

Whose Nation? Mustafa Djelaleddin between Ottomanism and Turkism

The person of Mustafa Djelaleddin Pasha – a Polish 19th-century émigré to the Ottoman Empire born as Konstanty Borzęcki – is familiar to every Polish student of Turkology. I recollect myself having learnt of his influence on the modern Turkish nationalism and then repeating this “established truth” to my own students. Yet, I must confess that until recently I have not read his famous book, *Les Turcs anciens et modernes*, published in Constantinople in 1869.¹ When I finally decided to do it, I found that there was no single copy in any library in Poland, including the large collection of Polonica of the National Library. Also my former teachers and now fellow Turkologists confessed that they had never seen the book itself. My research in Turkey proved more fruitful: apart from a copy in the Bayezit Devlet Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), also available in microfilm in the Millî Kütüphane (Ankara), there is another copy in the Atatürk Mausoleum collection, once belonging to Mustafa Kemal and provided with his handwritten margin notes.² Yet, there appears to be no single monograph, no doctoral dissertation, or even a Master’s thesis prepared in Turkey that would focus on the intellectual impact of Mustafa Djelaleddin. So far, the most extensive contribution in this field originates from Yusuf Akçura, himself a leading Turkish nationalist thinker and a historian as well. Akçura presented a paper entitled “L’oeuvre historique de Mustapha Djelalettin Pacha et ses points de vue sur l’histoire des Turcs” at the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Warsaw in 1930.³ The fact

¹ M. Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs anciens et modernes* (Constantinople, 1869).

² www.genelkurmay.org/anitkabir/kitap/m.html: Anıtkabir 1372; this copy was studied by Şerafettin Turan in his book: *Atatürk’ün düşünce yapısını etkileyen olaylar, düşünürler, kitaplar* (Ankara, 1982), pp. 25–27.

³ Unfortunately, only its resumé has survived; see: A.O. Youssouf Bey, “L’oeuvre historique de Mustapha Djelalettin Pacha et ses points de vue sur l’histoire des Turcs,” in: *VII-e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques. Résumés des communications présentées au Congrès*, vol. 2 (Warsaw, 1933), pp. 233–236.

that the paper was delivered in Warsaw and that Akçura was then the president of the Turkish Historical Society forces one to read his text with a grain of salt. Notwithstanding the apparent courtesy towards the Polish hosts, also evident from his repeated evocations of the Polish-Turkish friendship, Akçura's favorable opinion of Mustafa Djelaleddin was yet genuine and can be confirmed by his major book: *Türkçülük*, published in 1928. Like many later scholars, Akçura focused on the most original – but also most controversial – element of Mustafa Djelaleddin's book: his theory of Turo-Arianism (touro-aryanisme).⁴ In fact – as I will try to prove – there is much more in Djelaleddin's book worth focusing on.

A useful biography of Mustafa Djelaleddin has been written by Jerzy Łątka, a Polish journalist. Its shorter Turkish version is provided by a catchy title: *Lehistan'dan gelen şehit* (A shahid from Lehistan).⁵ To recall the basic facts: Konstanty Borzęcki was born in 1826, to a noble – though not too wealthy – family. Having graduated from the gymnasium in Piotrków, he studied for two years at the School of Fine Arts in Warsaw. Apparently, financial reasons forced him to give up his education there and enter the Theological Seminary at Włocławek. In 1848, with the outbreak of a Polish anti-Prussian insurrection in the Grand Duchy of Poznań, this would-be Catholic priest left the seminary and crossed the border from the Russian side, wishing to take part in the struggle. After the fall of the uprising, he chose to leave to France and in the fall of 1849 – during the peak of the refugees' crisis caused by the collapse of the Hungarian uprising⁶ – he arrived at Istanbul. Following the examples of his more famous compatriots – Michał Czajka turned Sadık Pasha and Józef Bem turned Murad Pasha, Borzęcki converted to Islam, adopted the new name of Mustafa Djelaleddin, and entered the Ottoman army. In this great age of dilettanti he persuaded a French instructor of the Istanbul Military Academy (Mekteb-i Harbiye) to examine his military knowledge and – without being ever formally trained – he became an Ottoman officer.⁷

⁴ Akçuraoğlu Oglou Youssouf Bey, *Türkçülük ve Dış Türkler* (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 27–32.

⁵ J. Łątka, *Pasza z Lechistanu. Mustafa Dżelaleddin (Konstanty Borzęcki)* (Krakow, 1993); idem, *Lehistan'dan gelen şehit. Mustafa Celaleddin Paşa/Konstanty Borzęcki* (Istanbul, 1987); Łątka corrects several errors of the article by Adam Lewak contained in the *Polish Biographical Dictionary*; cf. A. Lewak, "Borzęcki Konstanty (Dżelaleddin-pasza)," in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 2 (Krakow, 1936), pp. 365–366.

⁶ A. Lewak, *Dzieje emigracji polskiej w Turcji (1831–1878)* (Warsaw, 1935), pp. 55–91; see also a recent book on this subject, based on Ottoman primary sources, by Bayram Nazır: *Macar ve Polonyalı Mülteciler. Osmanlı'ya Sığınanlar* (Istanbul, 2006).

⁷ Łątka, *Pasza z Lechistanu*, p. 38; this information, originating from the memoirs of Hasan Enver Pasha, Mustafa Djelaleddin's son, reveals that in fact the earlier assumptions by Akçura and Lewak of his formal military education were wrong; the letter of Hasan Enver Pasha, describing his late father and addressed to his son-in-law, Sâmih Bey, was written in 1925; it has been preserved among the papers of Zeynep Menemencioglu and published; see: "Müşir Mehmet Ali Paşa'nın damadı Ferik Hasan Enver Paşa'nın kendi çocukluğuyla babası Ferik Mustafa Celâlettin Paşa'yı anlatan mektubu: Oğlum Sâmih Bey'e" *Tarih ve Toplum* 1 (January, 1984), pp. 4–14, esp. p. 5.

During the following years he served on various military posts in Anatolia and the Balkans, participated in the Crimean War as well as the military pacifications of Iraq (1858), Montenegro (1861–1862), and Crete (1867), attaining the rank of divisional general (*ferik*) in 1876. The same year he was killed in the war against Montenegro.

Besides his military career, Mustafa Djelaleddin actively participated in the intellectual life of the Ottoman Empire. He wrote numerous articles for the *Courrier d'Orient* – a newspaper published since 1860/1861 in Istanbul by a French editor named Giampietry and widely read by the Turkish intelligentsia.⁸ Also Mustafa Djelaleddin's book was published by the printing press of *Courrier*. Even more important was his role in the most popular Turkish daily – *Basiret* – published in the years 1870–1878 with a circulation reaching up to 10,000 copies.⁹ He not only published articles there, but also belonged to the editorial board. Unfortunately for a present scholar, his articles in both journals were usually unsigned, apparently for his fear of being dismissed from the army.¹⁰ This fear proved well grounded, since in 1871 he was temporarily removed from active service due to the allegations concerning his “publishing in foreign press.”¹¹

A constant feature in Mustafa Djelaleddin's writing is his extreme Russophobia.¹² To quote Roderic Davison: “because of their bitterness against Russia, the Poles and Hungarians were often more Turkish than the Turks.”¹³ In the case of Borzęcki, the other side of his Russophobia was his unabashed Turkophilism.¹⁴

A major task in the activity of the 19th-century Polish émigrés was to discredit Russia in the eyes of the Western public opinion. In a recent article, Aleksandr Filjuškin demonstrates that the tradition of Polish efforts to remove Russia from the mental map of Western Europeans predates the partitions by almost three

⁸ On Giampietry (or Jean Piétri) and his *Courrier*, see: Ş. Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought. A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas* (Princeton, 1962), p. 33; and R.H. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856–1876* (New York, 1973), pp. 205–206.

⁹ I. Yerlikaya, *XIX. yüzyıl Osmanlı siyasi hayatında Basiret gazetesi ve pancermenizm–panislamizm–panslavizm–Osmanlılık fikirleri* (Van, 1994), pp. 21–27.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 55–56, 66–67.

¹¹ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (Istanbul), Irade, Dahiliye, dosya 632, no. 43962 – the imperial order dated on 26 Safer 1288 A.H. (May 17, 1871); cf. Łątka, *Pasza z Lechistanu*, p. 56. Łątka associates this dismissal with the death of the grand vizier, Âli Pasha, and the rise of Russian influence on the Bosphorus. Âli Pasha, however, died in September 1871, almost 4 months after the dismissal. In March 1872 Mustafa Djelaleddin was restored to active service (BOA, Irade, Dahiliye, dosya 647, no. 44948).

¹² According to the family tradition, recalled to Łątka by Borzęcki's then 80-years' old daughter, the last words of her mortally wounded father were *psiakrew Katerina!* (“damn Catherine!”; *Katerina* would be a distorted form of Polish *Katarzyna*, i.e. Russian empress Catherine II the Great); see Łątka, *Pasza z Lechistanu*, p. 75.

¹³ Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, p. 76.

¹⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 231 and 438.

centuries and can be traced to the 16th-century wars between Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy¹⁵. Needless to say, such efforts were only intensified by the partitions of Poland and Russia's role in crushing the Polish uprisings of 1830, 1848, and 1863.¹⁶

Though the political results of the Crimean War were deeply disappointing for the Polish émigrés, its intellectual climate proved very favorable for disseminating the anti-Russian propaganda. In order to discredit Russia, many authors compared her with another traditional foe of Christian Western Europe, i.e. Turkey. In 1855, a symptomatic book appeared in faraway Spain, written by the prominent liberal journalist, Andrés Borrego. According to the author, Spain, France, and England, who once had defended Europe from the "Asiatic barbarism" (*la barbarie asiática*), embodied by Turkey, now should have protected Europe from "la Rusia, su arrogancia, su exorbitantes pretensiones" and restore Poland as well as independent Armenia, Georgia, Circassia, Moldavia, and the Crimea.¹⁷ A step further was made by a close friend of Borzęcki, Franciszek Duchiniński, who also spent eight years in the Ottoman Empire in the 1850s. Duchiniński not only "removed" the Russians from Europe but denied their belonging to the Slavic race, considering Russia no less but an anti-Slavic, Turo-Mongolian power!¹⁸

To Mustafa Djelaleddin, any comparison of Russia with Turkey was but an insult to the latter. Though once a close friend of Duchiniński, whom he mentions twice in his book,¹⁹ he could not agree with the idea of removing the Turks along with the Russians beyond the European family of nations. Duchiniński's (perhaps undeserved) popularity among some French intellectuals, such as the historian Henri Martin and the geographer Casimir Delamarre, resulted in a proposal by the latter to remove the history of Russia and Turkey from the French school curriculum reserved for the European history. According to Mustafa Djelaleddin, it was this very proposal that provoked him to develop his theory of Turo-Arianism. To quote him: "la déclaration faite récemment par M. Casimir Delamarre, dans sa

¹⁵ A. Filjuškin, "Kak Rossija stala dlja Evropy Aziej," *Ab Imperio* 1 (2004), pp. 191–227, esp. pp. 206 and 219.

¹⁶ A series of brilliant essays on this subject can be found in A. Nowak, *Jak rozbić rosyjskie imperium? Idee polskiej polityki wschodniej (1733–1921)* (Krakow, 1999).

¹⁷ A. Borrego, *Estudios políticos: guerra de Oriente, considerada en si misma y bajo el punto de vista de la parte que España puede verse llamada á tomar en la contienda europea* (Madrid, n.d. [1855]), pp. 37, 50, and 64.

¹⁸ A fair sample of Duchiniński's ideas can be found in his book in French: *Peuples Aryâs et Tourans. Agriculteurs et Nomades. Nécessité des réformes dans l'exposition de l'histoire des peuples aryâs-européens et Tourans, particulièrement des Slaves et des Moscovites* (Paris, 1864); on Duchiniński, see also Nowak, *Jak rozbić rosyjskie imperium?*, 54; M. Czapska, "Duchiniński Franciszek Henryk," in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 5 (Krakow, 1939–1946), pp. 441–443; S. Grabski, "Życie i działalność literacka Franciszka Duchinińskiego Kijowianina," in: *Pisma Franciszka Duchinińskiego*, vol. 1 (Rapperswil, 1901), pp. VIII–XXXIV; a scornful evaluation of Duchiniński's dilettantism is given in M. Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski* (Warsaw, 1950), vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 51–55.

¹⁹ Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, p. 229, 282.

pétition au Sénat de l'Empire français, demandant pour l'enseignement de l'histoire un programme d'après lequel les Turcs avec les Moscovites, rejetés de la famille des Aryas de l'Europe, se verraient relégués dans la race représentant la barbarie de l'Asie, m'engage à y ajouter quelques mots."²⁰

Published less than two decades after the seminal book by Gobineau,²¹ Mustafa Djelaleddin's book could be easily qualified as yet one more among various racial theories that were to develop during the following 70 years. Reacting to the racial theories developed in Western Europe, Mustafa Djelaleddin engaged to defend the Turks by trying to prove that they were Arians. If only the Arians were to be accepted in the European concert, then the Turks had to be Arians as well. Admittedly, a large part of Djelaleddin's book is taken by his dilettantish and pseudolinguistic arguments aiming to demonstrate that the Turks, along with the Indo-Europeans, belonged to the common Turo-Arian race. Following Duchiński, the author disqualified the Russians as a mélange finno-mongol, but he differentiated between the Mongols and the Turks, stating that the latter were close relatives of the Europeans.²²

Unfortunately, our reception of his work today has been heavily influenced by his reception in the 1930s, when racial theories were flourishing in Germany, Turkey, but also in Poland.²³ The article on Borzęcki, written by Adam Lewak for the *Polish Biographical Dictionary*, was published in 1936 and stressed his influence on the "current racial theories" in Turkey.²⁴ Indeed, in a study of the ideas and books that had influenced the mental world of Atatürk, Şerafettin Turan analyzed the handwritten notes made by Mustafa Kemal on the margins of his personal copy of Mustafa Djelaleddin's book. Significantly, a comment "very important" (*çok mühim*) appears in one of the most pretentious paragraphs, claiming a close affinity of the Turks and the Etruscans.²⁵ Knowing Atatürk's fascination with the supposedly Hittite origins of the modern Turks as well as his promoting the Sun-Language Theory (*Güneş-Dil Teorisi*), according to which Turkish was "the mother of all languages,"²⁶ this is hardly surprising. However, by reading Mustafa Djelaleddin's book in the way it was done in the 1930s, one might heavily distort its original meaning and proportions. In fact, his aim was simply pragmatic: to prove that the Turks as well as the Ottoman Empire deserved to be treated as

²⁰ Ibid., p. 229.

²¹ J.A. de Gobineau, *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*, vols. 1–4 (Paris, 1853–1855).

²² Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, pp. 291–292.

²³ This fact has been recently reminded in the book by M. Gawin, *Rasa i nowoczesność. Historia polskiego ruchu eugenicznego (1880–1952)* (Warsaw, 2003).

²⁴ Lewak, Borzęcki Konstanty, p. 366.

²⁵ Turan, *Atatürk'ün düşünce yapısını*, p. 27.

²⁶ U. Heyd, *Language Reform in Modern Turkey* (Jerusalem, 1954), p. 33; G.L. Lewis, "Atatürk's Language Reform as an Aspect of Modernization in the Republic of Turkey," in: J. Landau (ed.), *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey* (Boulder–Leiden, 1984), pp. 195–213, esp. p. 208.

equals by the Western powers. He even openly admitted his incompetence in the subject of linguistics and racial theory!²⁷ Besides, one must not forget that the question of race, however pseudoscientific it appears to the modern reader, might have been a matter of life and death only a half century ago. The Polish Karaites owed their survival under the Nazi occupation to their ability of persuading the German authorities that they were not of Semitic extraction!

Borzęcki's pragmatic attitude is best illustrated by his behavior at the outbreak of the French-Prussian war in 1870. Notwithstanding the traditionally pro-French sympathy of the Polish émigrés and his own experience of fighting against the Prussians in 1848, he persuaded his Turkish colleagues from the editorial board of the *Basiret* to side with Prussia, apparently assuming that a stronger Germany might weaken the future position of Russia. The role of Mustafa Djelaleddin in redirecting the editorial policy of the *Basiret* is acknowledged in the memoirs of its owner and editor-in-chief, Basiretçi Ali. His initiative cannot be underestimated, having in mind the key role played by the *Basiret* in the German-Ottoman rapprochement in the years to follow.²⁸ The pro-German stand of Borzęcki in 1870 can be regarded as a symbol of the final disillusion with Napoleon III among both the Polish émigrés and the Ottoman statesmen.²⁹ Borzęcki's uneasiness with the French policy is already apparent in his book, published a year before the war. We find there a scornful allusion to Napoleon's famous "principle of nationalities:" "la cause de l'humanité triomphera par la restauration de l'équilibre de l'Europe et celle de la grande nationalité de la Pologne, et non pas par l'application microscopique du principe des nationalités factices en Orient, au profit de la Russie."³⁰

Apart from a historical part, based on the studies by Joseph de Guignes, Joseph von Hammer *et al.*, and a section developing his theory of Turo-Arianism, Mustafa Djelaleddin's book contains numerous valuable observations, based on his twenty-years' experience of service in various Ottoman provinces, and a project of constitutional reform of the Empire. Yet, a survey of the extant historiography of the period, undertaken by the present author, has revealed that these latter aspects had not gained much scholarly attention. At the best, the ideas and projects of Mustafa Djelaleddin are summarized in a few sentences, paying lip service to their importance and typically focused on his racial

²⁷ "Avouons notre incompetence dans cette matière, que nous n'avons effleurée que pour répondre à M. Casimir Delamarre"; Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, pp. 298–299.

²⁸ Basiretçi Ali Efendi, *Istanbul'da yarım asırlık vekayi-i mühimme*, ed. by N. Sağlam (Istanbul, 1997), pp. 70–71; cf. Yerlikaya, *XIX. yüzyıl Osmanlı siyasi*, p. 67, 82–83, 87; and Łątka, *Pasza z Lechistanu*, pp. 79–80.

²⁹ On the reactions of the Polish émigrés to the outbreak of the French-Prussian war, see J.W. Borejsza, *Emigracja polska po powstaniu styczniowym* (Warsaw, 1966), pp. 382–389. Admittedly, though many welcomed the fall of Napoleon III, their sympathies were generally on the French side.

³⁰ Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, pp. 361–362.

theories.³¹ As the sole exemption stands the book by Roderic Davison, who not only read Djelaleddin's book, but was familiar with the study of the Polish emigration in the 19th-century Ottoman Empire, written by Adam Lewak.³² Davison was also the only scholar who questioned the possible connections between Mustafa Djelaleddin and the Young Ottomans, though he did not find an answer.³³

It is striking that Mustafa Djelaleddin's book was published in 1869, at the apex of the Young Ottomans' activity. Its publication was enabled by the editor of the *Courrier d'Orient*, Giampietry, who was instrumental two years earlier in facilitating the contact between the Young Ottoman intellectuals and the dissident prince, Mustafa Fazıl, then in exile in Paris.³⁴ Moreover, in the editorial board of the *Basiret*, Mustafa Djelaleddin must have regularly encountered such Young Ottoman writers as Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi, and Ahmed Midhat.³⁵ Yet, no single author so far has considered Mustafa Djelaleddin a Young Ottoman.

One might ask what criteria made one to be regarded as a Young Ottoman? The most formal document of the Young Ottomans, entitled "Organisation de la Chancellerie de la Jeune Turquie," was signed in Paris on 30 August, 1867, by Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, Ziya Pasha, Namık Kemal as well as two non-Muslims: the Polish émigré Władysław Plater and Austrian journalist Simon Deutsch.³⁶ Judging by such formal criteria, Plater and Deutsch should be considered Young Ottomans, although they did not even know Turkish. On the other hand, in his study of the Young Ottoman thought, Şerif Mardin devoted a whole chapter to Hayreddin Pasha, a Circassian from the then semi-independent Tunisia who authored a treatise on the proposed reforms, published in Arabic in 1867, but who had never belonged to the social circle grouping the Young Ottomans.³⁷

³¹ I.e. N. Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, with a new introduction by Feroz Ahmad (London, 1998), p. 316; D. Kushner, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism 1876–1908* (London, 1977), p. 9; B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford, 1961), p. 339; Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*, p. 120; I. Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun en uzun yüzyılı* (Istanbul, 1995), pp. 62, 219–220, 231; idem, "Osmanen-Reich und Polen nach 1683: Militaerreformen im Osmanen-Reich und Polnische Offiziere," *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Militaire* 67 (1988), pp. 57–65, esp. p. 64.

³² Lewak, *Dzieje emigracji* (see n. 6 above); the value of Lewak's study is enhanced by the fact that it was based largely on the manuscripts of the Rapperswil Library, destroyed in Warsaw during WW2.

³³ Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, pp. 231–232.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

³⁵ Yerlikaya, *XIX. yüzyıl Osmanlı siyasi*, pp. 55–56.

³⁶ This document was preserved in original in the Rapperswil Library (the library, founded by Plater, brought to Warsaw after WW1 and perished in WW2); its fragment is published in Lewak, *Dzieje emigracji*, p. 214; see also S. Kieniewicz, "La Turquie et l'indépendance de la Pologne au XIX^e siècle," *Bulletin* 47 (1983), no. 186, pp. 545–562, esp. pp. 558–559.

³⁷ Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*; pp. 385–395; admittedly, a decade later Hayreddin was to become the Ottoman grand vizier under Abdülhamid II in 1878.

Examining the context of Mustafa Djelaleddin's book, one finds some most typical postulates of the Young Ottomans:

- a) a proposal to introduce the parliamentary system, with a national assembly counting ca. 100 Muslim and ca. 100 non-Muslim deputies;³⁸
- b) a proposal of rendering ministers responsible before the parliament while simultaneously granting them more autonomy versus the grand vizier;³⁹
- c) a proposal of a provincial reform, based on the principle of local self-government;⁴⁰
- d) a proposal of a language reform.⁴¹

One wonders again, why not consider the author of such projects a Young Ottoman? One possible explanation might have been his social alienation within the Ottoman society. Indeed, in the memoirs of his son we read that no children were accepted in his father's house except for the children of other Polish emigrants.⁴² By his conversion, the father separated himself from his former coreligionists while on the other hand he could not find any soul mates in his new Muslim environment. Looked after with almost motherly care by his Turkish wife, who did not know French but carefully tended his French library, he sacrificed every spare minute to solitary writing.⁴³ Significantly, in the voluminous collection of letters by Namık

³⁸ Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, pp. 210-211; he also proposed to distribute the non-Muslim seats among 25 Armenians, 25 Bulgarians, 14 Greeks, 7 Syrians, 7 Jews, 4 Orthodox Albanians, 3 Catholic Albanians, 4 Orthodox Bosnians, 3 Catholic Bosnians, 3 Vlachs, 2 Nestorians as well as the representatives of Catholic and Protestant Armenians.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

⁴⁰ Though full of praise for the provincial reforms already introduced by Midhat Pasha, the author postulated that the basic unit become not a large *vilayet*, but a much smaller *kaza*; *ibid.*, pp. 179-185.

⁴¹ "Je me sers d'une langue bien vulgaire et bien populaire, qu'aucun écrivain turc n'oserait mettre sur le papier, et qui est parlée par les peuples turc et tatare. La nation turque, depuis plusieurs siècles, est affectée d'une plaie de persianisme et d'arabisme officiel;" *ibid.*, pp. 267-268; the author went further than most reformers of his generation as he also criticized the "hyéroglyphes arabes," complaining that "les Turcs ayant adopté l'alphabet et l'écriture arabe, qui ne convenait pas du tout à la langue turque;" *ibid.*, pp. 49 and 111.

⁴² "Evimize hariçten yabancı olan hiç bir çocuk kabul olunmaz ve benimle bulunamazdı;" "Oğlum Sâmih Bey'e," p. 9.

⁴³ "Mon père était un homme très bizarre. Quoiqu'il était un homme de monde et Européen il n'avait noué aucune relation avec aucun Européen et il s'est occupé pendant les époques de paix avec ses écritures et ses livres. [...] Ma mere, quoiqu'elle ne connaissait pas le français, gardait les livres et les écrits de mon père. Elle lui portait ses livres et papiers comme un garçon de bureau, lui fait préparer ses habits, et elle le soignait comme une mère. [...] Mon père, comme il était converti, ne pouvait pas naturellement être ami avec les étrangers chrétiens. Est-ce qu'à moins [*sic*] pouvait trouver parmi nous des gens du même esprit et de mentalité comme lui? Jamais! Parlons franchement, dans notre ancienne vie il n'y avait que du matérialisme. Notre vie ressemblait beaucoup à celle des animaux;" see Hasan Enver Pasha, „Mes idées” (a French summary of his inedited Turkish pamphlet, prepared by Halil Midhat Bey on the request of the Polish attache in Istanbul and sent to the Polish Embassy in Ankara in April 1931), Archiwum Akt Nowych (Warsaw), Ambasada RP w Ankarze, sign. 61, pp. 39-41 (pp. 3-4 according to the original pagination).

Kemal, edited by Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, the name of Mustafa Djelaleddin is not even once mentioned, though they must have known each other at least from the *Basiret*.⁴⁴ Still, it is hard to believe that a pasha and publicist was really alienated from the Ottoman society, in which he lived and served for almost 30 years. Besides, also Ibrahim Şinasi, especially in his later years, was notorious with his misanthropy and yet it does not prevent us from regarding him as a leading Young Ottoman thinker.⁴⁵

Perhaps it is time to pass the floor to Mustafa Djelaleddin himself. In concord with his own declaration: “j’ai obéi à un sentiment de piété filiale envers la patrie ottomane, de piété fraternelle envers les compagnons d’armes dont je partage depuis vingt années la vie laborieuse et militante,” he consistently identifies himself with the Ottoman society using first person plural while referring to “notre souverain,” “notre nation,” “notre société,” “nos armes,” “nos harems,” “nos intérêts,” and also: “nos libertés.”⁴⁶ His self-identification as a Muslim, Turkish speaking Ottoman, went so far that – though praising the newly introduced equality of all religions⁴⁷ – he also warned against an excessively hasty recruitment of non-Muslims to the Ottoman army,⁴⁸ and lamented the inequality of Ottoman Muslims competing in the fields of trade and cabotage with the Greeks, the latter being protected by the institution of capitulations.⁴⁹ Another proof of his assimilation is the fact that he alternatively used the terms *djehad* and *guerre nationale*.⁵⁰ Not unlike his Young Ottoman peers – Namik Kemal and Ali Suavi – he did not hesitate to defend the traditional Muslim customs, including the institution of harem and even... slavery.⁵¹

The aforementioned term “nos libertés,” used by Mustafa Djelaleddin, sets one on the intriguing trail of his *Weltanschauung*. The plural term “liberties,” as distinguished from “liberty,” used to apply to traditional privileges cherished by the Polish nobility.⁵² The nobles believed to be entitled to their liberties by their participation in the defense of their common *Patria*. A fitting fragment can be found in Borzęcki’s praise of the “patriotisme turc”: “En Europe tous les Turcs sont appelés Osmanlis, mais notre peuple ne decore [emphasis D.K.] de ce

⁴⁴ *Namik Kemal’in husûsî mektupları*, ed. by F.A. Tansel, vols. 1–4 (Ankara, 1967–1986).

⁴⁵ Cf. Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*, p. 255.

⁴⁶ Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, pp. 41, 77, 91, 96, and 103.

⁴⁷ “Dans cette grande fusion humanitaire, la distinction des religions étant à jamais proscrite, la tolérance, l’égalité, la fraternité, la solidarité de nos intérêts et de notre position géographique [...] devraient seuls lier tous les Ottomans, chrétiens et musulmans;” *ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴⁸ “Je considérerais comme le suicide de la Turquie, la formation de corps exclusivement chrétiens, que les russophiles se plaisent à nous suggérer;” *ibid.*, pp. 167–168.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74–77 and 96.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 162 and 164.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 91–98; as for slavery, especially of young Circassian girls, he trifled with its critique by merely comparing it to an adoption into a wealthy family.

⁵² Cf. A. Grzeskowiak-Krwawicz, *Regina libertas. Wolność w polskiej myśli politycznej XVIII wieku* (Gdańsk, 2006), p. 19.

nom que celui qui a vu le monde, qui a puisé de l'expérience dans les traverses de la vie, qui monté sur un cheval fidèle, a longtemps fait retentir les échos des montagnes du chant de *l'aman*, au souvenir de la belle qui l'attendait dans son *memlekiet* lointain."⁵³

The above statement is the definition of a political nation, whose membership is earned by one's deeds and not racial or ethnic origins. Remembering Borzęcki's own origin from the provincial nobility, one can better understand his favorable attitude towards the descendants of Ottoman sipahis who, like their Polish peers, had to defend their social position endangered in the industrializing world by education, hence joining the ranks of intelligentsia:

Prétend-on que les Turcs des provinces manquent d'hommes mûrs pour la vie publique ? Mais c'est surtout en province, qu'il y a des hommes qui lisent les journaux, qui méditent l'histoire et qui connaissent les intérêts du pauvre, ceux de l'agriculture, de l'industrie et du commerce. Qu'on ne s' imagine pas que les descendants des spahis sont ce qu'ils étaient il y a treize ans; la médiocrité des fortunes a forcé chacun à faire des réflexions et des études, et il y a en province des hommes qui surpassent de beaucoup nos bureaucrates, non seulement par la capacité et le discernement, mais aussi par la culture intellectuelle, les vues pratiques et l'expérience.⁵⁴

Throughout his book, Mustafa Djelaleddin consistently applies the French term "nation" to describe the political community. Hence, he alternatively refers to "la nation turque,"⁵⁵ "notre nation,"⁵⁶ or "la nation ottomane."⁵⁷ Addressing the issue of legal reforms, he explains to the Western reader: "Nous sommes dans une phase de transition, que chaque nation accomplit dans sa vie politique."⁵⁸ Yet another usage of the word nation for a political body is manifest in the statement: "les Turcs ont la supériorité des principes, proclamés par leurs Souverains et acceptés par la nation."⁵⁹

On the other hand, the Albanians, Kurds, Armenians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Walachians, Moldavians, and Serbs are described as "populations,"⁶⁰ "peuples,"⁶¹

⁵³ Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, p. 142.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 192; another Polish noble, who perceived the Ottoman society from the Polish perspective, was the émigré general, Władysław Zamoyski; in 1847 he tried to persuade Reşid Pasha to abandon recruiting bureaucrats from among former slaves and replace them by the sons of the gentry (*zastąpić synami z dobrych domów*); see J. Skowronek, *Polityka bałkańska Hotelu Lambert (1833–1856)* (Warsaw, 1976), p. 221.

⁵⁵ Djelaleddin, *Les Turcs*, pp. 63, 138–140, 189, and 233.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 112, 115 ("une multitude de populations non-musulmanes, pour la plupart chrétiennes"), 138 ("nos populations turque, albanaise, rouméliote, kurde etc." – hence the term *turque* has a different, ethnic meaning here), and 191 ("populations soumises").

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 139, and 189.

nationalités⁶² or even *peuples*⁶³. Able reference to the Kurds as a nation can be easily explained by its context, as they are praised as empire builders.⁶⁴

To sum up, in the eyes of Mustafa Djelaleddin only the Muslim Turks (or the Ottomans) qualified as a nation, political nation, while he denied such a status to the Ottoman minorities – Christian or Muslim alike.

Such a conclusion contradicts any textbook of the 19th-century Ottoman history. Usually we read that the Muslim Turks were the last ones to develop a separate national consciousness in a belated reaction to the secessionist movements of first the Christian and then the non-Turkish Muslim (i.e. Albanian and Arab) subjects of the sultan. Yet, most scholars of the Turkish nationalism focused their attention on its two founding fathers – Yusuf Akçura (1876–1935) and Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924), who belonged to the later generation of Young Turks and both developed an ethno-cultural rather than political type of nationalism. Indeed, they both followed Gobineau rather than Renan.⁶⁵ To quote Uriel Heyd: The clearly expressed will to continue a life in common, which is for Ernest Renan one of the main marks of nationality, is not mentioned in Gökalp's definition of a nation. Instead, he stressed common cultural heritage rather than political will to build a common future.⁶⁶ Invoking the typology of Hans Kohn,⁶⁷ differentiating between the West European enlightened nationalism based on citizenship and the Central-Eastern European romantic nationalism of an irrational, exclusive and cultural type, Heyd remarked that although Gökalp borrowed most of his theories from French sociology and philosophy, his nationalism is more of the Central European and particularly German type.⁶⁸

Heyd's view of the Young Turks' nationalism was upheld by his former student, David Kushner, who also stressed its romantic, cultural, and Central-European trait. Kushner also denied any national program to the predecessors of the Young Turks by stating that the doctrine of the Young Ottomans was based merely on the loyalty towards the common fatherland (*vatan*) and the ruling dynasty. Although he mentioned Mustafa Djelaleddin in his book, he did not regard him as a Young Ottoman and, like many others, he focused exclusively on his theory of Turo-Arianism.⁶⁹

⁶² Ibid., pp. 115 and 192.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 63.

⁶⁴ "Nos Kurdes de Souleimanié sont la première nation qui ait établi par les armes un empire;" *ibid.*, p. 295.

⁶⁵ In 1914 Akçura defined the nation as a unity of race, language, and tradition, though by race he meant ethnic rather than racial characteristics; cf. F. Georgeon, *Aux origines du nationalisme turc. Yusuf Akçura (1876–1935)* (Paris, 1980), p. 26.

⁶⁶ U. Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism. The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* (London, 1950), p. 62.

⁶⁷ H. Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism. A Study in its Origins and Background* (New York, 1944).

⁶⁸ Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism*, p. 164–165.

⁶⁹ Kushner, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism*, pp. 7–9 and 97–98.

Since its publication, the aforementioned typology of European nationalisms by Hans Kohn has influenced many scholars, to mentioned only Ernest Gellner, but also provoked numerous critics. Andrzej Walicki saw its main weakness in ignoring the case of Polish nationalism, which did not fit at all to the “Central European” type.⁷⁰

In the 18th century, departing from the tradition of noble republicanism, some Polish political thinkers developed a modern “enlightened” concept of nation, based on citizenship and not ethnic criteria. Reminiscent of the “West European” model, this concept was open to ethnic Poles as well as members of other ethnic groups inhabiting the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It was this type of nationalism that must have influenced young Borzęcki, who then transplanted it to the Ottoman realm. His concept of the Turkish (or Ottoman) nation was thus political and inclusive. It was open to non-Turkish Ottoman citizens, allowing them to keep their separate ethnic, and even religious, identities, but not tolerant towards separatisms or any competing national programs.

In the 19th century, after the partitions of Poland, the Polish political, enlightened nationalism underwent deep changes. On the one hand, the Poles had to face new nationalisms of their former subjects, especially the Ukrainians and Lithuanians, whose young intelligentsias rejected the idea of return to the idealized common past.⁷¹ On the other hand, deprived of their own state, the Poles developed a more ethno-cultural, exclusive nationalism challenging supra-ethnic structures of the Russian and Habsburg empires in which they found themselves. To quote Andrzej Nowak:

The Polish [...] aspirations to their own statehood, own independence and culture, challenged the belief inscribed in the very idea of Empire [...], according to which the major cultural and social aspirations of individuals belonging to various nations could be realized within its body and hence expecting these individuals to voluntarily merge into one, imperial ocean.⁷²

This schizophrenic character of the Polish nationalism made Polish émigrés who found themselves in the Ottoman Empire better tuned to listen to conflicting claims of the Ottoman statesmen as well as their Christian subjects. They could easily identify themselves with a statesman protecting his Fatherland against

⁷⁰ A. Walicki, *Idea narodu w polskiej myśli oświeconej* (Warsaw, 2000), p. 10; cf. the English version: *The Enlightenment and the Birth of Modern Nationhood. Polish Political Thought from Noble Republicanism to Tadeusz Kościuszko* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1989), pp. 5–7; see also the discussion on Kohn and his reception in T. Kizwalter, *O nowoczesności narodu. Przypadek polski* (Warsaw, 1999), pp. 13–14 and 42–43.

⁷¹ On this subject, cf. the recent discussion between Andrzej Nowak and Roman Szporluk, edited and commented by Andriy Portnov and postscripted by the authors: “Była li Polśa imperiej?” *Ab Imperio* 1 (2007), pp. 11–60; the discussion originally appeared in Polish in 2004.

⁷² Nowak, *Jak rozbić rosyjskie imperium?*, p. 31 (my translation – D.K.).

a conspiracy of powerful neighbors who would constantly stir internal unrest of the ethno-religious minorities, but also with a Serbian or Bulgarian insurgent, who would sacrifice his life on the altar of national freedom. However, this split of the mind made the Polish émigrés' politics, for numerous years directed and embodied by Prince Adam Czartoryski, increasingly inconsistent and inefficient, leading to the final decomposition of his camp.⁷³ While some Poles decided to support Balkan insurgents in the name of the international solidarity of freedom fighters, others remained loyal to the Ottoman Empire and even – like Borzęcki – participated in quelling Balkan rebellions.⁷⁴

One cannot deny the ultimate consistency of Mustafa Djelaleddin's choice. Living in the age of “imagined communities,” this would-be Catholic priest invented himself as a Muslim Ottoman and then invented the Turkish-Ottoman nation. Finally, he died fighting for this nation in a war that he himself labeled as “d jihad” or “guerre nationale.”

Judging by later developments, it appears that the “political nationalism” of Mustafa Djelaleddin did not find many followers in Turkey and was soon overshadowed by the “cultural nationalism” of the Young Turks, best formulated by Ziya Gökalp.⁷⁵ One reason of the weak reception of Borzęcki's thought might have been his yet incomplete integration within the Ottoman society.⁷⁶ Though

⁷³ On this dilemma, see Skowronek, *Polityka bałkańska*, pp. 183, 186, 217–218; Borejsza, *Emigracja polska*, pp. 322–325; idem, “O ‘zasadzie narodowości’ w dobie wojny krymskiej,” in: A. Cetnarowicz and S. Pijaj (eds.), *Węgry i dookoła Węgier... Narody Europy Środkowej w walce o wolność i tożsamość w XIX i XX wieku* (Krakow, 2005), pp. 111–121, esp. p. 116.

⁷⁴ As late as 1911 Tadeusz Gasztowtt, a Polish émigré born in Paris, voluntarily enlisted in the Ottoman army in order to fight the Italians in Tripolitania. Four years earlier he published a book, arguing that the interests of Poland and Turkey had been always closely connected; see T. Gasztowtt, *La Pologne et l'Islam* (Paris, 1907), p. 7; J. Reychman, “Gasztowtt Tadeusz,” in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 7 (Krakow, 1948–1958), p. 304.

⁷⁵ In his polemic with Uriel Heyd, Taha Parla stresses the open character of Gökalp's nationalism, based on subjective identification and acculturation rather than race or ethnicity. He also states that social Darwinism was alien to Gökalp; see T. Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp 1876–1924* (Leiden, 1985), pp. 10 and 21. Arguably, Heyd's critical attitude to Gökalp might have been influenced by the then fresh experiences of WW2 (cf. my comments above on the reception of Mustafa Djelaleddin's racial theories in the 1930s). However, Gökalp himself admitted that an individual could not change his nationality as it was psychologically impossible to change one's feelings; see Z. Gökalp, *The principles of Turkism*, trans. from the Turkish and annotated by R. Devereux (Leiden, 1968), p. 24. Being accused himself of being an ethnic Kurd, Gökalp first answered his critics that ethnic origin did not matter, but then took pains to prove that his two grandfathers immigrated to Diyarbakır from an ethnically Turkish region; see *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization. Selected essays of Ziya Gökalp*, trans. and ed. with an introduction by N. Berkes (London, 1959), p. 43 (from the essay *My Nationality*, originally published in 1923).

⁷⁶ Mustafa Djelaleddin's son, Hasan Enver, married a Catholic woman and could not get along with the Young Turks, to whom he owed his early retirement during the Balkan wars; see Hasan

much lip service has been devoted to the modernizing impact of the Polish and Hungarian refugees, not much research has been done so far on the level of their assimilation in the Ottoman Empire. Besides, one could ask with some reason: why should have the Ottomans westernized themselves by adopting the models from the European periphery?⁷⁷

Yet, the failure was not complete. From an article devoted to Turkey one should expect that it would end by evoking the name of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, and I will not disappoint these expectations. Much ink has been spilled on regretting the rather cold relations between the founder of the Turkish Republic and the chief ideologue of Turkish nationalism, Ziya Gökalp.⁷⁸ One reason was certainly their different attitude towards religion. While Gökalp considered Islam a vital – though elastic and subject to reforms – element of the Turkish culture, Mustafa Kemal regarded it with suspicion if not open hostility.⁷⁹ Yet, there was more. Having created the Turkish Republic, in order to unite its heterogeneous inhabitants, Mustafa Kemal needed a much more pragmatic, inclusive, and political nationalism than Gökalp was able or willing to propose. According to Kemal's own definition that appeared in a Turkish high school textbook in 1930, the most important trait of a nation was “unity of political life [*siyasal varlıkta birlik*].”⁸⁰ Knowing that Atatürk read and valued Mustafa Djelaleddin's book, one might suppose that his vision of the *Türk milleti* was at least partly influenced by that of *la nation turque*, cherished by the Polish exile.

Enver Pasha, *Mes idées*, p. 61 (p. 24 according to the original pagination). In January 1913, he considered spending his years of retirement in Switzerland or Galicia and inquired his Polish relatives about the costs of living as well as finding adequate education for his children (who knew Turkish and French, but no Polish); his letter – considered then a curiosity – was published in a Polish daily appearing in Lwow; see “List Enver baszy,” *Gazeta Narodowa* (Jan. 30, 1913), p. 2.

⁷⁷ On the other hand, the dissociation of Polish or Hungarian refugees from the hostile European powers might have facilitated the reception of their ideas and modes of life in their new Muslim environment. Studying the modernizing impact of Italian immigrants in early modern Poland, Wojciech Tygielski quotes the opinion of Roman Pollak on the “non-aggressive” character of Italian culture in Central-East European context. Unlike the German, Russian, or even French culture, the Italian culture was never regarded as a danger, thus it was not resented and more easily absorbed; see W. Tygielski, *Włosi w Polsce XVI–XVII wieku. Utracona szansa na modernizację* (Warsaw, 2005), p. 584. In support of the above thesis one might quote an opinion of Namık Kemal, expressed in a letter to a friend dated 1865; according to the Young Ottoman author, a replacement of Russian and French priests by Polish and Hungarian teachers in the province of Danube [*Tuna vilâyeti*] would be beneficial both for the local population and the Ottoman state; see: *Namık Kemal'in husûsî mektupları*, vol. 1, p. 19.

⁷⁸ Heyd, *Foundations*, pp. 39 and 139; Turan, *Atatürk'ün düşünce yapısını*, pp. 18–21.

⁷⁹ Heyd, *Foundations*, p. 82; Parla, *The Social and Political Thought*, p. 121.

⁸⁰ Turan, *Atatürk'ün düşünce yapısını*, p. 19.