhtar and the teacher were both very capable men and doing their level best to supervise and educate the village.

On the teacher, Muhtarrem Bey, fell a good deal of the burden because he was chiefly responsible for the preventive treatment of the children to whom he had regularly to distribute the quinine tablets.

“We started off by giving those between three and ten years of age quinine tannate made up in chocolate tablets, but we had to abandon the system because they didn't keep in the hot climate, and also because the little rascals grew too fond of them. Now they are getting their quinine in sugar-plums.”

The examination went on without further incident. When the last of the children had slunk down the stairs, Dr. Hamit sighed with relief and turned to us with a tired smile.

…

One after another the villagers climbed up the stairs, respectfully holding their shoes in their hands. At first I was unable to see why some turned to Dr. Hamit and others passed on to the chair in which Dr. Fehmi had settled down. But soon I found out that these peasants had quite definite ideas about the two men's competence. Dr. Hamit was the country-doctor, a respected person sent by the Government to attend to the ailments of their bodies. Dr. Fehmi was much more. He was the medicine-man whose influence extended far beyond easily definable limits into the mystic spheres of the soul and governmental power itself.

It was to him that in sparse words they explained their domestic troubles, hoping for an oracle. But his advice and intervention was also sought in matters of communal importance. There were still certain stagnant ponds left from the great flood of 1932, dangerous breeding-places of mosquitoes. Could the doctor send them the benzine motor-pump from Adana so that they could discharge the water on to the dusty road? And they needed some more implements, too, for the digging of the canals. Did he think the Government would let them have those free of charge?

And what about the bridge which was planned over the Seyhan? And the construction of the dykes by the Ministry of Public Works? Were there any signs of the work being started soon? And could the doctor get them one of those films which the Government had bought about malaria and trachome and some such things? The muhtar and the teacher had both seen entertaining films at Adana, but the rest of the people at Gokceli also wanted to marvel at modern progress and would rather watch mosquitoes on the screen than remain forever behind the times.
One of the women, belonging to the motherly type who overworries about everything, was anxious to know what Dr. Fehmi thought of the cotton factories at Adana because her daughter kept pestering her with entreaties to let her work there. Was the one owned by the state all right? Of course, it would be a terrible disgrace for the family, but what could you do with your children nowadays — they all disobeyed their parents. Yet she was sure if her daughter would have to earn her own living, she would come running home after a mere fortnight.
The local branch of the Halk Fırkası, the party that would become the Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP), which governed Turkey throughout the interwar period, issued a report on the administration, demographics, economy, and geography of the Cebel-i Bereket province in 1925, a full sixty years after Ahmed Cevdet Pasha filed his report on the region during the operations of the Reform Division (see Chapter 3). Gavurdağı maintained some of the characteristics that for Ahmed Cevdet gave it an inherently rebellious quality. There were still many nomads in the province that the Republican government hoped to gradually transition towards agricultural life.\(^1\) Tribal identities also endured, though the report indicated that the Kurdish populations around İslahiye had become “quite Turkified (oldukça Türkleşmiş)” over time.\(^2\) Despite numerous changes leading up to and during the war, the rebellious mountain landscape of Gavurdağı described by Cevdet in the 1860s would have still been recognizable in the 1920s.

Some of the questions at the center of Cevdet’s understanding of civilization came to the fore in a new context of the modernizing nation. The Cebel-i Bereket branch of the HF offered a provocative comment about the relationship between geography and the great strides in public health envisioned by the republican government. Referring to the yaylas of Cebel-i Bereket as “natural wonders (tabii bedia),” they suggested that the yayla must be treated as long-term resource of the province. Claiming with some exaggeration that summer climate in Çukurova

---

\(^{1}\) Cebel-i Bereket Vilayeti’ne ait coğrafi, iktisadi, ictimai, tarihi idari malumat ihtiva eder bir takaddüme, 18.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., 9-11.
reached extreme temperatures, they argued that the yayla could be developed as an aspect of public health policy. “If a portion of the special concern and attention that the government shows for health efforts in Çukurova would be dedicated and assigned to producing a modern life of transhumance (fenni bir yaylacılık hayati),” they proposed, “the fight against malaria and tuberculosis would begin to yield fruitful results in a more reduced time span.”3 Updating the old practice of transhumance — a longstanding response to malaria — using the methods and technologies of modern society might work wonders for public health.

The modernization that the report referred to entailed building a wide twenty kilometer road between Osmaniye and the yaylas of Amanus Mountains, something that in a short time could produce a veritable “revolution (inkilâb)” for the province.4 The proposal was intriguing; in order to improve the local health situation, transhumance — a practice fundamental to local understandings of health — would require modernization. In its divergence from the principal concerns of the doctors who oversaw public health in Turkey during the early Republican period (see Chapter 12), this simple suggestion made by local HF members reflects the vast variation in understandings of the process that would be described as “modernization.” While nomadic life was almost antithetical to modernity for some, for those already entrenched in Cilicia’s geographies of transhumance, modernity quite naturally meant using technology to improve upon local practices. Transhumance had been deemed incompatible with civilization by Ahmed Cevdet during the 1860s, but for the HF, it was to be enhanced by civilization.

---

3 Here I have translated fenni (meaning “scientific” or “technical”) as “modern” because this seems to be the implication of the suggestion. In a way not limited to the historical experience of Turkey, science and modernity were very much equated within early Republican discourse. On the subject of sciences during the late Ottoman period and emergent understandings of modernity, see M. Alper Yağcıkaya, Learned Patriots: debating science, state, and society in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2015).

4 Cebel-i Bereket Vilayeti’ne ait coğrafi, iktisadi, ictimai, tarihi idari malumatı ihtiva eder bir takaddüme, 21.
Subsequent decades would indeed bring transformation to the mountain plateaus of the Cilicia region, which became increasingly accessible by train, automobile, and bus. For those fortunate enough to afford it, the modern life of transhumance was attainable. Civilization was coming to the yayla in the form of small, leisurely resort towns ideal for weekend getaways. But ultimately, these transformations would have the overall impact of relegating the yayla to the margins of quotidian life in Cilicia. In 1961, the long-time Adana politician Damar Arıkoğlu offered an unusual description of the yayla and its place in the life of the region. “This flat land we call Çukurova becomes extremely hot during the summer months. Most of its inhabitants spend the summer months in the foothills of the Taurus Mountains, between forests of pine, beside cool springs at summer homes that they call ‘the yayla’ (YAYLÂ adını verdikleri sayfiyelerde).” To specifically define the yayla as a summer home would have seemed odd or at the very least redundant, as the yayla would not have been a particularly unfamiliar geographical feature or space for Turkish readers of the time.

In this regard, Arıkoğlu’s memoirs, written for posterity and an audience that he anticipated to be unfamiliar with the basic conditions of the Çukurova he knew, mystified the yayla, which he discussed as a feature of the past in juxtaposition with the promising natural beaches of the Cilicia region that might someday render it a “tourist paradise.” Yet in the same text, Arıkoğlu depicted the yayla as a space of intense personal nostalgia — a lieu de memoire — in a section concerning his “feelings (duygular)” about his country, which included a long self-authored poem about the luxuriant yayla of Bürücek near Pozantı. The yayla, which became a

---

5 Arıkoğlu, Hâtıralarım, 3.
6 Ibid., 4-7. He makes reference to the travel accounts of Mary Gough, an American woman who traveled in Cilicia and participated in archaeological activities there during the 1950s. Gough, Travel into Yesterday; Mary Gough, The plain and the rough places : an account of archaeological journeying through the plain and the rough places of the Roman Province of Cilicia in southern Turkey (London: Chatto & Windus, 1954).
7 Arıkoğlu, Hâtıralarım, 34.
modern space of leisure during Arıkoğlu’s lifetime, was becoming a natural artifact of the fond past by the 1960s.

This chapter focuses on the cultural history of environment in the Adana region during the early Republican period, placing the space of the yayla at the center of shifting understandings of geography, nature, and health. In doing so, I seek to connect the ways in which ecological changes in the Çukurova region were intertwined with discursive and conceptual transformations tied not just to nationalism but also a broad range of popular feelings about space, interpersonal relationships, and belonging. During the first decades of the Republican period, a number of interrelated processes reshaped the relationship between humans of Cilicia and their summer plateaus. From the late Ottoman period onward, the marginalization of transhumant pastoralism and the incremental settlement of tribal communities reduced the value of the yayla as an important economic space associated with the maintenance of livestock.

However, at the same time, improved transportation during the early republican period facilitated the ascendance of a new type of transhumance that involved the migration of middle class and elite families of Çukurova’s towns and cities to nearby mountain resort towns during the summer. This newfound appreciation of “nature” as an important component of the imagined national geography coincided with the romanticization of nature within public discourse. This romanticization extended not only to “natural spaces” such as the yayla but also to the increasingly marginal yet authentic residents of the yayla: the historical pastoralist communities of “Turkish” tribes in Anatolia. Yet the older use of the yayla for health purposes and warding off malaria in particular, while enduring on the level of imagined health benefits, was much diminished due to the changes in seasonal migration practices in the Çukurova region and the socioeconomic trends that gave rise to the modern life of transhumance.
Transformations of the Summer Pasture

The political ecology of transhumance (see Chapter 1), which posed a barrier to Ottoman administrative reforms, was eroded by the socioeconomic changes in Çukurova during the last decades of Ottoman rule. After breaking the local power of the derebeys, the Ottoman government tried to encourage pastoralist communities to settle in permanent villages throughout the late Ottoman period, though after the 1870s, the importance of seasonal migration at least for health purposes was acknowledged (see Chapter 4 and 6). The early republican government continued the policy of settlement in the Çukurova region, especially from the 1930s onward (see Chapter 12). Meanwhile, the war years and the expulsion of the large Armenian communities from the Taurus Mountains in particular decreased the centrality of mountain spaces in the quotidian life of the Çukurova region and greatly reduced the level of overall connection between the mountains and the plains. Finally, the emergence of new features in and around urban centers, from the annual grain, cotton, and sesame crops to the ascendant professional and commercial activities of Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin, created incentive for a wide variety of individuals whether wage laborers or well-to-do city folk to break the cycle of transhumance in order to pursue their livelihoods throughout the year.

Nonetheless, different forms of vertical transhumance were practiced by various communities in Cilicia for general health purposes and avoiding the discomfort of the summer climate in the Çukurova plain. The transhumant pastoralist communities that once dominated the Çukurova plain had become a relatively minor segment of the population, but even as the republican government attempted to urge them towards settled life, seasonal migration and a high degree of mobility continued to prevail among Çukurova’s communities least involved in agriculture. At the outset of the Republican period, transhumance was widely practiced among
the different tribal communities in the Çukurova region. In fact, wartime depopulation in the mountains may have led to an expanded availability of pasturage during the first decades of the Republican period. A study by Kemal Güngör in 1941 (more below) exhibited the transhumant geographies of ten pastoralist tribal communities (aşiret) that could be identified in the Çukurova region (see Figure 55). The majority of these groups wintered in the eastern portion of the plain, though there were also winter sites south of the railway near Tarsus and north of the railway near Mersin. All of these ten communities summered in the Taurus Mountains, with about half of their yaylas clustered west of the railway near Pozanti and the rest further to the northeast past Niğde and near the vicinity of the recently-depopulated village of Hadjin (Saimbeyli). Notably, only two of these ten communities, the Karahacılı and Bahşiş tribes, were mentioned in Langlois’s estimates of tribal populations in Cilicia during the 1850s (see Chapter 1). This disappearance is not so much evidence of the complete settlement or vanishing of entire pastoralist communities during the late Ottoman and early Republican periods but rather a strong indication that political and social change in the region likely caused significant regrouping or fragmentation among certain tribes, giving rise to new communities with new names. As a member of the Aydınlı tribe would explain to a reporter for Engizek newspaper, communal subdivisions and their shifting names were the consequence of peaceful fragmentation that occurred as groups split up to find new pasture (more below).

---

8 During the 1920s, a Balkan-born teacher named Ali Rıza Yalgin traveled with a number of these tribes in both the Taurus and Amanus Mountains. His travel notes were published many decades later. More below. Ali Rıza Yalgin and Sabahat Emir, Cenupta Türkmen Oymakları, vol. 1 (Ankara: Kültür ve Türizm Bakanlığı, 1977).
Figure 55 Summer (yellow) and Winter (blue) pastures of pastoralists in Çukurova region circa 1941 (Source: Kemal Güngör, Cenubi Anadolu Yürüklerinin etno-antropolojik tetkiki)
These pastoralist communities engaged in a consistent pattern of transhumance that divided the year into two halves: one revolving around summer and the yaylas in the mountains and another revolving around winter and the winter pastures in the plains. According to Ali Rıza Yalın, a teacher who traveled among the Turkmens of the Taurus Mountains throughout the 1920s, they conceptualized seasons in a manner somewhat distinct from the calendar used by most Turkish citizens. The word “yaz” roughly corresponded to the season of spring—not summer as in modern Turkish—and the period corresponding to the season of summer was referred to as yay. Quite naturally, this was the period that these communities spent at the yayla. According to a study by Turkish geographer Cemal Arif Alagöz from the 1930s, most pastoralists would begin their migration to the yayla before Hıdırellez, a feast day that falls on May 5/6 and marks the beginning of the warm season in many regions throughout the former Ottoman Empire. This yayla season would last more or less until October, when pastoralists returned to the plain to spend the winter.

The summer migrations were principally comprised of a significant change in elevation from relatively low regions (less than 500 m) to mountain regions as high as 2500 m during the peak of summer. However, these movements took place not in the form of one grand migration but rather multiple changes in elevation that brought pastoralists gradually up and then back down the mountains. Alagöz noted that especially for transhumant communities that practiced agriculture, multiple movements up and down the mountains might occur between May and November. Working many decades later in the 1970s, Daniel Bates found that the yörüks of the Taurus Mountains in his study migrated one to three times so that their animals could feed on wild mountain grass between May and September, but during the period of gradual descent from

11 Yalın and Emir, Cenupta Türkmen Oymakları, 51.
13 Ibid., 18.
2000 to 500 m during September and October they would stop 15 to 25 times to allow their animals to graze on post-harvest fields of grain and cotton or fallow areas. As such, the migrations of pastoralists were not dictated so much by weather but rather by the availability and depletion of pastures at different elevations and different points throughout the year. Particularly while in and around the Çukurova plain, the pastoralists in Bates’ study rented pasture from villagers and landlords in the regions through which they passed.¹⁴

Up until the late Ottoman period, the pastures used by Cilician pastoralists during the Ottoman period were more or less classified as “empty” lands, and so those communities may have been subject to pasturage or animal taxes but faced no great issue of land ownership before the coming of the Reform Division during the 1860s. However, the expansion of agriculture and the creation of an ascendant class of large landholders during the late Ottoman period fueled a creeping process of dispossession for always-opportunistic but increasingly powerless pastoralists. For example, during Ali Rıza’s travels in the yaylas of the Taurus Mountains in 1928, he spoke to members of the Bahşiş tribe, who had maintained approximately the same yayla since the late eighteenth century. They complained of difficulties in finding winter pasture. “The Bahşiş tribe has no land (toprak) or winter pasture (kişlak),” he remarked. “This tribe winters in rented locations (kiralık yerler) south of Adana during the winter. As they poured out their bitter sorrows, they began to discuss how they had until now remained without home or hearth (yurtsuz yuvasız), and how they wanted so much to settle.”¹⁵ A local official in Misis reported a similar phenomenon in the villages to Red Crescent inspector Muhittin Nuri during the 1920s. There, the villagers rented some of their property out to pastoralists coming down

¹⁵ Yalım and Emir, Cenupta Türkmen Oymakları, 221.
from the Taurus Mountains during the winter. The registration of land was a policy intended to create more landed agriculturalists and raise agricultural yields, but in effect, it created the opportunity for new landlords to generate revenue from unused land that was valuable to pastoralists. In this regard, the major factors influencing the settlement of migratory populations were not only government pressure or economic incentive but also the economic constraints that the sudden introduction of private property in the Çukurova region placed on landless pastoralists.

For urban and village populations that did not possess large flocks, transhumance was a perhaps no less visible aspect of quotidian life. These urban and village transhumants were identified as yaylaci, a “summerers” or “yayla-goers” that made long trips to the yayla at some point during the summer in order to enjoy a cooler climate and a change of air. The annual beginning of the yayla season for such people was more variable than that of their pastoralist counterparts by the 1930s. Whereas pastoralists timed their migrations with seasonal rhythms of precipitation and vegetation growth that allowed them to maintain their flocks at different altitudes, for most urbanites the primary factors were heat and humidity (more below). Working people, especially in Adana, had economic incentives to remain in the city even during summer. Meanwhile, the fact that schools were in session through end of May kept many families in the city a bit longer than they might have liked. But as temperatures began to peak, an exodus to the yayla and the orchards outside of the towns and in the foothills of the Taurus Mountains was inevitable. Temperatures could reach summertime levels as early as the beginning of May (see Figure 56), but generally speaking, the migrations would begin at some point during mid to late June and continue over the subsequent months. For example, in early July 1937, Türksözü reported that 25% of Adana’s inhabitants had moved to the yayla for the summer and that on the weekends, the city was desolate. During August in particular, cities like Adana would be almost entirely on vacation. Activity would begin to pick up gradually by September, and with

16 TKA, 210/86.1, Rasim to Muhittin Nuri, Misis (13 May 1927).
17 “Yaz tatili Adana mektepleri için pek geç kalıyor [Summer break remains quite late for Adana schools],” Yeni Adana 27 May 1930.
18 “Havalardı yaylalar göcüyor [The Weather is Getting Hot, the Summerers Have Migrated],” Yeni Adana 23 June 1936; “Adana ateş yağmuru altında: sıcaklar günden güne artıyor [Adana is under a rain of fire: the heat is increasing day by day],” Yeni Adana 22 July 1929.
20 “Sıcaklar tahammül edilmişพวก bir dereceyi buldu [The Temperatures Have Reached an Unbearable Degree],” Yeni Adana 15 August 1929.
the first days of fall and the arrival of cool breezes from the north (*poyraz*), usually by the end of September, many inhabitants would begin to return, although *yayla* season normally lasted into October.\(^{21}\)

Rhythms of transhumance played a large enough role in the life of Çukurova during the summer that to a great extent, the absence of people in their towns and villages dictated the nature of administration in the Adana province.\(^{22}\) However, the socioeconomic transformation of Çukurova during the early republican period also reduced the duration of the *yayla* season for many. Just as pastoralists faced greater troubles finding winter pasture without establishing permanent presences in the villages of Çukurova, ordinary families or migrant laborers could not afford to suspend their economic activities in the cities or the plain for an entire summer. Thus, the overall centrality of seasonal migration as a way of life waned. In particular, the more reduced migrations would have had a much smaller prophylactic impact on malaria rates, which had a sweeping effect from May until the end of November, spiking during July and often again in early October (see Chapter 12).

**Bourgeois Transhumance: the Rise of the *Yaylacı***

While the summer-long transhumance of pastoralists and certain segments of the population allowed some inhabitants of the Çukurova region to avoid major risk of malaria infection during the warm months, a new and more punctuated form of transhumance was also emerging during the early Republican period. For a certain class of summerers, duration of

---

\(^{21}\) "Adanada havalar değişti, sıcaklar azalıyor [The Weather Has Changed in Adana, Heat is Decreasing]," *Yeni Adana* 5 September 1929; "Yayla ve bağlarından dönüş başladı [The Return from the Yaylas and Orchards has Begun]," *Yeni Adana* 24 September 1935; "Yayla ve bağlarından göç başladı [Migration from the yaylas and orchards has begun]," *Yeni Adana* 26 September 1936.

\(^{22}\) As mentioned in Chapter 12, the malaria control teams that conducted examinations throughout the regions waited for the *yayla* season to end to ensure that a large enough segment of the population would be present in the areas surveyed. Tok, "Adana mıntakasında Sitma mücadeleşi [The anti-malarial campaign in the Adana region]," 1291. Seyfettin Okan’s work on malaria control in Turkey indicates that the policies of conducting mass examinations after the *yayla* season were still in effect during the 1940s. Okan, *Türkiye'de Sitma Savaşı*, 6.
migration was not so much dictated by the weather but more so by the amount of time they could afford to migrate for a summer vacation. In fact, changes in transportation, notably the expansion of rail and motor transport allowed such individuals — particularly working men — to spend the work week in the plain and the weekend at the yayla. For them, the yayla was not a summer pasture but rather an airy resort where they could beat the heat and engage in a variety of leisure activities. The rise of this form of “bourgeois transhumance” was an expression of the changing socioeconomic climate of the increasingly commercialized and industrialized agrarian economy of early republican Çukurova.

The Çukurova region has a special summer climate that is hard to describe with numbers alone. The combination of intense sun, searing heat, and high humidity makes summer in Adana just about the stickiest in all of Turkey. In her 1930s travel account, Lilo Linke commented that “Adana boasts of an Egyptian climate, relieved by refreshing winds. But I suppose in summer the winds are on vacation.”23 Newspapers from the interwar period frequently described the heat as “hellish.”24 Their summertime descriptions of Adana paint the picture of a “baking” and “desolate” landscape with listless stragglers wandering about drenched in sweat.25 In the summer heat, denizens of Adana looked to anything that could offer a tiny respite such as a glass of lemonade or a stroll in the park by the river where shade might be found.26 One newspaper article indicated that it was common for some to spend much of the day cooling off in the

---

24 “Sıcaktan… [From the Heat],” Yeni Adana 3 August 1935.
25 “Adana ateş yağmuru altında: sıcaklar günden güne artıyor [Adana is under a rain of fire; the heat is increasing day by day],” Yeni Adana 22 July 1929; “Sıcaklar tahammül edilmiyecêk bir dereceyi buldu [The Temperatures Have Reached an Unbearable Degree],” Yeni Adana 15 August 1929; “Dün Adana buram buram ter döktü! [Adana Was Sweating Buckets Yesterday!],” Türksözü 29 July 1936; Akverdi, “Sıcaklar başa vurunca… [When the Heat Gets to You],” Türksözü 31 July 1936.
bathtub. Others looked to the casinos and places that served alcohol, which during summer were among the few crowded establishments in an otherwise deserted city. The demand for ice would sometimes drive the price up to unconscionable levels. In the warm months, many looked to swim or bathe in the river, which explains why newspapers of the region reported more incidents of drowning every year. The city was most active in summer during the evening, when slightly cooler temperatures provided a space for open-air entertainment at cafes or the special summer cinema (yazlık sinema) in the center of Adana. Even then, nighttime temperatures would remain so high that it was difficult for locals to sleep, attacked not only by heat and humidity but also swarms of mosquitoes and bedbugs (tahtakurusu) that did their best work on summer nights.

Descriptions of other cities were scarcely better. Locals in Tarsus felt that their city was virtually uninhabitable during the summer. One of the bleakest descriptions of Tarsus came from Toros newspaper in Mersin. In addition to unbearable heat, summertime filth in the city was a major nuisance. The author remarked that animal manure on even the main streets of the town would be “dispersed by the tires of passing trucks and then the trucks and cars lift it into the air, causing us to swallow our fill.” With relatively few ways to beat the heat and all that came with it, the cities of Çukurova were anything but the place to be during the summer.

---

27 "Sıcaktan… [From the Heat]," *Yeni Adana* 3 August 1935; Akverdi, "Sıcaklar başa vurunca… [When the Heat Gets to You]," *Türksözü* 31 July 1936.
29 "Buz Mersinde bir kuruş iken Adanada neden on kuruş? [Why is ice ten kuruş in Adana while it is one kuruş in Mersin?]," *Yeni Adana* 8 June 1930; "Şehrimizde şiddetli sıcaklar [Extreme Heat in Our City]," *Türksözü* 18 July 1936.
31 "Yazlık Sinemeda: Bu akşam (Neş'e ile)," *Yeni Adana* 7 June 1937.
32 "Adana akşamları [Adana Evenings]," *Yeni Adana* 6 August 1931.
34 "Tarsusta Yaz ve Belediye [Summer and the Municipality in Tarsus]," *Toros* 15 August 1948.
By 1935, Adana had about twice the population it had possessed some seventy years prior, when the rise of cotton first caused the city to swell. With nearly 80,000 permanent residents and a fluctuating itinerant population in the tens of thousands, it was one of Turkey’s largest cities, surpassed by only by Istanbul and Izmir and still rivaling the growing capital of Ankara. The urban population, which was comprised of merchants, businessmen, civil servants, lawyers, teachers, and doctors on one hand and farmhands and factory workers on the other, was the primary beneficiary of the rise in commercial agriculture in the region. Yet material wealth often came at the price of comfort; most professionals and civil servants were obliged to spend the summer in the sweltering city, and agricultural laborers made their wage under the hot Çukurova sun.

---

35 RAC, 805 Turkey, Box 1 1.1 Projects, Folder 1, Ralph Collins, “Public Health in Turkey” (1926), pg. 163. According to the official statistics of the 1927 census, the population of Adana was 72,652. Türkiye Nüfusu [The Population of Turkey], 17. After Istanbul, Izmir, Ankara, and Adana, the next largest city in Turkey was Bursa with 61,451 inhabitants. By 1935, the population of Adana was around 76,500. Çukurova Bölgesi: bölgesel gelisme, şehirlesme ve yerlesme düzeni, 56.
The 1930s brought an especially uncomfortable decade to the city of Adana. Beginning in 1931, local newspapers reported levels of heat that older residents could not remember. Mosquitoes thrived during the 1930s, finding their way even to the normally comfortable orchards outside of the town. Although quinine prevented a large number of deaths from malaria, the disease reached epidemic rates in many summers (see Chapter 12). But during this same period, local inhabitants of Adana found new ways of beating the heat. In fact, a novel iteration of the longstanding practice of transhumance emerged with the rise of yayla resort towns in the Taurus Mountains. The inhabitants of Adana, Taurus, Mersin, and their environs

---

37 “Bağlarda sivri sinek [Mosquitoes at the Orchards],” Yeni Adana 4 June 1936.
had long sought refuge from the summer heat in the mountains, but a change in infrastructure allowed this seasonal migration to take a new form.

By the 1920s, Adana was linked to Pozantı and the villages of the Taurus Mountains not only by railways but also by paved roads frequented by automobiles and buses. This drastically reduced travel times and increased access to the yayla. Seasonal migration was no longer a ritualistic journey but rather could be casually completed by city folk in a few hours. From the late 1920s onward, local newspapers in Çukurova published reviews and the latest news on developments in yaylas near Adana and Tarsus as well as around Osmaniye on the other side of the plain. 38 Of all the yaylas profiled, the village of Bürücek near Pozantı received the most attention. At the outset of the decade, Bürücek had been a small settlement of around 40-50 houses. By 1936, there were more than 400 houses along with various hotels.39 By 1939, the number of homes had risen to 600.40 Yeni Adana reported that it had become the choicest yayla in the Taurus Mountains. Bürücek’s rise was not solely due to its natural beauty and cool mountain air. It also happened to be located on a paved road through the Gülek Pass just 7 km from Pozantı, a town easily reachable by train.41 The trip between Bürücek and Pozantı was just 20 minutes.42 Daily minibus services between Pozantı and Bürücek were advertised in Yeni


39 "Bürücek Torosların en eyi yaylası oldu [Bürücek has become the best yayla in the Tauruses]," Yeni Adana 23 June 1936.

40 Yaylacı, "Bürücek yaylasında ilerleme ve hızlanma hamlesi [The Campaign of Progress and Development at Bürücek Yayla]," Yeni Adana 25 July 1939.

41 "Bürücek röportajları, Part 1," Yeni Adana 3 September 1937.

42 "Bürücek Torosların en eyi yaylası oldu [Bürücek has become the best yayla in the Tauruses]," Yeni Adana 23 June 1936.
Adana beginning in 1930. By 1936, there was a special train designated for bringing people from Adana directly to Bürücek on Saturdays during the summer, and similar service for return to Adana early Monday morning just in time to start the work week. Coverage in Yeni Adana stated that whereas “the yaylacıs of old once traveled three days and three nights by camel, the yaylacıs of today reach Bürücek in four or five hours.”

Even though it was a mountain village, Bürücek had all the amenities that a respectable Adana family might seek. One article claimed that Bürücek was the simultaneous product of nature (tabiat) and civilization (medeniyet). There was good security in the town, which had its own gendarmerie. Yeni Adana went so far as to call it “safer than Switzerland.” Due to its growth, Bürücek was made administratively separate from the nearby village of Şıhlı and attached directly to the province of Adana. The yayla even had its own governing council, which became occupied primarily by professionals from the city. Bürücek had a telephone connection, a rarity at the time. Alongside its natural beauty, one admirer noted that “Bürücek is benefitting from its very civilized means (çok medeni vasitaları).”

Bürücek may have been a secluded Taurus Mountain village, but the yearly influx of yaylacıs from Adana was atypical of such villages. It was a space defined by leisure. People went about town with hiking sticks and flip-flops. At Bürücek, cafes and casinos played music throughout the day and nights. One reporter noted that people listened to records of Tanburi Cemil as well as more up-tempo and racy or “drawstring (uçkur)” tunes like the zurna playing of Arap Mehmed or Diyarbakır style melodies. The yaylacıs gathered at these locations for games.

43 "Bürücek yaylacılara müjde [Good News for Bürücek Summerers],” Yeni Adana 4 June 1930.
44 "Yaylacılara büyük bir kolaylık [A Great Convenience for Yaylacıs],” Türksözü 3 July 1936.
45 "Bürücek röportajları, Part 1,” Yeni Adana 3 September 1937.
46 "Bürücek röportajları, Part 2,” Yeni Adana 4 September 1937.
47 "Bürücek Torosların en eyi yaylası oldu [Bürücek has become the best yayla in the Tauruses],” Yeni Adana 23 June 1936.
of poker, tombola, backgammon, and chess. At night, there was drinking and even live theater performances. Bürücek had no proper muezzin at its mosque, with the call to prayer being issued by amateur young men.\textsuperscript{48}

The local press in Adana marveled at the cultural transformation of Bürücek yayla in the span of a few years. Vacationers brought modern, fancy lanterns that were always lit and other personal effects of the city to the village. Whereas the prior male inhabitants used to appear in the conservative, religious garb (\textit{sarıkli, kavuklu}) of clerics, now there were businessmen, farmers, artisans, civil servants, teachers, writers, doctors, pharmacists, and industrialists.\textsuperscript{49} The yayla also became home to a new summer camp for students.\textsuperscript{50} Due to its ease of access, Bürücek was attracting not only residents of the Çukurova region but also well-to-do vacationers from all over Turkey, especially Ankara and Istanbul.\textsuperscript{51} “Even Americans and Jews” one article stated were coming to the newly-found summer paradise.\textsuperscript{52} In this regard, Bürücek also became a space of conspicuous consumption for elite and aspiring families. When the building craze began in the village, people competed to build higher and higher up on the yayla.\textsuperscript{53} Although many yaylacı from Adana owned homes at Bürücek, the many more who could not afford to do so could have a taste of the high life by renting a home or booking a room in hotels such as the “The Pine Palace.”\textsuperscript{54} In fact, for many professionals and civil servants that worked during the summer, Bürücek was a weekend destination. \textit{Yeni Adana} reported that the hotels were full on the weekend and empty during the week and that on Monday, most men — including the

\textsuperscript{50} “Bürücek mektupları [Letters from Bürücek],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 18 July 1939.
\textsuperscript{51} “Bürücek yaylacılarına müjde [Good News for Bürücek Summerers],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 4 June 1930.
\textsuperscript{52} “Bürücek röportajları, Part 1,” \textit{Yeni Adana} 3 September 1937.
\textsuperscript{53} “Bürücek röportajları, Part 2,” \textit{Yeni Adana} 4 September 1937.
\textsuperscript{54} “Kiralık yayla yurdu [Yayla home for rent],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 4 June 1935; “Kiralık yayla yurdu [Yayla home for rent],” \textit{Yeni Adana} 21 May 1937; “Satılık yayla yurdu,” \textit{Türksözü} 9 September 1936.
Governor of Adana — would return to the city for work, leaving behind only women and children in the village.\(^{55}\)

Bürücek was only one of many *yaylas* to thrive amidst a climate of “bourgeois transhumance” during the early republican period. The much older and larger yayla town of Namrun, which served as the premier getaway for residents of Tarsus in particular presented a similar appearance. Around the time of the French occupation, Namrun was a town of a few hundred houses.\(^{56}\) However, a 1929 article in *Yeni Adana* indicated that Namrun had become a town of over 2000 households.\(^{57}\) By 1948, Namrun had a summer population of more than 25,000, with 5,000 to 10,000 people from Adana making the trip at some point during the *yayla* season.\(^{58}\)

Changing infrastructure and lifestyles caused residents of Çukurova to view the local geography in a new light.\(^{59}\) For example, the area of Karaisalı was in the eyes of Dr. Muhittin Nuri, the Red Crescent inspector of the Çukurova region, an extremely poor town with more 150 abandoned houses as of 1927.\(^{60}\) But during the 1930s, *Yeni Adana* ran articles that spoke positively of the charming simplicity and natural beauty of Karaisalı, which had good access to *yaylas* and orchards was “one of Turkey’s towns where death is sparse, air is clean, and forest is plentiful.”\(^{61}\) An article about the potential virtues of Bor, a town just on the other side of the Taurus Mountains, as a yayla resort reflected the concerns of *yaylacısı* in Çukurova. Like Karaisalı, Bor was relatively poor, but it possessed much of the natural beauty of other Taurus

---

\(^{55}\) “Bürücek röportajları, Part 2,” *Yeni Adana* 4 September 1937.


\(^{57}\) “Tarsus haberleri [News from Tarsus],” *Yeni Adana* 10 September 1929.

\(^{58}\) Reşat Aki, "Sıcaktan kurtuluş [Liberation from the Heat],” *Toros* 19 August 1948.


\(^{60}\) TKA, 210/133, Muhittin Nuri to Riyaset-i Hilal-i Ahmer, Karaisalı (12 October 1927).

Mountain yaylas, was easy to access, and less crowded and less expensive than other locations such as Bürücek. Moreover, the social atmosphere in Bor would be relatively comfortable for proper city folks as there were many “intellectuals (münevverler)” in the town and a truly exceptional library. The yaylacis in Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin were primarily in search for a yayla that had all the nature of the village with the comforts of the city.

Local governments in Çukurova made efforts to show that they were striving to make the yayla experience as convenient and pleasant as possible for the people of Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin. Türksözü’s own yayla correspondent by the penname Yaylacı said that the special local government in Bürücek was expected to bring about a “civilized (medenî)” and “modern” living situation on the yayla. However, the sudden growth of places like Bürücek gave rise to some complications. In particular, Bürücek suffered from severe water issues. There was limited drinking water on the yayla, and the influx of families quickly began to contaminate the water supply to the point that it was unpotable. The local council in Bürücek, the meetings of which were sometimes attended by hundreds of people, worked to make sure that the water supply was protected as a collective resource. But at the same time, the problem of waste water in Bürücek may have contributed to the rise of a mosquito problem at the yayla. In fact, there were even reports of malaria in Bürücek during the late 1930s, as epidemics in Çukurova raged on.

63 “İlbayımız Bürücek yaylasının imarını için büyük alaka gösteriyor [Our governor has shown major commitment to building up Bürücek yayla],” Yeni Adana 4 August 1936.
65 “Bürücek röportajları, Part 1,” Yeni Adana 3 September 1937; “İlbayımız Bürücek yaylasının imarını için büyük alaka gösteriyor [Our governor has shown major commitment to building up Bürücek yayla],” Yeni Adana 4 August 1936.
67 “Valimizin himmetiyle Torosların pırlantısı [The Diamond of the Tauruses, Through the Efforts of Our Governor],” Yeni Adana 9 September 1938.
The issues of water and malaria illustrate some of the differences between the forms of local transhumance of the Ottoman period and the one that emerged during the early Republican period. Because many people came and went from places like Bürüşek throughout the summer, it was not so much a summer-long home as much as a temporary resort where people engaged in leisure activities but (aside from those who catered to the yaylacas from Adana) did not contribute to a pastoralist economy or carry out the typical duties associated with village life. Similarly, this form of transhumance did not offer the same protection from malaria, as most visitors to Bürüşek only spent part of the summer there. Residents of the Çukurova region continued to associate the yayla with health. In one article about the Namrun yayla, one authored declared that “I believe that on summer days those who come to Namrun even for one day will have added ten years to their lives.” Likewise, Türksözü’s profile of Bor as a potential space for yayla development mentioned the resurgence of malaria epidemics as the primary factor pushing those who could afford it into the mountains for as long as possible during the summer. However, for those who could not afford to spend the entire summer at the yayla, and especially for those who traveled back and forth between the mountains and the plain throughout the malarial season, the Taurus Mountain air might have offered a modicum of comfort but such a limited transhumance could only offer a small degree of prophylaxis to malaria.

These changes also transformed the yayla as a socioeconomic space as aspects of the new, middle class household were transported to the summer home. In village or pastoralist economies that relied on transhumant as part of their livelihoods, both men and women engaged in various forms of labor during the summer months at the yayla. While women engaged in household labor and men looked after animals at the pasture, all participated in agriculture.

71 “Yayla ihtiyacı karşısında,” Türksözü 2 August 1936.
“modern” yayla, which was transformed into a space of leisure, did not presumably involved much labor for men, who made their livings in the plain. For them, the yayla was a place of rest and relaxation, where they could socialized with other men who spent the summer in the small towns or villagers. But to a large extent, women were still tasked with many of the household duties that would follow the family wherever it moved throughout the year.\textsuperscript{72}

In this regard, another important point of difference regarding the modern form of transhumance and the rise of the yayla resorts pertained to class. Going to the yayla may have been easier, but economic conditions also made it pricier. Agricultural workers and their families were especially deprived of the cool mountain air during the summer, as they could not afford to rent a place at the yayla or for that matter leave their wage-paying jobs in order to take a summer vacation. A regular commentator in Yeni Adana by the penname of Açık Göz reminded his readers of how summer was especially hard on the working class of Adana, saying “Let’s think of those who plow fields, work haymakers, and thresh grain in the hellish daytime heat. These poor souls have neither a bathtub nor a shower. Never mind that, they are deprived of even the shade or cold water that would give the slightest bit of relief.”\textsuperscript{73}

As the economic and technological environment of Cilicia transformed, so too did the yayla and the nature of summertime experience. Linke noted upon her stay in Adana during the late 1930s that “Frau Bornemann suggested that I should sleep on the roof. Formerly it was not done. Only peasants and poor townspeople thus escaped the dense stuffiness of their bedrooms. Richer men removed their household with bag and baggage northward to little chalets in the Taurus mountains. But for many reasons — the invention of the refrigerator is perhaps not the

\textsuperscript{72} Special acknowledgement to Gabor Agoston for offering this insight.
\textsuperscript{73} "Sıcaktan… [From the Heat],”\textit{ Yeni Adana} 3 August 1935.
least important — the number of nomads dwindles from year to year. More people remain in the town, and the bed on the roof is no longer a signpost of poverty.”74

The emergence of bourgeois transhumance was part of a broader commodification of nature, which became intertwined with the romanticization of certain natural spaces that typified the natural beauty of the Anatolian geography such as the yayla. The yayla resorts in the Taurus Mountains were places where travelers could have a taste of nature’s beauty, become acquainted with the vaunted national landscape, and construct idealized imaginings of that landscape. In this regard, the yayla played an important role not only in the transformation of middle class lifestyles in the Çukurova region but also in defining geographical and indeed racial understandings of Turkishness. Even as the summer pasture transformed in its form and function and transhumant pastoralists were pushed to the margins of society in Çukurova, Turkish writers and social scientists looked with growing interest to the yayla and its inhabitants in search of authentic Anatolian experience.

74 Linke, Allah Dethroned: a journey through modern Turkey, 242.
Figure 57 "Yayla Home for Sale," Mrs. Zahide (Source: Yeni Adana, 9 September 1936)

Figure 58 Automobile in Taurus Mountains near Pozantı (Source: John Whiting and Eric Matson, circa 1935, from Library of Congress)
Peasants into Turkmens: the Yayla, Transhumance, and Turkishness

These transhumants (yaylacılar), who are very close to nature (tabiata çok yakını), do not use matches and light their cigarettes by igniting tinder.\textsuperscript{75}

Cemal Arif Alagöz, Turkish geographer, 1938

describing the pastoralists in the Taurus Mountains

A serialized story entitled “The Yayla Flower” written by Seyfettin Arkan, ran throughout the early spring of 1935 in \textit{Yeni Adana} newspaper. It centered on a summer flirtation at the \textit{yayla} between a young man named Sermed and a green-eyed girl named Leman, who tests her suitor’s devotion by faking a tuberculosis infection. After Sermed throws caution to the wind in the face of her putative illness, he wins her trust and they embark on an unforgettable summer of love with many strange episodes, including Leman’s successful defense of her reading the novel \textit{Nana} by Emile Zola after Sermed declares that it is “disgusting.” With the end of summer approaching, Leman gives Sermed a “yayla flower,” a yellow species of helichrysum that grows in the Anatolian highlands and preserves its appearance when dried. She tells him to keep it always as a sign of their love. By her request, they agree to meet at the \textit{yayla} during a subsequent year. But she never comes again, and Sermed’s \textit{yayla} becomes haunted with the memories of a lost love. “Through her absence, even nature had metamorphosed,” he recalled. When he finds that she has married and moved on with her life, Sermed runs to a tavern to drown his sorrows and discards the wilted flower, a symbol of the true “flower of the yayla”: his beloved Leman. But many years later, the couple is reunited by chance in Adana and Leman — now a widow and single-mother — looks to Sermed for assistance.\textsuperscript{76}

Arkan’s particular bourgeois sensibilities about courtship and the roles of men and women in relationships run throughout the serialized story of a brief summer romance that left a long emotional trail. Yet the \textit{yayla} in Sermed and Leman’s love story cannot be seen as a mere

\textsuperscript{75} Alagöz, \textit{Anadoluda Yaylâcılık [Transhumance in Anatolia]}, 22.

\textsuperscript{76} See Seyfettin Arkan, “Yayla Çiçeği [Yayla Flower],” in \textit{Yeni Adana} (March-May 1935).
generic setting for romantic encounters or an ephemeral space that initiates a narrative driven by the feelings of longing and separation. Rather, the plot in Arkan’s story is believable for the period and possibly based on a version of the author’s own experience, or at the very least on a common fantasy of the summering middle class. By the 1930s, bourgeois romance had invaded the yaylas of the Adana region.

Arkan was only one of very many authors for whom the mountainous Anatolia geography and the yayla in particular became a natural source of inspiration and emotion. For early Republican writers, the mountains embodied the coveted natural beauty of Anatolia that elicited feelings of love be they for another person or the nation. Pastoral romance was nothing new per se, but the intimate relationship between the adoration of nature and the territorialization of early Republican nationalism represented a relatively new development within Turkish literature. For example, the biweekly journal Çukurovada Memleket, which was the official periodical of the Directorate of Education in the Adana region, devoted a considerable amount of space to literary pieces that fixated on the beauty of mountain landscapes in Anatolia. A short work entitled “The Taurus (Toroslar)” that its author İsmail Habip referred to as a work of “fantasy prose (fantezi nesir)” was the first piece featured by Çukurovada Memleket in 1928 (see footnote). İsmail Habip described the geological processes that led to the formation of the alluvial delta plain of Çukurova in the Mediterranean Sea. His description represented a geographical

---

77 An excerpt: “Two seas, raging like the lavas of hell, the Inner Sea within Anatolia and the White Sea beneath Anatolia at the time, were attacking the Taurus from both sides. How many centuries the war lasted no one knows, but in the end the mountain was victorious and Anatolia was liberated. However, mountains are even more resentful than camels. The Taurus never forgot its two flowing enemies. The Inner Sea dried up completely. And the Great Sea beneath began to retreat step by step. For mountains are not only resentful but also very clever. The Taurus found a way to beat water with water. It set the three rivers that poured forth from its mighty bosom upon the White Sea. These three rivers, each like a platinum-backed snake, began to slitheringly avenge the Taurus against the sea. The two mortal and eternal enemies on the earth are the water and the land. The mountains, each like armed soldiers of the continents, were only of course able to conquer the seas, which are like magnificent encampments of the waters, with soil. The Taurus continuously loaded soil from its bosom onto its three children that slithered like platinum-backed snakes. Those three self-sacrificing children of the Taurus continuously poured these soils into the sea. O beautiful rivers, you not only avenged the Taurus against the sea; you helped this country gain a golden homeland called Çukurova!” İsmail Habip, "Toroslar," Çukurovada Memleket 15 March 1928, 5.
expression of the post-independence fervor among nationalists in Turkey, especially those in regions like Cilicia that were occupied after the war. He introduces the Çukurova plain — the cradle of early Republican prosperity in Adana — as a product of the mountains, which stand as towering symbols of defiance and independence.

The popular poetry that appeared both in Çukrovada Memleket and the various newspapers of the Çukurova region all pointed to admiration and even worship of Anatolia’s natural beauty. A poem by a native of Gülnar (near Mersin) entitled “Anadolu (Anatolia)” offered a deified portrayal of the national geography:

Violets in the mountains, the sap of forest trees
All who enter sink deep into its airs that are free (hür)
They call this homeland (yurt) paradise, it’s full of history

Its rivers are heroic fighters (gazi), every cascade a soldier
There is a sweetness in its air, the soul its wind does enter
It is a place to be worshipped (tapılacak bir yerdir): Anatolia is a temple

The notion that the geography of the nation would be held sacred or serve as an object of admiration reflected the ways in which romantic nationalist discourse and the broader realm of romantic literature intersected at natural spaces.

The yayla literature of Çukurova during the early Republican period exhibits how contact with geography and nature was seen as a means of establishing a spiritual connection with the nation. When publishing in Çukrovada Memleket or a local newspaper, aspiring poets usually included a date and location for the poem’s composition. These locations reveal that a disproportionate amount of poetry was being composed at yaylas given that most of the

---

78 Jérôme Cler notes the paradox of the symbolic importance of the yayla within the music of village transhumants in Western Anatolia today. Whereas these communities are today permanently settled in the plains, their songs that feature transcendent or eternal time are for the yayla, whereas the songs of the plains are characterized by the theme of exile. Jérôme Cler, Yayla : musique et musiciens de villages en Turquie méridionale (Paris: Geuthner, 2011), 139.
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contributors spent most of their time in Adana, Tarsus, or Mersin. For example, Taha Toros (then Taha Ay) published numerous poems about the mountains, the *yayla*, and the natural beauty of the Anatolia geography which in Bürücek and Gülek. One presented the *yayla* as respite for the weary farmer or home for the lonely orphan, a refuge of comfort in the mountains of Anatolia. But while serving as the primary geographical aesthetic of the authors in question, the *yayla* setting was for the most part an exceptional space. The mountains may have served as a spiritual home for these authors, but daily life took place in city. Reaching the yayla entailed a journey or an excursion into nature that offered the opportunity to become acquainted with an exalted natural environment. In addition to numerous poems, local authors in Çukurova composed short travel accounts in the newspapers of region that allowed space for reflection on the national geography.  

The literary phenomenon briefly described above entailed a somewhat novel reimagining of the mountains and their character. During the late Ottoman period, mountains were portrayed within the official state discourse as spaces of rebellion, disorder, local autonomy, and trouble that threatened the integrity of the Ottoman state and the successful implementation of Tanzimat-era policies (see Chapter 3). While the mountains maintained their defiant character within early Republican discourses, they came to represent not a threat to the state but rather the strength of the Turkish nation. For example, in publications like *Çukurovada Memleket*, the new compositions of local writers, some of whom were students, were often printed side by side with rediscovered excerpts of folk poetry by the most prominent *aşiks* of Ottoman Cilicia such as

---

Karacaoğlan and Dadaloğlu. In claiming ownership of Dadaloğlu’s words, early Republican writers also claimed ownership of defiant lyrics such as “the mountains are ours (dağlar bizimdir)” that had once been directed at state attempts at forced settlement. Just as these works of poetry served as a model to be mimicked by young writers of the nation, the editors of Çukurovada Memleket chose excerpts that spoke to nationalist geographies of the period and established the new nation as the standard-bearer of resistance to Ottoman rule. Running sections on poetry about mountains in the words of the folk poets followed by contemporary odes to different mountains in the region such as Bulgar Dağı and Binboğa served to establish continuity between the literary geographies of the Anatolian Turkish past and the national present.81

From the growing enthusiasm for the folk poetry of Anatolian pastoralists past to the distinctly modern desire to connect with authentic Anatolian nature, nationalist understandings of Turkey’s geography fostered a new interest in not only mountain spaces but also their inhabitants. One of the first early republican intellectuals in Adana to work extensively on the subject of tribes in the Çukurova region was Ali Rıza Yalgın mentioned above. Born in the Ottoman Balkans, Yalgın worked as an educator in the Adana region for a number of years beginning in the 1920s. During that time, he made many excursions to travel with Turkmen communities that summered in both the Taurus and Amanus Mountains. His accounts and findings were published in newspapers such as Türksözü and then subsequently in book form. In Yalgın’s writings, these tribal communities who migration in and out of the Çukurova region appeared as a repository for tradition. He was especially eager to record any new folk song or lament that he encountered when traveling with pastoralists in the mountains. However, he also

81 As symbols, the mountains and the yayla also carried connotations of authenticity. An illustration of this association can be found in the names of newspapers that emerged in the smaller towns of the Çukurova region. One major newspaper in Mersin was called Toros (founded 1948) after the Taurus Mountains; another in Tarsus Gülek (founded 1945) was named after the Gülek Pass through the Taurus Mountains. The main newspaper in Marash Engizek (founded 1947) bore the name of a yayla near Marash.
solicited evidence of the familiar folk poets of the national repertoire such Karacaoğlan and Dadaloğlu and variation on popular folk tales such as “Dede Korkut” and “Alageyik.” In other words, Yalgın searched not only for new raw material to incorporate into a national corpus but also traces of familiar literary material that attested to a shared past between different communities in Anatolia.\(^{82}\)

The members of Taurus Mountain tribes could be used as discursive constructs of various forms of ideal Turkishness. For example, a woman named Müfide Hasan commented in her short travel account published in *Yeni Adana* during a train ride through Pozantı upon her encounter with some Tahtacı women of the region. “The lumberjacks in the Taurus were strong, powerful women,” she remarked. Her account was published with a photograph of a women, not photographed by Hasan herself, but rather chosen as an exemplar of the rugged Turkish women of the Tahtacı tribes that lived on the forests of the Taurus Mountains (see Figure 59).\(^{83}\) Interestingly, the article was accompanied by a photograph possibly taken by Yalgın that appeared in his publications.\(^{84}\) The caption read “One of the Turkish women mentioned in the [travel] notes,” not necessarily implying that the photograph belonged to one of the women that Hasan encountered during her journey but rather using a picture of a rugged Taurus Mountain woman from an ethnographic research as an archetype for the *yörük* woman.

---

\(^{83}\) Müfide Hasan, "Seyahat notları [Travel Notes],” *Yeni Adana* 18 August 1929.
\(^{84}\) The caption in Yalgın’s account was “An elder woman, one of the most influential figures in the tribe (*oba*) on the yayla roads.” Unfortunately, I did not have access to Yalgın’s original account and cannot verify with certainty that his work is the origin of this photograph. However, his writings did appear in the newspapers of Çukurova sometimes. Yalgın and Emir, *Cenupta Türkmen Oymakları*, 299.
During the 1930s, pastoralist populations in Anatolia increasingly became the object of study for a variety of social scientists engaged in the academic study of Turkishness. One such example from the Taurus Mountains region is Turkish geographer Cemal Arif Alagöz’s field research during summer of 1937. His research included a 24-day excursion in the Taurus Mountains, accompanied by German geographer Herbert Louis and Niyazi Çıtakoğlu, both Ankara University colleagues, encamped with some shepherds at different yaylas of the region. For Alagöz and his team, the transhumant pastoralists in the Taurus Mountains were innately attuned to the Anatolian geography and nature in quotidian ways. “These transhumants (yaylacilar), who are very close to nature (tabiata çok yakın), do not use matches and light their
cigarettes by igniting tinder,” he marveled.\(^{85}\) The pastoralists of the Taurus Mountains lived in black tents made from the hair of their goats and produced their own cheese and yogurt while living on the yayla.\(^{86}\)

In April 1938, Alagöz, gave a presentation about “Transhumance in Anatolia (Anadoluda Yaylâcılık)” about his field research the previous summer to an audience at the Ankara Halkevi. The theme of his presentation was the extent to which transhumance and pastoralism were an integral part of the Anatolian geography. He began the talk by emphasizing that in comparison with European countries, in Turkey sheep and goats were much more common than cattle. Sheep were not only more numerous than cattle but also more highly valued; he noted that in Anatolia “they say ‘oh he’s a rich man, he has farms and so many thousand sheep.’ Whereas in France, wealth for the Savoy villager is cattle.”\(^{87}\) Nonetheless, Alagöz was keen to emphasize that transhumance was practiced in many parts of the world from Argentina to the Alps.\(^{88}\) For Alagöz, who was educated in France, Anatolian transhumance was a natural feature of Mediterranean geographies, which possessed what he referred to as a “transitional climate (intikal iklimi)” between the tropics and Europe.\(^{89}\) He stated that all of the peoples of the Mediterranean have been “compelled by the climate” to practice transhumance.

The word that Alagöz used to express the notion of transhumant was yaylaci, a term that placed emphasis on the geographical space occupied by transhumant communities. In this regard, his term linked the movements of transhumant pastoralists with the practices of yayla-goers or yaylaci\(^{s}\) of Adana and the other towns in the Çukurova plain described above. Alagöz employed the concept of transhumance to construct a parallel between the lifestyles of Yörük and Türkmen

---

\(^{85}\) Alagöz, Anadoluda Yaylâcılık [Transhumance in Anatolia], 22.
\(^{86}\) Ibid., 20-21.
\(^{87}\) Ibid., 9-11.
\(^{88}\) Ibid., 13.
\(^{89}\) Ibid., 14.
tribes in Anatolia and the broader Turkish population’s practice of “urban transhumance (şehir yaylacılığı).” He noted that just as the pastoralist communities he studied engaged in seasonal migration, the inhabitants of Adana, Tarsus, and Mersin also had their own yaylas in Bürücek, Gülek, Tekir, Gözne and Namrun.  

While highlighting this shared way of life among two very economically different communities, Alagöz also made a critical distinction between the transhumance (yaylacılık) of pastoralists in Anatolia and the nomadism (göçebelik) practiced by communities in Africa, Iraq, Iran, and the Arabian Peninsula who “wander after their flocks from pasture to pasture (sürülerinin peşinde otlaktan otlağa gezmektedirler).” He claimed that “it is easily understood that nomadism and transhumance are not the same thing.” Nomadism was “geographically speaking, the result of a manner of raising animals,” whereas transhumance was formed through the practice of “sending or bringing animals to elevated areas and from there to mild-climated low regions.” The key difference was human agency in these distinct lifestyles. Nomads wandered after flocks, whereas transhumants moved with them deliberately. In other words, “the nomad has no fixed village, is not tied to the land, does not practice agriculture, and even if he does, it has a unique character. As for the transhumant (yaylacı), he moves between specified villages and specified mountain pastures on specified routes.”

The distinction that Alagöz made in his discussion of nomadism and transhumance had implicit racial connotations. The transhumant population that concerned his study was those who were properly considered Turkish or from “the Turkish race.” The racial component of early republican interest in yörükş, Turkmens, and the pastoralists of Anatolia was more explicitly stated in a 1941 study published by Alagöz’s colleague at Ankara University, an anthropologist.

---

90 Ibid., 23.
91 Ibid., 15.
92 Ibid., 16.
named Kemal Güngör. His analysis of the yörük populations of Southern Anatolia included not only information about way of life, economy, folklore, and traditions but also extremely detailed anthropometric measurements of the various tribes he studied during field research in 1938-39.93

The studies of Alagöz and Güngör occurred during a pivotal moment in the history of the Republic of Turkey that required qualifying transhumance with ethnic or racial modifiers. On one hand, the Turkish government embarked on many measures aimed at breaking the local autonomy of Kurdish communities in Eastern Anatolia. These measures were intertwined with policies of Turkification, and officials even claimed that the Kurds of Turkey did not display any clear markers of being a distinct race.94 The Dersim rebellion of 1937-38 was the culmination of such policies. In Dersim, the army waged war with largely pastoralist communities in Dersim, who resisted the 1934 Settlement Law and other measures aimed at pacifying Kurdish communities in Anatolia. The consequent military campaign against the region was brutal. It employed aerial bombing, killing large numbers of civilians and displacing most of the population.95 Meanwhile, Turkey annexed the İskenderun province from the French Mandate of Syria in 1939 through a much disputed League of Nations referendum that declared the region to be majority Turkish. This episode, much like the measures against Kurds in Eastern Anatolia during the 1930s, reinforced national distinctions, in this case between Arabs and Turks. 96

Within the framework of these two conflicts, Turkic pastoralists suddenly played a pivotal role in the formation of national identity. In Dersim, officials argued that the Zazas who

94 Çağaptay, Islam, secularism, and nationalism in modern Turkey, 107-08.
95 Ibid., 109-13.
96 For more on the vote and the links between this process and nationalism in Turkey and Syria, see Shields, Fezzes in the River: identity politics and European diplomacy in the Middle East on the eve of World War II; Keith David Watenpaugh, "Creating Phantoms": Zaki al-Arsuzi, the Alexandretta Crisis, and the Formation of Modern Arab Nationalism in Syria," International Journal of Middle East Studies 28, no. 3 (1996).
lived there were in fact Turkish, corrupted by proximity to Kurds in Eastern Anatolia. Resettling them would therefore cleanse them of the Kurdish habit of nomadism. The distinction between Turkish pastoralists and Arab or Bedouin “nomads” was vital to the Kemalist national discourse, which was somewhat hostile to Arabic elements of the language and culture. The distinction between the “Arab” and the “Turk” gained new meaning within the context of the struggle over the Antakya/İskenderun region. There, groups like the Reyhaniye Turkmens, who were settled around the Amik region by the Ottoman government before the time of the Reform Division (see Chapter 1), attested to the Turkish character of the İskenderun region, referred to in Turkish nationalist discourses as “Hatay” in reference to the region’s Hittite past. An article from Yeni Adana in 1938 declared that the Reyhaniye “Hittite Turks” (Eti Türkleri) suffered at the hands of Arab lootors (çapulcular) just months before the declaration of the Hatay State, a precursor to annexation (see Figure 60).

During the early Republican period, groups such as Turkmens and Yörüks were evidence of a longstanding link between the Turkish nation and the geography of Anatolia. They could be used discursively to establish the territoriality of the Republic of Turkey. In this regard, Alagöz’s distinction between the transhumant and the nomad was critical. Soner Çağaptay states that “the word nomad in the republican jargon was a euphemism for the Kurds, and the occasional Roma, the only unsettled groups in Turkey by the late 1920s.” The definition of transhumance employed by Alagöz rendered Turkish pastoralists essential similar to all other Turkish citizens in origin, no more distant than the Parisian was from the Alpine villager. This distinction in turn justified the settlement laws aimed at Kurdish populations, conceptualized as the settlement of nomads, whose way of life was incompatible with the modern republic.

97 Çağaptay, Islam, secularism, and nationalism in modern Turkey, 109.
98 Ibid., 86.
By the 1940s, the putative descent of the modern people of Turkey from different Turkic tribes was becoming an important component of popular imaginings of national and ethnic identity. Turkmen communities in Anatolia that had been sedentarized as late as the early twentieth century appeared as a reservoir of Turkish culture, and their oral traditions and songs became part of national corpus. While many of the racial constructs used to verify this link were questionable, the connection between Turkic nomads and modern Turkish villagers was not entirely imaginary. Many of the citizens of Turkey would have traced descent from such communities, and within regions like Cilicia, local communities preserved knowledge of the tribal affiliations of the ancestors. But at the same time, it is clear that the romanticization of the Turkish nomad within nationalist discourses only became dominant once most Yörüks and Türkmen in Anatolia had been settled.

The relatively few that had not sedentarized became something of a curiosity embodied by the “last nomads” trope that has lingered for decades in the Çukurova region. For example, in 1947, journalist Alaattin Benal, who also wrote romantic poems about the yayla for the local newspaper from Marash called Engizek (more in Chapter 14), published an interview he conducted with two members of the Aydınlı, an elderly man and a young man. The pair elaborated upon their various lifestyles and how they wintered near İslahiye and summered at Pınarbaşı—which had been the main settlement site of the Afşars (see Chapter 3).99 They belonged to different tribes (aşıret), which were among 10-11 tribes under the umbrella of the Aydınlı tribe (Aydınlı aşıreti) in the region. The young man explained that “as [a tribe] becomes more crowded, it becomes harder to feed the animals, and so we divide.” The two complained

---

99 In Chapter 5, I noted that there seems to be a great deal of overlap between the category of Afşar and Aydınlı. However, the putative origins of the Afşar were always cited as being in Central Asia and Iran. The name Aydınlı meanwhile refers to these groups tracing their ancestry from migrations from the Aydin region (near İzmir) in Western Anatolia. The two identities are not mutually exclusive but nonetheless point to both a high degree of historical mobility as well as the fluidity of tribal belonging.
about government policies, saying “the state banned goats, so now most of us raise sheep,” adding “may God not destroy our state (Allah devletimize zeval vermesin)” in order to express roughly the exact opposite sentiment. When asked if they would settle if given land, the young man said, “we can’t stay still, that’s what we’re used to. We would feel like they tied us down. If only pasture was as plentiful as it used to be, thankfully we have no other problem.”

Benal’s encounter with the Aydınlıs revealed many often ignored realities about the history of pastoralism in Anatolia. The first is that tribal membership and lineage are difficult to trace, as labels and what they actually refer to in the case of such groups constantly change. The second is that geography lent a tremendous degree of unity to the practice of transhumance across time. The Aydınlıs followed similar routes of migration used by communities in Cilicia before the 1860s; not because their lifestyles had not changed, but because their summer and winter locations were most conducive to such a way of living. Finally, the interview suggested that transhumant lifestyles were neither moribund nor the result of unchanging communities. Pastoralists reacted to regulatory environments and measures ranging from outright forced settlement to restrictions on movement, access to pasture, or the types of animals they could raise.

---

The Twilight of Transhumance

The Dersim and Hatay episodes of the late 1930s contained strong echoes of the Reform Division’s activities during the 1860s (see Chapter 3). After all, both regions had been in the purview of the Reform Division as rebellious geographies that would be reformed through the sedentarization of tribes. They were frontiers of state institutions. When Turkish bombers attacked the communities of Dersim, it was not dissimilar to the cannons of the Reform Division that rained down on the people of Gavurdağları many decades prior.

Even if they held a special place within nationalist discourses, Turkish pastoralists in regions such as Cilicia were still expected to sedentarize and become regular villagers, and while they did not face military pacification, they were target by other regulations such as forestry laws and limitations on grazing that would impede pastoralist lifestyles. As Alagöz noted at the end of his study, a 1937 law that put forests and yaylas under military control — a measure inextricable
from the Dersim context — was sure to limit the grazing capacity of pastoralists. He predicted that “transhumance in Anatolia will inevitably decline.”

The consistent romanticization of pure and free natural settings of Anatolia emblemized by the yayla and ways of life associated with those spaces performed an important discursive function within nationalist representations of geography that linked the nation to the land on one hand and the local to the national on the other. Yet the emotional and rhetorical fixation on nature, mountains and the yayla in early Republican publications stood in stark contrast to more material concerns of the authors and readership whose economic, political, and quotidian preoccupations were heavily centered in the cities and towns of Çukurova and the agricultural activities of the plain. In other words, though mountains loomed large in the discursive geography of the nation, mountain spaces were increasingly marginalized in the lived geography of a transforming early Republican countryside.

Nonetheless, the yayla continued to serve as an important summertime destination for city folk into the post-World War II period, and the newspapers of the Çukurova region continued to profile those yaylas. A July 1949 article in Gülek (Tarsus) declared that Namrun was “Tarsus’ Corner of Paradise.” However, another article in that same newspaper just weeks earlier offered a different sentiment and heralded another subsequent transformation of summer in Çukurova. Citing the economic detriment of Tarsus being completely vacated during the summer months, the author who adopted the curious penname Yayla declared, “Transhumance is becoming a detriment to Tarsus. Let’s bring Tarsus to a state in which it is habitable every month

101 Alagöz, Anadolu'da Yaylâcılık [Transhumance in Anatolia], 38.
of the year.”

In this view, Tarsus did not need the yayla so much as it need the amenities and developments in the control of malaria that would eliminate the urge and incentive to practice seasonal migration.

This perspective was not entirely new per se, but in the post-World War II period, those who envisioned a geographical overhaul for Çukurova towns like Tarsus were emboldened by a rising technological capacity for controlling malaria. By 1949, Tarsus was on the cusp of the transformation described by Yayla above. When an American traveler Mary Gough passed through the town just a few years later, she would find a different and very livable climate. “As we drew near to Tarsus, the forest of eucalyptus trees, planted some years ago to drain the swamps, came into view,” she noted in reference to the Karabucak plantation. “Several people pointed it out to us with varying enthusiastic comments. ‘It’s grown faster than any other in Turkey,’ said the gentleman in the front seat. ‘And crammed with wild boar,’ chimed in the man with the coin. ‘What a healthy place Tarsus is nowadays!’ Even the driver was unable to refrain from joining in the praise.”

The eucalyptus were part of the ecological transformation that made Tarsus and other towns of Çukurova more bearable during the summer, yet the biggest factor in reining in the malaria of the region did not even exist before Second World War. During the last years of the 1940s and into the 1950s, chemical warfare against mosquitoes using a new compound called DDT would fundamentally change the relationship between humans and malaria in many parts of the region, so that a malaria-free future was for the first time not only conceivable but even expected. With rapidly declining malaria rates in Çukurova during the 1950s, the accelerated mechanization of agriculture and irrigation, and an unprecedented dam project on the Seyhan

104 Gough, Travel into Yesterday, 158-59.
River that promised to not only protect the plain from floods and facilitate irrigation but also generate large volumes of electricity, it seemed increasingly possible that modern technology could be used to overcome forces of nature — even the seasons that had long impelled the inhabitants of Cilicia to engage in transhumance.
CHAPTER 14
THE MOSQUITO SPEAKS: CILICIA AND THE ANTHROPOCENIC MOMENT

What we call Man’s power is, in reality, a power possessed by some men which they may, or may not, allow other men to profit by… From this point of view, what we call Man’s power over Nature turns out to be a power exercised by some men over other men with Nature as its instrument.1

— C.S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man (1947)

Born in late Ottoman Istanbul, Nadire Tolun became one of Turkey’s first female journalists when she founded a small leftist newspaper called Engizek after settling with her husband in Marash during the late 1940s.2 The paper took its name from a yayla near the city, and its contents were a blend of local news, romantic poems about nature, and general information about important issues of the day. Her husband Kemal was a doctor. He had worked in several regions of Eastern Anatolia, and as such, many of his contributions dealt with rural concerns such as malaria prevention.3 One of the most colorful features of the paper was a running column by an anonymous author called Çoban or “The Shepherd.”4 In one piece from April 1947, Çoban recounted an evening in which he dreamed he was a rice farmer.

---

1 C. S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man (New York: Macmillan, 1947), 44-45. Cited in Tvedt, The River Nile in the Age of the British: political ecology and the quest for economic power, 1. The title to this chapter makes a gesture to the work of Timothy Mitchell on malaria in Egypt around the WWII period and his question about nonhuman agency in history raised as “Can the mosquito speak?” As a mosquito will literally speak during this chapter, I thought the allusion befitting. Timothy Mitchell, "Can the Mosquito Speak?,” in Rule of Experts (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), 19-53.


4 Given the small scale of the Engizek enterprise, we may suspect that Çoban was either Nadire Tolun, her husband Kemal, or perhaps a joint effort on the part of this couple; however, the newspaper did draw some other contributors from the Marash region.
In the dream, Çoban wanders the countryside around Marash, searching for a place to plant his rice. But alas, due to the regulations on rice cultivation, he is unable to find an appropriate area, as any rice paddy must according to law be at least 3000 meters from the nearest residential area. Çoban returns home in the evening frustrated with his misfortune. As he is about to get into bed, he hears a mosquito buzzing happily around the room, “just as if he were in his father’s swamp.” In a fit of anger Çoban shouts, “you bastard, aren’t all my troubles because of you? If not for you, everywhere would be rice paddies.” He begins to swat frantically at the mosquito, who easily evades his attacks. He chases it around the room, out the door of his home, and eventually across the town to the riverfront, where with some acrobatic maneuvers the mosquito stops him and asks, “why are you chasing me?” Çoban shouts back in frustration, “Why am I chasing you? Just let me get my hands on you and you’ll see. You accursed creature, I’m going to get rid of you once and for all!” They continue:

- You’ll get rid of me and then what?
- And then what? I’ll be rid of you, that’s what. Because of you I can’t plant rice anywhere out in the plain. You’re going to pay for coming all the way into the belly of this great big city!

The mosquito began to laugh saying,

- I’m surprised at you. OK, let’s say you kill me. Do you think it ends there? Just think about it…
- What are you trying to say?
- What I’m trying to say is, well, just have a look at our valley by the riverfront…

Çoban looks to the river as instructed and much to his dismay, an enormous cloud of mosquitoes rises up. The mosquito mocks Çoban saying:

- Wondering who they are? They’re neighbors coming to meet me. If you like, have a look at that valley. You’ll see there are hundreds of thousands, millions, just like them, hopping and playing in this happy little valley’s stagnant waters, which is a most abundant shelter to us in every season. And those are our mating season’s first fruits. Our blessed offspring…

---

5 Çoban, "Bir Sivrisineğin Peşinde [Chasing a Mosquito]," Engizek 1 April 1947.
Çoban’s dream conveyed two meanings at the same time. On one hand, it touched upon the need to deal with mosquitoes or make it easier for rice farmers to carry out their living. The constraints that malaria control regulations placed on rice cultivation in Marash had long been a source of tension between cultivators and the government. But on the other, it gestured towards a larger ecological question that had recently come to the fore. Was it really feasible to eliminate all the mosquitoes of Marash, and if such an attempt took place, where would it end?

The encounter with the mosquito reflected in Çoban’s dream in 1947 represented a pivotal moment in the history Cilicia and much of Turkey. Malaria had been a mainstay of daily life, continually influencing patterns of movement and settlement over the centuries. That year, Turkey began using DDT to exterminate mosquitoes, and the prospects of this new chemical for local communities in malarial regions were tremendous. The commercial economy of Marash relied on rice, and malaria was the biggest obstacle to rice farmers looking to expand their production. The regulation of rice cultivation was perhaps the most contentious issue in the local politics of Marash. Rice was not only economically central but as a known source of mosquito breeding grounds. As a result, rice cultivators became embroiled in the foremost public health issue of the time. For this reason, many were excited about the potential benefits that would come from DDT.

---

6 For example, a British diplomat noted the following with regard to rice in Eastern Çukurova in 1944: “It appears that the Malarial institute which has branches all over this and other sectors of the country where the anopheles mosquito is prevalent has a certain control over rice growers. It does not allow them to grow rice two years in succession, as this tends to increase the rate of malaria in the district under cultivation… The malarial institute claims that removing the stagnant water from an area and placing it in another prevents malaria from spreading to a point where it cannot be controlled.” TNA, FO 195/2485, “Report by Mr. H.R. Blair” (28 March 1944).

7 One of the central issues in Marash was that rice cultivators did not believe that they should be restrained because whether or not they planted, the swamps would remain and therefore malaria would remain. There were many fights over government regulation regarding rice cultivation. In fall of 1948, a doctor ran a months-long column in response to his various critics regarding his stance on the relationship between malaria and rice. Dr. Şerif Korkut, "Yine Çeltik meselesi: Beni tenkit edenlere toptan cevap," Engizek 13 September 1948. See also "Marash ve Pirinç [Marash and Rice]," Engizek 5 April 1947; "Yine Çeltik [Again Rice Paddies]," Engizek 8 April 1947; "Pazarcık’ta Çeltik sakaları kavga ettiler," Engizek 3 May 1947; "Çeltik Kanununa aykırı çeltikler," Engizek 14 October 1947; "Çeltik kanunu hükümlerine aykırı çeltikler," Engizek 1 November 1947; "İslâhiye’de," Engizek 22 January 1948;
Çoban weighed in on the use of DDT in a later piece about the perceived migration of mosquitoes towards his little town of Marash. He remarked that the mosquito situation had gotten so dire in recent years than in the little restaurants of the market, one could not eat due to the amount of energy expended on swatting away flies. Since DDT was already being used in some neighboring provinces, he hypothesized that the rising mosquito population in Marash must have been due to an exodus from regions where they were no longer welcome. “I’m nearly positive,” he declared, “that far too many of them must be from Antep or Adana on one side of family.”

Though intended as humor, Çoban’s comment, along with his prior dream, also pointed to the fact that reducing malaria by eliminating mosquitoes was a radical step that had never been taken in the history of the region and one that would require an absolutely comprehensive effort.

Over the course of the twentieth century, the people of Cilicia had grown increasingly eager to assert control over the lived environment in new ways. This desire extended in part from the experience of settlement in Çukurova and the ecological processes it initiated. DDT was just one of the technologies to arrive following WWII that promised such an opportunity. From an ecological perspective, these tools offered the ability of effecting anthropogenic changes of environments on scales and with speeds that were previously unimaginable. Mosquitos might suddenly be eliminated not by generation upon generation of incremental battles with the swamp through changes in settlement and agriculture but rather by the indiscriminate and rapid
application of a liquid chemical compound that was relatively inexpensive to produce. This shift is one reason that in recent years, the post-World War II period (and its antecedents) has been identified by scholars in a number of fields as a unique epoch of geological time — the Anthropocene — in which human activity has come to have a significant impact on processes rarely studied through the lens of culture: geology, climate, and biodiversity. Whether or not we accept the concept of the Anthropocene, I argue that the near-elimination of malaria in Çukurova, which was primarily carried out in the span of two decades following WWII and has thus far been of relative permanence, merits the definition of a new period in the social history of the region. When the mosquito strikes back, it may be time to define another.

Agrarian society in Cilicia has changed in countless ways over the past half-century. But one crucial change is that without malaria, people could live differently in Cilicia. As I explain in this chapter, the post-WWII period and the technological environment it brought

---

10 The Anthropocene refers to a period of time during which human beings have a larger impact on ecology than other environmental factors. Numerous starting points for this epoch of time range from as recent as the 1960s to millennia ago. See Simon L. Lewis and Mark A. Maslin, "Defining the Anthropocene," *Nature* 519, no. 7542 (2015). This study adopts the view that the historical development the notion of Anthropocene refers to is generally visible through phenomena such as human-induced climate change, but on the other hand, the Anthropocene smells very similar to notions such as modernity that were posited as meaningful distinctions between the past and the present that we would be right to view with skepticism. As McNeill and Engelke note about the Anthropocene, "The entire life experience of almost everyone now living has taken place within what appears to be the climatic moment of the Anthropocene and is certainly the most anomalous and unrepresentative period in the quarter-million-year history of relations between our species and the biosphere. That should make us all skeptical of expectations that any particular current trends will last for long." J.R. McNeill and Peter Engelke, "Into the Anthropocene: People and Their Planet," in *Global Interdependence: The World after 1945*, ed. Akira Iriye (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 366.

11 This development is not true for all parts of the world, especially in more tropical locations, the use of DDT was met with greater failure in terms of its capacity to function permanently as a malaria control method. As I will explain below, this was also true in Çukurova to some extent, but statistically speaking, malaria rates in the Adana region have been categorically different since the 1950s than they had been for at least a century prior, at least according to the data that is available. One could argue based on the work of Timothy Mitchell that the experience of Çukurova with malaria diverged markedly from that of Egypt during the post-WWII period. See Mitchell, "Can the Mosquito Speak?," 19-53.

facilitated a new agrarian transformation in the Çukurova plain. It solidified a shift in the center of gravity in the region from the mountains to the lowlands that had been initiated nearly a century prior. Local ecologies became more reliant on technology and less on the quotidian actions of peasants and their animals. In many ways, the agrarian transformation of Çukurova realized the plans envisioned both by the Turkish Democrat Party (DP) that ruled Turkey during the 1950s and its predecessors, as well as the US Marshall Plan advisers. But on the other hand, the seemingly united front against nature masked other uses of power, as the changes brought by the 50s increased the role of capital in the Anatolia countryside. And while technology was touted as a near cure-all for Çukurova’s most intransigent issues, these changes also birthed new conundrums. Even old ones such as malaria would sometimes prove surprisingly resilient.

**The Second World War and the Marshall Plan in Turkey**

The overall economic growth of the late 1930s in Turkey was disrupted by the outbreak of WWII. Turkey remained neutral until the end of the war, although Winston Churchill did his best to court President İsmet İnönü during a meeting in a railroad car under the shade of eucalyptus trees at the train station in Yenice, just 15 km from Tarsus. Instead, the Turkish government focused its energies on ramping up agricultural production through tighter control over the decisions of cultivators, prices, and the supply of goods. Its rhetoric declared that the country was in the midst its own agricultural war as the economic troubles of the war period unfolded. The government supplied aid to try to boost agriculture and spent millions of Turkish lira on equipment and seed. In February 1942, they called for “agricultural mobilization (ziraat

---


14 “Muhtaç çiftçiye hükümetçe çift hayvani verilecek [Draft Animals to be given to Farmers in Need by Government],” *Bugün* 22 January 1942; “Muhtaç çiftçiye ucuz ziraat âlet ve vasıtları dağıtılabacak [Affordable Agricultural Tools and Machines to be Distributed to Farmers in Need],” *Bugün* 4 February 1942; “Adana çiftçisi,
seferberliği)" to increase planting of wheat that even encompassed school children, who sowed 26 decares of agricultural land in the Çukurova region that year.\textsuperscript{15}

Nonetheless, the war period was filled with want. The disruption of trade cut Turkey off from many basic import items, sending prices skyward. The purchasing power of ordinary workers dropped by more than 40%.\textsuperscript{16} In the towns, bread and other items were dispensed through the use of ration cards.\textsuperscript{17} Among Taurus Mountain communities such as the Afşars of Sarız, the early 1940s are remembered as years of scarcity. The concurrent drought compelled villagers to scrounge for goat-weed (geven) in the mountains to keep their animals alive through the winter.\textsuperscript{18} The cost of cultivation also rose due to labor and transportation shortages; despite rising yields, the cost per kg of cotton production more than doubled between 1940 and 1942.\textsuperscript{19} Meanwhile, a malaria epidemic raged with new vitality throughout Turkey. Tropical strains of malaria spread all over the country during the war.\textsuperscript{20} Quinine could not be imported and as a result, Turkish citizens were left without the treatment and medicines they used to ward off the disease.\textsuperscript{21} Kemali Beyazıt, a parliament member from Marash who would later become health

\textsuperscript{15} NARA, RG 166, Box 437, Cotton (1939-54), Embassy to State (8 April 1952), pg. 16.
\textsuperscript{16} Those who did heavy labor received 750g of break whereas other adults received 375g and children 187.5g. "Ekrem tevzi işi: Ekrem kartları bugün tevzi ediliyor," Türksozü 17 January 1942. Factory workers in Tarsus published an open letter to the municipality in the newspaper demanding that they be issued cards that listed them as heavy laborers. "Tarsus’ta İşçilerin dileği," Türksozü 4 March 1942. The ration card process revealed that there were thousands in the region that did not yet possess government-issued identity cards. "Ölüler için Ekmek Kartı! [Ration Cards for the Dead!]," Bugün 3 February 1942.
\textsuperscript{17} NARA, RG 166, Box 436, Keld Christensen, Iskenderun, “Agriculture on the Cilician Plain” (5 July 1944), pg. 22.
\textsuperscript{18} Özdemir, Öykülerile Ağıtlar, 162.
\textsuperscript{19} Okan, Türkiye'de Sıtma Savaşı, 4.
\textsuperscript{20} "Kinin Yolculuğu [Lack of Quinine]," Bugün 25 March 1942; "Kinin İhtiyacı [Need for Quinine]," Bugün 1 May 1942; Dr. Cezmi Türk, "Tropika [Tropical Malaria]," Bugün 18 July 1946; "Kinin," Türksozü 5 May 1942. Well-off
minister, wrote a critical letter to the government asking what they were doing to stop the spike in malaria.22 Meanwhile, a virulent malaria epidemic on the other side of Cilicia in Karataş, which the health ministry was able to bring under control, illustrated that malaria was still entrenched in the Cilician geography.23

The government’s overall response to the wartime crisis was to continue a more heavy-handed economic policy and try to increase production and regulate the food supply.24 As a result, agricultural production did not decline as much as it might have and in some ways underwent expansion (see Table 32). For example, cotton production was high during WWII, and the Turkish government became the purchaser of all cotton produced as of 1941, giving cultivators some security. However, production greatly exceeded demand, and in many of the war years, large amount of cotton remained in stock.25 Perhaps as a sign of discontent, cultivators in Adana resumed wearing the formerly-banned baggy pants of the region, the karadon, in the words of the British Consul in Adana, “reverting to the comfortable habits of their forefathers,” much to the chagrin of local journalists.26

---

22 BCA, 3-0-10-0-0 177/224/4 (15 September 1943).
25 NARA, RG 166, Box 436, Keld Christensen, Iskenderun, “Agriculture on the Cilician Plain” (5 July 1944), pg. 19.
26 TNA, FO 195/2485, 507/13/44 (14 October 1944).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1938 Hectare</th>
<th>1938 Ton</th>
<th>1939 Hectare</th>
<th>1939 Ton</th>
<th>1940 Hectare</th>
<th>1940 Ton</th>
<th>1941 Hectare</th>
<th>1941 Ton</th>
<th>1942 Hectare</th>
<th>1942 Ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>143,054</td>
<td>151,223</td>
<td>115,348</td>
<td>131,122</td>
<td>120,768</td>
<td>144,375</td>
<td>115,775</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>119,206</td>
<td>82,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>87,544</td>
<td>72,278</td>
<td>79,455</td>
<td>98,685</td>
<td>88,478</td>
<td>117,240</td>
<td>79,164</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>82,512</td>
<td>74,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>59,008</td>
<td>50,806</td>
<td>47,217</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>60,200</td>
<td>78,012</td>
<td>58,823</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>52,665</td>
<td>48,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>9,356</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>5,232</td>
<td>9,185</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Bean</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>28,682</td>
<td>151,749</td>
<td>25,620</td>
<td>173,175</td>
<td>29,805</td>
<td>172,449</td>
<td>25,417</td>
<td>182,220</td>
<td>37,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesame</td>
<td>8,833</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>8,890</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>11,138</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>3,881</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>9,298</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>8,057</td>
<td>11,888</td>
<td>6,935</td>
<td>9,665</td>
<td>19,072</td>
<td>57,997</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>9,254</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickpeas</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentils</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>2,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>478,233</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>435,264</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>484,531</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>506,047</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>466,539</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic crisis lingered after the war, but the Turkish government was eager to increase the technocratic interventions in agrarian life that had driven production up during the five-year plan of the 1930s.\(^{28}\) Throughout the rise of peasantism and statism within Turkish political thought at the end of the 1930s, Turkey had adopted many practices from the Soviet Union. Although the cotton men of Çukurova were not prime candidates for socialism, the many workers in the region who had begun to organize, the large cooperatives of smaller cultivators, and the continuing influence of peasantism within ranks of CHP illustrated possible support for continued connections between Turkey and communist countries. A doctor named Cezmi Türk wrote in Adana’s Bugün newspaper that capitalism was a “beast” threatening the modern world.

---

\(^{27}\) These statistics come from a US report but are based on the same source as Turkish government statistics employed in earlier chapters (see Chapter 11). NARA, RG 166, Box 436, Keld Christensen, Iskenderun, “Agriculture on the Cilician Plain” (5 July 1944).

\(^{28}\) “Buhran [Crisis],” Bugün 9 July 1946.
saying, “A class of secret bankers rests above the all the nations, young and old, rich and poor. They have no religion, belief, nation, or creed.” He highlighted all the dangers of the capitalist path, warning that “if you take this route, the day will soon come that we bathe and drown in the blood of this nation. I thought you should know.” 29 Yet Dr. Türk would go on to be a parliamentarian from the newly-formed Demokrat Partisi (DP), which became the main opposition to CHP during the late 1940s and won the majority vote in 1950, heralded as the year of Turkey’s first free election that ushered in an era of economic liberalism.30

During the postwar period, Turkey would develop close ties with the United States due to the policies of the Marshall Plan, which were an extension of Cold War policies aimed at developing political allies through economic means. Turkey was a relatively minor but symbolically important recipient of this aid program, the first country along with Greece to begin receiving grants and loans for military, economic, and health programs in 1947, and given the size of the Turkish economy at the time, the aid was very significant. Over the decade that followed, fundamental changes occurred in the Turkish countryside that both the US as well as the ruling DP would claim as great achievements, having been the political entities that had presided over important economic and health policies. But many of the changes brought about simply would not have been possible prior to the war because they were the product of new technologies that enabled technocratic state institutions to carry out unprecedented ecological interventions.

29 Dr. Cezmi Türk, "Canavar [The Beast].” Bugün 27 July 1946.
The Great Mosquito Massacre

Turkey began its war on malaria well before the arrival of Marshall Plan aid. The Republican government had started to test and monitor the spleens of villagers even prior to completing its first population and agriculture censuses in 1927 (see Chapter 11). Although malaria proved tenacious, especially during the scarcity of the war years, the Ministry of Public Health continued its anti-malarial campaigns with new vigor immediately following the war. DDT, an insecticide invented in 1939, the use of which was pioneered during WWII, gave those campaigns yet another tool with which to combat mosquitoes.31 The chemical proved devastatingly effective at killing arthropods, and after some experimentation with DDT in 1946, malaria control teams began to deploy this pesticide throughout the countryside of Anatolia under the auspices of new Marshall Plan health programs.

The results appeared immediate to some. From 1945-1947, a third of the Turkish population was treated for malaria. But after a DDT surge in 1948, the rate dropped to 26%.32 Whereas 666 patients in malaria control zone hospitals had died of malaria in 1943, by 1948, that number had dropped to 91.33 In Marash, an additional 67,771 people had been examined for malaria; yet thanks to 6186 kg of DDT and 74,452 kg of various petrol, fewer infections had been found than the year before.34 A year of positive indications was all that malaria control official Seyfettin Okan needed to declare the results of the program.35 His 1949 book about malaria in Turkey read like a DDT manifesto, causing a sudden shift in the way doctors in

---

31 For a discussion of malaria during WWII and its subsequent deployment in Africa, see Webb, Humanity's Burden: a global history of malaria, 156-87.
32 Okan, Türkiye’de Sıtma Savaşı, 7.
33 Ibid., 10.
34 “Sıtma Savaş Tabipleri Toplantısı [War on Malaria Doctors Meeting],” Kahraman Yurt 20 April 1949.
35 The fact that Okan’s report was published in both Turkish and English indicates that it was intended not just for Turkish doctors and officials but also for American readers. Okan, Türkiye’de Sıtma Savaşı.
Turkey thought and wrote about malaria control.\textsuperscript{36} These views had antecedents in early periods and even in the Ottoman Empire. However, unprecedented success led toward to a singular focus on eliminating and controlling mosquitoes that drastically simplified the language of public health. On the cover of a short illustrated brochure intended for children and a general readership and funded by the Marshall Plan, an image of a human-sized mosquito dragged into the center of a village and tied to a stake by a group of triumphant peasant children expressed the sentiment of the campaigns (see Figure 61). The fight against malaria was a fight against the mosquito, a covert killer whose day of reckoning had finally come. Within the brochure, there were depictions of tanks armed with DDT and little children embracing a large bottle of the pesticide beside the caption, “DDT is the best remedy for killing mosquitoes.”\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 14-20.
Figure 61 Front Cover of *Sitma Savaşı [The War on Malaria]* from the Marshall Plan health brochure series, 1951 (Source: author’s collection)
DDT-based anti-malaria campaigns are most likely remembered for the infamous bombardment of swamps and fields with chemicals dropped from airplanes that rained death on mosquitoes. However, the first front in the battle against the mosquitoes of rural Turkey was the village space, especially the home. From 1948 onward, homes were inspected and sprayed for mosquitoes on a systematic basis, much in the way that Paris Green had been applied during the 1930s (see Chapter 12). Once in the spring, again at the beginning of summer, and finally at the end of fall, malaria control teams applied DDT to the interior of Turkish peasant homes in Adana and throughout the regions of Turkey labeled as malaria control areas (see Figure 62 and Figure 63).\(^{38}\) The malaria control activities were not limited to the application of DDT; older practices such as the draining of swamp land persisted during the 1950s.\(^{39}\) The malaria control teams tested the population for malaria on an annual basis throughout the 1950s, and the plummeting malaria rates suggested that DDT had proven a paramount solution when it came to controlling the disease. In 1950, the number of malaria cases in Turkey was half of what it had been in 1945 and the amount of DDT used was rising rapidly.\(^{40}\) Less than 10% of the blood in Turkey tested positive for malaria, and for the first half of the 1950s those rates hovered between 2-5%. By the late 1950s, the number of people being tested and treated for malaria was just a fraction of what it had been a decade prior due to the rapid decline in malaria infections.\(^{41}\) By 1960, just 1% of Çukurovans suffered a malaria infection, and by 1968, malaria rates were negligible.\(^{42}\)

---

\(^{38}\) Okan, Türkiye'de Sitma Savaşı, 15.

\(^{39}\) In towns such as Marash and throughout the countryside of Çukurova, these drainage activities were continuous. "Marash Sitma Savaşı Başkanlığından," Kahraman Yurt 1 July 1949; Fuat Kuşcuoğlu, "Gâvur Gölü," Kahraman Yurt 4 January 1950; Tanberk, "Bölgemiz Sitma Savaşı," Engizek 30 August 1947.

\(^{40}\) NARA, RG 166, Box 435, Turkey (Agriculture 1950-54), 882.20/1-1852, (18 January 1952).

\(^{41}\) Tekeli and İlkin, "Türkiye'de Sitma Mücadelesinin Tarihi," 254.

Figure 62 Malaria control unit prepared for spraying DDT in Adana region (Source: Seyfettin Okan, *Türkiye'de Sıtma Savaşı*, 1949)

Figure 63 Malaria control unit administers DDT to a home in a Çukurova village (Source: Seyfettin Okan, *Türkiye'de Sıtma Savaşı*, 1949)
The sudden disappearance of malaria from the countryside after millennia of presence and nearly a century of struggle throughout the frontier settlement process had major implications for life in a place like Çukurova. Aside from playing a major role in the reduction of child mortality, rise in life expectancy, and greater general health and wellbeing of rural inhabitants, malaria’s elimination facilitated new types of interaction between Çukurovans and their geography. The village spaces of Çukurova became increasingly habitable over the 1950s, and the rural population grew more rapidly than ever, thanks in part to an ambitious program to distribute state lands to villagers. Çukurova villages were rather small when compared with villages in other parts of Turkey as of 1945.

Following the war, the villager population of the Adana province (excluding urban) grew by almost 70% between 1945 and 1960 (see Table 33). That growth was highest in the districts of Ceyhan, Kozan, and Kadirli, the regions of Çukurova that had long served as primary areas of immigrant and tribal settlement but where malaria had historically been most fierce. Population growth was lowest (but still substantial) in mountain districts, especially Feke, Karaisalı, Saimbeyli (formerly Hadjin), and Pozantı. As an example of rural growth in Çukurova, the village of Dervişiye (modern-day Dervişli) near Osmaniye, which had been founded by the Reform Division in the 1860s and named after the military commander Derviş Pasha, more than doubled in population between 1945 and 1970. Throughout the Ottoman period, its population was around 125 households when it was founded in the 1860s and was still that number during the First World War, but by 1976, the number of households in Dervişiye was 265. Most of that

43 NARA, RG 166, Box 435, Turkey (Agriculture 1954-57), Scranton to State, Ankara (8 May 1954).
44 Vincent Lindquist, Charles Faye Sarle, and John H. Berryhill, Turkey 1950 agricultural census (Ankara: Central Statistical Office], 1951), 31. in NARA, RG 166, Box 435, Turkey (Agriculture 1950-54), Scranton to State, Ankara (7 November 1951).
growth had occurred following WWII. The village of Azaplı near Kadirli (Kars) in Upper Çukurova quadrupled its population between 1945 and 1970.46

Beyond facilitating the rise of the village in Turkey during the 1950s, the elimination of malaria reduced the importance of summer homes in the mountains and the Cilicia region’s cherished yaylas. Up until the 1950s, yaylas were still imagined as innately healthy spaces.47 But while the Çukurova heat was still mercilessly intense, the summers were no longer malarial, and as such, the necessity for health-based transhumance was greatly reduced. Given the economic incentives of remaining in the plain and cities (not to mention other benefits), the inhabitants of the Adana region suddenly had less reason to go to the mountains. In fact, the 1960s witnessed the rise of a new summer culture in Turkey that shifted its focus towards the coast.

Table 33 Change in villager population (excludes urban centers) of Adana province 1945-1964 (negative growth in red, more below)48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>26876</td>
<td>38543</td>
<td>45697</td>
<td>50134</td>
<td>49870</td>
<td>22994</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahçe</td>
<td>20062</td>
<td>22772</td>
<td>29473</td>
<td>36927</td>
<td>37337</td>
<td>17275</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceyhan</td>
<td>31187</td>
<td>44660</td>
<td>52671</td>
<td>59423</td>
<td>59272</td>
<td>28085</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feke</td>
<td>10688</td>
<td>11610</td>
<td>12419</td>
<td>13610</td>
<td>14516</td>
<td>3828</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadirli (Kars)</td>
<td>26642</td>
<td>34590</td>
<td>42216</td>
<td>53248</td>
<td>49419</td>
<td>22777</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaisalı</td>
<td>32276</td>
<td>36962</td>
<td>41567</td>
<td>41980</td>
<td>43155</td>
<td>10879</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karataş</td>
<td>18422</td>
<td>25805</td>
<td>25472</td>
<td>24773</td>
<td>26360</td>
<td>7938</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozan (Sis)</td>
<td>34794</td>
<td>45140</td>
<td>54263</td>
<td>63420</td>
<td>66384</td>
<td>31590</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mağara</td>
<td>10526</td>
<td>11901</td>
<td>13893</td>
<td>15079</td>
<td>16969</td>
<td>6443</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaniye</td>
<td>17877</td>
<td>21921</td>
<td>28561</td>
<td>32112</td>
<td>30955</td>
<td>13078</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozanti</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>8116</td>
<td>9419</td>
<td>9380</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saimbeyli (Hadjin)</td>
<td>7682</td>
<td>8496</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>9347</td>
<td>11069</td>
<td>3387</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumurtalık</td>
<td>7716</td>
<td>9927</td>
<td>12791</td>
<td>14768</td>
<td>15184</td>
<td>7468</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>250948</strong></td>
<td><strong>319362</strong></td>
<td><strong>375889</strong></td>
<td><strong>424240</strong></td>
<td><strong>429870</strong></td>
<td><strong>178922</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 Ibid., 30.
48 Bakanlıgı, Köy Envanter Etüdlerine göre Adana.
The Waning of the Ox: Technology and Agriculture in Çukurova

Post-war agricultural policy in Turkey focused on three main objectives: increased access to agricultural machines, fertilizer, and irrigation. These changes were synonymous with the goal of modernizing agricultural production. In an Ankara University study of the impacts of mechanization, the authors at one point actually referred to the rate of increase in number of tractors in Turkey as the “rate of modernization,” neatly equating machines with modernity.49 The introduction of tractors and other agricultural machines would transform agricultural production and labor. Between 1948 and 1952, the number of tractors in the Çukurova region increased by roughly 650%.50 Through the programs established by the Marshall Plan, tens of thousands of machines were imported between 1949 and 1952 (see Table 34). Fertilizer use likewise increased exponentially, with imports quickly outstripping local production during the early 1950s (see Table 35). Irrigation also greatly expanded in the Çukurova plain as cultivators reaped the benefits of the barrage and canal system the construction of which had begun before the war (see Chapter 11, more below). Finally, the development of insecticides such as DDT, which in addition to killing mosquitoes was also seen effective for killing agricultural pests, appeared as a possible means of securing more robust and reliable harvests by exterminating critters such as the cotton bollworm (yeşil kurt), which struck fear into the heart of cotton cultivators every time it reared its little green head.51 Prominent Tarsus businessman Şadi Eliyeşil told American agricultural advisers in the early 1950s that with fertilizer and insecticides, the cotton harvest of Adana could reach up to 1 million bales.52

50 Ibid., 28.
52 NARA, RG 166, Box 438. Turkey – Narrative Reports (1950-54), Economic Conditions (1953-54), 800.05182/4-254, “Notes on Leading Industrialists of the Adana Region” (2 April 1954).
Table 34 Importation of Agricultural Machines in Turkey, 1949-195253

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>33,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor plows</td>
<td>32,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc harrows</td>
<td>10,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One ways</td>
<td>3,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivators</td>
<td>6,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain drills</td>
<td>9,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton planters</td>
<td>5,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowers, reapers</td>
<td>9,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combines</td>
<td>3,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshers</td>
<td>2,489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 Fertilizer Production and Import in Turkey (in metric tons)54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6334</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>7068</td>
<td>2746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>8111</td>
<td>5041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>11323</td>
<td>15743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>15895</td>
<td>26963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>21490</td>
<td>23799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>24556</td>
<td>49024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>63400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there are many reasons why Eliyeşil’s estimates were a long way off, the changes in agriculture during the early 1950s did have an instantly observable impact. Turkey’s cotton production in 1951-53 was over 2 times what it had been at any point since 1935, a period that witnessed arguably the most consistently high production of cotton in the history of Çukurova.55 Whereas about 180,000 hectares of the Adana province had been cultivated with cotton in 1942, in 1953, which was relatively subdued in comparison with prior years, 252,000 hectares of land were planted with cotton. Major recipients of Çukurova cotton during this period included Italy,

53 NARA, RG 166, Box 435, Turkey (Agriculture 1950-54), Scranton to State, Ankara (26 March 1953).
54 NARA, RG 166, Box 435, Turkey (Agriculture 1954-57), Scranton to State, Ankara (8 May 1954).
55 NARA, RG 166, Box 437, Cotton (1939-54), 882.2321/12-1653, Embassy to State, Ankara (16 December 1953).
West Germany, France, Yugoslavia, Japan, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Israel. The changes to agriculture brought by the 1950s achieved a level of production that had been talked of in Çukurova for nearly a century. These high yields soon brought misery to cultivators and merchants, who were faced with surplus stock and plummeting prices during the 1950s.

The mechanization of agriculture also had an immediate impact on human-animal relations in the Çukurova region, which became the trendsetter for the rest of regions in Turkey. By the late Ottoman period, cultivators in Adana increasingly relied on machines for certain agricultural activities, such as plowing and threshing, and while relatively few farmers owned their own tractor during the early Republican period, a majority had access to such machines through tractor owners and drivers that plowed fields for an affordable price. Along with significant changes in transport through the introduction of the automobile and trucks during the interwar period, these machines began to gradually replace the role of human and animal labor. Yet even during the war, draft animals played a key role in agricultural labor. During the economic crisis of the early 1940s, the Turkish government distributed draft animals to farmers in need. Cultivators that relied on the few number of individuals who owned machines complained of exorbitant price hikes.

With rapid mechanization during the decade that followed the war, the use of draft animals plummeted in most regions of Turkey. The aforementioned Ankara University study surveyed dozens of villages in the Çukurova region (including İçel, referred to as Mediterranean). They found that in the span of a few years between 1948 and 1952, the draft

56 NARA, RG 166, Box 437, Cotton (1939-54), 882.2321/9-854, Embassy to State, Ankara (8 September 1954).
58 "Muhtaç çifticiye hükümetçe çift hayvani verilecek [Draft Animals to be given to Farmers in Need by Government]," Bugün 22 January 1942.
59 NARA, RG 166, Box 436, Keld Christensen, Iskenderun, “Agriculture on the Cilician Plain” (5 July 1944).
animal population of villages declined quickly. The number of oxen in these villages was just 15% of what it had been in 1948. The population of draft animals had declined roughly twice as fast in the Çukurova region as it had elsewhere in Turkey. In Southeast Anatolia, the change was only by 38% — still very striking — but not as dramatic as in the case of Çukurova.60 Work animals were quickly disappearing from daily life. During the 1950s, small-scale transport in village settings was still largely carried out by horses, mules, and the like, which were versatile, inexpensive, and reliable when compared with motor transport. As village populations increased, the need for these animals to a large extent remained. However, longer distance transport was increasingly the purview of trains, trucks, and tractors, and as a result, pack animals declined in importance. This was especially true for the camel, which at the outset of the Republican period, was still a primary means of conveying goods in Adana and other parts of Southern Anatolia. The camel population of Çukurova dropped by 12% between 1948-1952.61 The elimination of animals such as the camel from cityscapes had a symbolic significance during a time when machines meant modernity and animals, while important aspects of village life in Turkey during the 1950s, were associated with more primitive ways of life. However, it is important to note that machine repair and parts were extremely hard to find in Turkey at the time, and even in a place that mechanized early like Çukurova, a third of villagers reported frequent breakdowns and trouble obtaining repairs.62

---

60 Economic and Social Aspects of Farm Mechanization in Turkey, 25.
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Figure 64 “Fiat Tractors: Farmers!! Know How to Make Use of the Marshall Plan!” (Source: Yeni Adana, 7 December 1950)
“A Turkish Miracle”?: the Triumph of Technocracy in Çukurova

In January 1960, Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes visited Adana for the 38th celebration of the region’s liberation from the French in 1922. Before a crowd of many tens of thousands, he delivered a confident speech in which he proclaimed the successes of his governing Demokrat Party in the arenas of agriculture, industry, and public works. He referred to their achievements as a “Turkish miracle.” During a decade in power, Menderes had truly presided over a rapid transformation of the countryside. But that transformation had not been carried out in a politically-neutral context. His speech contained veiled hints to the people of Adana that they would have received more had they voted for his party in the previous elections. Mersin had done so and had recently been rewarded with a silo intended to facilitate wheat export (which in the end never got much use).63 Immediately following the speech he hurried off to the latter place to dine with 500 supporters, as a large group of CHP sympathizers had arrived and began to cheer for prominent CHP figure and Adana native Kasım Gülek, who held a rally that day in Kadirli. Gülek criticized Menderes for what he deemed restrictions on freedoms under the DP, citing the example of the Soviet Union as proof that human happiness was not just about dams, factories, and bridges. He warned of the impending economic crisis should US aid dry up.64

The DP had many loyal supporters in Adana, but local dissatisfaction dated to the early 1950s, and much of the criticism the party received concerned the issue of public works and interventions into the urban landscape as the government demolished and transformed neighborhoods. In Adana, the construction of the Seyhan Hydroelectric Dam project, was touted as one of the cornerstone achievements of modernization under the DP but was met by locals

64 NARA, RG 166, Box 804 Turkey (1955-61), Agriculture, 782.13/1-1160, Thompson to State, Iskenderun (11 January 1960).
with ambivalent reactions. The dam built upon the barrages of many predecessors dating well back into the Ottoman period. Even before Ziya Pasha’s emblematic stand during the 1870s, residents of Adana had struggled continuously to control the flow of the Seyhan River through the city in numerous ways, though no one could stop the floods.

The Seyhan Hydroelectric Dam was to improve upon the hydraulic works completed during the administration of İsmet İnönü just a decade prior. It was going to bring a much needed source of power to a city with rapidly growing demands for electricity, and in addition, greatly expand the area of irrigation in the plains surrounding the city of Adana. It was further aimed at controlling the flooding of the plain, which had devastated Adana in 1936 and again in 1948. In fact, İsmet İnönü and Kasım Gülek had flown over the region during the latter floods to observe the damage. In his report, İnönü stated that a comprehensive plan for Çukurova that included flood control, irrigation, transport, fertilizer and “perhaps electricity” was absolutely necessary. “No matter how much it will cost,” he wrote, “the government must risk all of it (hepsini göze almalı).”

The İnönü government had begun conversations with American companies about building a more systematic method of flood control that would irrigate an estimated 166,000 hectares on both sides of the Seyhan River. In other words, the predecessors of Menderes, Gülek included, had already made designs for hydraulic works in Çukurova when their party left office in 1950, and so the CHP’s objections to the DP’s hydraulic plans were not about whether or not Çukurova needed the work. In fact, İnönü’s plan was slightly more ambitious than the final DP project, which reached about 20,000 hectares less with irrigation.

---
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The Seyhan Hydroelectric Dam was the first of many hydroelectric projects of the World Bank, funded by an initial loan from the IBRD of $25 million. It was one of several hydraulic works in Turkey during the 1950s with a total value of some $500 million Turkish lira. The construction began in 1953 and was completed on schedule in 1956. In the months leading up to its opening, the dam’s representation in the press was mixed. The Democrat party newspaper in Adana Demokrat presented the impending dam opening as a historical moment in the weeks leading up to the event and in the days after. One article described the additional 144,000 hectares of irrigation the damn would bring saying, “The Hollow Plain is becoming a Golden Plain (Çukurova Altınova oluyor).” There was talk of Ceyhan soon getting a hydroelectric dam as well. One writer chastised critics who had accused the DP of violating the spirit of freedom within Turkish democracy, saying “today the Seyhan Barrage will open, and as it gives its first hydroelectric current, we will feel the electricity of all of our feelings, our ‘free’ feelings, and a deep peace and satisfaction.” At the opening ceremony, Menderes and the other DP officials criticized their CHP opponents for boycotting what they deemed a national achievement.

The other newspapers of the region featured less coverage. The pro-DP newspaper Hakimiyet in Mersin portrayed the dam favorably, and one author said the project would help the

---
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region attain the “light of civilization.” However, Türksözü largely ignored the opening. Its short summary two days later was not even the day’s feature article. Meanwhile, Yeni Adana had published many articles unfavorable to the DP and reported the project’s every failure during the course of construction. The opening ceremony was criticized for its extravagance, and a cartoon in Yeni Adana lampooned the event with illustrations of fish, lambs, wine, and whiskey marching towards the dam site. Türksözü was eager to report the dam’s shortcomings when the hydroelectric grid went down for the first time less than three weeks after the opening ceremony.

Given the mythical status occupied within the historical memory of the local CHP in Adana by Ziya Pasha, who was credited with starting the first such project in the 1870s, the criticism that the DP received can be interpreted as largely political (see Part 2 Introduction). The opponents of DP likely did not disagree about the general benefits of such a dam, and there was a consensus of these works being a general public good. They instead sought to criticize the way it was handled, especially mismanagement of funds, which they believed they would have used better. The DP and its opponents were to a large extent competing over control of international capital, which had come to play a singular role in local ecologies of Turkey after WWII.

A few years after the completion of the Seyhan Hydroelectric Dam and a few months after his visit to Adana in 1960, Adnan Menderes was removed from power by a military coup. He would be hanged along with other members of his cabinet the following year. Much had changed in Çukurova since WWII, and the projects undertaken during the 1950s such as the Seyhan Hydroelectric Dam remained as lasting evidence of the triumph of technocracy in the

---
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Cilician countryside that has endured since. The human relationships with the rest of nature are today increasingly mediated through state institutions and companies that rely on experts to implement policies regarding water management, agriculture, and public health, and though parties vie over stewardship, there is a broad consensus regarding this state. This particular transformation must in terms of political ecology be seen as significant, as the much more monolithic and concentrated ecology empowers a narrow group of actors to carry out sweeping and sometimes irreversible restructuring of environments. Rather than peasant families, ecology is controlled by an increasingly narrow segment comprised predominantly of men.

The fate of Lake Amik near the city of Antakya offers an illustration of this fact. Since the late Ottoman period, government officials and foreign companies had targeted the Lake Amik to be drained in order to eliminate malaria in the region and use the water for irrigation, even as early as the 1890s when the role of mosquitoes in transmitting malaria was unknown.79 When France assumed control of the region following the First World War, similar plans to drain Lake Amik were discussed.80 However, when the lake became part of Turkey’s Çukurova region at the end of the 1930s, such plans had not been realized, and Amik remained encircled by some seventy villages with homes built mainly from reeds from the lake where the people raised water buffalo and engaged in agriculture.81

During the 1940s, the Turkish government began draining parts of the lake to free up agricultural land and established a state farm. Refugees from Bulgaria were settled there during the 1950s, at which point the US Agricultural Attaché observed that some 200,000 additional

79 BOA, DH-MKT 402/65 (15 Temmuz 1311 [27 July 1895]); SD 510/23, No. 5, Nafia to Sadaret (14 Kanunuevvel 1329 [27 December 1913]).
80 Duraffourd’s report on the subject was even published with an Arabic translation in 1928. C. Duraffourd, Notice sur l’orogénèse des pays syriens et le problème de l’eau en Syrie : extrait du rapport de Monsieur C. Duraffourd sur la plaine de l’Amouk (Beirut: La Victoire, 1928).
81 Vedat Çalışkan, “Human-Induced Wetland Degradation: A case study of Lake Amik (Southern Turkey),” in BALWOIS (Ohrid, Macedonia 2008).
dönüms of land would be freed up if drainage of the lake was completed. In 1966 aggressive drainage efforts began under the directorship of Turkey’s State Hydraulic Works (DSİ), which has since carried out numerous dam and irrigation projects in Southern Anatolia and elsewhere. The Lake Amik desiccation project succeeded in virtually eliminating the lake from the map, but did not yield a wealth of arable land as anticipated. Instead, the former basin of the lake floods constantly and salination is a pervasive issue. The draining of the lake is viewed by many as an environmental disaster, as Lake Amik was also an important stop for migratory birds. Today, there is an airport near the center of where the lake once was.

The disappearance of Lake Amik is a profound symbol. When discussion of draining the lake began during the early twentieth century, such projects were seen as a fundamental necessity in order to eliminate malaria. The Ottoman government, the French Mandate government in Syria, the Turkish government, and numerous companies explored the possibilities of such a measure for decades. By the time desiccation began during the 1960s, malaria was still a minor factor in the life of the region, but overall ecological conditions had changed drastically. Nonetheless, the lake was drained as had been long foretold, leading to more costly flood control and irrigation activities as complications have arisen. The day may very well come when the Turkish government elects to refill the lake, as ecological degradation now greatly exceeds malaria in terms of overall public concern. When that happens, more money will be spent, more companies will be hired, and property will change hands once against as another ecological restructuring occurs.

---
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Unforeseen Impacts

The ecological questions of the countryside today in Çukurova are very different than they were before WWII. During the 1950s, government policies were focused on increasing village populations and mechanization of agriculture, but ultimately the latter may have undermined the former. By the 1960s, the countryside was already becoming crowded, and villagers began to move to the city in unforeseen numbers. In districts where land tenure was most stratified such as Karataş, this flight began to happen as early as the mid-1950s. The Çukurova region, which had resumed a path of rapid urbanization from the mid-1930s onward, witnessed a staggering rise in city populations throughout the 1960s that has more or less continued until this day. In 1965, many districts of Çukurova lost rural population for the first time since the First World War (see Table 33 above). The chief reason why villagers began to move to the cities was the high rate of landlessness in rural Çukurova, which has been the legacy of the region’s rapid agricultural expansion. Whereas the population of Turkey was approximately 75% rural from 1927 until 1950, by 1960 it was just 61.5% rural and only 41% by 1990.

Nonetheless, the agricultural prosperity of Çukurova has made its countryside comparatively enduring in light of the general issue of rural flight in Turkey from the 1960s onward. A detailed study of population movements in the region revealed that while Çukurova had lost some 60,000 inhabitants to other regions of Turkey, most notably Istanbul and Ankara, it had received nearly 200,000 new migrants, including over 100,000 from the Eastern Anatolian provinces of Elazığ, Diyarbakır, Erzurum, Gaziantep, and Van, in addition to more than 20,000
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migrants from abroad. These migrants continued an old process of settlement in Çukurova that began with immigrants from the Caucasus, Syrian and Anatolia peasants and merchants, and the seasonal laborer ancestors of Eastern Anatolian migrants and their former Armenian neighbors.

Despite massive ecological transformations, the recent history of the Çukurova countryside still carried many of the problems that arose during the late Ottoman period. The Seyhan and Ceyhan rivers continued to flood and damage crops, and one such flood in 1970 caused 3000 families in Adana to be relocated to Tarsus. Even the defining transformation of the 1950s — the elimination of malaria — was not in actuality as immediate or resounding as it initially seemed. There were practically no cases of malaria in Çukurova as of 1965. Just five villages in all of the Çukurova region (Adana, İçel, Hatay) reported cases of malaria infections in the year of 1968. Yet during the 1970s, malaria exploded back into the life of Çukurovans in epidemic form. According to a World Health Organization study, malaria rates increased rapidly from 1970 onward until in 1976, 1,014 of the 1,691 locations in the Çukurova region were malaria-positive. In 1977, there were 94,000 cases of malaria in Çukurova, which accounted for over 90% of the malaria infections in all of Turkey. In relative terms, this epidemic paled in comparison to that which struck the settlers of Çukurova during the 1860s or the yayla of Belemedik in 1916 (see Chapters 4 and 9). But by the late 1970s, an epidemic of that magnitude in a place like Çukurova served as a prominent example of the global resurgence in malaria epidemics that occurred as the declining efficacy of older pesticides and anti-malarial drugs

---
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along with socioeconomic change gave malaria and mosquitoes the opportunity for a comeback.  

In the case of Çukurova, the likely cause of the resurgence was the intensity of agriculture and dense rural population coupled with what the study mentioned as 560,000 floating laborers in the region who resided in temporary structures that left them exposed to mosquitoes. These workers, many of whom came from Eastern Anatolia, where malaria was still endemic, once again illustrated how Çukurova remained not just politically but also ecologically connected to neighboring regions. Public health officials brought the epidemic under control, and there are extremely few cases of malaria in Çukurova today; however, even as late as 2002 there were over 100 cases of *p. vivax* malaria in the Adana region.

**Conclusion to Part 4**

In 1979, Turkish director Erden Kıral made an internationally-acclaimed dramatization of Orhan Kemal’s *Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde* starring Tuncel Kurtiz. The Marxist overtones of the iconic novel, which was set in Çukurova and published in 1954, caused the film to be banned in Turkey following the 1980 coup. The final frame in the film featured a quotation attributed to Orhan Kemal from 1968, in which he said, “I checked and Çukurova is still the Çukurova of *Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde*. It has been this way for a thousand years.” Kemal’s assertion of Çukurova’s timeless character notwithstanding, its countryside had undergone significant transformation in a matter of decades. The ongoing disappearance of work animals, the
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93 Erden Kıral, "Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde," (Turkey 1980). Discussion of this quotation and other treatment of Orhan Kemal’s novels and their dramatizations can be found in Rahşan Yıldız Eyigün’s MA thesis. Rahşan Yıldız Eyigün, "Orhan Kemal'ın Hayatı, Eserleri ve Orhan Kemal Uyarlamalarının Türk Sinemasındaki Yeri" (Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts, 2006), 137.
considerable rise in rural population, and the almost complete absence of malaria would have been unmistakable changes that had occurred since Orhan Kemal’s time as a worker in the Adana region during the 1930s. Moreover, if this dissertation has proven anything, it is that even one century before 1968 — much less one millennium — Çukurova was in some ways a very different place. What did Kemal mean? Perhaps the enduring quality of Çukurova was something deeper, a repetition of certain themes throughout the continuous reiterations of land and labor relations over time.

Part 4 of this dissertation has been concerned with Çukurova’s history during the first decades of the Republican period and in particular, the continuities between its Republican present and its Ottoman past. Previous work has emphasized political continuities within the state institutions of modern Turkey and the groups that have controlled them or cultural continuities regarding issues of nationalism, class, and modernity. In this study, I have explored the ways in which ecological continuity served as an important link between the Ottoman and post-Ottoman periods in regions of the Middle East such as Çukurova. This ecological continuity comprises some of the political and cultural themes more commonly studied, but ecology also points to new and perhaps even more fundamental questions in the history of late Ottoman period. In doing so, I have aimed to examine not just physical continuities such as the centrality of cotton, the endurance of swamps, and the cyclical return of migrant workers but also the continuities nested within ecological change and the features that made Çukurova fundamentally the same place for “a thousand years” in the eyes of Orhan Kemal.

Some of these deep continuities can be observed through the changes in landholding patterns in the Çukurova region, and the ways in which the extensive and egalitarian distribution of land under ecologies of transhumant pastoralism translated into more stratified landholding
patterns through the implications of settlement, the rise of private property, and the sudden commercialization of agriculture. Other continuities can be found in the recurring waves of immigrants who, despite separate origins, were made part of the Çukurova soil which sometimes gave them bounty, other times hardship, and often simply swallowed them whole. Continuity is expressed through the different forms of contention that have arisen with every iteration of ecological change. Whether conflict between pastoralists and the state over pastures and mountain tops, competition between different social groups in Çukurova over access to agricultural land, often bitter negotiations between migrant workers and employers on farms and later factories, or the numerous disputes concerning water and other resources that occurred in Çukurova continuously throughout the agricultural expansion of the 1950s, the history of Çukurova bears witness to the observation of C.S. Lewis that “Man’s power over Nature turns out to be a power exercised by some men over other men with Nature as its instrument.”

Lastly, there are also simple but crucial continuities within the changing relationship between human beings and the land. The people of Adana have never and will probably never believe that it is in their best interest to remain under the hot Çukurova sun, no matter if their escape takes the form of a seasonal migration, weekend jaunts into the countryside, or simply an afternoon at the air-conditioned Özsüt in Ziyapaşa.

Likewise, continuity between the Ottoman past and the present can be observed in the geographical palimpsest of Adana today. The region’s palm trees are a remnant of when Mehmed Ali’s son briefly incorporated Cilicia into the Egyptian state and occupied the region during the 1830s. The cotton is to some extent the legacy of the US Civil War and its effects on Mediterranean economies. The Seyhan Dam remains as a feature of Çukurova’s landscape that
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links the efforts of an idealist Young Ottoman governor of Adana during the 1870s to the economic liberalism of Turkey’s first democratically-elected party and its Cold War American partners during the 1950s. The giant Australian eucalyptus forest near Tarsus is a silent reminder of the swamps that had long dominated the town and a period in history within which trees came to be seen as universally healthful allies in a war against malaria. The shops and trucks that sell *tantuni, mumbar,* and *şırdan* to night owls in Adana and Mersin are the legacy of more than one hundred years of migrant labor from Eastern Anatolia and Syria in the countryside. The ruined castle and monastery that tower over Kozan or the Sursock Quarter in Mersin are evidence of excised and largely forgotten Christian communities that participated in the transformation of the Adana region. The goats that feed on the weeds and grass between the highway and the Adana-Mersin railway are traces of the pastoralist ecology that waned throughout.
EPILOGUE

At the end of May in 2013, resistance to the scheduled demolition of Gezi Park, a tiny and formerly insignificant patch of green space in the sprawling metropolis of Istanbul, escalated improbably to revolutionary proportions. Despite the continued intervention of riot police, a protest movement started by a small group of activists was joined by throngs of supporters from different segments of the political spectrum. Sustained through organic leaderless coordination and social media, this movement captured the center of Istanbul and prevented the police from reasserting their hegemony for over two weeks. Numerous slogans and hashtags offered different labels and names for an organic phenomenon, but today in Turkey, this brief period of the country’s recent past is simply remembered as “Gezi.”

During Gezi, demonstrations continued in city centers throughout most of Turkey. Aside from some predominantly Kurdish provinces of Southeastern Turkey, where a tenuous balance between the ruling AKP and longtime Kurdish opposition parties had only recently been reached, regions representing the full political and socioeconomic spectrum witnessed some reverberations of these protests. I was just finishing up a stay in the Çukurova region and happened to see the demonstrations in the Armutlu neighborhood of Antakya and in the center of Mersin. In both locations, sentiments of discontent rooted in local dynamics figured prominently; however, it was remarkable to see groups gathered in the cities of Southern Turkey to chant “everywhere is Taksim” in solidarity with the protesters in Istanbul, aligning their own discontent with a geographical space very far away.

The occupied park in Istanbul was also an impressive sight. Within days, activists had organized to provide food, first aid, and even a library to the folks camped out in Gezi. People
carried goggles, masks, and bottles of milk and lemon that would be applied to the eyes of those exposed to tear gas during police assaults on the park. The region surrounding Taksim Square was protected by barricades that were erected and repaired with astounding quickness. One day, a Facebook group that posted news about protests, forums, and the latest happenings shared a map of the area on which each barricade had been honored with the name of different folk heroes and symbols of leftist resistance. The barricade blocking the road to the Gezi Park near Ataturk Library, a spot where I spent many a day reading newspapers and public health periodicals for my research, had been named for Dadaloğlu, the bard who composed so many songs of resistance to forced settlement in Cilicia during the 1860s. In the center of the map in the place of Gezi Park, the author had written, “the decree is the Sultan’s, but Gezi is ours.”

It was an allusion to the iconic lyrics of “the mountains are ours” authored by Dadaloğlu during resistance to the Reform Division, and the metaphor was absolutely perfect. With a single line, Gezi Park protesters had forged a very real connection to a past contention over space between the Ottoman state and the local inhabitants in a very different geography. Gezi had temporarily become the summer home of thousands of ordinary students and young people. A sudden battle over the urban geography had taught them to cherish an ordinary space that had long been invisibly present in quotidian life. The young guys who hurled tear gas canisters back at the riot police and dodged behind barricades and alleys were like those who had squared off with the cannons of the Reform Division in the Amanus Mountains more than a century before. Many of them of were ordinary adolescents, mischievous soccer fans whose energy and cohesiveness found a noble purpose in defending the ephemeral utopia of the park. The official government discourse branded them “looters (çapulcular),” just as the Ottoman government had
labeled the rebels of Cilicia “bandits (eşkıya),” and the protesters embraced the label of the outlaw with poetic irreverence.

But Gezi had much more in common with the mountains of Ottoman Cilicia than the theme of rebellion. The protests emerged from dissatisfaction with the ruling AKP’s intervention into individual private lives and most importantly urban space. The defense of the park against commercial development was in many ways analogous to the struggle of pastoralists to protect their access to the mountain spaces that allowed them to pursue their livelihoods. From this perspective, the battle over Gezi and the future of Turkish cityscapes was a direct descendent of the settlement movement of the 1860s and the efforts of the Ottoman government to impose sedentary life on the pastoralists of Cilicia and implement the forerunner to a regime of private property.

While a sociological explanation regarding urban transformation offered insight into the early beginnings of Gezi and was later championed by various commentators during and after the weeks of protest, it is also clear that those who came to Gezi did so for radically different regions. But what most who experienced Gezi remarked upon was the undeniably emotional aspect of the movement, the unique climate of euphoria and excited discussion, and the flourishing of art and humor that occurred as a result.

The songs of Dadaloğlu were part of that emotional climate because they had never been forgotten. They had become part of a national musical corpus over the course of the twentieth century (see Part 1 Introduction), and so when “the mountains are ours” was evoked by protestors, it was hardly because they are experts in the history of settlement and land tenure in Turkey. The collection and dissemination of folk songs has thoroughly alienated them from historical or geographical contexts, allowing them to be continually reappropriated for new
purposes. But as an observer, I was intrigued by the ways in which the sentiments contained and preserved in such songs could be mobilized by protesters in a radically different context, who without necessarily understanding the abstract metaphorical connections between rural policy of the 1860s and urban policy of the twenty-first century, identified a valid emotional connection with past experiences. It was not dissimilar from the Armenians of Cilicia who migrated to California after 1922 and carried with them the song of Kozanoğlu, another obstinate rebel of the mountains, who declared “I will not leave my place” (see Chapter 4). In exile, they likely forgot most of the Turkish songs that served as a cultural link with their former Muslim neighbors, but with the lingering memory of expulsion, the lesson of Kozanoğlu was one worth remembering.

These often coincidental convergences stand in stark contrast to a general reality, which is that it is impossible to narrate the history of Cilicia’s past in a manner that encompasses the meaning that this region carries for those who remember it in the present. Cilicia is essentially a symbol of nationalist victory in Turkey, viewed as a region where the independence movement was able to successfully expel a colonial French occupier and their Armenian collaborators. Meanwhile, Cilicia is a symbol of national loss for Armenians around the world. Even if the first generation of genocide survivors included some details about life with their Muslim neighbors in the memory books of Armenian villages in Cilicia, this aspect has faded from memory with time. The names of places in Cilicia are remembered as sites of sorrow that are uniquely Armenian. The historical significance of the region has been flattened and even banalized through repetition within a nationalist discourse. In Armenia today, the name Kilikia is uttered on a daily basis, not so much within the context of historical discussion per se, but rather as the name of the country’s most widespread and mediocre lager.
Throughout my time developing this project in Turkey, Armenia, the United States, and elsewhere, I have been continually confronted by the tension between the extreme complexity of a fine-grained picture of Cilicia’s past and the narrow view of its history in the present. When telling an interlocutor that I am studying Adana’s history, the most common images that come to their mind are the spicy cuisine of one of Turkey’s southern borderlands, the commercial empires of a few wealthy men, and most commonly the episodes of intense violence represented by the Adana massacres, the Armenian genocide, and the French Mandate of Cilicia. In fact, when reporting to other scholars that my dissertation was about Adana, the subsequent question was usually as to whether it was about the massacres of 1909 or something broader. In these frequent moments, I have felt as if the historiographical equivalent of Hakop Terzian (see Chapter 7), who following a horrific moment of violence that drew the world’s attention to his native Adana in 1909, confronted the tension of trying to offer a contextualized response to questions about what happened while simultaneously explaining that his hometown was much more than the site of a massacre.

I am satisfied with the extent to which this study has merged discussion of important themes in the environmental and socioeconomic history of the Ottoman Empire with coverage of the political events for which Cilicia is so often remembered. I believe I have shown that the two stories are deeply intertwined, that agrarian change was at the heart of many conflicts, and that death by sword and death by mosquito were not mutually exclusive experiences of violence. Yet I am still left with the feeling that beyond the common concerns of past observers and present commentators, there is a more compelling and vibrant layer of history that is difficult to convey by historiographical means.
Before and after the massacres of 1909, Adana was a bustling late Ottoman city. Families mingled in the parks, in the markets, in the taverns, and at the theatre and all the other urban spaces typical of fin de siècle urban spaces. They listened to public readings of the local newspapers, which contained news, rumors, announcements, stories, and jokes in Turkish, Armenian, and Arabic. Workers lounged about the inns or under the shade of the trees, napping, daydreaming, playing cards, drinking tea, and swatting away flies during their precious downtime. They searched the markets for small, symbolic items from the city to carry back to their families as evidence that their life in Adana was worthwhile and that even on the other side of the empire, they still always thought of their loved ones back home. They quarreled with each other continuously, sometimes over money or honor and sometimes out of boredom. They sang songs of love and exile. They talked about the ones they hoped to marry in their native villages. And when they did go back at the end of the harvest, they carried with them more songs about Adana and the living they made working the soils of the Çukurova plain.

The conflicts these people lived and the violence that they experienced and meted out are still relevant today. They are what have filled the remembered landscape of Cilicia with sites of sorrow and geographies of resistance. The violence is the reason why most have studied Adana as well as the reason why many have not. However, our fixation on their darkest and final moments does disservice to the full lives led by Cilicians past. I do not feel that I have adequately represented those lives to the extent that I have elaborated on the processes with which they intersected. But when telling stories of conflict, hardship, and disappointments in Cilicia, I have done my best to do so through the voices of those who experienced the events as I construct my own narrative of what has happened in that place. I have supplemented them at times with the perspectives of literary figures such as the late Yaşar Kemal, who understood the
histories well without opening a single dusty binder at the Ottoman archives. I have when possible made reference to the songs and poems passed down from the ordinary people who experienced momentous events. It is through the lives of those people and their descendants that we know its past and are enriched by exploring its history.
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