

M.Sh. Egamberdiyev*, I.Ye. Turgunbayev

Al-Farabi Kazak National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
**Corresponding author: mirzahan.egamberdiyev@gmail.com*

Young Turk Revolution's Influence on the National Liberation Movement of the Kazakh Intellectuals

Abstract. The article deals with the formation of the Young Turk movement, which at the end of its path was able to overthrow Sultan Abdul Hamid II, and its influence on the national liberation movement of the Kazakh intellectuals. Although most studies of the Young Turks, their leaders, adherents, and philosophy are based on secondary sources, memoirs, periodicals, and newspapers should not be overlooked. Economic challenges and modernizing processes that occurred in the Ottoman Empire in the middle of the 19th century contributed to the people's political and cultural awakening. Because of the empire's declining influence because of military setbacks, the concepts of "nation" and "pan-Turkism" began to arise. The Young Turks were the political heirs of the "new Ottomans" at the end of the 19th century. Their resistance was founded on a distinct interpretation of the term "nationalism". Young Turks mostly came from France and other European countries where they received their education. As a result, they were impacted by Western scientific, cultural, and lifestyle standards. Westernization, "pan-Turkism", and modernization were the three pillars of their political agenda. The Young Turk movement came to a logical end in July 1908, when they asked that Sultan Abdul Hamid II reinstate the constitution, which he had destroyed in 1876, and assemble a parliament 32 years after it was established. Following it, the country's political life became more intense, and different reforms began to be implemented, yielding some favorable consequences. Their experience and influence inspired the Kazakh intellectuals to fight for national liberation.

Keywords: Young Turks; revolution; national liberation movement; Kazakh intellectuals; Turkestan.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-6887/2022-139-2-212-223>
Received: 18.11.2021 / Accepted: 08.02.2022

Introduction

The opposition to national notions of unifying all peoples and ethnic groups against the Ottoman Empire under Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909), escalated following the closing of the parliament, which contradicted the philosophy of strengthening the state, is known as the Young Turk movement. The Young Turk movement can be traced back to 1889, when the Ottoman Union Committee, the first political organization, was founded in Istanbul's Medical Academy [1]. Unlike past efforts to overthrow the government, such as Abdulaziz's dethronement, this new organization was founded by medical students, not members of the scientific institution (ulema) or

the army. It was formed as part of the Ottoman Empire's Europeanization efforts in the second half of the 19th century.

Since the Era of Tanzimat, injecting European institutions and technology as a tonic to rejuvenate the decadent Ottoman Empire has been a hot topic in Turkish intellectual circles. The administration achieved this by sending students abroad, bringing in European tutors, and establishing Turkish counterparts in many Western institutions. However, these steps, especially sending students to the West, appeared to pose a risk of importing European ideas and values into Turkey, according to the power classes. *"When these young people who were sent to France were assembled in a resistance, they spoke in Turkish or Arabic languages, and only communicated with their French colleagues about technical subjects, thus avoiding the contamination of European values and beliefs"*, the government had envisioned. Instead of sending Ottoman students abroad for education, Abdul Hamid II wanted to bring European scientists to Turkey to protect them from the *"contaminating power of the values and beliefs of Europe"* [2].

The problem of researching Abdul Hamid II's reign is currently one of the scientific world's turning points. Many people believe that the Ottoman's last representative sought to preserve the state's integrity under pressure from Western powers; others refer to him as the *"Red Sultan"* because of his obvious cruelty toward his people [3]. In this regard, it is possible to accentuate this problem from different angles of the historiographic review. Despite this, historical facts show the opposite. For the Turkish audience, Abdul Hamid II is now a symbol of *"stabilization and the leader of the state's preservation during the transition period"*. Considering the moment of his meeting with the Jadid representative Ismail Gasprinsky (Gaspirali) and sending mudarises to the territory of Central Asia for new-method schools, it can be argued that Abdul Hamid II was the initiator of unity and enlightenment of the Turkic world. Thus, in this article, the goal is set – to reveal the main stages of the influence of the ideas of the Young Turks on the formation of national intelligence in Kazakhstan, by studying the activities of the Jadid mastabas and madrasahs in the region. Furthermore, this article criticizes skeptical theories and methodologies that focus on the negative aspects of Abdul Hamid II's reign, because the political events of the late 19th and early 20th centuries are characterized by the strengthening of imperialist power's colonial policies in general, as well as the confrontation of national liberation movements. Based on the scientific work establishes two main objectives that consistently disclose the essence of the influence of the concept of national identity on the establishment of both a political elite and national intelligence in the future.

Research methods

This article is based on a retrospective analysis of the works of Turkish scholars who studied the issues of confrontation between the Young Turks and Sultan Abdul Hamid II. The archival materials used in the study were tested by the method of the principle of historicism and objectivism.

The historiographic review of the study was the main scientific work of Sh. Mardin, the works of M.Sh. Khanioglu, A.B. Kuran, as well as foreign and domestic studies to identify the prerequisites for the emergence of the Young Turk movement and their influence on the national liberation movement of the Kazakh intelligentsia.

Formation of the Young Turk movement as a factor of national unity

As previously stated, the result of the political maneuvering of Abdul Hamid II and the struggle against colonial pressure from the European colonialists on the territory of Anatolia was the formation of several ideologically-minded movements, among which the Young Turks occupy

a special place. In Turkish literature, the Young Turks were called "*Jön Türkler*", i.e. ideologically inclined to change without taking into account national ideas and reunification with the European world [4]. Their understanding and confrontation against the state policy of Abdul Hamid II were based on a sharp transition to a parliamentary system of government. However, due to the political situation created by the European powers, it was impossible to implement these transformations.

In light of the foregoing, it is necessary to first uncover the reasons for the Young Turks' formation. The explanation for this may be traced back to the emergence of a new breed of intellectuals among the student population. While biological materialism was brought to Ottoman Empire through the positivist notions of textbooks and lecturers, new intellectuals arose, disconnected from the entire belief structure of a deeply religious local community [5]. This mechanism is well underway, as evidenced by the publishing of Bacon's method of scientific knowledge in the Academy's newspaper. When Abdul Hamid II noticed that positivism was growing among students, he attempted to "*Germanize*" the Medical Academy, which had been established according to French principles [6]. Ludwig Buchner's theories, which, like Felix Isnard's, saw religion as a barrier to social change, became very common among students. Since 1885, these students have been the backbone of political resistance to Abdul Hamid II's rule.

The resistance of the Young Turks was often noted for its "*populist*" tone. After completing his studies at Petersburg University, Huseyinzade Ali moved to Istanbul to coordinate the Young Turks at the Medical Academy. The fact that populism and biological materialism lived side by side in providing the ideological forum of Young Turks was no accident [7].

The Ottoman Union Committee was formed on May 21, 1889, by Ibrahim Temo and Ishak Sukuti, which were later joined by Abdullah Zhevdet, Mehmed Reshid, and Hikmet Emin. Initially, the committee was organized as a student organization. It was profoundly influenced by biological materialism and nationalism, which were widespread ideas at the time, notably in most military schools.

Following the creation of the Committee, Ibrahim Temo formed contacts with Ahmed Rıza and Ahmed Verdani, who were in Paris and in Cairo respectively, allowing resistance to extend outside of Turkey [8]. The Committee was discovered using the same cell structure that numerous underground groups used at the time. In the first five years of its life, its actions were very small, consisting primarily of participant discussions. The Committee's name was renamed the Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress in 1894. This reform was brought about by the recommendation of Ahmed Rıza, who was swayed by Auguste Comte's teachings.

Their actions were reported to the government shortly. It then detained the movement's leaders, only to release them after a short time. The distribution of flyers in Istanbul opposing the Armenian Affairs of 1895 was one of the Young Turks' first public activities [9]. As a result, the authorities conducted a comprehensive inquiry and arrested those who were engaged in the flyers distribution as well as those who had contact with the Ahmed Rıza party in Paris. These Young Turks were banished to Ottoman Turkey's Asiatic districts.

Meanwhile, the Young Turk movement, which began as a patchwork of disjointed organizations, evolved into a cohesive resistance force. In Paris, the Young Turk groups from across continental Europe rallied around Ahmed Rıza. Their English colleagues were led by Ali Shefkati. The Young Turks had London in mind as the nucleus of their movement, as evidenced by Ahmed Rıza's interaction with Ali Shefkati and Murad Bey's leaving for London [10]. Following Ali Shefkati Bey's death, Ahmed Rıza decided to gather most of the members of Young Turks in Paris, while Murad Bey traveled to British-ruled Egypt to manage the Young Turk movement there. Due to local constraints, Murad Bey was unable to continue his efforts unimpeded in Egypt, so he moved first to Paris, then to Geneva. There he continued to publish his newspaper, the

"*Mizan*". There were two branches of the organization, as well as two Young Turk movement leaders. The opposition grew quickly at first, thanks to a positive atmosphere of collaboration between the two branches. The Committee was also able to distribute political flyers and booklets into Turkey, opposing Abdul Hamid II's claimed dictatorship since they had their own printing machine.

The Palace, on the other hand, raised its strain on the movement's main organ, the "*Meshveret*" ("*The Consultation*" the newspaper published in Paris in French). The Turkish version of the "*Meshveret*", which was regarded the Young Turks' "*most dangerous newspaper*", was closed because of the French government's attempts. Ahmed Rıza had no alternative but to travel to Belgium in the hopes of striking a deal with Lorand, Marxist MP, who eventually agreed to print the "*Meshveret*" under his supervision. The Belgian government expelled Ahmed Rıza from the country in exchange for the Palace's release of some Armenian revolutionary leaders. Meanwhile, the French government, in response to the French court's protests, permitted Ahmed Rıza to print the Turkish version of "*Meshveret*" in Paris. As a result, the Committee was once again able to openly propagandize. Despite the double leadership role, the Young Turk movement around Ahmed Rıza wielded more influence in the Committee's decision-making structure. Murad was enraged by Ahmed Rıza's supremacy in the movement, and he sought but failed, to evict the former with the help of his supporters [11].

However, it should be noted that the committee lost its unity. The movement's Paris and Geneva headquarters should not be regarded as two departments of the same organization, but as two distinct organizations with their own cohesion. Sherafeddin Magmumi and his supporters, who were put on the editorial board of "*Meshveret*" to monitor Ahmed Rıza's activities, created another source of tension within the Paris Young Turk movement, in addition to the Geneva group's resistance to Ahmed Rıza. This was a good situation for the Palace, which had been attempting for a long time to stifle the Young Turk's activities. Ahmed Zhelaleddin Pasha, the Sultan's special agent, traveled to Europe and persuaded Murad to return to Istanbul in exchange for reforms in Turkey after a brief conversation [12]. When the Paris Embassy claimed that all persons involved in the opposition publications would be forgiven by the Sultan, the Young Turk movement was thrown into disarray. The Geneva department was closed soon after. The group headed by Magmumi inside the Paris department also left the movement.

The common perception is that these conflicts are a struggle between the materialists and traditionalists. However, since this point of view only represents a portion of the issue, it is easily refuted. To begin with, the Young Turks who left the movement were far from "*traditionalists*" in the usual sense of the word. Even if they were, Kadri Hodja and other ulema members who moved to Paris to cooperate with Ahmed Rıza could not be said to be the same. Second, it was believed that the publication of Aristide's article took the movement to the verge of disintegration. During the 1897th Ottoman-Greek war, Arisitidi, an Ottoman citizen of Greek descent, published a pro-Greek post [13]. It is an unjustified exaggeration to attribute the secessions to this single incident.

The Young Turk movement's problems can be understood as a leadership battle within the Committee, notwithstanding the importance of the above two aspects. The military, which provided the majority of the Young Turks' backing, was also impacted by the movement's crisis. The military's lack of sympathy for the Young Turks was increased by the Ottoman army's triumph in the Greco-Turkish war, as well as the Palace's successful use of this card. The only positive achievements during this period were Ibrahim Temo's effective attempts to establish similar branches in the Balkans and organize the resistance in that territory against Abdul Hamid II.

Despite the whole situation with all secessions, Ahmed Rıza continued his struggle [14]. Meanwhile, Abdullah Zhevdet left Tripoli, where he had been exiled, and traveled to Paris via

Marseilles to join Ahmed Rıza. With the assistance of the Committee, Itshak Sukuti was able to flee Rhodes and join the Young Turks in Europe. Abdullah Zhevdet and Itshak Sukuti told Ahmed Zhelaeddin Pasha that they would stop fighting for another three months if the Palace agreed to reforms and the release of 78 conspirators who plotted an unsuccessful assassination attempt on the Sultan's life. In the summer of 1897, the Young Turks demanded these conditions from the government in Contraxeville [15].

After five months, Itshak Sukuti, Tunalı Hilmi, and Abdullah Zhevdet came to Geneva to reorganize the disjointed Young Turk groups. Thanks to funds raised from Abdul Hamid II under the allocation system for students, the same trio began publishing a newspaper, the "*Osmanlı*", on December 1, 1897. Yıldız, on the other hand, believed that the Young Turks had broken their pledge and objected to the publication of the "*Osmanlı*". Despite Abdul Hamid II's complaints, the Young Turks accused the Sultan of treachery and continued to circulate "*Osmanlı*".

Under the pressures, Ahmed Rıza was forced to recognize the "*Osmanlı*" as the Young Turk movement's main organ. He made the decision to close the Turkish version of the "*Meshveret*". However, stopping publishing his works in the "*Osmanlı*" showed that Ahmed Rıza was having difficulties in building a relationship with the new department in Geneva. Because the editorial staff of the "*Osmanlı*" was made up of adherents of biological materialism, the discord within the Young Turks movements must be linked to a political battle for the leadership. After the beginning of 1899, Geneva became the focal point of the Young Turk movement. Meanwhile, two newspapers supporting the Geneva group were released, one in Bucharest and the other in Cairo [16].

After just a month of publishing, the "*Osmanlı*" ran into severe problems. To begin with, Abdullah Zhevdet, Itshak Sukuti and Tunalı Hilmi have reached a deal with the Palace in exchange for a lifetime pension from the opposition. However, the Palace soon discovered that these Young Turk leaders were already against the Sultan. As a result, fresh talks between the Palace and the trio began. During the discussions, the Palace was unable to recognize both the exile's pardon and the payment, requested by the Young Turks, to end their opposition. The Sultan's offer to assign them to Ottoman embassies in Europe was turned down by the Young Turks. As a result, no compromise could be reached. The Palace is now adamant to reduce the Young Turks' stipends, which have been used to support the Sultan's opposition [17]. Tunalı Hilmi Bey visited European capitals in the hopes of collecting donations for the Young Turk movement, which was crippled by financial difficulties. However, both his and Sukuti's attempts in Germany were in vain. The Cairo department was also on the verge of closure due to financial difficulties. In addition to these negative circumstances, the Swiss government has warned the leaders of Young Turks leaders to keep their attacks on the Palace to a minimum. Otherwise, they were threatened with deportation from the country. In a final attempt to extort funds from the Sultan, Abdullah Zhevdet, aided by his partner Mustafa Rahmi, attempted to blackmail Yıldız by convincing the Palace that a committee had been formed with an eye to replacing Abdul Hamid II with his brother Reshad. In Geneva, the Young Turks agreed to resume negotiations with Abdul Hamid II. The government decided to disperse offices to the Young Turks as a way of buying their sympathy and commitment after some haggling. Abdullah Zhevdet was assigned as the embassy doctor in Vienna and Itshak Sukuti was sent to Rome. Tunalı Hilmi and Halil Muvaffak, members of the Geneva department, were also assigned to Ottoman delegations in other countries. The Young Turks promised not to publish any materials about political exiles as part of this final agreement.

The Young Turks approved the closure of the "*Osmanlı*" with this agreement. The articles, nevertheless, proceeded to be published under Albert Karlen's editorship. The "*Osmanlı*" was being issued on Abdullah Zhevdet's orders by Edhem Rukhi, who was a retired doctor and political exile. It should be noted, nevertheless, that the Young Turks who stayed active in Geneva

were only those who were never interested in the Young Turk movement's decision-making positions, such as Lieutenant Fevzi, Akil Mukhtar, Abdurrakhman Bedirkhan and Burkhan Bakhaeddin.

While the Geneva group managed to survive, it was assumed that Ahmed Riza, who had harshly condemned those members of the Young Turk movement who had compromised and accepted the Palace's requirements, was projected to grow in popularity in the movement. However, an abrupt turn of events prevented this from happening. Mahmud Pasha, the Sultan's sister's husband, came to Europe with his two sons and declared his intention to be a member of the Young Turk movement. While the government was concerned about royalty rebelling against the Sultan by entering the ranks of the Young Turk resistance, Mahmud Pasha as well as those who entered the movement with him agreed to help the Young Turk departments with publications and money. Therefore, the "*Osmanli*" continued to be published.

When Mahmud Pasha and his sons arrived in Europe, they avoided getting involved in the Young Turk movement's leadership battle between the Paris and Geneva departments. Ahmed Riza was soon embroiled in a conflict with the Geneva department, which had managed to arrange itself for the 3rd time since 1896th year. Because they were unable to operate effectively in Geneva, the Young Turks agreed to relocate to London, where the "*Osmanli*" have been published, but later to Folkestone.

Development of the activities of the Young Turk movement and their impact on the national intelligentsia of Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century

Until 1902nd year, the Committee maintained its life by publishing the newspaper. In 1902, an initiative has been taken to bring together the weak and divided Young Turks in Europe for a Congress, with the aim of deciding the future direction of their resistance to the current government.

Mahmud Pasha and his supporters won the majority in the Congress election, securing control of the Young Turk's main organ, the "*Osmanli*". Underneath the name of the Committee of Ottoman Freedom lovers, the Young Turks who dominated a majority in the Congress became more officially organized. This community, led by Ismail Kemal, planned a rebellion against Abdul Hamid II with the active involvement of Rezhep Pasha [18]. The invasion of the Palace was too fantastical to be carried out. It's also worth noting that Mahmud Pasha's majority had little unity and was made up of loosely linked teams with widely divergent ideologies and methods. This was a key factor in the Young Turks' inability to reach an agreement on their goals. Therefore, the Armenians stopped supporting the campaign. Greek revolutionaries were far too inexperienced to be considered a reliable source of help and assistance. Only Ismail Kemal Bey and the Albanian nationalists kept maintaining the Young Turks' Mahmud Pasha squad. With all of this in mind, it can be concluded that the group supporting Ahmed Riza was a more cohesive community with greater clout and power than Mahmud Pasha's group [19].

Following the failed coup d'état, the Mahmud Pasha group's strength waned even further. Under the auspices of the Committee of Ottoman Freedomlovers, the newspaper stopped publication.

The Geneva department of the Young Turks gradually faded into obscurity after losing its main propaganda tool. The Ottoman Union and Reform Committee, on the other hand, looked more like anarchists than the Young Turks. In a nutshell, the Committee was a tiny part of the Young Turk movement.

Meanwhile, Ahmed Riza and his supporters reclaimed control of the Young Turk movement. They founded a new organization called the Committee of Ottoman Progress and

Union and received a lot of support from the Ottoman Empire's Young Turk departments. The Committee of Ottoman Progress and Union teamed up with the Ottoman Freedom Committee, which was established by Macedonian Young military leaders in 1907 [20]. As a result of this fusion, the military took control of the Young Turk movement.

In 1908, Macedonia's resistance to Abdul Hamid II gained significant traction. Despite professing devotion to the Paris Committee of Progress and Union, the Macedonian military commanders did not obey the latter's orders and instead devised their own plans to depose Abdul Hamid II. In May, the Salonika Young Turks emerged from the underground, distributing flyers to European consulates in Macedonia. The Young Turks expressed their discontent with the government in these flyers. They also killed Shemsi Pasha, who was sent by Abdul Hamid II against the rebels to put down the uprising. Osman Pasha, another loyal representative of the government, was kidnapped. The Palace had no option but to capitulate. On July 24, 1908, the Abdul Hamid II's irade proclaimed the Constitution's grant. It brought the Young Turks' 32-year-old dream to reality.

Young Turks' ideology strongly influenced the internal national policy of Russia, causing anxiety among local authorities. The February revolution, as well as subsequent changes in state government, served as a stimulus for the development of Turkestan's national liberation notion.

Initially, followers of these principles acted through the Cadet Party in the country's political life. On October 12, 1905, the Constitutional Democratic Party (CD) was created. It was also known as "*the People's Freedom Party*" and was Russia's first official opposition party.

The Cadets were used by the Provisional Government to administer its activities in the Steppe Territory and Turkestan. As a result, in March 1917, Alikhan Bokeikhanov was elected to the Cadet Party's Central Committee, and Mukhamedzhan Tynyshpayev and Mustafa Shokay were elected to the Provisional Government's Turkestan Committee. The Cadet Party, on the other hand, had no intention of providing ethnic autonomy to regions. As a result, there was a separation between participants of the Kazakh intelligentsia and the Cadet party. The Cadets were initially suspected of adhering to tsarist policies by intelligentsia, and their suspicions were justified. The Cadets simply asserted cultural autonomy, not national autonomy, or federalism in Russia as a whole. The Turkestan people's degree of development, in their perspective, did not allow them to achieve autonomy. As a result of these conclusions, the Kazakh intelligentsia, including Alikhan Bokeikhanov, left the party.

The formation of a political organization that would protect the people's interests was a natural outgrowth of these events. It was the "*Shura-i-Islami*" party, founded in Tashkent in March 1917. The party's major backbone was made up of Jadids and Kazakh intellectuals. And, though Jadidism began with an emphasis on enlightenment, it subsequently became increasingly politicized, laying the groundwork for the establishment of national ideologies [21]. The Jadids were inspired by the Young Turks, who had succeeded in establishing a constitution in the Ottoman Empire. At the same time, the Jadids avoided a strong sense of nationalism and attempted to develop bridges with the Russians, giving an account of their activities.

The first Muslim congress is held by the party in April 1917. It investigated the question of establishing autonomous regions in Russia with equal rights. However, the "*Shura-i-Islami*" party gained 11 places out of 112 in the Tashkent Duma elections in July, while the "*Shura-i-Ulema*" party, which is conservative and promotes Islamic interests, got 72 places [22].

This demonstrated that the people wanted to maintain the traditional society and were hostile to modernization. In turn, the parties did not demand that Russia grant them sovereignty. The major purpose was to gain independence. Turkestan was not quite ready to secede from Russia and become an independent state at the time [23].

Mustafa Shokay, a founding member of the “*Shura-i-Islami*” party, collaborated closely with the “*Alash*” party. Members of this party believed in the unity of Kazakhs and their right to self-determination. The question of Kazakh area autonomy was discussed in the first All-Kazakh Congress, which took place in Orenburg from July 21 to July 28. M. Dulatov and A. Baitursynov supported the foundation of an autonomous state, whereas A. Bokeikhanov supported Kazakh autonomy within federal Russia. The issues of confiscation of Kazakh lands and liberation from the colonial regime were also highlighted. They fought for Kazakh unity, attempting to find the best principles of government for the Kazakhs. Members of the party, for example, urged the government not to transfer land to private ownership and sought to separate the church from the state. However, because the party’s members and supporters were mostly intellectual and upper-class citizens, it had few supporters. As a result, the party attempted to enlist the help of representatives from other nationalities.

The establishment of the Turkestan (Kokand) autonomy was the culmination of the national liberation movement. The IV Muslim Congress was held in Kokand at the end of November 1917, and the foundation of Turkestan autonomy was announced. The Provisional People’s Council and Provisional Government were formed. M. Tynyshpayev became the government’s chairman, but he was only in the workplace for a short time before being replaced by Mustafa Shokay. He believed that Turkestan autonomy could not exist outside of the Russian Federation because the new state would be vulnerable to external enemies.

However, the disagreement between the Jadids and the Kadimists, as well as the lack of a unified vision, resulted in a political crisis. M. Shokay’s refusal to recognize Soviet power marked the end of an era of autonomy. The Turkestan autonomy was destroyed by the Bolsheviks after only three months.

Lack of cadres, political experience, differences of opinion among members of political currents, and poor organization could not be compensated for by drawing inspiration from other people’s movements, such as the Young Turks. All of this combined to prevent the Kazakh intelligentsia’s plans from being implemented.

Conclusion

To summarize, the main reason that prompted the Young Turks to take an opposing stance against the government was not political or democratic, but ideological. The Ottoman Empire became unstable due to economic and political crises in the late 19th century. Interreligious, interethnic strife in the country reached a peak and this became a catalyst for the birth of the Young Turk movement, which mainly consisted of people who received a Western education. The Young Turks were intellectuals who tried to distance themselves from religions and ossified beliefs by focusing on science, facts, and materialistic notions. As time went, they got more politicized, publicly criticizing Abdul Hamid II’s government and aligning themselves with the opposition. After that, both politically and ideologically, its composition becomes extremely diverse. They are solely linked by a shared goal: to depose the current government. Even though the Young Turks had no long-term plans for what to do once that goal was achieved, they were part of a series of revolutionary movements in the early 20th century that influenced Turkey’s later history.

The Jadids, who formed the backbone of Kazakhstan’s national intelligentsia and became the basis of Turkestan’s cultural uprising, were influenced by the Young Turk revolution’s activities and outcomes. Internal friction between reformers and traditional community members, as well as a lack of a shared point of view, resulted in a disastrous outcome.

References

1. Mağmumi Ş. Tohum ve Semereleri. Meşveret. – 1896. – No. 6. – P. 3.
2. TSA. № 1518-I/XIX Century
3. Сибгатуллина А.Т. Султан Абдулхамид II в фотоматериалах, документах и воспоминаниях // Восточный архив – 2011. – № 1(23). – С. 42.
4. Kuran A.B. İnkılap Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler. – İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2000. – 23 p.
5. Mardin S. The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas. – Princeton, New York: Princeton University Press, 1962. – 213 p.
6. Sağlam T.S. Gülhanenin Tarihçesinden Bir Kısım. Askeri Tıp Mecmuası. – 1927. – No. 9. – P. 260-267.
7. Westwood J.N. Endurance and Endeavour: Russian History. – London, 1973. – 119-147 p.
8. Imhoff Z.D. Die entstehung und der zweck des komitees für einheit und Fortschritt. Die Welt des Islams. – 1913. – No. 3-4. – P. 172.
9. Temo I. İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetinin Teşekkülü ve Hidematı Vataniye ve İnkılâbı Millîye Dair Hatıratım / I. Temo. – Mecidiye, 1939. – 48 p.
10. LBA.K. 303-3/102-(3).
11. Hanioglu M. Ş. Genesis of the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. Osmanlı araştırmaları. – 1982. – No. 3. – P. 284.
12. Murad M. Mücadele-i Milliye: Gurbet Ve Avdet Devirleri. – İstanbul, 1908. – 231-236 p.
13. Umid G. Illusions et Realites. Mechveret Supplement Français. – 1897. – No. 35. – P. 2.
14. Rıza A. İfade-i Mahsusa. Meşveret. – 1897. – No. 24. – P. 1.
15. Cevdet A. Ahmed Rıza Bey'e Açık Mektub. – İstanbul, 1912. – 37 p.
16. BBA-Yıldız Perakende, 17L131, №1199
17. BBA-BEO Hariciye Giden, 185-5/41-1299/121182
18. Kemal I. The Memoirs of Ismail Kemal Bey. – London: Constable, 1920. – 308-319 p.
19. BBA-BEO/Hariciye Giden, 186-5/42-106/136297
20. İТМК-I №386. P. 37
21. Калимуллин Р. Модернизированный джадидизм в России / Р. Калимуллин. – Уфа: БГПУ, 2011. – 20 с.
22. Халид А. Туркестан в 1917–1922 годах: борьба за власть на окраине России // Трагедия великой державы: национальный вопрос и распад Советского Союза / А. Халид. – Москва: 2005. – 198 с.
23. Чокаев М. Отрывки из воспоминаний о 17 годе / М. Чокаев. – Токио: 2001. – 13 с.

М.Ш. Эгамбердиев, І.Е. Тұрғынбаев

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Жас Түрік революциясының қазақ зиялыларының ұлт-азаттық қозғалысына әсері

Аңдатпа. Мақалада сұлтан Абдул-Хамид II-нің билігін құлатып, басқару жүйесін өзгертуге бет бұрған жас түрік қозғалысының қалыптасуы мен оның қазақ зиялыларының ұлт-азаттық қозғалысына ықпалы қарастырылады. Жас түріктер, олардың көсемдері, жақтастары мен философиясы туралы зерттеулердің басым бөлігі қосалқы дереккөздерге негізделгенімен, естеліктер, мерзімді басылымдар мен газеттер назардан тыс қалмау керек. 19 ғасырдың ортасында Осман империясында орын алған экономикалық қиыншылықтар

мен модернизация процестері халықтың саяси және мәдени оянуына ықпал етті. Әскери сәтсіздіктерге байланысты империяның ықпалының құлауы нәтижесінде “ұлт” және “пантүркизм” ұғымдары пайда бола бастады. Жас түріктер 19 ғасырдың аяғындағы “жаңа османлылардың” саяси мұрагерлері болды. Олардың қарсылығы “ұлтшылдық” терминін ерекше түсінігіне негізделген. Жас түріктер, негізінен, Франциядан және басқа да Еуропа елдерінен келді, сол жерлерде білім алды. Соның салдарынан оларға Батыстың ғылыми, мәдени стандарттары мен өмірлік көзқарастары әсер етті. Батыстандыру, пантүркизм және модернизация олардың саяси тұғырнамасының үш тұғыры болды. Жас түрік қозғалысы 1908 жылы шілдеде сұлтан Абдул Хамид II-ден 1876 жылы өзі күшін жойған конституцияны қалпына келтіруді және ол құрылғаннан кейін 32 жылдан кейін парламентті жинауды талап етіп, қисынды қорытындыға келді. Осыдан кейін елдің саяси өмірі шиеленісіп, белгілі бір қолайлы нәтижелермен түрлі реформалар жүргізіле бастады. Олардың тәжірибесі мен ықпалы қазақ зиялыларын отаршылдық режиміне қарсы ұлт-азаттық күреске шабыттандырды.

Түйін сөздер: жас түріктер; революция; ұлт-азаттық қозғалыс; қазақ зиялылары; Түркістан.

М.Ш. Эгамбердиев, И.Е. Тургунбаев

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

Влияние младотурецкой революции на национально-освободительное движение казахской интеллигенции

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается формирование младотурецкого движения, которое в конце своего пути смогло свергнуть султана Абдул-Хамида II, и его влияние на национально-освободительное движение казахской интеллигенции. Хотя большинство исследований о младотурках, их лидерах, сторонниках и их философии основаны на вторичных источниках, нельзя упускать из виду мемуары, периодические издания и газеты. Экономические проблемы и модернизационные процессы, произошедшие в Османской империи в середине XIX века, способствовали политическому и культурному пробуждению народа. В результате снижения влияния империи из-за военных неудач начинают возникать концепции “нации” и “пантюркизма”. Младотурки были политическими наследниками “новых османов” в конце XIX века. Их сопротивление было основано на особой интерпретации термина “национализм”. Младотурки в основном приехали из Франции и других европейских стран, где они получили образование, на них повлияли западные научные, культурные стандарты и их образ жизни. Вестернизация, “пантюркизм” и модернизация были тремя столпами их политической платформы. Движение младотурков подошло к логическому завершению в июле 1908 года, когда они потребовали, чтобы султан Абдул-Хамид II восстановил конституцию, которую он отменил в 1876 году, и собрал парламент через 32 года после его создания. После этого политическая жизнь страны стала более интенсивной и стали проводиться различные реформы, давшие определенные благоприятные результаты. Их опыт и влияние вдохновили казахских интеллектуалов на борьбу за национальное освобождение от колониального режима.

Ключевые слова: младотурки; революция; национально-освободительное движение; казахская интеллигенция; Туркестан.

References

1. Mağmumi Ş. Tohum ve Semereleri. Meşveret [Seeds and Seedlings. Consultation]. 1896. No. 6. P. 3, [in Turkish].
2. TSA. № 1518-I/XIX Century
3. Sibgatullina A.T. Sultan Abdulkhamid II v fotomaterialakh, dokumentakh i vospominaniyakh. Vostochnyi arkhiv [Sultan Abdul Hamid II in photographs, documents and memoirs. Eastern Archive №1(23)]. 2011. No. 1 (23). P. 42, [in Russian],
4. Kuran A.B. İnkılap Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler [Our History of the Revolution and the Young Turks] (Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2000, 23 p.). [in Turkish]
5. Mardin S. The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1962, 231 p.).
6. Sağlam T.S. Gülhanenin Tarihçesinden Bir Kısım. Askeri Tıp Mecmuası [A Part from the History of Gulhane. Military Medical Journal]. 1927. No. 9. P. 260-267, [in Turkish].
7. Westwood J.N. Endurance and Endeavour: Russian History. London, 1973, 119-147 p.
8. Imhoff Z.D. Die entstehung und der zweck des komitees für einheit und Fortschritt. Die Welt des Islams [The creation and purpose of the Committee for Unity and Progress. International Journal for the Study of Modern Islam, №3-4]. 1913. No. 3-4. P. 172. [in German].
9. Temo I. İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetinin Teşekkülü ve Hidematı Vataniye ve İnkılâbı Millîye Dair Hatıratım [The Formation of the Committee of Union and Association of Progress, My Remembrance of the Patriotic and the National Revolution] (Mecidiye, 1939, 48 p.), [in Turkish].
10. LBA.K. 303-3/102-(3).
11. Hanioglu M. Ş. Genesis of the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. Osmanlı araştırmaları [The journal of ottoman studies]. 1982. No. 3. P. 284, [in Turkish].
12. Murad M. Mücadele-i Milliye: Gurbet Ve Avdet Devirleri [National Movement: Periods of Struggle and Avenging], İstanbul, 1908, P. 231-236, [in Turkish].
13. Umid G. Illusions et Realites. Mechveret Supplement Français [Illusions and Realities. French Version of Consultation]. 1897. No. 35. P. 2, [in French].
14. Rıza A. İfade-i Mahsusa. Meşveret [Special Expression. Consultation]. 1897. No. 24. P. 1, [in Turkish].
15. Cevdet A. Ahmed Rıza Bey'e Açık Mektub [Open letter to Akhmed Rıza Bey]. (İstanbul, 1912. 37 p.), [in Turkish].
16. BBA-Yıldız Perakende, 17L131, №1199
17. BBA-BEO Hariciye Giden, 185-5/41-1299/121182
18. Kemal I. The Memoirs of Ismail Kemal Bey (Constable, London, 1920. P. 319.
19. BBA-BEO/Hariciye Giden, 186-5/42-106/136297
20. İTMK-I №386. P. 37
21. Kalimullin R. Modernizirovannyi dzhadidizm v Rossii [Modernized jadidism in Russia], (BGPU, Ufa, 2011, 20 p.), [in Russian].
22. Khalid A. Turkestan v 1917–1922 godah: borba za vlast na okraine Rossii. Tragediya velikoy derzhavy: natsionalnyi vopros I raspad Sovetskogo Soyuzu [Turkestan in 1917-1922: the struggle for power on the outskirts of Russia Tragedy of a great Power: the national question and the collapse of the Soviet Union] (Moscow, 2005, 198 p.), [in Russian].
23. Chokayev M. Otryvki iz vospominanii o 17 gode [Excerpts from memories of the 17th year] (Tokyo, 2001, 13 p.), [in Russian].

Information about authors:

Egamberdiyev Mirzahan Sharipbayuly – Candidate of Historical Sciences, The head of the Department, Associate Professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh University, Oriental Faculty, Department of Turksoy, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Turgunbayev Izbassar Yerlanuly – Ph.D. student, Al-Farabi Kazakh University, Oriental Faculty, Department of TURKSOY, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Эгамбердиев Мырзахан Шәріпбайұлы – т.ғ.к., кафедра меңгерушісі, доцент, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, шығыстану факультеті, ТҮРІКСОЙ кафедрасы, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Тұрғынбаев Ізбасар Ерланұлы – Ph.D. докторант, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, шығыстану факультеті, ТҮРІКСОЙ кафедрасы, Алматы, Қазақстан.