The Mechanics of Mecca:
The Technopolitics of the Late Ottoman Hijaz and the Colonial Hajj

Michael Christopher Low

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2015

ABSTRACT

The Mechanics of Mecca:
The Technopolitics of the Late Ottoman Hijaz and the Colonial Hajj

Michael Christopher Low

Drawing on Ottoman and British archival sources as well as published materials in Arabic and modern Turkish, this dissertation analyzes how the Hijaz and the hajj to Mecca simultaneously became objects of Ottoman modernization, global public health, international law, and inter-imperial competition during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. I argue that from the early 1880s onward, Ottoman administrators embarked on an ambitious redefinition of the empire's Arab tribal frontiers. Through modern engineering, technology, medicine, and ethnography, they set out to manage human life and the resources needed to sustain it, transform Bedouins into proper subjects, and gradually replace autonomous political life with more rigorous forms of territorial power.

At the same time, with the advent of the steamship colonial regimes identified Mecca as the source of a "twin infection" of sanitary and security threats. Repeated outbreaks of cholera marked steamship-going pilgrimage traffic as a dangerous form of travel and a vehicle for the globalization of epidemic diseases. European, especially British Indian, officials feared that lengthy sojourns in Arabia might expose their Muslim subjects to radicalizing influences from diasporic networks of anti-colonial dissidents and pan-Islamic activists. In contrast to scholarship framing biopolitical surveillance over the hajj as a colonial project, I emphasize the interplay between European and Ottoman visions of quarantines, medical inspections, steamship regulations, passports, and border controls. As with other more overtly strategic projects, such as rail and telegraph lines, I

argue that the Ottoman state sought to harness the increasing medicalization of the hajj, Hijazi society, and the Arabian environment as part of a broader assemblage of efforts to consolidate its autonomous southern frontiers.

Although historians have frequently held up the Hijaz and the pilgrimage to Mecca as natural assets for the invention of Hamidian tradition and legitimacy, they have often failed to recognize or clearly articulate how the very globalizing technologies of steam, print, and telegraphy, which made the dissemination and management of the Sultan-Caliph's carefully curated image possible, were only just beginning to make the erection of more meaningful structures of Ottoman governmentality, biopolitical security, and territorial sovereignty in the Hijaz possible. And while modern technologies clearly lay at the very heart of the Hamidian impulse to reform, develop, and modernize the empire, concomitantly these very same technologies were also extending British India's extraterritorial reach into the Hijaz. Thus, as an alternative to the traditional "Pan-Islamic" framing of the late Ottoman Hijaz, this study seeks to identify the assemblages of legal, documentary, technological, scientific, and environmental questions, the "everyday details" and quotidian "mechanics," which were *actually* escalating and intensifying Anglo-Ottoman and wider international clashes over the status of the Hijaz and the administration of the hajj.

In a sense, this dissertation is also a history of negation, absence, and contradiction. In order to better understand the possibilities and the limits of late Ottoman rule in the Hijaz, I spend much of this study detailing the enormous obstacles to territorial sovereignty and modern governmentality through an investigation of their Janus-faced inversions, autonomy and extraterritoriality. I argue that the autonomous

legal status, exceptions, and special privileges enjoyed by both the Sharifate of Mecca and the Hijazi population (Bedouin and urban) laid bare the compromised nature and limits of Ottoman sovereignty and provided both the gateway and the rationale for the extension of the Capitulations and European extraterritorial protection into corners of the Ottoman world and Muslim spiritual affairs, which prior to the late-nineteenth century had been inconceivable.

Table of Contents

Note on Sources, Transliteration, and Dates

At its core this dissertation is a trans-regional and comparative study. It situates the nineteenth-century Hijaz and Arabian Red Sea littoral between two rival imperial powers, the Ottomans and the British. From a spatial perspective, it challenges the seemingly obvious notion that the nineteenth-century Arabian Peninsula can or should be understood exclusively or even primarily through the Cold War lens of Middle Eastern area-studies and its preoccupation with Arab nation states. Instead, this study positions the Hijaz as a liminal borderland between the Ottoman Empire's Arab frontiers and the British-dominated Indian Ocean. And in order to fully represent the full trans-regional texture of the nineteenth-century Hijaz, the pages of this dissertation are populated by a dizzying mélange of Ottomans, Arabs, Europeans, Indians, Jawis, and Hadramis. In order to strike a balance between these overlapping worlds, this project is based primarily on archival research conducted at the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi in Istanbul and The National Archives of the United Kingdom (formerly the Public Record Office) at Kew. In addition to these two main collections, I also used the British Library's Asia, Pacific, and Africa Collections (India Office Records) and the Thomas Cook Group Archives. Likewise, in Istanbul I also made use of the Beyazit Devlet Kütüphanesi and the İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM).

Despite its trans-regional vistas, the core of the original scholarly contribution made by my research comes from Ottoman and Turkish archival and published sources. In transliterating Arabic, Ottoman, and modern Turkish source materials, I have generally been faithful to *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (*IJMES*) transliteration guidelines. When quoting from printed sources where the Ottoman Turkish has already

been rendered into Latin script, I have generally kept to the original author's transliteration. However, due to the inconsistent usages among Turkish authors, in both Ottoman and modern Turkish transliterations I have eliminated all long â, î, and û diacritics from words of Arabic origin. So throughout the text you will find İslam and not İslâm. And wherever possible, I have tried to opt for the simplest modern Turkish renderings in order to avoid Ottoman spellings littered with diacritics for Arabic characters like *'ayn* and *hamza*.

Because Ottoman and modern Turkish are the primary research languages featured throughout this study, I have generally opted for Turkish rather than Arabic spellings for Islamic terminologies and technical concepts like *mücavirin*, *istitaat*, or *ulema*. However, for terms and places commonly known in English, I have opted for the most widely accepted Arabic transliterations. Thus, I have used hajj and not *hacc*, *fatwa* and not *fetva*, and *jihad* not *cihad*. Place names follow their primary linguistic affiliation. So it is Jidda not Cidde. Likewise, I refer to the Hijaz not Hicaz.

For individual names and titles, however, it gets a bit trickier. I have tried to transliterate titles and proper names in a way that reflects each individual's primary official or linguistic affiliation. All Ottoman officials' names are rendered with Turkish spellings. Thus, it is Mehmed Ali and not Muhammad 'Ali. By contrast, for the Arabic cultural milieu of the Hijaz and the Hadrami diaspora, I refer not to Avnürrefik Paşa, Şerif or Emir of Mekke, but 'Awn al-Rafiq, the Sharif or Amir of Mecca. Finally, this study also includes the names of a great many colonial subjects either working for or receiving protection from the British consulate in Jidda. For these names, I have generally tried to retain the Latin transliterations used in British documents. Thus, for the

Indian Muslim vice-consul, I use Dr. Abdur Razzack and not Dr. ‘Abd al-Razzaq. Likewise, for the British translator at Jidda, it is Yusuf Kudzi and not Qudsi or Kudüslü. At least part of the logic behind retaining these idiosyncratic nineteenth-century spellings is to ensure that readers with an interest in the British Empire will be able to locate and match these names with other archival and secondary materials. However, for a diasporic figure like ‘Umar al-Saqqaf or Omar al-Sagoff, who is known in Hadrami-Hijazi circles, but is even more well known in the historiography of Singapore and Southeast Asia, I have provided both spellings.

As for dates, Common Era or *miladi* dates are used throughout the text. In citing Ottoman archival documents, I give the *hicri* date followed by the Common Era equivalent. For the abbreviations of the Ottoman Turkish Islamic months, I have followed the system used by the *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehber*:

Ottoman Turkish Islamic Month Abbreviations

M	Muharrem
S	Safer
Ra	Rebiülevvel
R	Rebiülahir
Ca	Cemaziyelevvel
C	Cemaziyelahir
B	Receb
Ş	Şaban
N	Ramazan
L	Şevval
Za	Zilkade
Z	Zilhicce

Acknowledgements

Portions of my 2008 article, "Empire and the Hajj: Pilgrims, Plagues, and Pan-Islam under British Surveillance, 1865-1908," which appeared in the *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, and "Ottoman Infrastructures of the Saudi Hydro-State: The Technopolitics of Pilgrimage and Potable Water in the Hijaz," which will appear in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* in October 2015, have been adapted for the dissertation and reprinted here by permission of Cambridge University Press.

This dissertation was the project would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of my mentors and colleagues at Columbia University. First and foremost, I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Richard Bulliet, Rashid Khalidi, Alan Mikhail, Timothy Mitchell, and Christine Philliou. While each played a part in shaping the dissertation itself, more importantly they all contributed to my overall development as a scholar and helped guide me through the maze of professionalization, publishing, and the academic job market.

I am especially indebted to my dissertation sponsor, Richard Bulliet. While his imprint as a mentor and influence over the dissertation and my teaching interests are obvious, I am equally thankful for his constant presence as a friend and intellectual companion during my time at Columbia. I will sorely miss the familiarity of his office-cum-orientalist lair and our always refreshing conversations on work, life, family, and everything in between. And our adventures in Urfa and Mardin rank among the fondest memories of my graduate career. I would also like to extend a similar word of special thanks to Rashid Khalidi who patiently calmed my nerves through every stop along the seven-year journey. In the process, he taught me more about the landscape of our field

than anyone else and a provided a perfect model of professionalism and graduate mentoring. I feel terribly fortunate to have had not one, but two truly legendary advisors to rely on at every turn.

Beyond Professors Bulliet and Khalidi, I owe a great deal to Alan Mikhail, Toby Jones, Lale Can, Timothy Mitchell, Christine Philliou, Adam McKeown, and William Ochsenwald. During the latter half of my graduate career Alan Mikhail generously read countless drafts, diligently wrote and endless stream of letters, dispensed advice, and nurtured my increasing turn toward environmental history. Again, I owe Professor Bulliet a debt of gratitude for introducing us in Turkey. Likewise, I owe a great deal to Toby Jones and Lale Can. Their assistantance with publication advice, the job market, syllabi, and general spirit of intellectual comradeship and collaboration kept my confidence up through the final stretches of the dissertation. In addition to their kind support with the dissertation, I would also like to thank Timothy Mitchell and Christine Philliou for their input and encouragement with my publication projects with *Comparative Studies in Society and History* and *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*. I also owe special thanks to Adam McKeown. His encouragement, especially during my first few years at Columbia, was instrumental in shaping many of the topics covered in the dissertation. Finally, I would like to thank William Ochsenwald for his encouragement of my interest in the Hijaz. It has been humbling to receive positive feedback from someone whose work I've admired and benefited from so much over the years.

I owe a similar debt of thanks to my language teachers. I could not have even attempted this project without the patient and truly remarkable teaching of Zuleyha

Çolak, whose one-on-one mentoring nurtured and transformed my Turkish and Ottoman Turkish proficiencies. Likewise, I would like to thank Sevim Yılmaz Önder and Abdullah Uğur at Yıldız Teknik Univeristy's summer Ottoman program for their painstaking guidance through the maze of Ottoman paleography.

Over the years this project and my language training in Arabic, Turkish, and Ottoman Turkish have been sustained by support from Columbia University, Georgia State University, the London School of Economics-Columbia Academic Exchange, the American Institute of Yemeni Studies, the Institute of Turkish Studies, FLAS, and the David L. Boren National Security Education Program. And finally, I wish to extend a special thanks to Lavinia Lorch, Kristin Gager, and the Columbia Undergraduate Scholars Progam. The support of the Kluge Graduate Fellowship carried me through my final two years at Columbia.

I would like to thank a number of friends and fellow travellers, who have helped me to refine my ideas while working at the archives, at conferences and workshops, and through conversation both digitally and in person. First, I would never have had the opportunity to undertake this work without the intellectual nourishment and friendship that I received from the late Ronald S. Love at the University of West Georgia. Likewise, my journey from Georgia State University to Columbia was only possible with the mentoring and friendship I received from Stephen H. Rapp and Donald M. Reid. This project is ultimately a more mature version of the Master's thesis and 2008 *International Journal of Middle East Studies* article that it ultimately spawned.

I would also like to extend thanks to Patrick Adamiak, Seth Anziska, Zeinab Azarbadegan, Hannah Barker, Isa Blumi, Rosie Bsheer, Andre Deckrow, Sam Dolbee,

Jeffery Dyer, Chris Gratien, Will Hanley, Jared Manasek, Mostafa Minawi, Casey Primel, Eileen Ryan, Nir Shafir, Will Smiley, Dale Stahl, Simon Stevens, Trey Straussberger, Nathan Stroupe, Sam White, and John M. Willis. I would like to extend an extra special thanks to Aimee Genell. Aimee has been a tremendous friend and support system. Time and again she has gone above and beyond to help me in any way possible. I am tremendously grateful for her friendship and intellectual comraderie. I look forward to continuing our collaborations for years to come. And finally, Keith Orejel was a constant companion throughout our time at Columbia. He probably suffered through more tedious stories about Ottoman bureaucrats and pilgrims than anyone else. I really can't possibly thank him enough for his friendship through all the ups and downs of pursuing the Ph.D.

Above all, I am indebted to my family, Cari, Annabelle, and Josie. My deepest thanks are reserved for my wife Cari. Simply put, I would not have made it here without you. You've always been and will continue to be my best friend and center of gravity. You've supported my passions and followed me across the world from Georgia to New York, London, Istanbul, and now to Iowa (and who knows where else in the future). You've endured the stresses of academia and the absences caused by language training and foreign travel with saintly patience. I can't thank you enough for the sacrifices that you've made to support my work and interests. I am truly fortunate to have you and our wonderful daughters, the real highlights of our time in New York. On to our next adventure together…

For Cari, Annabelle, and Josie

Introduction

Scraping Away the Veneer of Pan-Islam: Excavating the Material Histories of the Late Ottoman Hijaz and the Colonial Hajj

> … in Egypt, Arabia, and even in the Hijaz the English have some taken villainous measures and conspired to foment a plot (*bir fesat çıkarmak*) in order to sever (*tefrik ettirmek*) the Ottoman Sultanate from the Holy Islamic Caliphate…. The English are attempting to plant the seeds of all manner of disunion and strife within Islam… And piece-by-piece, I have submitted this information by telegraph. I have given an exhaustive account of this to the Serkatib's servants. I have taken the necessary measures to uncover who is involved in this plot and get to the bottom of these diabolical enterprises (*teşebbüsat-ı melanetkarane*).
>
> -Salih Münir Paşa, Ottoman Ambassador to Paris, 1899[1]

> It is clear, from a study of the situation, and from the information received, that [they] skillfully intrigue to take Arabia and Najd, and the Hijaz, gradually out of the Ottoman government's possession, to transfer the holy Islamic Caliphate to the Sharifs [of Mecca] who will be under British influence from afar, and later to take Arabia, Najd, and Iraq under British protection, and make them colonies, just like Aden and other places.
>
> -Salih Münir Paşa, Ottoman Ambassador to Paris, 1903[2]

Salih Münir Paşa's reports on Britain's "diabolical" plots to bring the Hijaz and the broader Arabian Peninsula under British protection and to "sever" the bond between the Ottoman dynasty and the Caliphate are not particularly notable for their timing, detail, or accuracy. Rather, I highlight these intelligence reports primarily to point out their ordinariness. From the 1880s onward, reports of this kind are a ubiquitous feature of the Ottoman archival collections from the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid II (r. 1876-1909). Reports of British efforts to transfer the Caliphate from Istanbul to Egypt or Mecca come

---

[1] Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşvi (hereafter BOA), Y. PRK. EŞA, 31/156, "İngilizlerin; Saltanat-ı seniyye ile Hilafet-i mukaddeseyi birbirinden ayırmak için Hıtta-i Hicaz'da ve Arabistan'da fesad çıkardıkları" (25 N 1316/6 February 1899). See also BOA, Y. PRK. BŞK, 58/63, "İngilizlerin Hıtta-i Hicaz'da fesat çıkartmaya ve hilafeti, Saltanat-ı Osmaniye'den tefrike çalışdıklarından dolayı alınması gereken tedbirlerin tamimi"(25 N 1316/6 February 1899).

[2] Quoted in Gökhan Çetinsaya, "The Ottoman View of British Presence in Iraq and the Gulf: The Era of Abdulhamid II," *Middle Eastern Studies* 39, no. 2 (2003): 199-200.

in many forms. There are lengthy briefs from high-ranking Ottoman diplomatic personnel stationed in Europe. Likewise, there is a seemingly endless supply of translations and press clippings from European, Egyptian, and Indian newspapers dedicated to this subject.

There are also some rather colorful reports from spies and informants (*jurnalciler*) recounting their efforts to shadow anti-Ottoman propagandists.[3] In one such report, an Ottoman informant warns of the rapidly multiplying Indian population in Mecca. As the author warns, the Indian population numbered in the tens of thousands and had multiplied several times over in recent years. As the anonymous author hypothesizes, the British had undertaken a project to encourage Indians to take up residence in the Hijaz with the intention of using them to lay the groundwork for their ultimate goal of transferring the Caliphate to Mecca.

As proof of this scheme, the author cites a recently published article in the pro-British leaning Egyptian newspaper *al-Muqattam*, which had been translated and circulated in the European press.[4] The piece, apparently supporting British designs on moving the Caliphate to Mecca, was anonymously signed "an Indian in Mecca" (*Mekke-i Mükerreme'de bir Hintli*). As the Ottoman informant continues, he explains how he had set out to uncover the identity of the author. In the course of his inquiries, he discovers that the author had since arrived in Cairo. The informant goes on to detail the whereabouts of this Indian spy in the service of the English crown (*İngiliz casusluğunda*),

---

[3] For examples of this genre, see Raşit Gündoğdu, *Jurnallerin Tahkik Raporlar, 1891-1893* (İstanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2010).

[4] Marwa Elshakry, *Reading Darwin in Arabic, 1860-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 80, 96.

tracking him to the offices of *al-Muqattam* and through the alleys of the Khan el-Khalili bazaar before he booked his eventual return to Jidda.[5]

What is perhaps most striking about the intelligence report from Cairo is that while it warns of precisely the same kind of vague plot to transfer the Caliphate as those "uncovered" by the Ottoman Ambassador in Paris, in the *jurnalci*'s version the threat is supported not just by monitoring the foreign press or the whisperings of the French Foreign Minister. Instead, the report from Cairo hints at the details and mechanics of a deeper anxiety about the questions of "population" and "territory" at the heart of Hamidian apparatuses of security, biopolitical discipline, and sovereignty.[6] The document raises the question of whether the diaspora of Indian Muslims settled in the Hijaz (*mücavirin*) might represent the cat's paw of British extraterritorial influence. Did the Ottoman state really consider the Muslim subjects of European colonial powers living in Jidda, Mecca, and Medina potential fifth columns? And if so, how should we square this anxiety with the Hamidian regime's supposed devotion to supranational Pan-Islamic unity?[7]

Setting aside for a moment the short-term accuracy of these particular samples of intelligence, I contend that this genre of documents offers a valuable window into the Hamidian-era worldview, one that cannot be casually dismissed. What then are we to make of these reports? Should we take them seriously? If not, how can we explain their

---

[5] BOA, Y. PRK. TKM, 53/4, "İngiltere'nin Hicaz'ı Devlet-i Aliyye'nin elinden çıkarmak ve hilafeti Hicaz'a nakletmek için yaptığı faaliyetler" (29 Z 1327/11 January 1910).

[6] On the relationship between population and security, see especially Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978* (New York: Picador, 2007). On the body and biopolitical discipline, see Michael Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).

[7] Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909* (London: I.B Tauris, 1999), 53-67.

persistent recirculation and the official credence given these ideas across multiple decades by figures ranging from the Sultan himself on down to low-level informants? What might these reports tell us about Anglo-Ottoman relations or Ottoman provincial rule in the Hijaz? Alternatively, what has been occluded or completely missed by previous framings of these questions? What kinds of subject matter are still lurking just beneath the veneer of Ottoman Pan-Islamic discourse and its British alter ego?

The lingering power of the facile historiographic tradition of "Pan-Islam" has conditioned us to see the late nineteenth-century Hijaz primarily through the literalist lenses of outmoded diplomatic and colonial histories. As a result, we have consistently failed to acknowledge how the mutually-constructed fears surrounding the Islamic Caliphate could and did have real-world, material consequences for both the British and Ottoman empires and their respective subjects. However, I also argue that historians have repeatedly failed to identify the assemblages of legal, documentary, technological, scientific, and environmental questions, the "everyday details" and quotidian "mechanics," which were *actually* escalating and intensifying Anglo-Ottoman and wider international struggles over the status of the Hijaz and the administration of the hajj.[8]

Although historians have frequently held up the Hijaz and the pilgrimage to Mecca as natural assets for the invention of Hamidian tradition and legitimacy, they have often failed to recognize or clearly articulate how the very globalizing technologies of steam, print, and telegraphy, which made the dissemination and management of the Sultan-Caliph's carefully curated image possible, were only just beginning to make the erection of more meaningful structures of Ottoman governmentality, biopolitical security,

[8] In thinking through the "everyday details" of how modern forms of governmentality and disciplinary power, both European and Ottoman, imposed new conceptions of space and subjecthood, I draw inspiration from Timothy Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), ix-xi.

and territorial sovereignty in the Hijaz possible.[9] And while modern technologies clearly lay at the very heart of the Hamidian impulse to reform, develop, and modernize the empire, concomitantly these very same technologies were also extending European colonial regimes' extraterritorial reach into the Hijaz.

It is precisely this paradox that my dissertation addresses. In this study, I chart the multiple collisions and frictions between Ottoman sovereignty and autonomy on the empire's Arab tribal frontiers, European extraterritoriality, and their awkward, often contradictory, coexistences with official Pan-Islamic rhetoric. Rather than framing late Ottoman provincial rule in the Hijaz as a clash of wills between the Ottoman governor (*Vali*), the Sharif of Mecca, and recalcitrant Bedouin "savages" or a protracted inter-imperial propaganda war over the fate of the Caliphate, instead I trace the Ottoman state's mixed fortunes in materializing territorial sovereignty and thickening modern forms of governmentality on its southern frontiers.

From the 1880s onward, Ottoman administrators began to envision an ambitious re-spatialization of the empire's Arab tribal frontiers. Partly informed by the mounting threats to Ottoman sovereignty in the Arabian Peninsula and partly redefined by the Ottoman state's increasing engagement with new international legal concepts, modern engineering, technology, and ethnographic approaches to the particularities of local populations were taken up as the keys to ameliorating the frontier's biopolitical weakness and compromised sovereignty. Armed with this emergent techno-scientific vision, they set out to better manage human life and the resources needed to sustain it, improve

[9] On the "invention of tradition," see Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). On Hamidian symbolism, see also Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 16-43. On the technological component of representational and disciplinary regimes, see also James Gelvin and Nile Green, eds., *Global Muslims in the Age of Steam and Print* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 1-14.

Arabia's defective nature, transform Bedouins into proper subjects, and gradually replace autonomous forms political life with more rigorous territorial power. By taking this broader assemblage of concerns as a whole, I seek to trace the making of a very different brand of provincial administration, a nascent frontier technopolitics.[10]

To be sure, the relative effectiveness of the state-building and developmentary processes documented here will differ substantially from the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Egypt explored in Timothy Mitchell's iconic *Rule of Experts*. The late Ottoman state never achieved the levels of calculability, cadastral precision, or ethnographic mastery of rural violence as those witnessed in British-occupied Egypt, colonial India, or post-World War I Iraq.[11] However, to only focus on final outcomes misses the point entirely. The ambitious nature and novelty of late Ottoman frontier experiments were embodied in mechanics and processes, which, in spite of their incompleteness, were no less real.

In a sense, this dissertation is also a history of negation, absence, and contradiction. In order to better understand the possibilities and the limits of late Ottoman rule in the Hijaz, I will spend much of this study detailing the enormous obstacles to territorial sovereignty and modern governmentality through an investigation of their Janus-faced inversions, autonomy and extraterritoriality. Here, I argue that the autonomous legal status, exceptions, and special privileges enjoyed by both the Sharifate of Mecca and the Hijazi population (Bedouin and urban) laid bare the compromised

---

[10] Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-politics, Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 12, 15, 42-43. See also Gabrielle Hecht, *The Radiance of France: Nuclear Power and National Identity after World War II* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998), 15-17.

[11] On technopolitical development in Iraq, see Priya Satia, "Developing Iraq: Britain, India and the Redemption of Empire and Technology in the First World War, *Past and Present* 197, no. 1 (2007): 211-255.

nature and limits of Ottoman sovereignty and provided both the gateway and the rationale for the extension of the Capitulations and European extraterritorial protection into corners of the Ottoman world and Muslim spiritual affairs, which prior to the late-nineteenth century had been inconceivable.[12]

My emphasis on the synergistic relationship between autonomy and extraterritoriality is also meant to demonstrate how the Hijaz, almost universally acknowledged as a unique or "incomparable" case in Ottoman history, a province characterized by its exceptional spiritual status, was actually much more similar to other Ottoman territories than previous scholars have allowed. While historians of the Balkans, Anatolia, Egypt, and the Levant are intimately familiar with the relationship between the creep of European consular protection of protégés and the international legal ramifications of the proliferation of autonomous provincial administrations, the Hijaz (with the notable exception of the very brief suggestions in Selim Deringil's groundbreaking work) has never been written into this mainstream conversation.[13]

At the intersection between the interwined stories of technopolitics, autonomy, and extratraterrioriality in the Hijaz, sits the pilgrimage to Mecca. The steamship-era hajj, in all its manifestations, legal, technological, biological, environmental,

---

[12] On the Capitulations, see especially Umut Özsu, "Ottoman Empire," in Bardo Fassbender and Anne Peters, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the History of International Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 429-448; Feroz Ahmad, "Ottoman Perceptions of the Capitulations, 1800-1914," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 11, no. 1 (2000): 1-20; Davide Rodogno, *Against Massacre: Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 29-31; John T. Spagnolo, "Portents of Empire in Britain's Ottoman Extraterritorial Jurisdiction," *Middle Eastern Studies* 27, no. 2 (1991): 256-282; Mary Dewhurst Lewis, *Divided Rule: Sovereignty and Empire in French Tunisia, 1880s-1930s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

[13] On the threat of extraterritorial protections for non-Ottoman Muslims, see especially, Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 57-67. On the politics of protégés and protected, see also Albert Hourani, "Ottoman Reform and the Politics of Notables," in Albert Hourani, Phillip Khoury, and Mary Wilson, *The Modern Middle East: A Reader* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1993), 83-110; Salahi R. Sonyel, "The Protégé System in the Ottoman Empire," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 2, no. 1 (1991): 56-66.

infrastructural, and commercial, cast an increasingly long shadow over Ottoman provincial rule in the Hijaz. Thus, it is the perfect vehicle for writing the Ottoman Hijaz into the material and trans-national turns.

As a result of the worldwide attention produced by the hajj's implication as the primary conduit for the globalization of epidemic cholera from the 1860s onward, the sanitary administration of the pilgrimage and the entire Red Sea was effectively internationalized under the auspices of the Ottoman Board of Health (*Meclis-i Umur-ı Sıhhiye*).[14] The Ottoman Board of Health, the very body tasked with overseeing these questions, was itself a mixed body of European and Ottoman members, attached to the Foreign Ministry (*Hariciye Nezareti*), and a perfect symbol of capitulatory interference within internal Ottoman affairs.[15] And yet, at the same time, the internationally sanctioned management of the hajj also provided the Ottoman state with new opportunities to underscore its sovereignty and tighten its disciplinary grasp over the frontier and the empire's subjects more broadly.

However, this is not just an Ottoman center-periphery story. I take an explicitly trans-regioal approach utilizing the Hijaz and the steamship-era hajj as spaces to excavate dimensions of the Arabian Peninsula and the Indian Ocean that traditional national and area-studies historiographies have generally left marginalized and inchoate. I contend that neither the history of the nineteenth-century Hijaz, nor the hajj can be separated from their multiple imperial, international, diasporic, and trans-oceanic linkages. Both the

---

[14] On the internationalization of public health considerations surrounding the hajj and their connection to European extraterritoriality in the Ottoman Empire, see Birsen Bulmuş, *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012); Gülden Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı, 1865-1914* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1996); Osman Şevki Uludağ, "Son Kapitülasyonlardan Biri Karantina," *Belleten* 2, no. 7/8 (1938): 445-467.

[15] Ahmed Midhat, "Devlet-i Aliye-i Osmaniye'de Karantina Yani Usul-ı Tahaffuzun Tarihçesi," in *Salname-i Nezaret-i Hariciye, 1318* (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Osmaniye, 1318/1900-1901), 436-471.

overlapping management and surveillance of the Indian Ocean hajj and the Hijaz's large Indian, Hadrami, and Southeast Asian diasporic communities gave the region the complexion of an Anglo-Ottoman borderland. The Hijaz and hajj were entangled in both the Ottoman and Indian Ocean worlds in almost equal measure and cannot be written as discrete either-or histories.[16] As such, they provide windows into the muddle of inter-imperial encounters between a reinvigorated Ottoman frontier presence in the Red Sea, the extraterritorial tentacles of British Raj's Indian Ocean imperium, and the tangle of Pan-Islamic rhetoric, which simultaneously bound together and constrained the two empires. In this sense, the hajj is the central thread that tethers the local mechanics of Ottoman tecnopolitics in the Hijaz to a wider constellation of inter-imperial, international, diasporic, and trans-regional questions.

The Future of Islam: Visions of Britain's Great Islamic Protectorate

> …England, Christian but benevolent, would be the best protector of Islam.
> -Acting Consul, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Jidda, 1882[17]

Beginning as early as 1870s, British debates surrounding the Islamic legal legitimacy of the Ottoman Caliphate had begun to accumulate a certain momentum among ex-Indian civil servants, intelligence officers, and members of parliament, most notably Sir George Campbell, George Birdwood, George Percy Badger, and James Redhouse. A series of articles and pamphlets appearing in 1877 called into question whether tracing the Ottoman dynasty's transfer of the title from the last Abbasid Caliph

[16] For a reconceptualization of the Arabian Peninsula's multi-directional connections with both the conventionally-defined Middle East and the Indian Ocean world, see Michael Christopher Low, "The Indian Ocean and Other Middle Easts" *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 3 (2014): 549-555. On the hajj's position between Middle Eastern and Indian Ocean historiographies, see also Michael Christopher Low, "Empire and the Hajj: Pilgrims, Plagues, and Pan-Islam under British Surveillance, 1865-1908," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40, no. 2 (2008): 269-290.

[17] The National Archives, United Kingdom, Formerly the Public Record Office (hereafter TNA): Foreign Office (hereafter FO) 539/21, Acting Consul, Lynedoch Moncrieff to Earl Granville, 10 May 1882.

in 1517 constituted a legitimate claim. Collectively, these pieces also pointed out that the Ottoman dynasty, not being descendants of the Quraysh tribe and the Prophet Muhammad, was unfit for the title.[18] In an article in *The Times* from June 1877, Birdwood laid out what was to become the central axis of Britain's anti-Ottoman version of Pan-Islam. As he put it: "it is a great pity that we do not get the Muhammedans of India to look up to the Shareef of Mecca as the Caliph of Islam for he lives by the side of our road to India and would be as completely in our power as the Suez Canal."[19]

In many respects, Birdwood's desire to bind the Caliphate to British naval dominance in the Red Sea was an obvious outcome of the rapid deterioration of relations between London and Istanbul. In the decades between the Crimean War (1853-1856) and the Russo-Ottoman War (1877-1878), Anglo-Ottoman relations were strongly aligned against Russia. However, in 1876, when the Ottoman state had decisively moved against a rebellion in Bulgaria, it had sparked a liberal backlash in Britain. William Gladstone spearheaded a public denunciation of the "Bulgarian horrors" perpetrated by the Ottoman state against their non-Muslim subjects in the Balkans. Gladstone's rhetoric during the Eastern Crisis of 1875-1878 sparked an anti-Turkish crusade in the press. Abdülhamid was transformed into the bloody-thirsty "red" sultan and derided as nothing short of an irrational, reactionary monster in the European press. As a result, the post-1849 image of liberal Ottoman reformers gave way to one of rapacious Muslim tyrants presiding over the slaughter of innocent Christians and effectively ended Britain's pro-Ottoman policy.[20]

---

[18] Ş. Tufan Buzpınar, "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate in the Early Years of Abdülhamid II: 1877-1882," *Die Welt des Islams* 36, no. 1 (1996): 65-69.

[19] George Birdwood, *The Times*, 12 June 1877, p. 8.

Gladstone's assault on the Anglo-Ottoman alliance would lead to a radical reassessment of British naval strategy and the defense of India. Between the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, the British occupation of Cyprus in 1878, and Egypt in 1882 it had become increasingly clear that British interests in the Near East and India could be maintained even if the Ottoman Empire were allowed to collapse. This strategic shift meant that British assurances to defend of Ottoman territorial integrity against Russia were no longer valid. Thus, the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-1878 would mark the end of Britain's active support of the Ottoman Empire.[21]

In the wake of this sea change in Anglo-Ottoman relations, Birdwood's suggestion of the strategic convenience of transferring the Caliphate to the Hijaz would blossom. Ultimately, this theory would find its fullest expression in a series of essays featured in the *Fortnightly Review* in the summer and fall of 1881 and later published as *The Future of Islam* in 1882 by Wifrid Scawen Blunt, an eccentric English aristocrat, traveler, and Arab enthusiast. Blunt prophesizes the imminent fall of the Ottoman Empire and outlines his vision of the benefits which might accrue from disentangling the Caliphate from its connection to a hopelessly compromised Ottoman territorial sovereignty:

> … the only true resting-place for theocracy is in Arabia, its birthplace and the fountain head of its inspiration. There, alone in the world, all the conditions for independent exercise of religious sovereignty are to be found. In Arabia there are neither Christians nor Jews nor infidels of any sort for Islam to count with, nor is it so rich a possession that it should ever excite the cupidity of the Western Powers. A Caliph there need fear no admonition from Frank ambassadors in virtue of any capitulations; he would be free

---

[20] M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008), 111; Kemal Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State* (New York: Oxford, 2001), 140-155.

[21] M.S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923: A Study in International Relations* (London: MacMillan, 1966), 178-260; L. Carl Brown, *International Politics and the Middle East: Old Rules, Dangerous Game* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 107-117.

> to act as the Successor of the Apostle should, and would breathe the pure air of an unadulterated Islam. A return, therefore, to Medina or Mecca is the probable future of the Caliphate.
>
> The importance of Arabia has of late years been fully recognized both at Constantinople and elsewhere. It has been the sustained policy of Abd el Hamid at all cost and by whatsoever means to maintain his influence there; and he knows that without it his spiritual pretensions could have no secure foundations. Arabia, he perceives, is the main point of the Caliphal problem; and whether or not the future holder of the office reside in Hejaz, it is certain that by its tenure alone the Mohammedan world will judge of his right to be their leader.[22]

Blunt goes on to conjure up an audacious plan for Britain's role in a post-Ottoman Muslim world:

> As things stand, therefore, it would seem natural that, in the general disruption, which will follow the fall of Constantinople, it is to England the various nations of Islam should look mainly for direction in their political difficulties. The place of adviser and protector, indeed, seems pointed out for her. With the disappearance of the Ottoman Sultan there will be no longer any great Mussulman sovereignty in the world and the Mohammedan population of India, already the wealthiest and most numerous, will then assume its full importance in the counsels of believers. It will also assuredly be expected of the English Crown that it should then justify its assumption of the old Mohammedan title of the Moguls, by making itself in some sort the political head of Islam. Her Majesty will be left its most powerful sovereign, and it will be open to her advisers, if they be so minded, to exercise paramount influence on all its affairs.[23]

Blunt also provides some practical examples of the kinds of services Britain's protectorate of the Caliphate and the Hijaz might provide to Raj's Indian subjects. Here, Blunt outlines the necessity of bringing the hajj "under English auspices." As he explains, "the regulation of the Haj, is indeed, an immediate necessary part of our duty and condition of our influence in the Mussulman world; and it is one we should be grossly in error to neglect." In relation to the pilgrimage, Blunt goes on to ventriloquize his vision for a British administration of the hajj by quoting an unnamed "loyal Mohammedan." He advocates that the government of India bring the pilgrimage

---

[22] Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, *The Future of Islam* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1882), 100-101.

[23] Ibid., 194-195.

transportation industry under direct supervision. By making these arrangements, he argues, "the English Government will gain, not only the good-will of the whole Mohammedan population of India, but they will also inspire the Hajjis with the wholesome feeling that they owe allegiance to, and can claim *protection* from, an empire other than that to which the people of Arabia are subject (the Turkish)." Such proposed measures, in Blunt's eyes, stood "in very favourable contrast to the sufferings, which the pilgrims undergo from maladministration at Mecca." In Blunt's opinion, such assistance would serve to counteract any Ottoman propaganda designed to "animate" Indian pilgrims "with hostility toward the British supremacy in India."[24]

In many respects, Blunt's assessments ultimately wound up foreshadowing Britain's long-term position on these matters. When viewed as a flattened intellectual genealogy, later British support for Sharif Husayn bin 'Ali's Arab Revolt of World War I would seem to mark the conclusion of an almost comically ambitious, multi-decade project aimed at nothing less than the destruction of the Ottoman dynasty, the establishment of Britain's legitimacy as the Islamic world's leading power, and control over the Caliphate, the hajj, and Islam's most sacred sites. Obviously, the Arab Revolt did not spring forth *sui generis* from the mind of T.E. Lawrence or the pages of John Buchan's 1916 spy novel, *Greenmantle*.[25] In this sense, this dissertation is an attempt to build up a more realistic understanding of the multiple long-term processes pulling the Hijaz into the orbit of British legal imperialism and informal empire in the Arabian

---

[24] Ibid., 209-211.

[25] During World War I, Lord Horatio Herbert Kitchner was obsessed with Pan-Islam. He believed that another European power could manipulate the Caliphate and use it against Britain. His fears of German-sponsored *jihad* found their way into John Buchan's novel, *Greenmantle*, in which the plot revolves around Germany's attempt to use a Muslim prophet to destroy the British Empire. See David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace* (New York: H. Holt, 1989), 96-105.

Peninsula.[26] By tracing Britain and India's increasing interest in the day-to-day affairs of Hijaz and hajj over a period of several decades, it becomes much clearer how Blunt's fantastical speculations on Britain's need to separate the Hijaz from the Caliphate eventually morphed into the realm of actionable policies.

Technologies of the Caliphate: Service to the Haramayn Made Material

In the age of steam, print, and telegraph technologies, revolutions in transportation and communications enabled regimes across the globe to reach deeper into their populations. Although these technological revolutions emerged from European and American societies and were often disseminated via colonial rule, as James Gelvin and Nile Green point out, Muslims worldwide quickly adopted "the tools of empire" and adapted them to purposes that their inventors had never imagined.[27] These tools simultaneously allowed the Ottoman state to borrow the instruments of European governance and better protect itself from the threat of European colonial encroachment. Likewise, these technologies enabled the state to achieve tighter control over its subjects through disciplinary and representational regimens.

As Cemil Aydın notes, in the foreign policy arena, the Hamidian state was also able to take advantage of the rising importance and politicization of the Caliphate, which developed in tandem with "the globalization of information and transportation

---

[26] On the archipelago of consulates, frontier residencies, treaty shaykhdoms, and protectorates in the Arabian Peninsula created by and attached to British India, see especially James Onley, *The Arabian Frontier of the British Raj: Merchants, Rulers, and the British in the Nineteenth-Century Gulf* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); John M. Willis, "Making Yemen Indian: Rewriting the Boundaries of Imperial Arabia," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 41 (2009): 23-38.

[27] Gelvin and Green, *Global Muslims in the Age of Steam and Print*, 1-14. On the unpredictable outcomes and "countertempos" of steam, rail, and telegraphy, see also On Barak, *On Time: Technology and Temporality in Modern Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

technologies and rising anti-imperialist sentiments in the Muslim world."[28] As the social fabric of the Muslim world came under increasing pressure from the imperial powers of Europe, especially Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Russia, disparate groups of Muslims from Central Asia to Indonesia rallied around the Ottoman Caliphate. In response, the Ottoman state deployed the Caliphate as a defensive foreign policy tool (albeit a weak one) directed against European colonial powers ruling over large Muslim populations.[29]

On the domestic front, the state was able to articulate official religious and national practices like never before. Partly in response to the shortcomings of the Tanzimat ideology of Ottomanism and the dramatic loss of European after 1878, the Hamidian period was characterized by a growing sense that the Islamic character of the state needed to be reasserted. Internally, this ideological shift was meant to inoculate the empire's Muslim populations against the metastasis of proto-nationalist sentiments. While the multi-national empire could theoretically survive the loss of its Christian peripheries, if nationalism spread amongst its Muslim populations, representing roughly 73 percent of its remaining post-1878 population, the empire's fate would be sealed.[30]

This simultaneous shift in demography and imperial mood translated into a self-conscious effort among Ottoman intellectuals and bureaucrats to reinvigorate basic institutions, most notably shari'a law and the Caliphate. Within Ottoman lands this effort

---

[28] Cemil Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 63.

[29] It is in this context that Abdülhamid allegedly commented that just one utterance from the Caliph (*halifenin bir sözü*) would be enough to bring down an anti-colonial "*jihad*" against the European colonial world, spelling disaster for the Christians (*hıristiyanlar için felaket*). Sultan II. Abdülhamid Han, *Siyasi Hatıratım* (İstanbul: Hareket Yayınları, 1974), 164.

[30] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam*, 148-150.

would manifest itself in revamped mechanisms of imperial education and loyalty production.[31] There were new missionary efforts to convert or reform heterodox Muslims, such as the Yazidi and Shi'i populations, and to promote an officially sanctioned version of Hanafi rite Sunni Islam. The state established a monopoly on the printing and inspection of the Qur'an and supported the printing of thousands of Islamic legal and religious texts. Not coincidently, many of these works explicitly promoted and reinforced the legitimacy of the Ottoman dynasty's claims to the Caliphate and its Hijazi appanage.[32]

Eyüp Sabri Paşa, an Ottoman naval officer, historian and ethnographer of the Hijaz and Arabia, and anti-Wahhabi polemicist, wrote extensively on the spiritual and legal underpinnings of the Ottoman Caliphate.[33] His writings provide a vivid example of this reinvented Hamidian worldview. Eyüp Sabri explicitly argues that the Ottoman sultans were the legitimate (*meşru*) claimants to the title of Caliph. As such, they were to be regarded as God's shadow on Earth (*Zıllullah fi'l Arz*) and obedience (*itaat*) to their will a great sacred obligation (*fariza-i mühimme*) specified by Islamic law (*vacib-i şeri*).[34] In his 1888 text, *Esbabü'l-İnaye fi Tercemeti Bidayeti'n-Nihaye*, Eyüp Sabri succinctly conveys the sense of spiritual and temporal power that Hamidian Ottoman-Islamic legitimacy structures were meant to inculcate:

---

[31] Benjamin Fortna, *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

[32] On missionary activities and the promotion of an officially sanctioned Ottoman version of Hanafi Sunnism, see especially Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*.

[33] On the life and career of Eyüp Sabri Paşa, see Mehmet Akif Fidan, *Eyüp Sabri Paşa ve Tarihçiliği* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2011).

[34] For a survey of Eyüp Sabri's writings on the Ottoman Caliphate, see Fidan, *Eyüp Sabri Paşa ve Tarihçiliği*, 143-147.

> The paramount Muslim leader (*Ulu'l-Emr*) should be obeyed. In our era the leader is the Sultan. He should be obeyed and loved. The Sultan is the Prophet's vice-reagent. A revolt against the Sultan is a revolt against Allah. The state and the nation can only survive with the existence of the Sultan. The sultans are just and merciful. They strive for the people's welfare and comfort. They protect the weak. In particular, Abdülhamid Han II is very compassionate. He worries about us night and day. We are very fortunate to live in his time. May Allah grant him long life. May his works be eased. May the enemies of the [Sultan] and his reign be crushed.[35]

In *Mirat ül-Haremeyn* (1883-8), his encyclopedic history and ethnography of Mecca, Medina, and the wider Arabian Peninsula, Eyüp Sabri elaborates on the connection between the Ottoman Caliphate and service to the Two Holy Places in Mecca and Medina. Of course, because the Ottoman dynasty could not feasibly claim Arab or Qurayshi descent the state's claims to the Caliphate rested on tenuous foundations. According to the official myth, the title of Caliph had devolved from the last Abbasid Caliph, al-Mutawakkil, to the Ottoman bloodline as a result of the conquest of Egypt in 1517. By the late nineteenth century, however, this claim had acquired the customary weight of nearly four centuries. Even so, it is clear that the Ottoman dynasty's claims to the Caliphate were heavily dependent on their position as the Servitor of the Two Holy Places (*Khadim al-Haramayn al-Sharifayn*).[36]

As Eyüp Sabri explains, although much ink had been spilled analyzing this title, in reality most of the supposed services provided by previous Islamic dynasties, such as the Umayyads, Abbasids, and Fatimids, were little more than tall tales (*rivayet*) and meaningless talk (*laf-ı bi mana*). Here, he contrasts Ottoman solicitude for Mecca and Medina with what he regards as a shameful record of "indifference, injustice, and even

---

[35] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Esbab'l-İnaye fi Tercemeti Bidayeti'n-Nihaye* (İstanbul: Bahriye Matbaası, 1306/1888), 124-126. See also Fidan, *Eyüp Sabri Paşa ve Tarihçiliği*, 152.

[36] Selim Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State: The Reign of Abdülhamid II (19876-1909)," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 23 (1991): 346.

attacks on the sacred towns" (*ilgisizlikler, haksızlık hatta mübarek beldelere hücumlar*) under previous dynasties. For Eyüp Sabri, the proof of Ottoman service to the Holy Places lay in the tangible public works (*asar-ı fiiliye*) provided by the state.[37]

In many respects, Eyüp Sabri's reading of the connection between caliphal legitimacy and material service to the Two Holy Places was a perfect expression of the age in which he lived. On the one hand, his writing could be seen as a prototypical example of the kind of Hamidian Pan-Islamic discourse that the existing historiography has emphasized. On the other hand, however, it also speaks to the dramatic uptick in the intensity of Ottoman state building and development in the Hijaz from the 1880s onward. In this sense, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn* is a rather striking revision, written both as a reaction to and in anticipation of the re-engineering of the physical infrastructures of the Muslim holy places and Ottoman rule in Hijaz taking place at the time. Throughout the 1880s, Istanbul initiated a wave of infrastructural improvements in the region, including new military barracks, government offices, telegraph lines, schools, printing presses, and quarantine facilities. Proposals drafted in the mid-1880s and early 1890s also planted the seeds for the eventual construction of the Hijaz Railway (*Hamidiye Hicaz Demiryolu*, 1900-1908).[38] In this context, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn* was simultaneously a historical revision of the ineffective Arab caliphal regimes of the past and narration of the material and infrastructural gains being made in real time. Thus, rather than thinking of the Hijaz as a "traditional" pillar upon which Hamidian Pan-Islamic legitimacy rested, in reality, it

---

[37] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn: Mirat-ı Medine*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: Bahriye Matbaası, 1304), 505-522.

[38] On the Hijaz Railway, William Ochsenwald, *The Hijaz Railroad* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1980); Ufuk Gülsoy, *Hicaz Demiryolu* (İstanbul: Eren, 1994); Murat Özyüksel, *The Hejaz Railway and the Ottoman Empire: Modernity, Industrialisation and Ottoman Decline* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014).

was a pillar that the Hamidian state hoped to rapidly build up in order to gradually reconfigure the Hijaz's semi-autonomous status.

Hamidian "Colonial Policy" or Technopolitics on the Tribal Frontier?

As Selim Deringil notes, the nineteenth-century Ottoman state was both a victim and a practitioner of colonial methods. As a result of its unique intermediate position between subalterns and imperial masters, however weak in comparison to its European rivals, it has become the "empire that fell through the cracks."[39] The effect of this Manichean binary of colonizers and colonized is two-fold. On the one hand, it turns a blind eye to the relative vitality displayed through Tanzimat and later Hamidian policies of defensive expansion and consolidation in the Arabian Peninsula. On the other, it forces us to play some curious games of mental gymnastics. In the realms of international law, diplomacy, military affairs, language, culture, science, technology, and the overall organization of the state, we know that nineteenth-century Ottoman elites were voraciously consuming and adapting various branches of European thought. However, when it comes to colonialism, conceptions of a civilizing mission, frontier governance, and indirect rule we have chosen to selectively believe that these elements were not a meaningful part of the freight of European modernity being imbibed by Ottoman elites. As a result, we often find ourselves tongued-tied and unable to describe the complex of inter-imperial contestations happening in places like the Hijaz, Yemen, Libya, Iraq, the Najd, and the wider Persian Gulf.[40] We have remained hesitant, even

[39] 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): 312-317. For similar questions stemming from the idea of a "colonized colonizer" see also Eve Troutt Powell, *A Different Shade of Colonialism: Egypt, Great Britain, and the Mastery of the Sudan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 5-19.

afraid, to label evolving late Ottoman practices in frontier administration as comparable to "colonialism" or even inspired by the logic of European colonialism. This has left the Ottoman Empire stranded on the fringes of the wider comparative conversations surrounding European colonial empires.[41]

In the aftermath of the devastating defeats of the Russo-Ottoman War, most of the empire's European provinces were lost. Abdülhamid inherited an empire that was more Muslim than ever. While this demographic shift has typically been cited as one of principal reasons for the sultan's promotion of supranational Islamism as an alternative to the secular ideology of the Tanzimat, another outcome of this altered demography was

---

[40] On the emerging debates concerning the changing shape of late Ottoman governance on the empire's Arab and tribal frontiers, see Frederick F. Anscombe, *The Ottoman Gulf: The Creation of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997); Isa Blumi, *Rethinking the Late Ottoman Empire: A Comparative Social and Political History of Albania and Yemen, 1878-1918* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2003); Reşat Kasaba, *A Moveable Empire: Ottoman Nomads, Migrants, and Refugees* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009); Thomas Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference: Ottoman Rule in Yemen, 1849-1919* (Leiden: Brill, 2011); Eugene Rogan, *Frontiers of the State in the Late Ottoman Empire: Transjordan, 1850-1921* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Mostafa Minawi, "Lines in the Sand: The Ottoman Empire's Policies of Expansion and Consolidation on Its African and Arabian Frontiers, 1882-1902" (Ph.D. diss., New York University).

[41] The Ottoman Empire has traditionally been compared with other supposedly pre-modern, multi-ethnic land empires like the Habsburg or Russian empires. This comparison is also a natural outgrowth of the venerable historiography of the Eastern Question and the three empires' collective demise during World War I. While this framework has its their merits, it discounts the importance of Ottoman interaction, particularly on its southern frontiers, with nineteenth-century British, French, and Italian imperial expansion. For a survey of the Ottoman Empire's place in the history of comparative imperialism, see Alan Mikhail and Christine Philliou, "The Ottoman Empire and the Imperial Turn," *Comparative Studies of Society and History* 54, no. 4 (2012): 721-745. For examples of Ottoman-Russian-Habsburg comparison, see Dominic Lieven, *Empire: The Russian Empire and Its Rivals from the Sixteenth Century to the Present* (London: Pimlico, 2003); Michael A. Reynolds, *Shattering Empires: The Clash and Collapse of the Ottoman and Russian Empires, 1908-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 331-368. On comparisons between the Ottoman Empire and British India, see Dina Rizk Khoury and Dane Keith Kennedy, "Comparing Empires: The Ottoman Domains and the British Raj in the Long Nineteenth Century," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 27, no. 2 (2007): 233-244; C.A. Bayly, "Distorted Development: The Ottoman Empire and British India, circa 1780-1916," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 27, no. 2 (2007): 332-344.

the increased value placed on bringing the empire's Arab frontier provinces under more direct control in order to tap into their neglected manpower and economic potential.[42]

As Ussama Makdisi observes: "In an age of Western-dominated modernity, every nation creates its own Orient. The nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire was no exception." As he explains, articulating Ottoman modernity was a delicate operation, requiring the Turkish core of the empire to prove its state, military and technological advancement, and level of civilizational attainment were equivalent to Europe, while still maintaining its sovereignty and cultural distinctiveness as a Muslim empire. It also required a parallel recalibration of the relationship between the Turkish center and its subject peoples, most notably the empire's Arab provinces. Beginning in the Tanzimat period, Ottoman reformers had identified these subjects as "potential" citizens. At the same time, they also came to see these subjects "as backward and as not-yet-Ottoman, as hindrances as well as objects of imperial reform."[43] As the state worked to consolidate and homogenize its core territories in Anatolia and Eastern Thrace, by contrast, its Arab provinces were increasingly looked upon as a colonial space characterized by "nomadism and savagery." Thus, as Selim Deringil argues, at some point "in the nineteenth century the Ottoman elite adopted the mindset of their enemies, arch-imperialists, and came to conceive of its peripheries as a colonial setting." Within its remaining frontier territories the Ottoman state began adopt its own "civilizing motif" and to imitate and borrow a variety of practices from European colonial empires.[44]

---

[42] Benjamin Fortna, "The reign of Abdülhamid II," in Reşat Kasaba, ed., *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 47, 52-3.

[43] Ussama Makdisi, "Ottoman Orientalism," *The American Historical Review* 107, no. 3 (June, 2002): 768-772.

[44] Selim Deringil, "'They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery'317-318.

Indeed, as Tahsin Paşa, head of Abdülhamid's royal secretariat from 1894 to 1908, confirms in his memoirs, this new posture toward "far away" provinces was understood as something akin to a "colonial policy" (*müstemleke siyaseti*).[45] As he explained, from the Sultan's perspective, "the people living there are not like those living in other regions of the [Ottoman] domains and the same laws and forms of administration would not have been possible." The Sultan thought it prudent to tailor "a system of administration in accordance with the local inhabitant's capacities."[46]

Given the Hijaz's sacred status such frank and direct language calling for the use of European colonial methodologies was perhaps more taboo. However, in practice the actual differences between the semi-autonomous Hijaz, Yemen, Libya, and other Arab provinces are less clear. Indeed, in Tahsin Paşa's memoirs, the Hijaz was very much part of a broader group of Arab provinces suffering from similar flaws. As he puts it, "The affairs of the Hijaz, Yemen, Baghdad, Syria, Beirut, Mount Lebanon, and Tripolitania were among the internal problems that caused Sultan Hamid the greatest anxiety." All of these territories were subject to "foreign influence" and various forms of "intrigue" and "trickery." The other defining feature of these territories was the troublesome presence of "independent" rulers, such as the Khedives in Egypt, the Imams in Yemen, the Sanusiyya in Libya, and other semi-autonomous figures similar to the Sharif of Mecca.[47]

As Thomas Kuehn explains, in part, this was a critique of the failed one-size-fits-all approaches of Tanzimat centralization. Hamidian-era administrators claimed that the

---

[45] Tahsin Paşa, *Sultan Abdülhamid: Tahsin Paşa'nın Yıldız Hatıraları* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1999), 205.

[46] Ibid., 205.

[47] Ibid., 341-342.

"customs and dispositions" of the local inhabitants in provinces like the Hijaz, Trablusgarb (Libya), Yemen, and parts of Iraq rendered them unfit for full incorporation into the imperial system imagined by the universalizing ideology of the Tanzimat. The lack of censuses, regular taxation procedures, cadastral surveys, land registration, conscription, and the *nizamiye* court system indicated that local inhabitants remained outside the realm of civilized Ottoman subjects. In response, the state sought to articulate new forms of provincial governance designed to narrow this presumed civilizational gulf. At the same time, however, the Hamidian state's efforts to extend its administrative reach farther into frontier provinces than ever before would necessitate a greater reliance on local tribal and religious leaders and the management of various degrees of autonomy. Here, Ottoman readings of indirect rule in places like British Aden, Sudan, and India also inspired new debates on how best to "repackage and rehabilitate" older pre-Tanzimat Ottoman practices, which had tolerated various measures of decentralization and local autonomy.[48]

One of the most difficult problems of describing the Ottoman adaptation of colonial practices has been the need to distinguish them from European colonialism. On this point, Deringil points out that the Ottoman perspective on colonial rule was not a *tabula rasa*. Rather, Ottoman bureaucrats were able to "dip into a whole bag of concepts, methods, and tools of statecraft, prejudices, and practices that had filtered down the ages."[49] On this point, Kuehn and Deringil are generally in agreement that the Ottomans not only borrowed techniques for their European colonial contemporaries; they also

[48] Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference*, 91-145, 207-26, 213-4, 251; Tahsin Paşa, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, 205, 341-2.

[49] Deringil, "'They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery'," 312.

combined these newer elements with retooled strategies borrowed from older Ottoman forms of autonomy.

Kuehn tries admirably to the thread the needle and articulate a hybrid brand of provincial administration, which he dubs "colonial Ottomanism." While clearly arguing that there was a colonial element to Ottoman rule in Yemen, he is also careful to tease out its ambivalent and contradictory nature. Building on the work of Partha Chatterjee, Kuehn describes the gap between Tanzimat-era ideals and Yemeni particularities as the "politics of difference." As he cautions, however, colonial Ottomanism was distinct from European colonialism in that it never produced dual structures of governance and separate codes of law, nor did it mobilize discourses of race or sexual segregation in order to uphold a stark dichotomy between colonizing citizens of the metropole and colonized subjects of the periphery. Rather, for Kuehn, colonial Ottomanism implied a "hierarchy of subjects" that marked Yemenis as "Ottomans of a lesser kind."[50]

Although I agree with Deringil and Kuehn that there is definitely an element of inter-imperial learning and borrowing at work, I wonder whether the emerging debate on "Ottoman colonialism" or "colonial Ottomanism" might not be more accurately reframed and clarified as a question of modern governmentality or a case of "borrowed" technopolitics.[51] Thus, in contrast to the Hijaz's conventional associations with Sultan Abdülhamid II's Pan-Islamic legitimacy structures or more recent attempts to identify a Hamidian "colonial policy," this dissertation seeks to outline an alternative narrative of technopolitical state building and development rooted in the secular logics of

[50] Kuehn, Empire, *Islam, and the Politics of Difference*, 10-14, 135.

[51] For this critique of Thomas Kuehn's concept of "Ottoman colonialism," see John M. Willis's review of *Empire, Islam, and the Politics of Difference* in the *Journal of Islamic Studies* 24, no. 3 (2013): 378-381.

governmentality, sovereignty, and the materialization of territory. I argue that the Hamidian state sought to deliberately deploy technology, biopolitical discipline, and infrastructure in order to gradually establish its political authority over previously autonomous spaces, environments, and populations and re-engineer frontier society in its own image.[52] To be sure, many of the ambitious projects described here were never quite carried to their logical conclusions, nor was the autonomous nature of the Hijaz ever fully surmounted. Thus, while the state was able to execute tremendous technological feats, such as the construction of the Hijaz rail and telegraph lines, it was never able to fully leverage this expertise as a means to produce the intensity of territoriality or the thickness of biopolitical control over the population, whether Bedouin, settled, *mücavir*, or pilgrim, necessary to eliminate autonomous forms of frontier political life.[53]

In spite of the limitations of Ottoman technopolitical development, this does not mean that autonomy meant the same thing in 1903 that it had in 1803. The scale, meaning, and purposes of autonomy in the Hijaz and the Sharifate of Mecca underwent dramatic reformulations over the course of the nineteenth century. Thus, by training our attention on the tensions between Hamidian frontier development and the Hijaz's autonomous status, we are able to scrape away the seemingly impenetrable layers of historiography, which have painted an over-determined portrait of the Hijaz as a propaganda tool, a host to the Sultan's pet projects, and the centerpiece of Pan-Islamic foreign policy. Thus, instead of an exclusive focus on the Hijaz's role as a symbol of

---

[52] Particularly in chapters 1 and 4, I draw upon Arun Agrawal's idea of "environmentality," marrying notions of environmental management with "biopolitical governmentality." Arun Agrawal, *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005), 8. See also Toby Craig Jones, *Desert Kingdom: How Oil and Water Forged Modern Saudi Arabia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 10.

[53] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 59-62.

supranational Pan-Islam I propose turning our attention to the region's role as a laboratory for the state's shifting approaches toward its semi-autonomous frontier. By starting with the question of autonomy, we are confronted with an alternative set of internationalized legal, material, and technical trajectories, which often rest awkwardly against the discursive practices of Pan-Islam. Indeed, a deeper exploration of this side of the story reveals how the material and technopolitical concerns of frontier governance, as defined by the Ottoman men on the spot, frequently formed the nucleus of policies, which were only belatedly folded into Pan-Islamic legitimacy structures. And as we shall see, Pan-Islamic legitimacy structures often contradicted or even undermined the quest for more rigorous control of the semi-autonomous frontier.

Sanitation and Security: Framing The Hijaz and the Hajj against the Backdrop of Britain's Indian Ocean Imperium

At the very heart of these contradictions was the rapidly evolving steamship-era hajj. From the mid-nineteenth century onward, the Ottoman state was no longer free to act as the sole protector of hajj. The affairs of Muslim colonial subjects making the pilgrimage to Mecca gradually came under the scrutiny and surveillance of European colonial regimes. As a result, the Hijaz became increasingly entangled in an ever-expanding web of European extraterritorial influence and informal empire. For the first time in history, the hajj had become an object of international regulation and non-Muslim intervention.

The driving force behind this dramatic shift in the administration of the hajj was the expansion of the British Empire. As Britain's power in the Indian subcontinent grew, so too did its maritime supremacy throughout the Indian Ocean basin. Looking to secure its access to India, ward off its European competitors, and expand its commercial

interests in southwestern Arabia, the Red Sea, and the Gulf of Aden, Britain's role in the region was intensified by the transit opportunities that emerged with the development of regular steamship routes between the Mediterranean and India from the 1830s to the 1860s and the eventual opening of the Suez Canal in 1869. With the exponential growth of maritime traffic that accompanied these technological advances came a similarly dramatic rise in oceangoing pilgrimage traffic from India and Southeast Asia. Owing to this expansion in the number of seaborne pilgrims, the hajj soon came to be recognized as the primary conduit for the globalization of epidemic diseases, such as cholera and plague.

Although the initial impetus for the increased European surveillance in the Red Sea was largely the result of international sanitary and trade concerns generated by the outbreak of cholera during the 1865 pilgrimage season and the resultant call for quarantine measures at the 1866 international sanitary conference in Istanbul, such interests cannot be separated from more directly political considerations. In the decades following the Sepoy Mutiny (Great Rebellion) of 1857-1858, British officials became increasingly concerned with monitoring international webs of anticolonial radicalism, both real and imagined, being forged among diasporic networks of Indian dissidents, pilgrims, and the Ottoman state. As elusive as these connections may have been during the 1850s and 1860s, by the 1870s and 1880s it had become conventional wisdom among British officials that these linkages had given way to a more clearly defined Pan-Islamic ideology, sponsored in part by Abdülhamid himself. In the words of William Roff, collectively the Hijaz and the hajj came to represent a source of "twin infection."[54] As a

[54] William Roff, "Sanitation and Security: The Imperial Powers and the Nineteenth Century Hajj," *Arabian Studies* VI (1982): 143. On the sanitiation-security nexus, see also Valeska Huber, *Channelling Mobilities:*

result of this "twin infection" of sanitary and security concerns, the British and Ottoman empires engaged in a contestation of sacred space in which the stakes ranged from suzerainty over the Hijaz and administration of the hajj to even larger questions of global leadership and protection of the Muslim world.

Freed from the rhythms of sailing in accordance with the monsoon cycle, the costs of transport and the length of passage for Indian Ocean pilgrims traveling after the introduction of the steamship were reduced drastically. Although previous generations of pilgrims were confined mainly to elite officials, wealthy merchants, and the *ulema*, the "modern" hajj also became accessible to Muslims of modest means. However, the relative affordability of the steamship-era hajj also made the journey possible for a "dangerous class" of so-called "pauper pilgrims" (*fukara-ı hüccac*).[55] As the numbers of destitute pilgrims rose, so did the incidence of death and disease in the Hijaz. Much to the dismay of Ottoman and Egyptian officials, and to the embarrassment of the British who vehemently denied that British India and its pilgrims were the source of epidemic cholera, by the 1860s international consensus was converging on the connection between India's pilgrim masses and the dissemination of epidemic disease.[56]

Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1969-1914 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 204-238; Eric Tagliacozzo, *The Longest Journey: Southeast Asians and the Pilgrimage to Mecca* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 109-200.

[55] David Arnold, *Colonizing the Body: State Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth-Century India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 186-189; Radhika Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp: 'The problem of the pauper pilgrim' in colonial India c. 1882-1925," in Ashwini Tambe and Harald Fischer-Tiné, eds., *The Limits of British Colonial Control in South Asia: Spaces of Disorder in the Indian Ocean region* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 49-83. Here, it is also important to note that Ottoman officials also made use of this category. See especially, "Fukara-ı Hüccac Meselesi," in Kasım İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye ve 1330 Senesi Hacc-ı Şerifi: Hicaz Sıhhiye İdaresi Senevi Rapor* (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Amire, 1330/1911-1912), 52-66.

[56] TNA: FO 78/4094, "British efforts to improve travel conditions for pilgrims; appointment of travel agent; problem of indigent pilgrim," October 1884-February 1887; Alan de L. Rush, ed., *Records of the Hajj: A Documentary History of the Pilgrimage to Mecca*, vol. 3 (London: Archive Editions, 1993), 593-

The breaking point came in 1865, when a particularly virulent cholera outbreak spread from India and struck the Hijaz. It was a "*Hacc ül-Ekber* " year when the standing at Mount Arafat falls on a Friday. Because such years are considered particularly auspicious the number of pilgrims ballooned to four times more than the previous year's attendance, leading to overcrowding, food and water shortages, and the perfect environment for the spread of cholera.[57] Although numbers vary wildly, it is thought that between March and April casualties ranged anywhere from 15,000 to 30,000 out of a total attendance of roughly 150,000. To make matters worse, when ships of returning pilgrims arrived at Suez in May of the same year, it was falsely reported that no instances of disease had been detected despite the fact that over a hundred corpses had been tossed overboard during the voyage. Two days after the ship had anchored at Suez the epidemic was in motion. Prior to the opening of the Suez Canal pilgrims moved by train to Alexandria. Thus, by the first days of June cholera had arrived in Alexandria by rail. The epidemic in Egypt would rage for three months, killing 60,000 Egyptians. From there, the epidemic would set sail across the Mediterranean to ports from Beirut and Istanbul to Marseilles and Algiers, setting off a chain reaction that would eventually ravage Anatolia, Europe, and Russia. By November 1865, cholera had spread as far away as New York City and would smolder on until 1874 in some locations. In Russia some 90,000 would perish. In North America, primarily in the ports of the Eastern seabord, the figures ran closer to 50,000. The death toll in the Habsburg Empire, caught

---

626; TNA: FO 78/4328, "Mémoire adressé au Conseil Supérieur de Constantinople sur la proportion sans cesse croissante des indigents parmi les pélerins Musulmans sui se rendent a la Mecque et sur les inconvénients sérieux qui en resultant" (Constantinople, 1890); TNA: FO 78/4328, "Translation: Circular addressed to Mudirs and Governors," Riaz Pasha, Minister of the Interior, Khedival Government of Egypt, 20 January 1890.

[57] BOA, İ. DH, 537/37312 (10 M 1282/5 June 1865).

in the midst of war with Prussia, topped 165,000. Other estimates count 200,000 European and North American deaths in major cities alone.[58]

Given the severity of the 1865 epidemic, international attention focused immediately on the role of the hajj in the dissemination of cholera. Dr. Achille-Adrien Proust, a professor of hygiene at the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Paris, expressed the terror felt throughout the Mediterranean, commenting that "Europe realized that it could not remain like this, every year, at the mercy of the pilgrimage to Mecca."[59] Echoing Proust's anxiety, W. W. Hunter, director general of statistics to the government of India and a leading authority on Indian ethnography and history, noted with haughty contempt that although India's pilgrim masses might "care little for life or death," their "carelessness imperils lives far more valuable than their own."[60] Thus, for the remainder of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire and Europe, acting upon the conclusions of the 1866 international sanitary conference held in Istanbul, embarked upon an ambitious and highly contentious program of sanitary reform and surveillance.[61]

As F. E. Peters observes, "the threat of devastating cholera epidemics invading Europe" resulted in a "concerted *politique sanitaire* whose objective was the regulation

---

[58] Hamdi bin Aziz, *Kolera* (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tibbiye-i Şahane Matbaası, 1311/1893-1894), 9; Firmin Duguet, *Le pélerinage de la Mecque au point de vue religieuse, social et sanitaire* (Paris: Reider, 1932), 126–28; Mark Harrison, *Contagion: How Commerce Has Spread Disease* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 139; F. E. Peters, *The Hajj: The Muslim Pilgrimage to Mecca and the Holy Places* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 301–302; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 14.

[59] A. A. Proust, *Essai sur l'hygiéne . . . Avec une carte indiquement lamarche des épidémies de cholera par les routes de terre et la voie maritime* (Paris, 1873), 45, quoted in Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 146.

[60] W. W. Hunter, *Orissa*, 2 vols. (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1872), 1:145–67, quoted in Arnold, *Colonizing the Body*, 189.

[61] From 1851 to 1894, eight international sanitary conferences addressed the threat posed by cholera. For surveys of the Ottoman role in the international sanitary conferences, see Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*; Kasım İzzeddin, *Mekke-i Mükerreme'de Kolera ve Hıfzıshha* (İstanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 1327). For Eurocentric perspectives, see Peter Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 228-231; Valeska Huber, "The Unification of the Globe by Disease? The International Sanitary Conferences on Cholera, 1851–1894," *The Historical Journal* 49, no. 2 (2006): 453–76; Norman Howard-Jones, *The Scientific Background of the International Sanitary Conferences, 1851-1938* (Geneva: World Health Organization, 1975).

of the life of Western Arabia and, no less, of the most sacred ritual of Islam, the hajj."[62] For British officialdom, however, this situation was complicated by the looming anxieties of Muslim-inspired political subversion that haunted colonial authorities in the wake of the Sepoy Mutiny. On the one hand, despite British claims to the contrary, India's Ganges valley was established as the source of cholera. On at least twenty-two, but possibly as many as forty, occasions between 1831and 1914 cholera spread from India to the Hijaz and was then dispersed far and wide by returning pilgrims, as well as Europeans attempting to flee from the advance of the disease, ensuring that global outbreaks of cholera were a perennial threat.[63] On the other hand, contact with Arabia was widely considered by British officials to be a primary source of religio-political fanaticism among Indian Muslims. First referred to as "Wahhabism" and then later conflated with Hamidian-era Pan-Islam, Arabian influences were repeatedly blamed for spreading unrest and rebellion in India, the Straits Settlements, and the Dutch East Indies.

Although the British were convinced that the hajj was a possible source of political subversion, they feared that direct interference with this fundamental Islamic practice carried an even greater potential to incite a backlash in India. During the height of the cholera era, from the 1860s to the 1890s, these considerations placed Britain in direct confrontation with the reform-minded *politique sanitaire* being imposed by the rest of Europe and the Ottoman Empire. Britain's concerns were threefold. First and foremost, Britain worried that restricting access to the hajj would agitate its Muslim subjects. Second, Britain feared that strict quarantine measures would threaten the free flow of trade between India and Europe. As a result, British officials obstinately denied a mounting body of scientific evidence and international consensus that cholera was a

---

[62] Peters, *The Hajj*, 302.

[63] Kasım İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 4; Kasım İzzeddin, *Rehber-i Zabıta-i Sıhhiye* (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Amire, 1331/1912-1913), 11; William H. McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples* (New York: Anchor Books, 1976), 269.

contagious disease.[64] Thus, for three decades Britain obstructed Ottoman and international efforts to impose quarantine restrictions and documentary practices designed to limit the number of indigent and infected pilgrims and strengthen Ottoman sovereignty in the Red Sea.

Instead, Britain opted for a strategy of increased surveillance activities, in terms of both public health and politico-religious machinations. While the government of India could control much of the legal and regulatory framework of the rapidly industrializing Indian Ocean pilgrimage services industry, their ability to monitor and regulate the hajj did not *directly* extend past the port city of Jidda. Britain and other European colonial powers accepted that their Christian consuls were forbidden from entering Mecca and Medina and were essentially confined to Jidda. Nevertheless, they sought to provide consular protection for their colonial subjects by appointing Muslim agents or vice-consuls to act on their behalf in the holy cities.[65] Although the Ottoman government vociferously opposed this scheme, denied Muslim colonial agents the full standing afforded European Christian consuls, and prevented these officials from residing permanently in Mecca, between the 1850s and World War I European consuls, translators, physicians, and steamship agents, both Christian and Muslim, became increasingly integrated into not only the affairs of the hajj, but of the Hijaz more generally. And while this emerging system of consular legal and commercial representation often involved relatively mundane issues surrounding the protection of pilgrims and European protégés in their commercial and real estate dealings, court

---

[64] Sheldon Watts, *Epidemics and History: Disease, Power and Imperialism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 167–212.

[65] For a very brief overview of British India's Muslim agents in Jidda, see John Slight, "The Hajj and the Raj: From Thomas Cook to Bombay's Protector of Pilgrims," in Venetia Porter and Liana Saif, *The Hajj: Collected Essays* (London: The British Museum, 2013), 115-121.

proceedings, in cases of robbery, tribal raids on pilgrimage caravans, disputes over ship registration, and the repatriation of remains or property of deceased subjects, the question of consular representation also raised the specter of the Capitulations and the kind of political, economic, and military interventions exercised by European governments in other corners of the Ottoman Empire.[66]

As a result, the nature and direction of the security concerns posed by the colonial hajj took a curious turn, calling into question whether the Hijaz was a legitimizing asset for the Hamidian state after all? Or was it merely another distant province, bordering a rival empire, populated by an unsustainable mix of autonomous subjects, unruly Bedouin, and foreigners claiming European protection under the Capitulations?

Organization

This dissertation is organized around a bundle of five legal and technopolitical themes: autonomy, extraterritoriality, quarantine and biopolitical discipline, infrastructure and the environment, and passport and steamship mobility controls. Due to its thematic and episodic organization, there is a jagged chronological progression, pulling in events from as early as the first half of the nineteenth century and telescoping forward to as late as World War I and its immediate aftermath. However, in most cases the disparate storylines converge on the period between the early 1880s and 1909. In this sense, the worldview and technopolitical solutions described here are primariy explorations of the Hamidian period.

Chapter 1, "Building a Province, Searching for Subjects: Osman Nuri Paşa and the Shifting Meanings of Autonomy on the Tribal Frontier," covers the tumultuous

[66] On the establishment of European consulates in Jidda, see Ulrike Freitag, "Helpless Representatives of the Great Powers? Western Consuls in Jeddah, 1830s to 1914," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40, no. 3 (2012): 357-381.

governorship of Osman Nuri Paşa from 1882 to 1886. During this period, Abdülhamid gave Osman Nuri a free hand to subordinate the semi-autonomous Sharifate of Mecca to the will of the Ottoman center. Abdülhamid ultimately sacked Osman Nuri and backed away from direct attempts to subdue and centralize the Sharifate. However, I argue that the governor's policy proposals for the recalibration of the relationship between Istanbul and Mecca would eventually form the backbone of Abdülhamid's gradualist policy of technopolitical centralization in the Hijaz. As Osman Nuri warned, however, the maintenance of the Bedouin autonomy and the privileged status of the Sharifate of Mecca not only compromised Istanbul's ability to make proper subjects out of the Hijaz's permanent populations, whether Bedouin or settled, it also provided the cracked door through which European extraterritorial influence over non-Ottoman Muslims and pilgrims would inevitably slip.

Through an examination of Osman Nuri's ideas and policy prescriptions (successful and failed), I also seek to undermine the persistent misperception that the traditional shape of Hijazi autonomy miraculously escaped the centralizing transformations of the Tanzimat and Hamidian reforms unscathed. Despite Abdülhamid's decision not to abolish the Sharifate, over the remainder of the Hamdian era, Osman Nuri's vision of tribal education and his strong emphasis on technological and infrastructural state-building and development in the Hijaz helped to inspire a myriad of Hamidian frontier policies from the Aşiret Mektebi (Tribal School) to the Hijaz rail and telegraph projects. Indeed, I argue that Osman Nuri's radical experimentation in the Hijaz would ultimately mark him as one the principal architects of the Hamidian state's wider re-spatialization of the empire's tribal and semi-autonomous frontiers.

In Chapter 2, "Unfurling the Flag of Extraterritoriality: Foreign Muslims, Muslim Consular Agents, and the Evolution of the Capitulations in the Indian Ocean Hijaz," I trace how the Hijaz drifted into the orbit of European extraterritorial influence and British India's informal empire in Arabia. While scholars of the late Ottoman Empire have long been obsessed with how the Capitulations and the Tanzimat reforms effectively placed Christian protégés and protected persons beyond the reach of Ottoman justice, curiously little attention has been paid to the analogous projects of European powers claiming to protect their Muslim colonial subjects from the supposed corruption of Ottoman rule. From the 1880s onward, the Ottoman state began to fear that the Muslim subjects of foreign powers could act as potential fifth columns and infiltrate the holy land of the Hijaz. As a result of the interplay between sanitary and security threats, the pilgrimage to Mecca became subject to an ever-expanding inter-imperial web of medical and political surveillance, spies and consular agents, quarantines, steamship and pilgrimage brokerage regulations, passport controls, and documentary practices.

While European powers controlled much of the legal and regulatory framework of the rapidly industrializing pilgrimage transportation industry, their ability to monitor and regulate the hajj did not extend past the port city of Jidda. European powers accepted that their Christian consuls were forbidden from entering Mecca and Medina. Nevertheless, they sought to provide consular protection for their colonial subjects by appointing Muslim agents or vice-consuls to act on their behalf. In response, the Ottoman Empire claimed that due to the Hijaz's sacred status the province was not subject to the Capitulations or other legal concessions. However legitimate this argument might actually have been, by claiming that the Capitulations and other internationally

binding treaties did not apply to the Hijaz, the Ottoman state only further exposed the compromised and divided nature of its sovereignty over the Muslim holy places. Indeed, in many ways the Hijaz's exceptional status was precisely the kind of terrain that the Capitulations and colonial extraterritoriality were designed to navigate.

Chapter 3, "Quarantine and the Global Crisis of Cholera: The Ottoman Sanitary State and Its Limits," traces the development of Ottoman quarantine and public health controls in the Hijaz and wider Red Sea between 1865 and 1895. Typically, the Ottoman Empire's role in questions of quarantine and international sanitary regulation has been overshadowed by the concerns of Europe. The nexus between the Hijaz, pilgrimage, and quarantine has focused primarily on Europe, Egypt, and British India. In this narrative, the erection of the sanitary state is a resolutely European project. The Ottoman Empire is positioned as a semi-civilized buffer, the last line of defense standing between Europe and teeming hordes of cholera-carrying pilgrims of the Indian Ocean basin. And thus, the interests and challenges facing the Ottoman Empire are immaterial. By contrast, this chapter asks what the Ottoman response to the global crisis of cholera looked like. It explores why the Ottoman state took such as an enthusiastic role in the erection of international quarantine systems during the late nineteenth century. It also attempts to ascertain what the Ottoman state hoped to achieve through its participation in international quarantine regulations directed against the Red Sea and the hajj. Was this merely a defensive policy or did cholera and the erection of the Red Sea quarantine system play a constructive role in the late Ottoman resurgence in the Arabian Peninsula? In other words, were quarantine regulations part of the wider constellation of Ottoman frontier technopolitics deployed in service of increasing disciplinary power and territorial

sovereignty? And conversely, what were the limitations of Ottoman sanitary discipline on its Red Sea frontiers?

Chapter 4, "Nature or the Nature of the State?: Infrastructure and the Environmental Imaginaries of Pilgrimage and Potable Water," juxtaposes the international and extraterritorial lenses of cholera and quarantine with a more localized examination of the relationship between late Ottoman modernization discourse, infrastructure, and the "defective" Arabian environment. In contrast to the existing historiography's obsession with the sanitary surveillance of the steamship-era hajj, I examine the Ottoman state's responsibility for the provision of potable water for both pilgrims and permanent residents. Here, I argue that Ottoman analyses of the Hijaz's public health often moved along a very different set of axes. While European observers might have seen Mecca through the prism of their own hygienic concerns, from an Ottoman perspective the decline and revitalization of the Hijaz's urban water systems was imbedded in environmental imaginaries of the empire's tribal frontiers. In this respect, the construction, repair, and upkeep of the Hijaz's aqueducts, water tanks, cisterns, pipes, fountains, and desalination systems collectively serve as a microcosm of the Ottoman state's incomplete projects of modernization and state building on the empire's Arab tribal peripheries.

While the Ottoman state possessed the technical capacity to overcome the Hijaz's environmental constraints, it was incapable of governing the spaces that these projects traversed. Ottoman waterworks, not unlike other large-scale infrastructural projects like the Hijaz rail and telegraph lines, were repeatedly sabotaged, hobbled, and reshaped by

local resistance, both urban and Bedouin. Thus, Ottoman tehnopolitics proved incapable of managing or eliminating autonomous forms of frontier political life.

Chapter 5, "The Sharif's Share: Pauper Pilgrims, Passports, and the Failed Regulation of Indian Ocean Mobilities," explores the conflicting international and imperial regulations and practices governing passports, quarantines, shipping firms, pilgrimage guides, camel drivers, and even the legal interpretation of Islamic ritual itself. In both the high diplomatic negotiations and on-the-ground contestations over these questions, Pan-Islamic rhetoric became the inter-imperial lingua franca of solicitude for the welfare of pilgrims. Rather than inspiring dramatic humanitarian reforms, however, Pan-Islam generally undermined and contradicted Ottoman efforts to impose modern forms of governmentality, underscore the empire's territorial sovereignty, and fully apply biopolitical documentary practices and border controls. For the Indian Ocean pilgrims caught in middle, it was precisely this vicious cycle of legitimacy claims that ensured British caution and lax safety standards even in the face of ghoulish rates of morbidity and mortality. Neither side was willing to risk being accused of interfering with pilgrims' sacred obligations to perform the hajj.

The collective failure to regulate the hajj opened space for the institutionalization of suffering, corruption, and monopolistic business practices on local and global scales. The weak chains of inter-imperial regulation were easily evaded and conditioned through the collaboration of the Sharif of Mecca, Ottoman provincial administrators, European steamship companies, elements within the European consular community in Jidda, and the trans-oceanic networks of Indian and Hadrami commercial interests controlling the pilgrimage transport and brokerage industries linking Mecca and Jidda with India,

Singapore, and Java. At the center of these networks stood the autonomous Sharifate. This autonomous space at the heart of the steamship-era pilgrimage combined with the presence of large numbers of non-Ottoman Muslims controlling the commercial and financial services of the region simultaneously underscored the gaping holes in Ottoman sovereignty and attracted increasing levels of British attention to the "maladministration" of the Hijaz and hajj.

In the Epilogue, I analyze Ahmed Muhtar Paşa's proposals for the abolition of the Sharifate of Mecca. Ahmed Muhtar's complaints were partially in response to the seemingly never-ending train of pilgrimage-related scandals reported in the Egyptian and Indian presses. As Ahmed Muhtar tried in vein to warn, in the long run the Sharifate and the continuation of semi-autonomous or indirect methods of rule more generally would always provide tempting pretexts for British intervention in the Hijaz. At the same time, Ahmed Muhtar was also a strong advocate for the construction of the Hijaz Railway. Taken as a whole, his proposals suggest that the virtual encirclement of the Hijaz by the European colonial world had rendered the Hijaz's previously "incomparable" religious and constitutional status a moot point. As the nineteenth century wore on, autonomy was increasingly incompatible with the new demands of territorial sovereignty and colonial competition.

At present the concluding section of the dissertation is somewhat elliptical. In essence, it provides a brief précis suggesting of the future direction of the project. As I revise the dissertation as a book manuscript, I plan to return to Istanbul and London in order to collect more material for a final full chapter on the Hijaz Railway, the Sharifate, and the region's Bedouin population, extending the project into World War I. In

particular, I would like to focus on Hijazi resistance to the project and the failure to extend the line past Medina. I plan to draw a contrast between the continued autonomy of Mecca and the relatively rapid centralization of Medina under the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP or *İttihad ve Terraki Cemiyeti*).[67] Here, I plan to narrate the incomplete railway project as a fitting conclusion to the story of late Ottoman technopolitics in the Hijaz. And rather than recapitulating the story of the Arab Revolt from the well-worn perspectives of Sharif Husayn and T.E. Lawrence, I will offer a counter-narrative anchored by the memoirs of Fahreddin (Fakhri) Paşa, whose besieged and starving forces defiantly held onto Medina until 1919.[68]

[67] On the CUP-era Hijaz, see Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 144-170.

[68] Feridun Kandemir, *Fahreddin Paşa'nın Medine Müdafaası: Peygamberimizin Gölgesinde Son Türkler* (İstanbul: Yağmur Yayınevi, 2012). See also, Alia El Bakri, "'Memories of the Beloved': Oral Histories from the 1916-1919 Siege of Medina," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46, no. 4 (2014): 703-717.

Chapter 1

Building a Province, Searching for Subjects: Osman Nuri Paşa and the Shifting Meanings of Autonomy on the Tribal Frontier

Between 1870 and World War I, the Ottoman state displayed renewed vigor in the Red Sea. Following the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 and the reconquest of Yemen by 1872, Ottoman efforts to consolidate control over the Hijaz and defend the Muslim Holy Places from European encroachments gained a new sense of urgency.[1] During the reign of Abülhamid II, stewardship over Mecca and Medina also took on a new significance for the Sultan-Caliph's Pan-Islamic image.[2] At the outset of his reign, however, control of this semi-autonomous province remained tenuous. The first half of the nineteenth century had been an unmitigated disaster. The center had lost control of the region during the Wahhabi-Saudi occupation (1803-1811) and the Egyptian campaigns and administration that followed (1811-1841). During the 1850s, the province had been rocked by an anti-Ottoman insurrection stemming from the prohibition of the slave trade in 1855 and the massacre of Jidda's Christian population in 1858.[3] It was not until the 1880s that Istanbul began to exert a stronger influence over the province.

The first half of the 1880s would witness the articulation of a new brand of technopolitical approaches to the empire's semi-autonomous tribal frontiers. In this chapter, the Hijaz is positioned as a critical laboratory of late Ottoman frontier governance. It was a space where the symptoms of autonomy and divided sovereignty

---

[1] Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference*, 36-37.

[2] Deringil, *The Well-Protected*, 44-67.

[3] William Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia: The Hijaz under Ottoman Control, 1840-1908* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984), 131-152.

would be observed, diagnosed, and new experimental treatments proposed. Some of these proposals would fail and be discarded as too risky. But others would provide a durable template for the elaboration of Hamidian technopolitics in the Hijaz and even the even the empire as a whole.

Osman Nuri Paşa and the Birth of the Hamidian Hijaz

Early in his reign Abdülhamid flirted with the idea of completely wresting power from the Sharif of Mecca in order to subordinate the semi-autonomous Amirate of Mecca to the will of the Ottoman center. Ultimately, however, Abdülhamid reasoned that a direct attempt to subdue the Amirate of Mecca and his Bedouin levies would prove expensive, foment unrest, and increase the potential for European intervention in the Hijaz.[4] Nevertheless, the career and ideas of the man to whom this mission was entrusted are no less illuminating.

Born in 1840 in the Maçka quarter of Istanbul, Osman Nuri Paşa (also known by the appellations Hacı or Topal, meaning "the lame") was the son of Colonel Ahmed Şükrü Bey. In 1863, he graduated from the *Mekteb-i Erkan-ı Harbiye-i Şahane* (the Ottoman Imperial Military Academy). Osman Nuri was a veteran of the Balkan and Serbian campaigns (1875-1878) and served as a staff officer under the command of Gazi Osman Paşa. Thus, began his meteoric rise through the Ottoman military ranks. In 1881, Osman Nuri was promoted to the rank of Mirliva (Brigadier General). It was at this point that Osman Nuri was catapulted onto the center stage of late Ottoman history.[5]

---

[4] Butrus Abu Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid II and the Sharifs of Mecca, 1880-1890," *Asian and African Studies* 9, no. 1 (1973): 5.

[5] For Osman Nuri's life (1840-1898) and career, see BOA, DH. SAİD. d, 18, p. 277; M. Metin Hülagü, "Topal Osman Nuri Paşa Hayatı ve Faaliyetleri, 1840-1898," *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi* no. 5 (1994): 145-53; Halil Sedes, *1876-1878 Osmanlı-Rus ve Romen Savaşı*, vol. IX (İstanbul: Askeri Matbaa, 1950), 39; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Mekke-i Mükerreme*

On 30 May 1876, Sultan Abdüalaziz (r. 1861-1876) had been deposed in a coup orchestrated by Midhat Paşa and his allies and sanctioned by the *Şeyh ül-İslam*. Although Abdülhamid II was allowed to replace Murad V on 31 August 1876 on the grounds of the latter's poor mental health, he did so under duress and was forced to agree to the promulgation of Midhat Paşa's proposed constitution. In 1878, Abdülhamid was eventually able to consolidate enough power to suspend the constitution indefinitely. However, Abdülhamid harbored deep suspicions of Midhat's seditious aspirations. He also continued to view Abdüalaziz's ouster and subsequent suicide as a "murder" plotted by Midhat and his associates. Following the closure of the second parliament in 1878, Midhat was arrested and put on a ship destined for Brindisi. However, he was eventually brought back and appointed governor of Syria. But in 1881, he was arrested and tried at Yıldız Palace for the murder of Sultan Abdülaziz.[6]

Another element of the backdrop to Midhat's arrest and conviction were the swirling rumors surrounding the threat of a rival Arab Caliphate. According to the theory presented by Gabriel Charmes, Midhat and the constitutionalists had intended to separate the Caliphate from the Sultanate and the Ottoman dynasty.[7] They believed that if the Caliphate were transferred to the Amir of Mecca, the Sharifate would take on the ecumenical duties as spiritual head of the Muslim world and the Ottoman Sultanate would be forced to base its authority on constitutional legitimacy. In order to accomplish

---

Emirleri (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1972), 27-29; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1992), 144-145; Atıf Paşa, *Yemen Tarihi*, vol. 2 (Dersaadet/İstanbul: Manzume-i Efkar Matbaası, 1326/1908-1909), 144.

[6] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam*,166, 246.

[7] Gabriel Charmes, "La Situation de la Turquie: La politique du caliphat et ses consequences," *Revue Deux Mondes* 47 (1881): 740-745. For the Ottoman translation summarizing Charmes's theories, see BOA, Y. EE, 91/39 (29 Z 1299/11 November 1882).

this dramatic step and consolidate a new constitutional regime, Midhat reportedly supported granting autonomy for the Hijaz and even the rest of the Arab provinces.[8]

According to intelligence collected by the British Consulate in Jidda, after Abdülhamid had come to throne, Midhat Paşa and his co-conspirators "had designs of deposing His Majesty and forming a republic" with the infamous 'Abd al-Muttalib ibn Ghalib (served as Sharif of Mecca: 1851-1855, 1880-1882) "as an old and innocuous person as Khalifa without any civil powers." According to this report, however, upon being approached with this scheme, 'Abd al-Muttalib "refused his consent and informed the Sultan." Thus, the consular informant claimed that 'Abd al-Muttalib was named to replace the recently assassinated Sharif Husayn (d. 1880) "as a reward for his loyalty, but also perhaps partly… to keep him out the way."[9]

While the stories of the conspiracies and plots surrounding Midhat Paşa, his exile and imprisonment, and subsequent strangling in the Hijaz are the stuff of legend, little serious attention has been paid to the ways in which the question of the Hijaz's vulnerable semi-autonomous status was reconsidered in the wake of the constitutional crises sparked by Midhat's machinations. It is a great irony that Midhat, perhaps the greatest figure of Ottoman administrative reform in the nineteenth century, was exiled and died in the province that was in many respects the very antithesis of the reforms he had championed. It is doubly ironic that the man chosen by Abdülhamid to oversee Midhat's confinement and his extra-judicial murder in 1884 would also emerge as the chief engineer of a reordered and reinvigorated Hijaz and wider Arabian frontier. In many respects, the intellectual roots of Osman Nuri's own Arabian state-building projects

---

[8] Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam*, 195-196, 245-246.

[9] TNA: FO 195/1415, Acting Consul Lynedoch Moncrieff, Jidda to the Earl of Dufferin, 1 February 1882.

bear a certain affinity to Midhat's tenure in Baghdad (1869-1872), his Persian Gulf campaign, and the creation of the *sancak* of Hasa.[10] In a way, the contrasts and similarities between these two men are simultaneously emblematic of the shifts and continuities that marked the transition from Tanzimat to Hamidian statecraft.

At the time of Midhat Paşa's conviction in 1881, military command in the Hijaz was in the hands of Necip Paşa and the governorship was held by Safvet Paşa. Both were on good terms with the Amir of Mecca, 'Abd al-Muttalib. Due in part to the Sharifate's supposed role in Midhat's scheme to transfer the Caliphate, Abdülhamid was understandably anxious to avoid having the province's governor or military command compromised by Midhat and his co-conspirators or the Amir of Mecca.[11] There was also considerable anxiety that the British Consulate in Jidda was engaged in a plot to assist Midhat in escaping from his confinement in Taif.[12] Thus, the Sultan required someone who had no relationship to these principal figures and had total loyalty to him. Owing to these needs, Osman Nuri Paşa was chosen. On 31 October 1880, he was informed that he would be brought to Istanbul for a personal audience with the Sultan. During their meeting, Osman Nuri was given special verbal instructions regarding the unique duties of his new posting. Abdülhamid explained that Osman Nuri was to have complete responsibility for the conditions and movements of Midhat and his associates. And henceforth, this responsibility would be taken completely out of the hands of the Ottoman

---

[10] Anscombe, *The Ottoman Gulf*, 1-53. It is also clear that even after his fall from grace Midhat's attempts to consolidate and deepen the empire's Persian Gulf and peninsular presence in the face of British expansion continued to resonate in Hamidian-era strategic thinking about the geopolitical challenges facing the Hijaz and Arabia more broadly. For example, see BOA, Y. EE, 5/100, "İngiltere'nin Arap Yarımadası siyaseti" (19 B 1300/26 May 1883).

[11] Uzunçarşılı, *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları*, 34-36.

[12] Yılmaz Öztuna, *II. Abdülhamid: Zamanı ve Şahsiyeti* (İstanbul: Kubbealtı, 2008), 191.

governor and Sharif of Mecca. Once Abdülhamid was certain of Osman Nuri's loyalty and understanding of the special mandate that the post entailed, Abdülhamid had Osman Nuri promoted to Major General (*Ferik*). To further reinforce his authority, Osman Nuri was accompanied by 2,000 troops, bringing the number of Ottoman soldiers in the Hijaz to 5,000 regulars and 500 irregular cavalrymen. He was also provided 750 gold pieces for himself and an additional 2,000 to distribute to his retinue. In addition, all of his men were given a one-degree promotion in rank (*rütbe*). In addition to his military command, Osman Nuri was also named the lieutenant governor (*Vali Vekili*) until a new governor arrived to replace Safvet Paşa.[13] And within just two years in 1882, Osman Nuri Paşa was given the governorship of the Hijaz and awarded the empire's highest military rank (*Müşir*).[14]

At the time of Osman Nuri's initial appointment, the then governor of the Hijaz, Safvet Paşa, was pedaling intelligence reports of plots involving the Hijaz. One such report claimed that a representative of the Sanusi order had been sent from Benghazi in order to secure the friendship and influence of the Sharif of Mecca and promote Sanusi claims of being the Mahdi. Another report claimed that the British had been working to foment (*tahrik*) an anti-Ottoman rebellion (*isyan*) among the Bedouin shaykhs of the Hijaz through the distribution of as many as one million British pounds. Osman Nuri was instructed to interview Safvet and investigate the veracity of these claims.[15]

---

[13] For the *talimatname* outlining Osman Nuri's appointment, see BOA, Y. EE, 6/3 (27 Za 1298/31 October 1880); BOA, Y. EE, 6/7 (29 Za 1298/2 November 1880). See also Uzunçarşılı, *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları*, 34-37; Öztuna, *II. Abdülhamid: Zamanı ve Şahsiyeti*, 191; Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid II and the Sharifs of Mecca," 1-22.

[14] BOA, DH. SAİD. d, 18, p. 277; Hülagü, "Topal Osman Nuri Paşa Hayatı ve Faaliyetleri, 145-53.

[15] See Uzunçarşılı, *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları*, 35-36; Süleyman Kani İrtem, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Mısır Yemen Hicaz Meselesi* (İstanbul: Temel, 1999), 163-167.

However, there is little evidence that Osman Nuri occupied himself with these rumors. Osman Nuri had more pressing matters to address. In 1880, Sharif Husayn ibn Muhammad had been assassinated by an Afghan pilgrim.[16] Upon receiving news of the assassination of Husayn, Abdülhamid deftly sought to both balance the competing claims on the Sharifate by the Zayd and ‘Awn branches of the Hashemite family and simultaneously diminish the Sharifate’s political significance. On the one hand, Abdülhamid was mindful to avoid the ‘Awn clan due to their association with leading Tanzimat figures. On the other hand, the Sultan was also careful to choose a replacement that could be relied upon to oppose British interests in the Hijaz.[17]

Somewhat shockingly, the Sultan appointed ‘Abd al-Muttalib to a second term as Sharif. ‘Abd al-Muttalib had already held the position in the early 1850s, but had led an open revolt against Ottoman rule in the Hijaz in 1855-1856, following which he had been deposed and exiled first to Salonica and then Istanbul where had remained until his re-appointment in 1880.[18] Despite his past disloyalty, however, the irascible ‘Abd al-Muttalib suited the Sultan’s political motives perfectly. ‘Abd al-Muttalib was almost ninety years old at the time of his reappointment. He was also paired with a new governor, Ahmet İzzet (Erzincanlı), who had also served as governor in the 1850s. The appointment of this duo of nonagenarians was hardly an accident. As rapidly became

[16] On speculation that Amir Husayn’s assassination might have been carried out from within the Ottoman state in retaliation for his secret correspondence with the British consulate, see Ş. Tufan Buzpınar, “Abdulhamid II and Amir Hussein’s Secret Dealings with the British, 1877-1880,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 31 no. 1 (1995): 99-123.

[17] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 180-183.

[18] Nurtaç Numan, “The Emirs of Mecca and the Ottoman Government of Hijaz, 1840-1908” (M.A. thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2005), 72-73.

clear, real control of the region and Istanbul's interests was intended to reside solely in Osman Nuri's hands.

Due to 'Abd al-Muttalib's advanced age he was unable to sufficiently monitor the day-to-day demands of the Sharifate. This left the Sharifate largely in the hands of his inexperienced sons and his business manager, Jabir al-Yamani. At the same time, however, in his haste to consolidate power and remove supporters of the rival 'Awn clan 'Abd al-Muttalib alienated both Ottoman officials and local Meccan dignitaries alike. In the transition enemies of the new Sharif complained of arbitrary confiscations, arrests, beatings, and the transfer of offices and patronage to the new agents of the Sharifate. As these purges unfolded, the Hanafi Mufti of Mecca, 'Abd al-Rahman al-Siraj resigned in protest. The Jidda-Mecca and Mecca-Taif roads succumbed to Bedouin raiding. And in 1881, Taif came under a Bedouin siege. Eventually the unraveling of security became so bad that food prices reached famine levels.[19]

'Abd al-Muttalib's heavy-handedness provided Osman Nuri with sufficient pretext and political leverage to move against the elderly Amir. In February 1882, Osman Nuri dispatched a detailed report, outlining the Sharif's tyrannical behavior and the need to take drastic steps to limit his powers.[20] Osman Nuri recommended that the Sharif be stripped of all judicial power. He argued for disbanding the Sharifate's private security forces. The Sharif was also to lose his responsibility for the affairs of the Haram, the appointment of its personnel, and the management of its endowments. Even the

---

[19] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 180-183; Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid and the Sharifs of Mecca," 6-10.

[20] BOA, Y. EE, 88/64, "Mekke Emareti'nin ahvali ve Hicaz'daki vaziyeti izah eden Hicaz Fırkası Kumandanı Ferik Osman mühürlü bir yazı" (3 R 1299/22 February 1882). See also BOA, Y. EE, 88/61, "Abdülmuttalib Efendi hakkında Hicaz Kumandanı Osman Paşa'nın layihası ve layihanın takdim kılındığı" (15 M 1299/7 December 1881).

management of the Bedouin shaykhs was to be transferred to the Vali. This essentially left the Sharifate with two functions: the mediation of disputes between Bedouin tribes and the organization of the hajj. Osman Nuri's requests were evidently met with a favorable response from Yıldız. Henceforth, 'Abd al-Muttalib's complaints about the governor fell on deaf ears. As one British official put it, the governor's intention was to "do away with the Sherifate altogether or, if that was not possible, to deprive the Grand Sherif of all secular powers and leave him to enjoy his title as a sort of high priest."[21] At least from the British Consulate's perspective, Osman Nuri's plans to bring all of the Hijaz under direct Ottoman administration were a smashing success. As the Acting Consul, Lynedoch Moncrieff, wrote in April 1882:

> The affairs of Mecca and the Bedoween have gradually almost passed into the hands of the Vali and Osman Pasha. The Grand Sherif is consulted and orders are given in his name but he has become so indifferent to anything but his own personal advantage for which he alone seems to have a little mind and energy left, that he makes no opposition to anything the Vali proposes. Osman Pasha is credited with private orders from the Sultan and steps beyond the duties of Commander-in-Chief.[22]

As it turned out, Osman Nuri was prepared to go considerably farther. In June 1882, 'Abd al-Muttalib requested to be excused from his position as Amir of Mecca and be allowed to take up residence in Medina. Osman Nuri cautioned against allowing this, claiming that 'Abd al-Muttalib's true design was to join forces with Muhammad ibn Rashid of Hail in order to return to Mecca and declare himself under British protection.[23] Although the likelihood of this scheme is dubious at best, this narrative dovetailed with rumors connecting 'Abd al-Muttalib's caliphal ambitions and his purported sympathies

---

[21] Quoted in Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid and the Sharifs of Mecca," 10-11.

[22] TNA: FO 195/1415, "Report on the Affairs in Mecca," Acting Consul, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Jidda, 30 April 1882.

[23] BOA, Y. PRK. ASK, 13/33 (9 Ş 1299/25 June 1882).

for Midhat Paşa and his fellow prisoners in Taif. Despite their lack of veracity, authorities in Istanbul were prepared to take precautions against them.[24] Thus, in August 1882 a messenger was intercepted in Mecca carrying letters purportedly verifying the Sharif's conspiratorial communications with the British Consulate and Ibn Rashid. As a result, in September 1882 'Abd al-Muttalib was arrested, deposed, and replaced by 'Awn al-Rafiq (r. 1882-1905).[25]

Having deposed 'Abd al-Muttalib, between 1883 and 1886 Osman Nuri's consolidation of power continued at break-neck speed. Osman Nuri struck against local power on multiple fronts. In 1884, he had himself named Shaykh of the Meccan Haram in order to exert firmer control over the *ulema*. The governor also set out to cow local elites in Mecca and Jidda. The most notable example of this policy was the exile of 'Umar Nasif, the Sharif's agent in Jidda. Citing Nasif's complicity in inciting an uprising among the Harb Bedouin, he attempted to destroy his influence in the region. Nasif was arrested and sentenced to 15 years in prison by the governor. Despite Osman Nuri's claims, it is highly unlikely that Nasif's harsh treatment was really due to any connection to the Harb tribe. Rather, it is more likely that the governor struck at Nasif due to his strong support for the Amir of Mecca, whose powerbase he was determined to erode.[26]

---

[24] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 182.

[25] BOA, Y. EE, 88/47 (29 L 1299/13 September 1882); BOA, Y. EE, 88/49 (23 Za 1299/6 October 1882). According to Uzunçarşılı, Osman Nuri deposed 'Abd al-Muttalib without consulting Istanbul and achieved the Sharif's deposition with a forged *ferman*. See *Mekke-i Mükerreme Emirleri*, 133-134. In a subsequent investigation headed by the jurist, Lebib Efendi, 'Abd al-Muttalib was shown to have had no role in the affair. Lebib Efendi argued that the letters could have been forged by a member of his secretariat. Despite this discovery, 'Abd al-Muttalib's fate was sealed and he was kept under confinement until his death in 1886. See also, Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid II and the Sharifs of Mecca," 12.

[26] BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 6/34 (9 S 1301/10 December 1883). Despite this harsh setencing Nasif was pardoned shortly afterwards. See also Ochsenwald, *Relgion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 109.

From the outside it appeared that Osman Nuri had succeeded in putting the Hijaz on par with Ottoman provincial rule in other parts of the empire. In the wake of 'Abd al-Muttalib's deposition 'Awn al-Rafiq was initially unable to offer any real resistance against Osman Nuri's assault on the autonomy of the Sharifate. As the British consul, T.S. Jago, wrote in 1885, 'Awn al-Rafiq resigned himself to the situation and had "accepted his position," but "enjoys little or no influence and still less consideration." From Jago's perspective, Osman Nuri had been handpicked by the Sultan in order to "reduce the Hedjaz, so far as local independence goes, to the condition of a third rate Turkish province." And thus, "Osman Pasha's word" had become "law in all matters great and small…. while his summary proceedings and despotic powers are naturally feared."[27]

Ultimately, however, Osman Nuri's alienation of local notables had swollen the ranks of 'Awn al-Rafiq's supporters. Likewise, the governor's decision to withhold payments to the Bedouin in exchange for the maintenance of security of the pilgrim routes combined with his harsh dealings with the camel brokers of the Harb tribe had begun to threaten the safety and efficiency of the pilgrimage caravans between Mecca and Medina. Taken as a whole, the growing sense of local discontent with the governor's performance would provide 'Awn al-Rafiq with the leverage he needed to campaign for the removal for Osman Nuri removal in 1886.[28] In their dueling letters to Istanbul, the two men succinctly laid out the stakes of their conflict. As 'Awn al-Rafiq pointed out,

---

[27] TNA: FO 195/1514, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Earl Granville, Foreign Office, 5 March 1885.

[28] For 'Awn al-Rafiq's campaign for Osman Nuri's dismissal, see Y. A. HUS, 196/32, "Mekke Emiri Avnurrefik'in Hicaz Vali'si Osman Paşa'nın gayr-ı meşru ve gaddarane muamelatından şikayeti" (8 S 1304/6 November 1886); Y. A. HUS 196/33, "Hicaz Valisi Osman Pasa'nın azl ve nasb-ı makamına ait olmayıp Mekke emirine raci bulunan bazı müftü ve saireyi azletmesinden dolayı sikayeti havi" (8 S 1304/6 November 1886).

Osman Nuri was waging a determined campaign to strip away (*nez' etmek*) the long-standing (*min el-kadim*) privileges of the Sharifate. In response, Osman Nuri claimed that if left to his own devices the Amir of Mecca harbored a desire (*meyl ü arzu*) to revolt and establish independence (*tefferüd ve istiklal*) for himself. Whatever the veracity of either man's claims, as the Grand Vezier (*Sadrazam*) Kamil Paşa remarked, this level of persistent conflict could not continue in a place as sensitive as the Hijaz. He concluded that it was necessary for one of the two men be removed from office (*müşarün-ileyhümadan birinin tebdili taht-ı vücub ve elzemiyette görünmüş*) in order to prevent further escalation of the situation.[29] In addition to the Grand Vezier's growing impatience with the situation, 'Awn al-Rafiq was also able to exert influence on the Sultan himself through his father-in-law, Ahmed Esad Efendi, who held the ceremonial post of Sweeper of the Prophet's Mosque in Medina (*Feraşet-i Şerife Vekili*). Ahmed Esad was among the circle of Arab dignitaries advising Abdülhamid and often acted as a back channel intermediary between Istanbul and Hijazi notables.[30]

Osman Nuri's dismissal should not be interpreted as a reversal of the Sultan's drive to dramatically alter the semi-autonomous status of the Hijaz, nor should it be considered a repudiation of Osman Nuri's ambitious ideas, many of which would become central planks of Hamidian frontier reform. Rather, the end of Osman Nuri's direct confrontation with the Sharif of Mecca coincides neatly with an overall Hamidian shift

---

[29] BOA, Y. A. HUS, 194-2/55 (6 Z 1303/5 September 1886).

[30] For criticism of the role of Ahmed Esad Efendi and his connections to the Sharifate, see Mahmud Nedim Bey, *Arabistan'da Bir Ömür: Son Yemen Valisinin Hatıraları veya Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Arabistan'da Nasıl Yıkıldı?*, edited by Ali Birinci (İstanbul: İsis Yayıncılık, 2001), 71-72. For more on Ahmed Esad and his position within the wider coterie of Arab religious dignitaries surrounding Abdülhamid at Yıldız Palace, see Ibrahim al-Muwayhlihi, *Ma Hunalik*, English translation by Roger Allen, *Spies, Scandals, and Sultan's: Istanbul in the Twilight of the Ottoman Empire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008), 133-153.

toward experiments with frontier policies bearing a certain resemblance to colonial methods of indirect rule through princely states or chieftans.[31]

From this point forward, Abdülhamid's approach toward integrating previously autonomous tribal regions would prove considerably more eclectic and nimble than that of his Tanzimat predecessors. The Sultan adopted what might be loosely termed "sayyid sovereignty." As Abdülhamid and his closest advisors had reasoned, a direct attempt to subdue the Sharifate and his Bedouin levies in the manner that Osman Nuri flirted with would be expensive, eventually foment unrest, and only increase the potential of European intervention. From Istanbul's perspective, a more veiled, diplomatic approach was necessary. In a sense, the raiding and the chaos of tribal life were accepted as a natural part of the Arabian political landscape. In this formulation, it was acceptable to rely on the Sharif of Mecca's sacred status and noble lineage as an instrument of "pastoral power" to rule and contain Hijazi tribal life. The sayyids and sharifs of the Arabian Peninsula represented a kind generalized and historically-grounded Ottoman "commonwealth" of natural rulers. So long as they maintained a modicum of peace within their territory, the region's external relations were left "exclusively in the hands of the one true sovereign," the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph. And in the end, what constituted sovereignty in the latter half of the nineteenth century was not whether or not the Ottoman state could exercise complete control over the Hijaz's Bedouins. Rather, it was whether or not it could maintain the Hijaz in manner that ensured its internationall-

[31] Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference*, 143-144, 207-221.

recognized claims over the province's sovereignty and would not provoke European intervention.[32]

The Sultan also understood that an open contest between the Ottoman state and the Sharif also increased the likelihood of a challenge to his status as Caliph and might very well drive the Sharif into the arms of the British. Instead, as Butrus Abu-Manneh reasons, 'Awn al-Rafiq became a useful prop in Abdülhamid's hands. Over the next two decades, the Sharif's reputedly despotic tendencies and gross abuses of power, especially his extortion of money from pilgrims through his coercive and monopolistic organization of the pilgrimage transportation industry, would effectively neutralize him as a rival claimant to the Caliphate and serve as an instructive lesson in the Sultan's production of loyalty. Thus, the Sultan's own well-advertised demonstrations of concern for the welfare of pilgrims were meant to stand in stark contrast to the Sharif's rapacity.[33] In the meantime, Istanbul would pursue a slower technopolitical strategy of building up and connecting the Hijaz to the Ottoman center.

Technopolitics on the Tribal Frontier: Re-Making the Hijaz and Other 'Hot Provinces'

As Selim Deringil has noted, while we have mountains of biographical information detailing the careers of Tanzimat notables, such as Midhat Paşa, Reşid Paşa, Ali Paşa, and Fuad Paşa, for the Hamidian period historians have frequently attempted to reconstruct the late-Ottoman world view by obsessing over the inner thoughts, fears, and personal eccentricities of Abdülhamid himself. As a result, we have often credited (or more frequently disparaged) the Sultan for almost singlehandedly remolding the late-

[32] Wilson Chacko Jacob, "Of Angels and Men: Sayyid Fadl bin Alawi and Two Moments of Sovereignty," *Arab Studies Journal* 20, no. 1 (2012): 41-42, 46-49.

[33] Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid II and the Sharifs of Mecca," 18-21.

Ottoman worldview in his own image. By seeing the world through the eyes of a loyal Hamidian statesmen, dedicated soldier, and provincial administrator, however, we discover a more nuanced understanding of the challenges facing the Hamidian state, one that both conforms to and departs from our potted histories of the period. We also discover that not all innovations in Hamidian governance were hatched in Yıldız Palace. In many respects, Osman Nuri Paşa, a virtually "unknown soldier," demonstrates how the expertise generated through experimentation in provincial administration could (and did) bubble up and reshape the state at the imperial level.[34]

Between 1882 and his death in 1898, Osman Nuri Paşa would serve as governor of Yemen, Aleppo and again in the Hijaz, garnering a reputation as an expert on empire's Arab tribal frontiers.[35] His experience recalibrating the relationship between autonomy and technopolitical centralization would ultimately mark him as one the principal architects of the Hamidian state's wider re-spatialization of the empire's tribal and semi-autonomous frontiers. Over time, his vision of tribal education and his strong emphasis on technological and infrastructural state-building and development in the Hijaz would inform Hamidian frontier policy at an empire-wide level.

In 1885, Osman Nuri wrote a report (*layiha*) outlining his plans for provincial reforms in the Hijaz.[36] In it he attempts to adapt Istanbul's vision of modernity and

---

[34] Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 199, footnote 83.

[35] Hülagü, "Topal Osman Nuri Paşa Hayatı ve Faaliyetleri," 145-53.

[36] The Hijaz section of this report was written in 1885. However, there is also a Yemen report dating from 1890, which his son Said Bey included in an 1898 report to Yıldız Palace. Apparently neither draft was finalized prior to his Osman Nuri's death in 1898. For the full Ottoman text of the Hijaz report with a critical reading in modern Turkish, see Selçuk Akşin Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu," *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* (1996): 1-38. For a gloss on an earlier iteration of these ideas, drafted in 1301/1884, see also "İstikbal'de Ceziret ül-Arab ve Hicaz ve Yemen İslahatı," in BOA, Y. EE, 13/29 (2 R 1326/4 May 1908).

civilization to better suit the Bedouin profile of these provinces. As Selçuk Akşin Somel points out, this genre of comprehensive reporting on the threats facing the Ottoman state in the provincial hinterlands (*taşra vilayetler*), written in frank and direct language, is a common feature of the Yıldız Esas Evrak and Yıldız Mütenevvi Maruzat archival records. In this sense Osman Nuri's attempt to place the Hijaz, Yemen, and Trablusgarb in a wider intellectual framework bears a certain resemblance to the kinds of reports produced by Ahmet Şakir Paşa and Derviş İbrahim Paşa in their respective capacities as General Inspectors (*Umumi Müfettişlik*) in Anatolia and the Balkans.[37]

Interestingly, he is completely silent on the position of the Sharif of Mecca in his reform plans. And yet, the Sharifate's corrupting presence is palpable throughout the text. In a sense, Osman Nuri seems to suggest that the Ottoman state should simply build up a new state apparatus, which would in turn dramatically alter the balance of political and administrative power in the region. In the text's introduction, Osman Nuri emphasizes the Sultan's role as a provider of justice and public works. And while he alludes to the political legitimacy generated by the Ottoman dynasty's role as the Sunni world's leader and the connection between the Sultan's claim to the Caliphate and his responsibilities as "*Hadim ül-Haremeyn üş-Şerifeyn*," it is clear that he was primarily concerned with more secular questions of modern governmentality.[38]

His main priorities included: political and administrative divisions, taxation and revenue, educational and legal reform, the construction of government buildings and infrastructure, and transportation and communications. As he argues, without the proper

---

[37] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu," 1. On the activities of the *Umumi Müfettişlik*, see also Ali Karaca, *Anadolu Islahatı ve Ahmet Şakir Paşa (1838-1899)* (İstanbul: Eren, 1993).

[38] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu," 3.

administrative and political divisions the region's people would remain in a nomadic condition. Under these conditions he laments that the local population was likely to remain distant form the Ottoman state, harboring ill feelings and a sense that the state is a foreign and alien actor. That said, it is no surprise that the Hijaz would remain trapped in a vicious cycle of "slaughter" (*katliamlar*) directed against both pilgrims and settled populations, extortion and raiding on the roads, material destitution, and dependency on government aid. As he complains, hundreds of years had passed since the Hijaz first came under Ottoman suzerainty and yet the Bedouins had not passed from nomadism (*bedeviyet*) to civilization (*medeniyet*). And still the Hijaz was left with two separate governments and two sets of laws and standards for civilized conduct (again a clear allusion to the pernicious relationship between the Sharifate and local custom).[39]

Osman Nuri argues that without his slate of reforms there will be "no way the state can bring any executive power to bear" on the Bedouin. And "they will continue to live according to their savage old customs (*adat-ı vahşiyelerini*) which are against Sharia and modern laws." In turn, "they will be bereft of the legal structure that would ease their path to civilization."[40] For Osman Nuri a critical step en route to civilization and prosperity was the proper implementation of "civilized laws" (*kavaid-i medeniye*). Accordingly, the power of the state and general security in the region would be proportional to the implementation of these principles. To the degree that private and civil law and shari'a and Nizamiye courts could be adapted to both the requirements of

[39] Ibid., 10.

[40] Quoted in Deringil, "'They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery', 327.

the state and traditions and character of the locals, the prosperity of economic exchange and activity would flow.[41]

To illustrate this point Osman Nuri underlines the need for the state to set the parameters of shari'a and civil legal procedures in order to avoid the continued corruption of what he calls "Arab law" (*kanun-ı Arab*) or local customary law, which inevitably infects and alters the shape of the provincial administration itself if left unchecked. Here, Osman Nuri relates a story of his encounter with Arab law in Taif. As he explains, there was a young couple hailing from the Quraysh tribe. Apparently, the two had fallen in love. The girl's father refused to consent to the match. As a result, the couple fled and joined another tribe. In response, the Quraysh tribe had decided that the couple should be executed in accordance with local custom. As Osman Nuri points out, however, from the perspective of shari'a their union was a legitimate marriage. He laments "what a great sin" it was to impose "the world's most notorious punishment[s]" (*dünya iştiharen olan idam ile mücazat olunmasının ne kadar günah-ı azime*) on these poor youths. Moreover, such a punishment was "contrary to the judgments of the Qur'an" (*muhalalefe-i Kuran-ı Kerim*). When the case was brought to Osman Nuri's attention, he inquired to one of the Qurayshi shaykhs. As Osman Nuri recalls, the shaykh replied flippantly: "What should we do? Arab law requires it." With that the governor said: "may Allah chasten you! Did Arab law descend from Allah specifically to the Arab tribes? If it contradicts the judgment of the Qur'an you should abolish it." To this the shaykh pleaded that abolishing such practices would simply not be possible because Bedouin girls and boys in the mountains and valleys could easily visit one another under the cover of the vast

[41] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu,12.

geography. Therefore, the application of the Ottoman center's understandings of shari'a would be impractical. As the shaykh pointed out, there is no Zaptiye or police in the countryside. And thus, the shaykh reasoned, Arab law was necessary to protect our "chastity" (*ırz*) and "honor" (*namus*).[42]

In addition to the gaping chasm between Ottoman and Bedouin visions of justice, Osman Nuri also shows grave concern that the state's failure to provide appropriate access to "imperial" education had left the population "like so many lifeless corpses of no benefit to humanity."[43] Here, Osman Nuri points out the need to draw the Arab tribal chiefs into the structure of government service, make it easier for them to fulfill their ambitions in a manner that is consistent with the needs of the state, making medals of honor, decoration, and the trappings and pomp of the state more easily attainable. By bring the chiefs closer to the state, the Ottoman government will seem like less of a foreign entity. This notion also dovetails with his call for the development of the region's human resources. As he argues, this might be accomplished by recruiting the children of local notables to attend a school for civil service (*Medrese-i Mülkiye* or *Mekteb-i İdari*). Thus, the sons of tribal shaykhs, pilgrimage guides, Zamzam water carriers, muezzins, imams, and preachers should be recruited into a multi-layered Ottoman school system and trained as servants of the state through a curriculum featuring a "unified language of instruction" (*tevhid-i elsine*), which he naturally argued should be Ottoman Turkish.[44]

---

[42] Ibid., 12-13, 27-28.

[43] Quoted in Deringil, "'They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery'," 327-9.

[44] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu, 19-20; BOA, Y. EE, 13/29 (2 R 1326/4 May 1908).

As Osman Nuri warned, however, even this most difficult population could not be perpetually treated as though they were living in a recently occupied territory. He understood the need to balance the pressure of increased centralization being placed on Bedouin populations with a measure of accommodation and indoctrination. Eventually, his ideas on Bedouin education would have empire-wide implications. Osman Nuri was instrumental in the founding of the Aşiret Mektebi (or Tribal School). Rather than forced sedentarization programs the Tribal School aimed to foster allegiance to the state by training the sons of tribal notables for government service. As Eugene Rogan explains, the idea of founding a school for the sons of the empire's tribal leaders in order to foster connections between tribal loyalties and the state-sponsored supranational allegiances of Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism was one of the Hamidian period's most ambitious projects of social engineering.[45] Although it is clear the Sultan was a great supporter of this idea, its origins are deeply connected to Osman Nuri's visions of the empire's southern frontiers. In 1886, a pilot group of students was selected from the Hijaz, Yemen, and Trablusgarb. And later in 1892, Osman Nuri was called upon to write the school's curriculum.[46] This example is significant not only because it confirms the Hijaz's place alongside the rest of the empire's tribal frontier zones, it also shows the degree to which the experience of governing the Hijaz played a central role in the Hamidian state's turn toward new methods of harnessing the human potential of the Arab frontiers.

As Osman Nuri observes, tribal populations also hindered Istanbul's ability to project force along its Arab frontiers. As he concedes, Muslims from Arab, Kurdish, and

---

[45] Eugene L. Rogan, "Aşiret Mektebi: Abdulhamid II's School for Tribes (1892-1907)," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 28, no. 1 (1996): 83-107.

[46] Alişan Akpınar, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Aşiret Mektebi* (İstanbul: Göçebe Yayınları, 1997), 20-8.

Albanian tribal areas all remained in "a state of nomadism and savagery" (*hal-i bedeviyet ve vahşet*), representing a massive, untapped reservoir of military recruits, agricultural and economic productivity, and tax revenue. However, the problem was not limited to Bedouins. Rather, it was the autonomous status of both the urban and tribal populations of these regions that most hampered provincial administration. In the Hijaz, Yemen, and Trablusgarb, the Bedouin question was compounded because even the settled Muslim populations were "exempt" (*muaf*) from military service. As Osman Nuri acknowledges, the Hijaz was riddled with "exceptions and exemptions" (*istisna ve muafiyetler*) in part due to its sacred status and lack of agricultural production. However, he argues that as in other countries all persons living there should be responsible for the upkeep of fiscal health of the region. As a result of the total lack of revenue, foreigners living in the Hijaz (*mücavirin*) had achieved a virtual monopoly on crafts and commerce and even land and property. As he argues, the blanket application of tax exemptions in the Hijaz had disproportionately benefited wealthier foreigners at the expense of the local population. Thus, practically all of the levers of economic productivity and profits were flowing into the hands of Indians and Jawis, raising the specter of endless potential for British and Dutch diplomatic interference (*müdahele*) on behalf of their colonial subjects. And because the government had refused to show the necessary sensitivity in encouraging and facilitating foreigners to adopt Ottoman nationality (*tabdil-i tabiiyet*), more and more real estate continued to pass into the hands of foreigners.[47]

In essence, there was no constituency, Bedouin or settled, Arab or foreign, which could be identified as proper Ottoman subjects and expected to contribute to the state by any meaningful metric. Between the cosmopolitan mix of foreign Muslims in Mecca,

[47] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu,13-14, 29.

Medina, and Jidda and the hitherto ungoverned Bedouin population outside of the cities, Osman Nuri recognized that the Hijaz was a province in search of subjects. Therefore, the burden of the "blood tax" (*kan vergisi*) shouldered by Anatolian Turks or the "fundamental element" (*unsur-ı asli*) was exacerbated. Difficulties forcing soldiers to go to these provinces were also tied to environmental factors. The high mortality facing troops came not only from local resistance, but also from disease, poor water and sanitation, and extreme climate. Owing to these dangers, Osman Nuri proposed that this trio of "hot provinces" (*vilayat-ı harre*) should be considered as a special administrative unit earmarked for reforms to reduce the burden placed on soldiers from the more temperate climes of the Balkans and Anatolia.[48]

On the one hand, Osman Nuri succinctly expresses Istanbul's desire to assert modern notions of territorial power in previously autonomous frontier regions. As Timothy Mitchell argues, Bedouin territories constituted a "geographical margin, partly within and partly beyond government control." By the standards of modern governmentality these "forms of marginal political life, where allegiance to the central authority was graduated or variable," demanded elimination and replacement by "more uniform and rigorous methods of control."[49]

On the other hand, Osman Nuri reframes the assumed civilizational gap between center and periphery in environmental terms.[50] Just as colonial expertise represented tropical environments as "strange and defective" in comparison with western Europe's

---

[48] Ibid., 11, 25-6.

[49] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 12, 61.

[50] On environmental history's potential to reframe Ottoman center-periphery, see Alan Mikhail, *Nature and Empire in Ottoman Egypt: An Environmental History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 15-27.

supposedly "normal" climates, Osman Nuri's reporting demonstrates how Ottoman modernization discourse resorted to similar forms of "environmental orientalism" when describing the Arab periphery. Bedouin disorder was seen as a defining element of the frontier's "foreign nature" and the underlying impediment to the eventual Ottomanization of these "hot provinces."[51] As a result of this slippage between human and natural objects of development, Ottoman efforts to address the region's water supply, aridity, and disease profile were often indistinguishable from efforts to tame "unruly" autonomous populations, both Bedouin and urban.[52]

Landscapes of Infrastructure and International Law

If Osman Nuri diagnosed the Hijaz's virtually "subjectless" autonomous status and the intertwined nature of Bedouin and environmental disorder as the province's primary ailments, infrastructural development was his panacea. His prescriptions display an almost magical faith in the construction of government buildings, military instillations, courts, schools, and other desired infrastructure as a means to "reflect the glory of the state" and bind the local population to it.[53] As a result, Osman Nuri's tenure in the Hijaz could easily be characterized as a government-building spree. And thus, with Osman Nuri's dramatic display of Ottoman capacity for public works and government construction, the outlines of a new, more Ottoman Hijaz began to take shape.

Between 1882 and 1886, Osman Nuri oversaw repairs to the Haram and Mecca's principal gates. He was responsible for the construction of a new government

---

[51] Diana K. Davis, "Imperialism, Orientalism, and the Environment in the Middle East," in Diana K. Davis and Edmund Burke III, eds., *Environmental Imaginaries of the Middle East and North Africa* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2011), 3-4.

[52] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 15, 210.

[53] Deringil, "'They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery'," 327-9.

headquarters (*hükümet konağı/dairesi*), telegraph office, and provincial printing press.[54] A Rüşdiye school was also built in both Mecca.[55] He would lead a massive overhaul of both Mecca and Jidda's water systems (see Chapter 4).[56] Major repairs were made to the eighteenth-century Ciyad Kalesi (fortress).[57] New military barracks (the Hamidiye Kışlası) were constructed in Mecca.[58] In all, four new barracks, eighteen smaller army stations, and a compliment of military hospitals were completed across the province.[59] Twelve outposts were constructed along the Jidda-Mecca road in order to quash banditry and improve security.[60] The Amir's Arab guards were disbanded and disarmed and robbers were summarily shot, leading to a dramatic decrease in raiding and robbery targeting pilgrims.[61] Osman Nuri's expansion of the Ottoman military footprint also facilitated his successful retrieval of 'Aqaba (Akabe), al-Muwaylih (Moylah), Umluj (Emlac), al-Wajh (El-Vecih), and Duba (Zaba) from the Khedive's Egyptian administration.[62]

---

[54] BOA, İ. ŞD, 55/3121 (13 N 1298/9 August 1881); BOA, İ. ŞD, 73/4328 (7 C 1302/24 March 1885); Muhammad el-Emin el-Mekki, *Hulefa-yı İzam-ı Osmaniye Hazaratının Haremeyn-i Şerifeyn'deki Asar-ı Mebrure ve Meşkure-i Hümayünlarından Bahis Tarihi Bir Eserdir* (Dersaadet: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1318); reprint in Latin transcription, *Osmanlı Padişahlarının Haremeyn Hizmetleri* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008), 28-29; Uzunçarşılı, *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları*, 145.

[55] BOA, İ. DH, 73827 (9 M 1302/29 October 1884).

[56] el-Mekki, *Osmanlı Padişahlarının Haremeyn Hizmetleri*, 25-27.

[57] BOA, Y. MTV, 10/72 (11 Ca 1300/20 March 1883).

[58] BOA, İ. DH, 70980 (12 L 1300/16 August 1883).

[59] Uzunçarşılı, *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları*, 145; Hülagü, "Topal Osman Nuri Paşa Hayatı ve Faaliyetleri, 1840-1898," 153.

[60] BOA, İ. ŞD, 80/4706 (28 Ca 1303/4 March 1886); BOA, İ. DH, 76364 (27 R 1303/2 February 1886).

[61] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 189.

[62] BOA, Y. MTV, 63/67 (14 Za 1309/10 June 1892); Uzunçarşılı, *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları*, 145.

Osman Nuri was also an early advocate for the construction of telegraph (1880-1882, 1899-1902) and rail lines (1900-1908) in the Hijaz. Ultimately, his recommendations would prove startlingly clairvoyant. Indeed, these would eventually become signature features of Hamidian technopolitical approaches to the tribal frontier. In his 1885 *layiha*, Osman Nuri stresses the critical need for better communications and transport, both within the Hijaz and between the Hijaz and Istanbul. At the most basic level, he stressed the need to first draw up a proper physical map (*harita-yi tabiiyesi teressüm*) of the Hijaz.[63] Power would be derived through topographic knowledge and command of space and nature. And in turn, "power over persons was to be reorganized as power over space."[64] He argued that in order to command the Hijaz as a space basic road construction and military outposts were needed to connect the various administrative centers throughout the province. As he complained, the connection between Mecca and Medina was virtually an imaginary one. Due to their distance and the slowness of communications, they were administered in almost total isolation from one another. Thus, without the completion of telegraph lines linking the major commercial and administrative centers of the province, security would continue to suffer. The centerpiece of his plan to revolutionize transportation and communications in the region was a railroad link between Syria and the Hijaz. He also envisioned lines connecting Jidda and Mecca, Yanbu' and Medina, 'Aqaba and Jerusalem, and perhaps even a link to Hudayda.[65] Of particular importance was the proposed (though never built) Jidda-Mecca

---

[63] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu"; 31.

[64] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 90.

[65] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu"; 21-22, 36-38; Gülsoy, *Hicaz Demiryolu*, 33-5.

line, which would have provided rapid transport, obviating the long journey by camel and creating a buffer between pilgrims and the local Bedouin population.[66]

To compliment these rail links, Osman Nuri argues that government concessions might also be established to promote a more robust steamship service connecting the ports of the Red Sea. In order achieve the improvements in transportation and communication that he desired without opening this sensitive region to foreign interests, the governor also suggests that it would be advantageous for the concessions (*imtiyaz*) for their construction to be granted to "Muslim companies" (*İslam şirketler*).[67]

Conventionally, the story of Ottoman technical expertise in the Hijaz has been narrated through the construction of the Hijaz Railway as the "physical embodiment" of Abdülhamid's Pan-Islamic ideology.[68] And while it might be tempting to read Osman Nuri's call for Muslim concessionaires exclusively through this lens, at the same time Pan-Islam is an inadequate container for the broader secular aims of state building efforts featured in Osman Nuri's proposals and simultaneously being applied elsewhere across the empire's Arab frontiers at the same time. Likewise, anachronistically reading the Hijaz Railway project through the lens of later propaganda produced for Arab and Indian

---

[66] For more on the ill-fated Jidda-Mecca proposal, see also BOA, Y. MTV, 59/38, "Hicaz Fırka-i Askeriyesi Kumandanı Hacı Osman Nuri Paşa'nın Cidde ile Mekke arasında bir demiryolu inşasına, Mekke'de Daire-i Belediye teşkiline ve hacıların Medine'ye gidiş dönüşlerini kolaylaştıracak vasıtalara başvurulması hususlarını havi tahriratı hakkında Maiyyet-i Askeri Komisyonu'nun mütalaası"(18 B 1309/17 January 1892).

[67] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu,"21-22, 36-38.

[68] William Ochsenwald, *The Hijaz Railroad* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1980), 23.

audiences ignores the original context and intellectual genealogy from which such projects had originally arisen.[69]

Particularly in light of the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, the ensuing scramble for Africa, and the intensification of European colonial interest in the Red Sea, both overland telegraph and rail links were seen as essential to insulate the Hijaz and Yemen from British naval dominance in the event of a future war in which communications via the Suez Canal would likely be cut.[70] Telegraph and rail construction also played a similar role in strategies to more effectively integrate Eastern Anatolia and Iraq and stave off British expansion via the Persian Gulf.[71] Thus, at their inception, these infrastructural projects were meant to ameliorate the negative effects of autonomy, improve security, and accelerate the periphery's integration with the Ottoman center.

The infrastructural turn evidenced in Osman Nuri's visionary recommendations was not just a product of the local situation in the Hijaz. Rather, it served multiple audiences at the local, imperial, and international levels. As Mostafa Minawi argues, following the 1884-1885 Berlin Conference, Istanbul reacted to new developments in international law. The Berlin Conference had stipulated that international claims to

---

[69] For examples of this tendency, see Jacob Landau, *The Hejaz Railway and the Muslim Pilgrimage: A Case of Ottoman Political Propaganda* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1971); Syed Tanvir Wasti, "Muhammad Inshaullah and the Hejaz Railway," *Middle Eastern Studies* 34, no. 2 (1998): 60-72.

[70] On the strategic logic of interior rail links to the Hijaz, see Süleyman Şefik Söylemezoğlu's 1892 report, *Hicaz Seyahatnamesi*, edited by Ahmet Çaycı and Bayram Ürekli (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012), 199-200; Ahmet İzzet Efendi's (Cidde Evkaf Müdürü, later known as Arap İzzet Paşa) 1892 memo on the strategic necessity of the Hijaz Railway, BOA, Y. MTV, 59/64 (B 26 1309/25 February 1982); and Ahmed Muhtar Paşa's 1897 report on the subject, BOA, Y. EE, 118/10 (3 C1315/30 October 1897).

[71] Yakup Bektaş, "The Sultan's Messenger: Cultural Constructions of Ottoman Telegraphy, 1847-1880," *Technology and Culture* 41, no. 4 (2000): 669-696; Sean McMeekin, *The Berlin-Baghdad Express: The Ottoman Empire and Germany's Bid for World Power* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010); Soli Shahvar, "Tribes and Telegraphs in Lower Iraq: The Muntafiq and the Baghdad-Basrah Telegraph Line of 1863-65," *Middle Eastern Studies* 39, no. 1 (2003): 89-116.

territory must demonstrate "effective occupation." These conditions were supposed to define the methods by which European powers could claim "spheres of influence" within Africa. From that point forward, mere "discovery" or the process of surveying the land by a citizen or subject of an empire would not provide sufficient grounds to claim control. Thus, new developments in European diplomacy led the Ottoman Empire to legitimize its territorial claims to frontier provinces internationally by referring directly to stipulations originally intended to apply to the acquisition of new colonies by European powers. Internalizing and applying these concepts in Libya and later in Hijaz, the construction of large-scale infrastructure projects was meant to serve as physical proof of Ottoman sovereignty and compensate for the state's inability to demonstrate fuller territorial control over the autonomous Bedouin spaces these projects traversed.[72]

Applying the logic of the Berlin Conference, the necessity of establishing workable relationships with Bedouin populations was an obvious part of establishing claims in Libya and its hinterlands. On the other hand, Minawi argues that due in part to the largely uninhabitable landscape of the Sahara the Ottoman decision to construct telegraph lines to connect the Libyan hinterland with the Ottoman center was calculated to provide physical proof of Ottoman claims over the territory.[73] Similarly, Ottoman decisions to construct overland telegraph and rail connections to the Hijaz were animated by the same international legal considerations. The Ottoman center desperately needed to insulate their transportation and communications lanes from British-occupied Egypt and British naval power in the Red Sea. Thus, in the construction of both the Hijaz's

[72] On the consequences of the Berlin Conference and "territorialization" in Yemen and the wider Red Sea, see also Isa Blumi, *Foundations of Modernity: Human Agency and the Imperial State* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 59-77.

[73] Ibid., 38-43.

telegraph and rail lines, the Ottoman state also decided to studiously avoid foreign concessions and assistance in part because doing so would have allowed foreign states to have rights over physical infrastructure on Ottoman soil; thereby satisfying one of the essential conditions for "effective occupation" outlined at the Berlin Conference.[74] In this regard, Osman Nuri's point that the concession for rail projects in the Hijaz should be granted to a Muslim company cannot be dismissed as coincidental.

On the other hand, the construction of physical infrastructure was not merely aimed at an international audience. The imposition of poles, telegraph offices, low-voltage lines, train tracks, and stations could be also be "read" by local inhabitants as symbolic markers of the "colonization" of "tribal domains, which were previously outside the purview of the Ottoman state."[75] Similarly, the management of the hajj also offered opportunities for the state to expand its bureaucratic and infrastructural footprint. Thus, the erection of passport controls, quarantine facilities, hospitals, shelters for indigent pilgrims, and water infrastructure to support the hajj were also part of the broader assemblage of technopolitical solutions applied to the Hijaz's other mobile population, pilgrims to Mecca. These projects mere meant to present new facts on the ground, slowly altering the balance of power between Istanbul, the Hijaz's Bedouin population, and the Sharif of Mecca without presenting a direct military or constitutional challenge to their traditional semi-autonomous privileges.

Ultimately, Osman Nuri's technopolitical outline of the Hijaz's future dovetails neatly with Minawi's legal-infrastructural turn. By reframing Hamidian decision-making

---

[74] Ibid., 160-168.

[75] Mostafa Minawi, "Lines in the Sand: The Ottoman Empire's Policies of Expansion and Consolidation on Its African and Arabian Frontiers, 1882-1902" (Ph.D. diss., New York University), 38-43, 162-163, 209-212, 251-8.

in the material concerns and language of international law and diplomacy, we find an alternative to the wrong-headed temptation to conclude that all Hamidian policies in the Hijaz originated as Pan-Islamic props. Building on Minawi's intervention, it becomes clearer that Ottoman readings of Eurocentric international law were redefining the state's approach to its frontier provinces in ways that have previously been ignored.

However, I contend that this pattern has an even longer history than Minawi suggests. In addition to the scramble for Africa, earlier chapters in the internationalization of Ottoman internal affairs in the Balkans and in response to Mehmed Ali's Egyptian empire-building had created new standards and concepts that had already seeped into how the Hijaz would be administered. Thus, although the Hijaz was theoretically exempt from the consequences of the Tanzimat reforms, in practice sheltering even this most exceptional province from the empire's wider patterns of change proved impossible. The new rules of Eurocentric international law and colonialism reshaped how Ottoman sovereignty over the Hijaz would be claimed, protected, and judged by European observers. In turn, this called into the question whether the traditional semi-autonomous status of the province could be maintained in the face of the challenges posed by European colonial expansion.

Fikr-i İstiklali: British Decentralization and the Anatomy of Autonomy

Despite the very real threat posed by British interests in the Hijaz and the rest of the Ottoman Empire's Arab frontier, previous generations of Ottomanists have often been utterly dismissive of the grave concern that this idea inspired in Abdülhamid and his administration. For example, as F. A. K. Yasamee puts it:

> This emerging belief in a long-term British plan to detach the Arabs and promote a rival Caliphate reflected something more than Abdülhamid's normal suspicious-

> mindedness: it bore the hallmarks of a paranoid obsession. Few if any of the Sultan's ministers shared the belief; but it was to prove remarkably resistant to argument, and resilient in the face of changing circumstances.[76]

As Yasamee contends, all "activities, real or alleged, of figures as diverse as the Khedives of Egypt, the Emirs of Mecca, Ahmed 'Urabi and the Sudanese Mahdi" were all lumped together in Abdülhamid's mind as part of a "single British conspiracy."[77] While there is undoubtedly some truth to Yasamee's contention that the Hamidian regime's deep sense of insecurity often, especially regarding British intentions, led to conspiratorial thinking. That said, Yasamee and countless other historians have chosen to play up Abdülhamid's "paranoia" without giving equal consideration to the substance of his concerns. This myopic focus on the personality of the Sultan has contributed to an unspoken division between the "real" diplomatic or international legal histories of the Eastern Question in Ottoman Europe and a ghettoized historiographic tradition for the history of European encroachment on the Ottoman Empire's Arab frontiers, frequently framed only as imaginary plots, dueling propaganda efforts, and a seemingly endless string of dead-end conspiracies.[78]

In an attempt to push back against the remarkably resilient emphasis on Abdülhamid's personality and psyche, I second Cemil Aydın's recent efforts to resituate Hamidian Pan-Islam as a "realist" foreign-policy strategy to confront the unequal playing field presented by positivist Eurocentric international law and society. As Aydın argues,

---

[76] F. A. K. Yasamee, *Ottoman Diplomacy: Abdülhamid II and the Great Powers, 1878-1888* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1996), 90.

[77] Ibid.

[78] For examples, see especially Buzpınar, "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate in the Early Years of Abdülhamid II: 1877-1882"; Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam*; 59-89; Azmi Özcan, *Pan-Islamism: Indian Muslims, the Ottomans and Britain, 1877-1924* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Yasamee, *Ottoman Diplomacy*.

Hamidian Pan-Islamic policy must be seen more as a reflection of "the international context of the changing nature of the relations between the Muslim world and the Western powers than the sultan's own personal inclinations."[79]

Throughout the Tanzimat era, the Ottoman state repeatedly attempted to prove its acceptance of the emerging civilizational norms of European international society in a bid for equal membership in the European family of nations.[80] The high-water mark of this effort was the Ottoman signing of the 1856 Treaty of Paris, which ostensibly welcomed the empire as member of the European family of nations, guaranteeing the Ottomans the same legitimacy and rights to international existence and territorial integrity as any other member of this club.[81] By the 1880s, however, Ottoman elites had become increasingly convinced that regardless of their earnest attempts at reform, the European family of nations was actually a Christian club. They identified a persistent anti-Muslim double standard, negating virtually all European promises to respect the empire's borders, territorial integrity, and sovereignty.[82]

When viewed from this perspective, the rising tide of British interest in the Hijaz and the Arabian Peninsula more generally had the familiar feel of European interventions

---

[79] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia*, 5, 63.

[80] On the "standards of civilization" and emerging system of international law in the nineteenth century, see Anthony Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Gerrit Gong, *The Standard of Civilization in International Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984); Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law, 1870-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 98-151. For discussions specific to the Ottoman Empire's anomalous position in the European family of nations, see also Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia*,18-24; Rodogno, *Against Massacre*, 47-54.

[81] The Treaty of Paris directly tied domestic reforms to international recognition. Indeed, the domestic reforms promised by the *Islahat Fermanı* (Reform Edict) of 1856 issued just before the Treaty of Paris, were widely understood to be the price of admission into the European family of nations. Turan Kayaoğlu, *Legal Imperialism: Sovereignty and Extraterrioriality in Japan, the Ottoman Empire, and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 104-121.

[82] Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia*, 39-69.

that had already played out in other parts of the empire. As the Sultan understood, British support for a rival Arab caliphate, the ambitions of the Sharif of Mecca, and Arab separatism more generally were not just a pack of idle conspiracies. Rather, these were completely consistent with the British government's empire-wide program to promote autonomy and decentralization for all of the Ottoman Empire's subject peoples from the Balkans and Armenia to the Arab provinces.[83] As Ahmed Midhat Efendi framed the situation for Abdülhamid:

> It is clear that England—God forbid!—is striving to dissolve the Ottoman Empire into statelets (*müluk* or *küçük devletçikler*). It amounts not to autonomy (*otonomi* or *muhtariyet*) but to anatomy (*anatomi*), by creating for example, an Albanian Albania, an Armenia in the Armenian inhabited places, an Arab government in all the places inhabited by Arabs, and a Turkey in the Turkish-inhabited areas.
>
> Meanwhile, [England] also wishes to transfer the great Caliphate from Istanbul to the Arabian Peninsula, to Jidda, or somewhere in Egypt. And by using the caliphate as a tool in her service, to rule all Muslims as it pleases.[84]

As Ahmed Midhat's note to the Sultan suggests, lurking just beneath the question of autonomy was the threat of a rival Arab Caliphate. While it is well understood that British attempts to undermine the legitimacy of the Ottoman Caliphate surged between 1878 and 1883, the connection between the Britain's promotion of autonomy throughout the Ottoman Empire and its long-term adoption of an ethno-nationalist view of the Sharif of Mecca as the rightful Caliph has been generally been left inchoate. By contrast, Yıldız Palace did see a clear connection between the 1878 Treaty of Berlin, Britain's autonomy policy, and Midhat Paşa's alleged Arab Caliphate plot. As a Yıldız *layiha* on the subject

---

[83] For more on the connection between British conceptions of autonomy and sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire, see also Aimee M. Genell, "Empire by Law: Ottoman Sovereignty and the British Occupation of Egypt, 1882-1923" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2013). On autonomy and decentralization, see also Elektra Kostopoulou, "Armed Negotiations: The Institutionalization of the Late Ottoman Locality," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 3 (2013): 295-309.

[84] BOA, Y. EE, 4/59, undated imperial note (*muhtıra-ı seniye*) from Ahmed Midhat Efendi to Abülhamid, reproduced in Sultan İkinci Abdülhamid Han, A. Atilla Çetin ed., *Devlet ve Memleket Görüşlerim*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2011), 241.

explains, the "idea of independence" (*fikr-i istiklali*) and the prospects of "an Arab state stretching from the Nile to the Euphrates and from the Indian Ocean to the Taurus Mountains" had been cause for concern since the conquest of Syria by Mehmed Ali's son, İbrahim Paşa, a half-century earlier.[85] But the international context was considerably different after 1878. Reflecting on the results of the catastrophic territorial losses suffered as a result of the treaty, the report attempted to draw something of a line in the sand, arguing that: "comparing Ottoman territories as a whole and Ottoman provinces located in Europe to each another is unacceptable."[86] As the report cautioned, the state's submission to the Treaty of Berlin had set a dangerous precedent for the continued spread of ethno-nationalist successions, territorial losses, and the multiplication of autonomous provinces spilling over beyond the empire's European territories and becoming applicable to the rest of its Asian provinces.

Therefore, when viewed from the wider perspective of the Eastern Question, international law and diplomacy, and the systematic erosion of Ottoman sovereignty, the connections that the Sultan draws between the Treaty of Berlin, British occupation of Egypt, and the insecurity of the Hijaz and the Caliphate demand more careful consideration. Put another way, was it only British propaganda or paranoia that held together the sultan's web of fears or did the Caliphate's entanglement with the Hijaz's problematic semi-autonomous status and increasing vulnerability to international legal

---

[85] Undated *layiha*, BOA, Y. EE, 101/95, Berlin Muahedesinde elden çıkacak arazi yüzünden hilafet makamının manevi kudretinin kaybolacağı ve belki Arapların bir başka halife seçecekleri ve Arap milletinin uyanmak üzere olduğu ve saire hakkında layiha" (6 R 1327/27 April 1909).

[86] Ibid. *Evvel emirde umum memalik-i Osmaniye ile Avrupa kıtasında bulunan Osmanlı eyalatı yekdiğere kıyas kabul etmez*.

intervention and extraterritorial consular interference not also provide greater depth to his conclusions about the likelihood of further European interventions?

Other Eastern Questions: The Changing Meanings of Autonomy in the Hijaz in the Wake of Mehmed Ali

One of the biggest impediments to the integration of the Hijaz into the wider landscape of Ottoman history has been the assumption that its sacred status made it completely exceptional. To be sure, the Ottoman state did attach special significance to Mecca and Medina. However, this did not mean that they set the entire Hijaz and its Bedouin inhabitants apart from their wider frontier policies. Similarly, Ottoman administrators understood that the Hijaz's sacred status did not necessarily exempt it from European or international legal scrutiny. Nor were they unaware that European powers might draw certain parallels between the status of the Hijaz and calls for autonomy in other parts of the empire.

Most historians merely take for granted that the Hijaz had always been an autonomous possession. At first glance, there are a variety of seemingly sound reasons for assuming Mecca's exceptional status and incomparability. Its importance to the legitimacy of the Ottoman dynasty is the most obvious. As a result of its singularity as the lynchpin of the Caliphate, historians have traditionally emphasized how the Hijaz stood outside the framework of reforms that washed over "regular" Ottoman provinces during the nineteenth century.[87] Even though this is true in the sense that it was exempted from certain reforms, this claim overlooks that the meanings and uses of autonomy themselves also changed dramatically over the course of the long nineteenth century. Istanbul was no longer free to manage its internal affairs and center-periphery

[87] For a textbook example of this conventional wisdom, see Carter Vaughn Findley, *Turkey, Islam, and Modernity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 138.

relations without reference to the norms of Eurocentric international law. As a result of the increasing territorialization of sovereignty becoming a characteristic of "civilized" statehood and membership in the European family of nations, older forms of autonomy, which had served the Ottomans well in the past, came to constitute a new kind of vulnerability, even a violation of international law, inviting European intervention and ultimately contributing to the empire's disintegration.[88] With the rise of positivist international law at some point during the nineteenth century autonomy had transformed from an accepted tool in the management of a large, multi-ethnic empire into a characteristic of compromised sovereignty and a blemish on the Ottoman state's international standing.[89] In this respect, even in spite of the Hijaz's exceptional status as a symbol of legitimacy, it still shared a great deal in common with many of the most vulnerable parts of the Ottoman Empire.

Since the Ottoman conquest of Mamluk Egypt in 1517, the Ottomans had claimed sovereignty over the Hijaz. During this period, the Ottoman dynasty had taken up the title of Servitor of the Two Holy Places, making their custodianship over the holy cities and the hajj the bedrock of their claims on the Caliphate. This title entailed two principle responsibilities: the continued provisioning of grain and foodstuffs from Egypt and the maintenance of security along the caravan routes to the Hijaz.[90] However, their actual control over the Hijaz itself was tenuous. The Ottomans entrusted virtually all functions of government and public security to the Sharif of Mecca. Owing to the sharifs'

---

[88] Genell, "Empire by Law," 8-13; Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference*, 251.

[89] Aimee Genell, "Practicing International Law in the Late Ottoman Empire," unpublished paper presented at "The 'Subjects' of International Law: Autonomy, Extraterritoriality, and the Making of Ottoman Citizens," CUNY Graduate Center, New York, 7 January 2015.

[90] Suraiya Faroqhi, *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans, 1573-1683* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1994); Mikhail, *Nature and Empire in Ottoman Egypt*, 113-123.

Hashemite lineage as descendants of the Prophet Muhammad and their religious legitimacy, the Ottomans granted them the title of Amir or prince. In exchange for public demonstrations of loyalty and recognition of Ottoman sovereignty, the Ottoman state showered the Sharif with generous gifts and distributed large sums of money in order to subdue the local Bedouin populations. For much of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the governors of Egypt and Syria were responsible for overseeing the Hijaz and the administration of the hajj.[91] In the eighteenth century Jidda became the seat of the *Habeş Eyaleti* encompassing Massawa, Suakin, and other Ottoman possessions in East Africa.[92] However, the governor's authority within the Hijaz itself was essentially limited to Jidda. Even there, half of the port's customs revenues were given over to the Sharif.[93] Indeed, prior to the Tanzimat era interventions in the Hijaz, there was no direct Ottoman administration outside of Jidda. The rest of the region remained completely autonomous and under the sway of the Sharif of Mecca.[94] Even in the Tanzimat period, the projection of Ottoman troops and resources remained a more or less seasonal affair tied to the pilgrimage.[95]

---

[91] For the development of the relationship between the Ottoman government in Jidda and the Amirate of Mecca from the sixteenth through the early nineteenth century, see Ahmad bin Zayni Dahlan, *Khulasat al-Kalam fi Bayan Umara' al-Balad al-Haram* (Cairo, 1305); Zekeriya Kurşun, "Hicaz: Osmanlı Dönemi," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 17 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vafkı, 1998), 438; Uzunçarşılı, *Mekke-i Mükerreme Emirleri*.

[92] Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğ'nun Güney Siyaseti: Habeş Eyaleti* (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1974).

[93] Faroqhi, *Pilgrims and Sultans*, 156-158.

[94] Butrus Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid II and the Sharifs of Mecca," 1-3; Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu," 2.

[95] Indeed, even as late as 1892, Arap İzzet Paşa points out that the Ottoman state's continuation of the traditional Caliphal role as the guarantor of safety and public order during hajj season had prevented it from achieving sovereignty in its fullest sense. BOA, Y. MTV, 59/64 (B 26 1309/25 February 1982). See also Gülsoy, *Hicaz Demiryolu*, 35-37.

However, this traditional pattern of autonomy was disrupted at the start of the nineteenth century. During the Wahhabi occupation of the Hijaz (1803-1818), the Ottoman center completely lost control of the region. The Wahhabi seizure of Mecca was an utter humiliation threatening to completely undermine both the Ottoman dynasty's internal political legitimacy as well as the Sultanate's leadership of the global Islamic community. During the first decade of the nineteenth century Istanbul was beset by more immediate challenges as the state struggled unsuccessfully to impose modernizing reforms and simultaneously bring to heel the Janissaries and the provincial notables of Rumelia and Anatolia. Under these circumstances, Mahmud II (r. 1808-1839) was forced to delegate the mission to recapture Mecca and Medina to the governor of Egypt, Mehmed Ali Paşa. In 1811, Mehmed Ali appointed his sons, Tosun Paşa and İbrahim Paşa to retake the Hijaz. Mehmed Ali's forces regained control over the Hijaz, pursued the Wahhabis across central Arabia, and eventually sacked the Wahhabi capital al-Dir'iyya, capturing the Wahhabi leadership and shipping them to Istanbul for execution.[96]

Emboldened by his successes in the Hijaz and his decisive interventions on behalf of the Ottoman state during the Greek rebellion in 1820s, by the end of the 1830s, Mehmed Ali and his son had carved out a small empire at the expense of Sultan's domains, extending his control to the Hijaz, Sudan, Yemen, Eastern Arabia, Crete, Syria, and Adana. By 1832, İbrahim had marched into Anatolia, threatening to march on

[96] For a conventional treatment of the Wahhabi movement, see David Commins, *The Wahhabi Mission and Saudi Arabia* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2006). For Ottoman-centric perspectives on the Wahhabis, see Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. 7 (İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Osmaniye, 1309/1893), 182-207; Emine Ö. Evered, "Rereading Ottoman Accounts of Wahhabism as Alternative Narratives: Ahmed Cevdet Paşa's Historic Survey of the Movement," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 32, no. 3 (2012): 622-632; Zekeriya Kurşun, *Necid ve Ahsa'da Osmanlı Hakimiyet: Vehhabi Hareketi ve Suud Devleti'nin Ortaya Çıkısı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1998).

Istanbul and ultimately to take over the Sultanate itself. Throughout the 1830s Mehmed Ali's Egyptian empire seemed increasingly poised to swallow up the remaining core of the Ottoman state. Ultimately, however, Europe intervened on behalf of the Ottoman Sultanate in order to protect the territorial integrity of the state. Under the terms of the 1840 London Convention Mehmed Ali was forced to withdraw from Syria, Adana, Crete, and Arabia. In exchange the Sultan was forced to issue a *ferman* naming Mehmed Ali governor of Egypt for life and granting his male descendants hereditary rights to the governorship.[97]

The legacy of the Wahhabi occupation of the Hijaz and the legal precedents set by the province's subsequent absorption into Mehmed Ali's Egyptian would have remarkably long-lasting consequences.[98] On the one hand, the Ottoman center lost complete control of the Hijaz for nearly four decades. Ottoman rule was only restored through European intervention and the internationalization of the Sultanate's conflict with its rogue governor. Mehmed Ali's administration and troops were finally forced to withdraw in 1841 in accordance with the London Convention. On the other hand, however, Mehmed Ali had achieved a level of centralization unthinkable under Istanbul's control. Most strikingly, in 1836 the Amir of Mecca was detained and held in Egypt. Thereafter, secular Egyptian administrators governed the Hijaz until 1840.[99]

---

[97] Khaled Fahmy, *All the Pasha's Men: Mehmed Ali, his army, and the making of modern Egypt* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997). For the texts of the 1840 London Convention and *ferman* granting Mehmed Ali's hereditary governorship, see J. C. Hurewitz, ed., *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*, vol. 1. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 271-278.

[98] On the wider consequences of Mehmed Ali's sub-imperialism on the Arabian Peninusla, see Blumi, *Foundations of Modernity*, 31-47.

[99] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in* Arabia, 131-137.

From the 1840s onward, the sharifs of Mecca would be appointed and deposed at the pleasure of the Sultan. In addition to the bureaucratization of the Sharifate, the subsequent Tanzimat reforms also reconfigured the Hijaz's administrative structure and its jurisdictional boundaries. Between 1868 and 1873, the 1864 Provincial Reform Law and the 1867 Law of Vilayets were partially applied to the region. As a result, the old governorship of Jidda was replaced with a new-style *vilayet*. For the first time the province was referred to as the *Hicaz vilayeti* and its jurisdiction swelled to encompass the entirety of the geographical Hijaz. Even the center of the new province was Mecca. Whereas the previous incarnations of Ottoman provincial authority in the Hijaz had maintained an administrative and geographical distinction between Jidda and the Sharifate of Mecca, the new Hijaz province overlapped the Sharif's jurisdiction. As a result, the traditional character of the autonomy enjoyed by the Sharifate was greatly circumscribed. On the other hand, the governors of this new province were put in the awkward position of sharing and negotiating their jurisdiction and power with the Sharif of Mecca. This institutional dualism set the stage for the conflict that ensued between Osman Nuri and the Sharifate.[100] Traditionally, this institutional dualism has been interpreted as evidence of the continued autonomy of the Hijaz and the lack of effort by the Ottoman center to impose Tanzimat-style centralization. This, of course, overlooks the fact that the reconceptualization of Ottoman rule in the Hijaz was a Hamidian project.

From the vantage point of the mid-1880s, Osman Nuri's frenzied assault on the Hijaz's autonomous status sheds light on just how much things had changed since 1803 or even 1840. This shift was certainly noticed by contemporary observers. From a British perspective, the Wahhabi and Egyptian occupations of the Hijaz had ironically

[100] Ibid., 167-169. Numan, "The Emirs of Mecca and the Ottoman Government of Hijaz, 72-73.

helped to clarify the Hijaz's place as a more proper Ottoman province. In a wide-ranging 1886 report on the administrative history of the Hijaz, consul T.S. Jago explains how the Wahhabi occupation had done irreparable damage to the independence of the Sharif of Mecca. As Jago notes, prior to the Wahhabi occupation, "the dominant and sole power in the Hedjaz was wielded by the Grand Sheriff or Prince of Mecca." However, following Mehmed Ali's reconquest of Mecca on behalf of the Ottoman state, Jago argues that "although preserving his rank and title, his *sovereign sway* over the country was nominally at least at and end, and the Hedjaz has since been garrisoned by Ottoman troops." Jago also points out that from Mehmed Ali's occupation onward "the Sharif has been chosen and appointed" at the pleasure of the Sultan.[101]

What is perhaps most interesting about Jago's report is that it is written as something of a pre-history leading inexorably to Osman Nuri Paşa's successful centralization of the Hijaz. Although Osman Nuri's almost total restriction of the Sharif's responsibilities was ultimately short lived, it does provide a glimpse into how a more centralized Hijaz was viewed by British authorities. As Jago argues, the Sultan's fears of 'Abd al-Muttalib's "independent tone" on the 1882 'Urabi Revolt had lead him to grant Osman Nuri permission to depose 'Abd al-Muttalib and assume "full civil and military powers to put down all opposition to the Sultan's direct authority." As Jago puts it:

> Osman Pasha's mission has been crowned with success. The Grand Sheriff's power, despite various petty attempts at disturbances and intrigue his favor among the Bedouin has been gradually taken from him and while preserving his title and endowments he has become a nonentity in the country and the Turkish Government through its officials now wields supreme control over every branch of the

[101] TNA: FO 195/1457, "Report by Consul Jago on Revenue and Taxation in the Vilayet of the Hedjaz," 4 February 1886.

administration…[102]

Jago's discussion of the Ottoman state's bolstered sovereignty and direct rule in the region also leads him to depart from other British commentators' attempts to promote the Sharif of Mecca's religious qualifications as a rival claimant to the Caliphate and global Islamic leadership. As Jago explains:

> I would venture here to point out a popular error, which attributes to the Grand Sheriff of Mecca, ecclesiastical power or character but which he is no wise enjoys.
> He is simply a Sheriff, or one of the descendants of the Prophet of whom there are many thousands in the country, and enjoys his exceptional position not in virtue of any religious office or character, but simply as the chief among the Sheriffs.[103]

Consul Jago's report gives us a better sense of just how far Osman Nuri's drive toward centralization had gone prior to his dismissal, suggesting how the establishment of a more robust Ottoman sovereignty in the Hijaz could have effectively undermined foreign attempts to elevate the Sharifate's religious credentials and potential as an alternative sovereign in the Hijaz. On the other hand, Ottoman provinces, especially autonomous ones like the Hijaz, were simultaneously being sorted and graded on the merits of their claims on internal and external sovereignty.

Eyalat-ı Mümtaze: The Problem with Privileged Provinces

As Aimee Genell has recently pointed out, one of the most overlooked aspects of Mehmed Ali's Egyptian sub-empire was its impact on the rapidly evolving redefinitions of autonomy and sovereignty in nineteenth-century international law. As she argues, the international management of autonomy became a central axis of the protracted loss of Ottoman territories conventionally known as the Eastern Question. In 1841 the Sultan granted Egypt special status as one of a small number of autonomous or "privileged"

[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid.

provinces known as the *eyalat-ı mümtaze*. As she points out, in most cases autonomous status marked these provinces as the products of conflicts that precipitated either European diplomatic or military intervention or some form of occupation or annexation.[104]

The British Foreign Office viewed independent successor states as dangerous experiments that might threaten to unravel Europe's delicate balance of power. Instead, Britain showed a strong preference for various measures of administrative autonomy within the Ottoman state, but guaranteed and overseen by the collectivity of European international society. On the other hand, the Ottoman state rightly viewed British support for autonomy and decentralization as a derogation of sovereignty. However, the Ottomans also pragmatically accepted that various forms of decentralization, autonomy, or even foreign military occupations were preferable to the complete loss of a province via annexation or independence.[105] Whatever legal protections this concept provided the Ottoman state against outright partition, however, the list of provinces that belonged to this special category at various points throughout the nineteenth century is instructive: Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Eastern Rumelia, Moldavia and Wallachia, Samos, Crete, Cyprus, Mt. Lebanon, Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, and the Sharifate of Mecca (*Mekke Şerifliği*).[106] The list provides something of road map plotting the hotspots of Europe's gradual dismemberment of Ottoman Europe via the Eastern Question and the absorption of the empire's Arab peripheries as protectorates and colonial possessions of one kind or

---

[104] Genell, "Empire by Law," 7-12.

[105] Ibid., 12.

[106] Sinan Küneralp, *Son Dönem Osmanlı Erkân ve Ricali, 1839-1922: Prosopografik Rehber* (İstanbul: İsis Press, 1999), 43.

another. Both the Ottomans and Europeans understood that these provinces were the frontlines of European intervention and partition. And as Genell makes clear, "the real problem with the autonomous provinces was that 'local political tendencies' produced a centrifugal force away from the concerns of the state and this led to international pressure and intervention." Thus, "no matter how well the Ottomans administered their Empire, localism would open the door to Europe."[107]

Reading the 1876 Ottoman Constitution (*Kanun-i Esasi*) as an international legal instrument calculated to communicate directly with the great powers of Europe, this fear is made explicitly clear. Article 1 specifically singles out the *eyalat-ı mümtaze*, noting that like all other territories comprising the Ottoman Empire, these privileged provinces were considered part of an "indivisible whole" (*yek vücud*) and would "not be subject to partition" (*tefrik kabul etmez*) under any circumstances.[108] Despite these pleasant self-affirmations, as one late Ottoman official working in the offices (*Vilayet-i Mümtaze Kalemi* and later as the *Eyalat-ı Mümtaze ve Muhtare Kalemi)* dedicated to these provinces admitted, it was a bit like working for the "colonial office of another state." More accurately, "it resembled a foreign ministry for dealing with territories that had yet to consummate their break from the empire."[109]

---

[107] BOA, HR. HMS. İSO, 214/14 (15 M 1337/21 October 1918), cited in Genell, "Empire by Law," 209.

[108] *Düstur*, 1 Tertip, vol. 4, pp. 4-20. Article 1: *Devlet-i Osmaniye memalik ve kıtaat-i hazıra-yı ve eyalat-ı mümtaze-i muhtevi ve yek vücud omağla hiç bir zamanda hiç bir sebeble tefrik kabul etmez*. For a serviceable English translation of the 1876 constitution, see "The Ottoman Constitution, Promulgated the 7th Zilbridje, 1293 (11/23 December, 1876)," *The American Journal of International Law* 2, no. 4 (Oct., 1908): 367-387.

[109] Carter V. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire: The Sublime Porte, 1789-1922* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 244, 305. See also *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi* (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 2010), 211, 218, 350.

Conclusion

Despite definitive claims that the traditional shape of Hijazi autonomy miraculously escaped the centralizing transformations of the Tanzimat and Hamidian reforms unscathed, upon closer examination such claims are shot through with contradictions. Nor was the Hijaz the only province with these irregular features. Indeed, when viewed alongside other frontier provinces, the *eyalat-ı mümtaze*, and other parts of the empire altered by the legacy of Mehmed Ali, the Hijaz's seemingly "incomparable" status begins to look rather more ordinary. Indeed, when viewed alongside the other provinces of the *eyalat-ı mümtaze* the Hijaz looked very much like other targets of colonial and international legal intervention.

Whatever the Hamidian state's post-1886 political strategy toward the Sharifate might have achieved in terms of building up the Sultan-Caliph's religious legitimacy, the maintenance of the semi-autonomous Sharifate in an age of increasingly territorialized sovereignty came with inherent risks. As Osman Nuri had warned, the maintenance of autonomy badly compromised Istanbul's ability to make proper subjects out of the Hijaz's permanent populations, whether Bedouin or settled. Autonomy was also the cracked door through which European extraterritorial influence would inevitably slip. And as Osman Nuri would experience firsthand, reminding European officials of the Hijaz's exceptional status provided little protection. However legitimate, even this excuse came to be viewed as further proof of the Hijaz's similarity to other vulnerable frontier provinces. Moreover, attempts to maintain the Hijaz's exceptional status were increasingly viewed as evidence that the Capitulations and the promise of consular protection for European subjects in Ottoman lands, the very yardstick by which Ottoman

sovereignty was to be judged in European eyes after the Treaty of Paris, could not be properly applied in the Hijaz.

Chapter 2

Unfurling the Flag of Extraterritoriality: Foreign Muslims, Muslim Consular Agents, and the Evolution of the Capitulations in the Indian Ocean Hijaz

> If it had become known in Mecca, the sanctuary land of the Muhammadans where a large number of Muhammadan fanatics from India and many a rebel of the time of the mutiny of 1857 are domiciled, that an agent of the British Government had arrived incognito, there is no doubt that some sort of commotion might have ensued. They would have never appreciated the benevolence of the motives with which I was sent, but would, on the contrary, have considered it as an uncalled for intrusion and an unnecessary trespassing and prying into the workings of one of the noblest rites of Islam; and there is small doubt that, under the countenance of the ruling authorities, they would have at least tried to thwart me by not throwing difficulties in my way, but restricting my personal freedom, if not to do away with me altogether in a quiet and secret manner.
>
> -Dr. Abdur Razzack, Assistant Surgeon, Bengal Medical Service, 1879[1]

While scholars of the late Ottoman Empire have long been obsessed with how the Capitulations and the Tanzimat reforms effectively placed Christian protégés and protected persons beyond the reach of Ottoman justice, surprisingly little attention has been paid to the analogous projects of European powers claiming to protect their Muslim colonial subjects from the supposed corruption of Ottoman rule and the arbitrary nature of the shari‘a courts of Mecca. As early as the 1850s local resistance to European consular interference in the commercial and political life of the region had already sparked multiple episodes, which have traditionally been framed as fairly straightforward manifestations of anti-European or anti-Christian violence. However, I argue that these violent outbursts were equally rooted in the proliferation of a new class of "legal chameleons" cloaked in the diplomatic and economic protections of "borrowed

[1] British Library, Asia, Pacific, and Africa Collections, W 4087, "Report by Dr. Abdur Ruzzack on the health and sanitation of pilgrims to Mecca, 24 June 1879," 46.

nationalities," which sprang up around European consulates in the Hijaz and other imperial borderlands.[2] In the 1850s there was as of yet no Ottoman nationality law clearly defining who was and who was not an Ottoman subject in the Hijaz. New imperial conceptions of subjecthood and citizenship based on nationality were only just beginning to be articulated. These concepts had yet to disrupt the traditional expectation of the Hijaz as a non-territorial space of refuge, a cosmopolitan magnet for foreign Muslims (*mücavirin*), where the only meaningful bar to claiming rights as an Ottoman subject in the past had been defined by confessional status, i.e. being a Sunni Muslim.[3] Likewise, in the absence of standardized passport controls and international documentary practices, there were Muslim migrants from India who had been born in the Hijaz or had been settled there for extended periods, who although they had never renounced their foreign nationality, might have lived for many years essentially as *de facto* Ottoman subjects without ever being forced to produce evidence of their nationality.[4] There were ethnically Indian Muslims, carrying British Indian (East India Company) identity papers and travel documents, who nevertheless claimed and maintained Ottoman nationality. And then there were Ottoman subjects, who claimed Ottoman nationality, but still sailed vessels under British flags, traded, and conducted their commercial, financial, and political lives under British consular protection. Thus, with the emergence of European

---

[2] On the subject of consular protection, divided sovereignty, and "borrowed nationalities" see Lewis, *Divided Rule*, 61-97.

[3] On the breaking of the link between religious and civic identities after 1869, see especially Selim Deringil, *Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

[4] I would like to thank Lale Can for her insightful comments and for sharing a number of documents and drafts from her closely related work on consular protection and citizenship among pilgrims from Central Asians in the Ottoman Empire from her forthcoming book manuscript tentatively titled, *Spiritual Citizens: Central Asians and the Politics of Pilgrimage in the Ottoman Empire, 1869-1914*.

consular authority, the Hijaz's already ambiguous semi-autonomous status and divided sovereignty provided the perfect breeding ground for the proliferation of foreign Muslims who were increasingly adept at leveraging the capitulatory system of "negotiated" or "manipulated" identities to maximize rights and privileges derived from subjecthood or consular protection.[5] As Ziad Fahmy puts it, these individuals were "borderlanders par excellence."[6] And, as we shall see, the complicated identities juggled by these expert borderlanders and "identity freelancers," more often than not, confounded both European and Ottoman imperial authorities.[7]

Ironically, outbursts of direct resistance to European consular authority attempting to turn back the clock on these emerging identities, would only serve as further justification for the future application of the Capitulations to the region. Rooted in these violent origins, in part, this chapter traces how the surveillance and legal protection of the Hijaz's Indian diasporic community became preoccupations of both the British Indian security apparatus and their diplomatic counterparts in the Foreign Office. On the other hand, I also attempt to tease out how the Ottoman state struggled to delicately subvert the logics of European colonialism, international law, and the divided sovereignty of the Hijaz in order to avoid having the Hijaz picked apart by the extraterritorial contradictions that its foreign Muslim population presented.

As the frequency of these questions of extraterritorial manipulation increased, by the Hamidian period the Ottoman state had begun to learn from past experience.

---

[5] Ziad Fahmy, "Jurisdictional Borderlands: Extraterritoriality and 'Legal Chameleons' in Precolonial Alexandria, 1840-1870," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 55, no. 2 (2013): 305-329.

[6] Ibid., 315.

[7] Here, I borrow the term "identity freelancer" from James Meyer, *Turks Across Empires. Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Hamidian officials began worry that the Muslim subjects of foreign powers, whether pilgrims or permanent residents, could unwittingly act as potential fifth columns, sowing the seeds for further European intervention in the Hijaz. In response, beginning with the tumultuous tenure of Osman Nuri Paşa, the Ottoman state began to take aggressive steps to more carefully differentiate between Ottoman and non-Ottoman Muslims and prohibit non-Ottoman Muslims from property ownership, a measure that stood in especially stark contrast to the avowed universal brotherhood espoused by the Hamidian regime's Pan-Islamic rhetoric. The state also began to work out new legal strategies claiming that due to the Hijaz's sacred status the province as a whole, but especially the Sharifate of Mecca, was not subject to the Capitulations, consular protection, or other extraterritorial legal concessions. Yet, as this chapter argues, by claiming that the Capitulations and other internationally binding treaties did not apply to the Hijaz, the Ottoman state only further exposed the compromised and divided nature of its sovereignty over the Muslim holy places. Indeed, in many ways the Hijaz's exceptional status was precisely the kind of terrain that the Capitulations and colonial extraterritoriality were designed to navigate.

The Rise of British Steam and Surveillance in the Red Sea and the Hijaz

As John M. Willis has suggested, "Historians of Arabia should perhaps look beyond the peninsula that carries its name." As he points out, "unencumbered by the legacy of a postwar concept of "area studies" or nationalist constructs of the 'Arab world' and 'India,' the British Empire employed a far more inclusive definition of their Indian empire."[8] In reality, British India extended well beyond the national boundaries that constitute present-day India; its western frontiers stretched into the Persian Gulf, Arabia, the Red Sea, and the coasts of East Africa. Far from being a contiguous landmass,

[8] Willis, "Making Yemen Indian," 24, 35.

British India was actually an Indian Ocean empire, which safeguarded British India's regional interests through and archipelago of scattered dependencies, treaty shaykhdoms, consulates, and agencies. These agencies, writes Robert Blyth, "met India's strategic needs, served commercial interests, dealt with the consequences of the Indian diaspora, facilitated pilgrimage to Arabia, and acted as listening posts across much of the Islamic world."[9] These outposts originally developed around the commercial needs of the East India Company and India's native merchant diaspora. During the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the company was already active in the Red Sea, particularly in Jidda and Mocha. It seems probable that company residents, particularly Muslims, became involved in preexisting pilgrimage networks of shipping, lodging, and financial transactions. As a result, large communities of Indian Muslims could be found in Mecca, Jidda, Mocha, and Aden.[10]

After the Sepoy Mutiny and parliament's transfer of East India Company possessions to the Crown in 1858, new security needs led the imperial state to project its powers of surveillance throughout the Indian Ocean and Red Sea. However, even before 1858, a more expansive imperial mode of operations was already emerging. The intensification of British interests in the region began in earnest with the voyage of the steamship *Hugh Lindsay* in 1830. Aggressively backed by the Bombay Presidency, even when plans for the ships and its proposed Red Sea route had been discarded by the East Indian Company's court of directors, the *Hugh Lindsay* quickly proved its worth, reducing the journey from Bombay to Suez to a mere twenty-one days. Seeing the

---

[9] Robert Blyth, *Empire of the Raj: India, Eastern Africa and the Middle East, 1858-1947* (New York: Palgrave-MacMillan, 2003), 1-11.

[10] Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 144.

potential benefits of steam technology, the Bombay Presidency and the government of India both looked to the Red Sea with renewed interest.[11]

The opening of the Red Sea to regular steamship services, however, still depended on military support from British India to ensure its success. In order to provide a coaling station for its ships, the Bombay Presidency forcibly seized the island of Socotra, off the Horn of Africa, in 1835. Britain's escapade in Socotra ultimately proved disastrous, and four years later, when the port of Aden was found to offer better harbor and climate than that of Socotra, Aden's ruler, like Socotra's, was intimidated, bribed, and ultimately overpowered. This aggressive stance in the Gulf of Aden rapidly intensified the activities of British agents in the region.[12]

Another sign of change came in 1837, when the East India Company began to appoint "English" (i.e. non-Muslim, non-Indian) agents to Red Sea posts, such as Jidda, Mocha, and Qusayr. By August 1838, these same agents were recognized by the Foreign Office as vice-consuls.[13] As Alexander Ogilvie, the first British vice-consul at Jidda reported to his new post, his French counterpart, Fulgence Fresnel, described the scene: "Jeddah, that old concierge of the Holy City, received within its walls, stupefied, a European consul arrayed in the European fashion and the cannon of the Muslim fortress

---

[11] Daniel Headrick, *The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 129-156. On the shift from the Cape route to the Egyptian-Red Sea route, see also Barak, *Technology and Temporality in Modern Egypt*, 21-53.

[12] David Killingray, Margarette Lincoln, and Nigel Rigby, eds., *Maritime Empires: British Imperial Maritime Trade in the Nineteenth Century* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2004), 68-83; Sayyid Mustafa Salim, *al-Bahr al-Ahmar wa-l-Juzur al-Yamaniyya: Tarikh wa Qadiyya* (San'a': Dar al-Mithaq li-l-Nashr wa-l-Tawzi', 2006), 43-58.

[13] Apparently when Ogilvie arrived in Jidda, he found a Baghdadi Armenian, one Maalim Yusof, acting as the East Indian Company agent in Jidda. At some point Yusof had come into possession of the insignia of a vice-consul, before being stripped of them by Olgilvie. See Freitag "Helpless Representatives of the Great Powers?," 359-360.

saluted with 21 guns the English flag as it was hoisted over the consular residence."[14] To underscore the significance of this shift in the Red Sea's balance of power, only sixty years earlier the Ottoman Sultan had considered "the sea of Suez" and the "noble pilgrimage to Meccah" to be wholly Muslim affairs. Only decades earlier, the Sultan had warned his governor in Egypt that "to suffer Frankish ships to navigate therein, or to neglect opposing its, is betraying your Sovereign, your religion, and every Mahometan."[15] Despite such resentment, no Muslim power, not even the Ottoman Empire, was in a position to halt Britain's nineteenth-century expansion into the Red Sea. The opening of the British vice-consulate would also have the added effect of establishing the precedent of consular representation, which would eventually lead to the opening of consular agencies by other European powers as the nineteenth century unfolded: France (1839-1843), the Netherlands (1869-1872), Sweden and Norway (1876), Austria (1880), Russia (1891).[16]

The middle decades of the nineteenth century also revealed that Britain's steam-powered imperialism had spawned a number of unintended consequences. Chief among them were growing numbers of Indian and Southeast Asian pilgrims traveling to Mecca. Around the mid-nineteenth century the annual flow of oceangoing pilgrims from the subcontinent is estimated to have hovered between 5,000 and 7,000 participants.[17] By the

---

[14] Fulgence Fresnel, "L'Arbie," in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Paris, 1839), iv, xviii, 256, quoted in Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 145.

[15] David Kimche, "The Opening of the Red Sea to European Ships in the Late Eighteenth Century," *Middle Eastern Studies* 8, no. 1 (1972): 71.

[16] Freitag "Helpless Representatives of the Great Powers?," 359-360.

[17] Michael Pearson, *Pilgrimage to Mecca: The Indian Experience, 1500-1800* (Princeton, NJ: Markus Weiner, 1996), 56-57; Roff, "Sanitation and Security" 145.

1880s, however, average numbers rose to around 10,000.[18] Doubling again during the pilgrimage season of 1893, the number of Indian pilgrims was reported to have exceeded 20,000.[19] Although Indians and Jawis sent the largest contingents of pilgrims each year, the growth of the steamship-era hajj was not confined to these groups. The total number of pilgrims rose from an estimated 112,000 in 1831 to over 200,000 (possibly even 300,000) in 1893 and 1910.[20]

By the 1850s British observers began to note the potential dangers and embarrassments presented by the rising tide of Indian Ocean pilgrims and *mücavrin* in the Hijaz. As early as 1814, the explorer Johann Ludwig Burkchardt had commented on the wretched state of Indian pilgrims, but little urgency was attached to these observations before the Sepoy Mutiny and international cholera crisis of 1865-1866.[21] Prior to these events, British officialdom had not yet fully considered the potential link between the hajj and its capacity to spread disease, political subversion, and inter-imperial legal conflicts. As a consequence, no passports or travel documents were required of pilgrims from British territories, despite Ottoman proposals from as early as the 1840s.[22] Likewise, no real effort was made to document the numbers of pilgrims

---

[18] TNA: FO 195/1583, "Report on Hajj of 1303 A.H. (1886)," in *Records of the Hajj*, vol. 3, 733.

[19] Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 150.

[20] David E. Long, *The Hajj Today: A Survey of the Contemporary Makkah Pilgrimage* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1979), 127; Adam McKeown, "Global Migration, 1846-1940," *Journal of World History* 15, no. 2 (2004): 162; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 66-67.

[21] Johann Ludwig (John Lewis) Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia* (London: Henry Colburn, 1829), 16, 191, 259.

[22] Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 146. Although the Ottomans, French, and Dutch all called for some form of passport documentation, sanitary certificates, and/or the purchase of return tickets to avoid poor pilgrims being stranded in the Hijaz, the British repeatedly claimed that such restrictions would be misunderstood as an infringement upon religious freedom. For example, see TNA: FO 881/3079, "Correspondence respecting Turkish Regulations for Pilgrim Traffic, 1875-1877," Consul Beyts, Jidda to

traveling, nor was there much that British officials thought could be done to curb the proliferation of indigent pilgrims because the government felt strongly that it had "no right to prevent any person who desires to do so, from proceeding on pilgrimage."[23]

In sharp contrast to this laissez-faire attitude, Richard Burton's experiences during his famous pilgrimage in disguise in 1853 convinced him that the problem of indigent pilgrims and pious refugees would eventually have much wider political implications. In his pilgrimage narrative, Burton related the tale of a Punjabi who, "finding life unendurable at home," sold his possessions, gathered his family, and set out for Mecca. As with many poor pilgrims of the period, it was very likely that this family would either fall victim to physical privations or settle in the Hijaz permanently. Using this example, Burton described what he considered a dangerous pattern of Muslim emigration and potential radicalization in the Hijaz. He warned:

> To an 'Empire of Opinion,' this emigration is fraught with evils. It sends forth a horde of malcontents that ripen into bigots; it teaches foreign nations to despise our rule; and it unveils the present nakedness of once wealthy India. And we have both prevention and cure in our own hands.[24]

Burton's "cure" prescribed that pilgrims should be made to prove their solvency before being permitted to embark from Indian ports. He further recommended that pilgrims be made to register with the vice-consul upon their arrival in Jidda. Burton also pointed to the need for a stronger diplomatic British presence in the region. In short, Burton accurately predicted that the hajj increasingly would become perceived as an outlet for

---

Secretary to the Government of Bombay, 30 April 1875; Governor-General of India in Council to the Marquis of Salisbury, Fort William (Calcutta), January 1876; TNA: FO 412/58, The British Delegates to the Paris Cholera Conference to the Earl of Rosebury, Paris, 21 February 1894; "Correspondence respecting the Paris Cholera Conference and the Question of Sanitary Reform in the East," January 1895.

[23] Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 146.

[24] Richard Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to al-Medinah and Meccah*, vol. 2 (London, 1855; repr. Of the 1893 ed., New York: Dover, 1964), 184-186.

anti-British sentiment. Moreover, he understood how easily negative opinions about British rule could be spread to other parts of the Muslim world via the hajj and the diaspora of Indian exiles who were beginning to circulate around it. In retrospect, the aggressive steps recommended by Burton were at least twenty to thirty years ahead of their time.

Only two years after the publication of Burton's pilgrimage account, in 1857-1858, the Sepoy Mutiny shook British India to its very core. For much of the rest of the nineteenth century, the traumas of the Mutiny would provide the lens, or perhaps more accurately the blinders, through which urban upheaval, anti-European/anti-Christian violence, and the application of consular protections to the Hijaz would be viewed.

Violent Precedents: The Traumatic Birth of the Capitulations and Consular Protection in 1850s Jidda

The 1850s marked a period of enormous transformation across the Ottoman Empire. Perhaps no other period demonstrates the intimate linkage between the empire's acute need for international recognition and security and the pressure to enact sweeping domestic reforms like the Crimean War and its immediate aftermath. With the conclusion of the Paris treaty in 1856, the Ottoman Empire ostensibly became a member of the European concert and placed its territorial integrity under the collective protection of the Great Powers of Europe. However, this dramatic achievement did not come without a price. It is no coincidence that the Reform Edict (*Islahat Fermanı*) of February 1856, formally granting equality to non-Muslims in all aspects of life and ostensibly paving the way for the complete overhaul of Ottoman state and society, was issued barely a month prior to the conclusion of the post-war settlement.[25] Although it would be unfair

[25] Kayaoğlu, *Legal Imperialism*, 104-121.

to suggest that such reforms did not enjoy support from powerful elements within the Ottoman bureaucratic elite, it must also be remembered that much of the impetus for and accelerating pace of reforms were products of European, especially British, encouragement. While British support for gradual change was one thing, pressure for the immediate and full implementation of the 1856 Reform Edict opened up a variety of unforeseen rifts between the imperial center and the provinces. Not surprisingly, Muslim apprehensions concerning both the leveling of legal distinctions between Muslim and non-Muslim subjects were especially pronounced in the Hijaz. Combined with Istanbul's open alliance with Britain and France during the Crimean War, secularizing reforms opened provincial administrators to charges that the center had taken a radically pro-Christian turn.[26]

Hijazi opposition to Tanzimat reform took many shapes. When Istanbul attempted to implement new imperial regulations requiring advisory councils and local government in 1853, riots broke out in Mecca. In November 1853, the new Tanzimat council in Istanbul, the *Meclis-i Mahsus*, undertook a general audit of Hijazi affairs and appointed a new governor, Kamil Paşa. Unfortunately, no sooner had he arrived in the Hijaz than 'Abd al-Muttalib initiated a letter-writing campaign condemning him. Over the course of the next two years, the relationship between the governor and Sharif deteriorated rapidly. While many of the underlying tensions were purely local, the pressures exerted upon the governor by the central government to placate Britain and France severely narrowed his options. As Kamil Paşa explained to the French consul, the real reasons for the quarrel between himself and the Sharif were actually prompted by the execution of some Bedouins without the consent of the Sultan, the protection of the

[26] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 137.

Sharif 's cronies from imperial justice, and allegations that the 'Abd al-Muttalib was pilfering local coffers. However, according to Kamil Paşa, these issues were being obscured by the Sharif's efforts to incite the population against the empire on the grounds that it was pro-Christian. As the conflict between the two men worsened, soldiers and government officials went unpaid for nearly two years. Likewise, the state's customary subsidies to the Bedouin tribes and the pious notables of the *haremeyn* went unpaid. The final straw was the murder of Ishaq Efendi, the head of the descendants of the Prophet and a critic of 'Abd al-Muttalib. Kamil Paşa wrote to Istanbul demanding that 'Abd al-Muttalib be deposed.[27]

From 'Abd al-Muttalib's perspective the Crimean War had dramatically weakened the empire and demonstrated their complete dependence on European powers. Threatened with the very real possibility of being deposed, 'Abd al-Muttalib opted not to bow to pressure from Istanbul. Instead, he became convinced that he could expel the Ottomans from the Hijaz altogether. By exploiting popular resentment of European commercial and consular influence in Jidda, he began to plot the ouster of the Ottoman government. In early 1855, 'Abd al-Muttalib arrived at the perfect way to mix commercial and religious resentments into a highly flammable cocktail.[28]

In 1847, the British had been able to push Istanbul toward major concessions regarding the trafficking of black slaves. Again, in 1857, they obtained a major *ferman*

---

[27] On the circumstances contributing to the rift between Kamil Paşa and 'Abd al-Muttalib, see BOA, İ. MMS, 3/98 (22 S 1272/3 November 1855). On the murder of Ishaq Efendi and events leading to Ferik Raşid Paşa's investigation see also Cevdet Paşa, *Tezakir*, 1-12, edited by Cavid Baysun (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1986), 106-110; Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 136-137; Ahmed Emin Osmanoğlu, "Hicaz Eyaletinin Teşekkülü, 1861-1864," (M.A. thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2004), 63-69.

[28] Ehud Toledano, *The Ottoman Slave Trade and Its Suppression: 1840-1890* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 130.

prohibiting the traffic of African slaves, with the exception of the Hijaz.[29] The reason for this conspicuous exemption was the revolt of ʻAbd al-Muttalib and the very real threat that abolition had posed to the religious legitimacy of Ottoman rule in the Hijaz. In the early months of 1855, reports concerning Ottoman steps to curb the slave trades had begun to alarm Hijazis.

In response, on April 1, 1855, a circle of prominent merchants in Jidda addressed a letter to the leading *ulema* and sharifs of Mecca expressing the depth of their concerns. According to Cevdet Paşa, the letter contained rumors that Istanbul had ordered the Governor of Suez to prohibit of the sale of Circassian, Ethiopian, and African slaves and slaves exported from the Hijaz to Egypt be returned. In addition to voicing their displeasure over the steps that had already been taken, the letter echoed rumors that a complete prohibition on the slave trade would soon be imposed as part of the Tanzimat reforms.[30]

The ban was flatly condemned as anti-Islamic innovation. As Cevdet relates, the letter posed a series of polemical questions speculating about what other kinds of Christian-inspired changes might come next: Would non-Muslims be able to build buildings in the Arabian Peninsula? Would women be free to rebel against husbands or fathers? Would infidels be allowed to marry the wives of the *Ehl-i İslam* without objection? As the letter continues, even if rumors of the prohibition of the slave trade had not proven to be true, "everyone is stricken with fear and awe by this news and the House of Islam is in a great state of grief" (*herkes duçar-ı havf-ü haşyet olup bu haberi işiten ehl-i islam azim keder etmektedir*). The letter queries how such a prohibition could

[29] Ibid., 135-138.

[30] Cevdet Paşa, *Tezakir*, no. 12, 102-103.

be decreed in Muslim countries? How could "these infidel regulations be applied to us" (*bize kavaid-i küfriyyenin te'yid ve iş'asiyle*)? And how Muslims could stand for this "comingling with infidels in everything" (*her şeyde kefere ile ihtilatı*) since "in every way, Islam and the religion of the infidels are contrary to one another."[31]

As Cevdet explains, the arrival of this letter was the "genesis of the rebellion" (*mebde'-i fitne ve fesad*). However, as Cevdet claims, the letter was not the initiative of Jidda's notables. According to the investigations of Ferik Raşid Paşa, the letter was in fact "secretly prepared" (*hafiyyen tertib ettirilmiş olduğu*) by 'Abd al-Mutallib himself in order to set in motion an anti-Ottoman revolt. As Cevdet claims, prior to the letter's public reading, 'Abd a-Muttalib had invited Shaykh Jamal, the *reis ül-ulema*, to Taif to discuss his plans. As he explained to the cleric, the outcome of the Crimean War would be "calamitous" (*vahim*) for the Ottoman state. And regardless of the outcome, he argued that the state would be "crushed by debt" (*Bu muharebe bir suretle hitam bulsa dahi borcunun altından kalkamayıp ezilir*). Moreover, he reasoned that the Turks were in fact apostates (*mürted*), who had chosen to hide their apostasy for the time being (*şimdilik irtidadlarını ihfa ediyorlar*), but would later reveal it (*ise de ba'dehu ilan edecekleri der-kardır*). As he concluded, "these days of war are a great opportunity for us" (*bu eyyam-ı muharebe bize tamam fursattır*). And the issue of the prohibition of the slave trade provided just the pretext (*bahane*) to seize power.[32]

Although the basic outlines of the revolt had been set in motion, 'Abd al-Muttalib postponed revealing his hand until after the pilgrimage season, during which time the Ottoman military presence would be at his height. In the interim, however, the plot

[31] Ibid., 103.

[32] Ibid., 103.

became known to Istanbul. As a result, Raşid Paşa was sent to investigate and, if necessary, to put down the rebellion. Upon his arrival in Jidda, Raşid Paşa and the governor, Kamil Paşa, began to take steps to bring the crisis to a head. The *kaymakam* (district governor) of Mecca received an order from the governor ordering the prohibition of the slave trade. The kaymakam was instructed to read the order at the shari'a court in the presence of the *ulema* and the sharifs. When the order was read on October 30, 1855, the time for rebellion had come. On 'Abd al-Muttalib's instructions, Shaykh Jamal issued a *fatwa* proclaiming that the ban on the slave trade was "contrary to Islamic law" (*şer-i şerife mugayirdir*). The *fatwa* declared that as a result of this and other anti-Islamic innovations, the Turks had revealed themselves as apostates (*Türkler mürted oldu*). It was deemed lawful to kill them without the risk of criminal penalty or bloodwit (*heder*). The enslavement of their children was even declared lawful. The kaymakam and the judge were verbally and physically assaulted and forced to renounce the prohibition. Throughout the city, Ottoman garrisons and foreigners were attacked by mobs. In the streets of Mecca a jihad was proclaimed against the Christians and the polytheists, a category which now included the Ottoman state (*Jihād 'alā al-Nasārā wa-l-mushrikīn yā mu'minūn*).[33]

In total, 'Abd al-Muttalib's rebellion would last some seven months. By June 1856, he had been captured and exiled to Salonica (though later relocated to Istanbul).[34] While the capture and exile of 'Abd al-Muttalib might have quelled the immediate problem, it did not mean that local resentments against Istanbul and its European allies had merely evaporated. Rather, it was a harbinger of things to come. The prohibition of the slave

[33] Ibid., 111-112. See also Toledano, *The Ottoman Slave Trade and Its Suppression*, 131.

[34] BOA, İ. DH, 1289/101423 (7 Z 1272/9 August 1856).

trade was only one manifestation of the gulf between empire-wide Tanzimat ideals, complete with all its international legal implications, and the Islamic character of the Hijaz.

In the midst of 'Abd al-Muttalib's revolt an abortive effort was made to tear down the flags of the foreign consulates in Jidda and murder all persons under foreign protection. And later, in June 1856, there was a failed attempt to murder the British Consul by an Albanian soldier.[35] Although the motivations behind the attack were never proven, the British and French consulates worried that the attack had been sparked by their opposition to the Ottoman monopoly on the salt trade held by the *muhtesib* (superintendent of police, the second-raking Ottoman official behind the kaymakam) of Jidda, Abdullah Ağa.[36] In many respects, the very presence of European consuls in Jidda encapsulated a number of emerging tensions. However, these tensions were not merely produced by the rising visibility of Christians or Europeans in Jidda, a town of only 15,000 at the time. Rather, it was the changing status of foreign powers, most notably Britain, and their subjects, that was rapidly altering local perceptions of foreign economic competition. These changes were a direct outcome of the 1838 Treaty of Balta Liman, through which Britain had forced the Ottoman Empire to liberalize trade and lower tariffs. In the Hijaz, this also eventually led to the breakup of trading monopolies established during the Egyptian administration of Mehmed Ali. Another problem was related to the nature of the consuls themselves. During this period European consuls were often not professional diplomats. Rather, they were trading consuls. As such, they

[35] TNA: FO 195/375, Acting Vice-Consul, Stephen Page to the British Ambassador, Istanbul, 9 June 1856; 25 June 1856; 6 August 1856; 27 October 1856.

[36] Ulrike Freitag, "Helpless Representatives of the Great Powers?," 368.

were far from detached or objective overseers of their government's interests. Armed with the privileges of the Capitulations, European consuls could forge alliances with foreign traders and extend the status of protected-person to safeguard their own business interests. In turn, disputes adjudicated between European and Ottoman officials frequently involved their local business and financial partners.[37]

Here, it should also be stressed that the most important outcome of the introduction of consular protection to the Hijaz was not an increase in anti-Christian or anti-European sentiment. Rather, it was the division of the Hijaz's commercial and political elites between Ottoman subjects and European-protected persons that ultimately proved most explosive. In this sense the Capitulations did not divide neatly along confessional lines. Rather, the most corrosive element of foreign protection was its extension to colonial Muslim subjects residing in the Hijaz. With a wildly cosmopolitan population, composed of large communities of diasporic merchants and *mücavirin*, many of whom were clearly of foreign origin, but had lived for extended periods in the Hijaz, the extension of protection to Muslims who were theoretically connected to territory under European colonial rule would quickly unravel the fabric of Muslim communal identity and economic and political life. It also raised a tangle of thorny new questions about which Hijazi locals were to be considered Ottoman subjects and which might be counted as European colonial subjects.

Following the advent of regular steamship operations in the Red Sea by Egyptian-based companies, the volume of passengers and freight using the Red Sea route to Egypt

[37] Ulrike Freitag, "Symbolic Politics and Urban Violence in Late Ottoman Jeddah," in Ulrike Freitag, Nelida Fuccaro, Claudi Ghrawi, and Nora Lafi, eds., *Urban Violence in the Middle East: Changing Cityscapes in the Transition from Empire to Nation* (Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, forthcoming 2015). On trading consuls, see also Freitag, "Helpless Representatives of the Great Powers?," 360.

and the Mediterranean from India began to explode.[38] However, this new steamship traffic threatened to deprive more established local firms of their markets. Hijazi, Hadrami, and Yemeni ship owners, crews, and stevedores all feared that they would lose their livelihoods. Here, it should also be noted that these same constituencies were also the backbone of the Red Sea slave trade as well as ardent allies of ‘Abd al-Muttalib.[39]

By 1856, roughly one quarter of all Red Sea commerce was in the hands of just one Greek merchant outfit, Toma Sava and Company. Operating under British protection, Toma Sava and Co. was a branch of the Cairo-based trading outfit of Toma Myrialaki and A. D’Antonio. Although this firm had been operating in the Red Sea for at least two decades, the scale of its operations and relationship to European consulates had begun to raise eyebrows among Hijazi and Hadrami commercial interests. With offices in Mecca, Qusayr, Wajh, Yanbu‘, Suakin, Massawa, and Aden, Toma Sava had encroached upon territories that had previously been almost exclusively Hadrami preserves.[40]

This rivalry was further compounded by the incestuous relationship between the shipping industry, financial services, and the British consulate. Faraj Yusr, an Indian Muslim under British protection (though apparently not considered a British subject) was also the chief merchant of Jidda and by all accounts the richest person there in the

---

[38] On the emergence of Egyptian, Ottoman, and British steamship interests in Jidda, see Muhammad Sa‘id Sha‘afi, *The Foreign Trade of Juddah during the Ottoman Period, 1840-1916* (1985), 53-66; Nabil Ridwan, *al-Dawlat al-‘Uthmaniyya wa Gharbi al-Jazirat al-‘Arabiyya ba‘da Iftitah Qanat al-Suways* (1286-1326 H./1869-1908 M.) (Jidda: Tihama, 1983), 72-103.

[39] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 141-42.

[40] Ibid.

1850s.[41] At one time Yusr was an associate of Toma Sava but later struck out on his own and eventually came to own eight ships. In addition to his close working relationship with Toma Sava and his own shipping enterprise, Yusr also emerged as the Hijaz's principal banker, lending money to the provincial administration to be repaid by the central government at exorbitant interest rates.[42] As the Hijazi and Hadrami merchants well understood, bankers like Yusr with their access to large-scale credit arrangements offered Europeans and their colonial protégés an undisputed edge over local capital. In addition to these business concerns, Yusr had also cultivated close contacts with the British consulate, often serving as the acting vice-consul in Jidda.[43]

Needless to say, both Faraj Yusr and the representatives of Toma Sava had numerous enemies. In 1856, Toma Sava and Co. became embroiled in a conflict with local Hadrami merchants of the Banaja family and the muhtesib, Abdullah Ağa, who led a boycott against the firm.[44] Abdullah Ağa was also alleged to have played a leading role in supporting 'Abd al-Muttalib's 1855 revolt. And Kamil Paşa had him exiled him for allegedly planning to lead a massacre of Christians. However, when Kamil Paşa was replaced as governor, his successor Mahmud Paşa reappointed him in October 1856.[45] Although the local rivalries of this extraordinarily small circle of merchants, bankers, and bureaucrats might at first glance appear to be little more than petty squabbles, the

---

[41] On Faraj Yusr's ambiguous status as either "a British subject or a person who, although not a subject, enjoyed British protection," see TNA: FO 881/848, Inclosure in No. 381, "Opinion" 22 February 1859, pp. 266-267.

[42] BOA, İ. MVL, 316/13320 (22 M 1271/15 October 1854); BOA, İ. HR, 310/19768 (7 S 1271/30 October 1854); BOA, İ. MVL, 319/13514 (27 S 1271/19 November 1854); BOA, İ. MVL, 370/16223 (16 Ş 1273/11 April 1857); BOA, İ. MVL, 547/24563 (19 N 1282/5 February 1866).

[43] William Ochsenwald, "The Jidda Massacre of 1858," *Middle Eastern Studies* 13, no. 3 (1977), 315.

[44] Ibid., 317.

[45] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 142-143.

position of Faraj Yusr at the nexus between the province's financial services, Red Sea shipping, and Britain and India's long extraterritorial arm raised the stakes exponentially. In contrast to the case of 'Abd al-Muttalib's revolt, where a power struggle between the Sharif and provincial governor had remained an internal Ottoman affair, the anger and anxiety aroused by the penetration of European capital now carried the potential of internationalizing a provincial spat into an issue of global significance.

In 1858 all of these tensions would come to a head. On June 15, 1858, a premeditated massacre of Europeans and European-protected persons took place in Jidda.[46] That night the British and French consulates were attacked, ransacked, and their respective flags pulled down. Among the victims was the British vice-consul, who was reported to have been cut into pieces and thrown from the window of his residence. Likewise, the French consul and his wife were also slaughtered. Their bodies were dragged naked through the streets, urged on by the cheers of local women. The homes and property of Christians and persons closely associated with Europeans were plundered. Owing to his affiliation with the British consulate, the home of Faraj Yusr was also attacked and looted, though he was eventually spared through the intervention of 'Abd Allah Nasif, one of the leading notables of Jidda and agent of the Sharif of Mecca.[47] In all, twenty-two Europeans, mostly of Greek origin, were slain and another twenty-six were eventually rescued by the steam frigate, *The Cyclops*.[48]

---

[46] The massacre is referred into in Ottoman as the *Cidde hadiseleri* and in Arabic the term *fitna* is generally used.

[47] On this point, Freitag argues that due to his status as the leading merchant (*shaykh al-tujjar*) and the primary lender to both the local commercial elites and the Ottoman provincial administration, in the end, he was viewed as indispensible. Freitag, "Symbolic Politics and Urban Violence in Late Ottoman Jeddah."

[48] TNA: FO 424/18, Acting Consul-General Green to the Earl of Malmesbury, Alexandria, 6 July 1858; Précis of Captain Pullen's Letter, Jidda to the Secretary of the Admiralty, 25 June 1858. For full accounts

While the lurid details of the killings, the chillingly premeditated plot, and the graphic testimonies of forced conversions given by the survivors are certainly titillating, the seemingly obvious anti-Christian or anti-European character of the violence obscures as much as it reveals. Indeed, the original dispute that sparked the violence did not directly involve any Europeans or Christians. Rather, it arose out of the ambiguous status of the Indian Muslim merchantile community, whose nationalities had not yet been carefully defined as British or Ottoman subjects.

Ironically, the initial dispute that sparked the massacre was between two Indian Muslims, or more accurately two Muslims *allegedly* of Indian origin. The incident that precipitated the massacre was a seemingly banal dispute involving questions of property, inheritance, power of attorney, and the contested registration of a ship docked in the Jidda harbor, the *Irani*. The *Irani* was originally part of a company jointly-owned by members of the Jawhar family, which was registered under the English flag. Originally ownership had been shared between Ibrahim Jawhar and his slave, Salih Jawhar.[49] Following Ibrahim's death, Ibrahim's brother Said was named the administrator of his commercial property. Shortly, thereafter Said also died, leaving the administration of the property to his daughter. It was at this point that Salih Jawhar was elected as the estate's agent. However, when Hassan bin Ibrahim Jawhar, the original beneficiary, reached the age of

---

of the British investigations into the incident, see TNA: FO 881/848, "Papers Relating to the Outbreak at Jeddah in June 1858," July 1858 to December 1859. For the Ottoman investigations, see especially BOA, İ. MMS, 14/597-1 (13 B 1275/25 February 1859); BOA, İ. HR, 160/8566 (25 S 1275/4 October 1858).

[49] In the account of the consul's initial interrogation of Salih Jawhar, his status the slave of Ibrahim Jawhar is only noted in passing. Through a comparison with Ottoman documentation it would also appear that Ibrahim Jawhar's aunt was also a slave. TNA: FO 881/848, Captain Pullen to the Secretary of the Admiralty, 19 June 1858. See also Osmanoğlu, "Hicaz Eyaletinin Teşekkülü, 71.

majority and married his uncle Said's daughter, Salih Jawhar's services were no longer required.[50]

It was at this point that Salih and Hassan Jawhar fell into deep dispute over the vessel. When Hassan had asked for his share of the business in order to trade on his own, Salih had refused to relinquish control. In response, Hassan sought the assistance of Faraj Yusr. Yusr, a personal enemy of Salih's, had called him to account for his supervision of a number of financial matters related to his Hassan's inheritance. Fearing punitive actions from Yusr, Salih decided to dissolve his partnership with Hassan and take full ownership of the *Irani*. In order to do so, Jawhar claimed that he was an Ottoman citizen so that the case would be heard by Ottoman, not British authorities.[51] Thus, in his attempt to disentangle ownership of the vessel from the partnership, he applied to the kaymakam of Jidda, İbrahim Ağa, to have the ship's flag changed from British to Ottoman. In turn, the kaymakam forwarded the application to the governor, Mehmed Namık Paşa and the provincial council. When the *meclis* met it was decided the partnership's property could be divided and that Salih Jawhar's share would be the *Irani*. And according to Ottoman documentation of the affair, at this point Salih declared that he wished to conduct his future business concerns under Ottoman protection.[52]

Because the company was originally registered under British protection, under the terms of the Capitulations the attendance of a British consular representative was required. However, the vice-consul was away in Egypt on other business and consulate

---

[50] BOA, İ. MMS, 14/597-1 (13 B 1275/25 February 1859). See also Osmanoğlu, "Hicaz Eyaletinin Teşekkülü, 71.

[51] TNA: FO 881/848, Captain Pullen to the Secretary of the Admiralty, 19 June 1858, pp. 72-73.

[52] BOA, İ. MMS, 14/597-1 (13 B 1275/25 February 1859).

had been left in the hands of Faraj Yusr, who was the acting vice-consul. Although Yusr argued that the Ottomans had no jurisdiction, Ottoman authorities approved the change. Upon his return from Egypt, the British vice-consul Stephen Page was apprised of the situation. Within a matter of hours, Salih Jawhar was being held in the consulate. Upon interrogation, Salih Jawhar, the would-be Ottoman, reportedly replied that he would "answer nothing, except at Calcutta." However, the register of the ship was produced from the consular files, certifying that Salih Jawhar and Ibriham Jawhar were the co-owners of the vessel. It was also promptly confirmed that both were British subjects and that the vessel had been registered in Calcutta and had always flown the British flag. According to British Admiralty law, any attempt to change the registration of a British vessel in order to avoid legal action would render the vessel subject to confiscation.[53]

Page then reached out to Captain Pullen of the *Cyclops*, a British warship, anchored off the coast surveying telegraph cable routes. As Pullen recounts, Page's advice was clear. The Capitulations gave him full authority to seize the ship:

> The Consul then suggested to me to haul down the Turkish flag, which she, at the moment, was flying illegally, and take possession of the ship for the purpose of sending her to a Vice-Admiralty Court to be adjudicated upon.
>
> He called my attention to several Treaties existing with Turkey, giving to the Consular authorities *full jurisdiction* over all British subjects in the Ottoman ports "*in the same and as ample manner as if Her Majesty had acquired such power or jurisdiction by the cession or conquest of territory*."

[53] TNA: FO 881/848, Captain Pullen to the Secretary of the Admiralty, 19 June 1858, pp. 72-73. The law states: "if the master or owner of any British ship does, or permits to be done, any matter or thing, or carries, or permits to be carried, any papers or documents, with intent to conceal the British character of such ship from any persons entitled by British law to inquire into the same, or assumes a foreign character, or with intent to deceive any such person as lastly hereinbefore-mentioned, such ship shall be forfeited to Her Majesty."

In short order, Page and Pullen notified the kaymakam that the *Irani* would be seized. The vessel was then boarded, the Ottoman flag was lowered, and the British standard was once again raised.[54]

According to Ahmad bin Zayni Dahlan's famous chronicle, *Khulasat al-Kalam*, it was not the question of jurisdiction that precipitated the massacre. Instead, the violence was a result of the vice-consul having insulted the Ottoman flag and by implication the Sultan, the Caliphate, and Islam. As Dahlan explains, following the vice-consul's decision to board the *Irani* and lower the Ottoman flag, "news spread that after he brought down the Ottoman flag, he trampled upon it with his foot, and spoke in an indecent manner."[55] This basic narrative also makes its way into Ottoman reporting. In the Ottoman version, after the English soldiers lowered the Ottoman flag, according to the testimony of a number of local Jiddawi witnesses, the flag was then "thrown into the sea."[56] Initially, Ottoman authorities argued that the massacre had arisen spontaneously from the anger over the confiscation of the vessel and the alleged desecration of the flag mentioned above. However, European observers argued that such a trivial incident could not have precipitated an impromptu slaughter of Jidda's European population.

When Mehmed Namık Paşa heard of the violence in Jidda, he was in Mecca making plans for the pilgrimage. His first reaction was to send a letter threatening to

---

[54] TNA: FO, 881/848, Captain Pullen to Admiralty, 19 and 25 June 1858; F.O.195/579, Pullen to Mehmed Namık Paşa, 15 June 1858.

[55] Ahmad bin Zayni Dahlan, *Tarikh Ashraf al-Hijaz, 1840-1882: Khulasat al-Kalam fi Bayan Umara' al-Balad al-Haram*, edited and introduced by Muhammad Amin Tawfiq (Cairo, 1887; reprint, Beirut: Dar al-Saqi, 1993), 48. For an alternative Arabic-language account of the 1858 *fitna* written in 1863/1864, see also Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Hadrawi, *al-Jawahir al-Mu'adda fi Fada'il Jidda* (Cairo: Maktaba al-Thaqafa al-Diniyya, 2002), 43-44.

[56] BOA, İ. MMS, 532/13, "Cidde'de bayrak sebebiyle öldülüren İngiliz ve Fransız konsolosları ile saire dair" (5 Z 1274/17 July 1858). See also Osmanoğlu, "Hicaz Eyaletinin Teşekkülü," 72.

punish the notables of Jidda if peace was not immediately restored. Events had, however, already taken on a momentum all their own. On the morning following the violence, Captain Pullen offered to assist the kaymakam in putting down the rioting. His overture was refused. Worse still, the boats of the *Cyclops* were fired upon by the mob. As the governor well knew, an open confrontation between the citizens of Jidda and the British navy would certainly end in disaster.[57] As Dahlan reports, when the Mehmed Namık convened a *meclis* in Mecca, he had to forcefully caution the notables of the Hijaz from taking any further actions against the *Cyclops*. As Dahlan recounts, the governor sternly warned the assembled members of the *ulema*, the merchant elite, and other notables, who were eager to mobilize the Bedouin tribes, that any further attempt to confront the British would have consequences far beyond the Hijaz. As he pointed out, "If you sink a ship, ten more will come, and if you sink ten, one hundred more will come. Thus, it will no doubt continue and the damage will not cease. Also, it is possible that they will leave Jidda and turn their attention to attacking the rest of the cities of Islam." Mehmed Namık attempted to impress upon the locals that nothing they could do would be of any use given that they had neither ships nor the kind of firepower necessary for an all-out-war. He goes on to paint an apocalyptic picture of how any further escalation of the conflict would only lead to the further of internationalization of the situation, the occupation of Jidda or even Mecca, or to war between the Ottoman state and Britain and France.[58]

As Dahlan explains, the governor advocated a negotiated settlement regarding the case of the *Irani* and for the punishment of the ringleaders of the violence. However, he was unable to act quickly enough. In the meantime, the British Foreign Secretary had

---

[57] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 140-151.

[58] Dahlan, *Tarikh Ashraf al-Hijaz*, 48-49.

ordered Captain Pullen to obtain the punishment of the murderers. As a result, Pullen threatened that if justice was not meted out hastily, he would attack Jidda. While Pullen was informed that all of the murderers were known, the governor informed him that he would have to wait for the approval of the Sultan before any executions could be performed. As Ottoman records make clear, Istanbul had hoped to avoid opening the case to further European interference. As a result, "symbolic" convictions were needed in order to restore its relations with Britain and France. Here, Mehmed Namık points out that the participants in the events in question numbered in the hundreds.[59] Moreover, he did not accept the notion of executing a handful of individuals as a peace offering. In the meantime, Ferik İsmail Hakkı Paşa was dispatched from Istanbul to Jidda with an order to investigate the incident and carry out the demanded executions. However, he would not arrive until 2 August.[60] Assuming that Mehmed Namık's hesitation had merely been a stall tactic, on 23 June Pullen issued a thirty-six-hour ultimatum. Two days later, the bombardment of Jidda commenced. By the end of the crisis, seven Jiddawis (one family and two female slaves) were dead and much of Jidda's population had either fled to Mecca or the desert interior.[61] And despite the governor's pleas, Captain Pullen had rashly opted to fire on Jidda just as throngs of pilgrims were returning from Mecca. Although the British Ambassador in Istanbul would eventually apologize to the Ottomans for the bombardment of Jidda, citing Pullen's impetuousness, the message sent by Pullen's overwhelming show of naval force was crystal clear.

---

[59] Osmanoğlu, "Hicaz Eyaletinin Teşekkülü, 78.

[60] BOA, İ. HR, 160/8566 (25 S 1275/4 October 1858); TNA: FO 881/848, Vice-Consul Henry H. Calvert, Jidda to Acting Consul-General Green, Cairo, 8 August 1858, pp. 96.

[61] BOA, İ. HR, 160/8566 (25 S 1275/4 October 1858); TNA: FO 881/848, Vice-Consul Henry H. Calvert, Jidda to Acting Consul-General Green, Cairo, 8 August 1858, pp. 93-98.

In the aftermath of the bombardment, British demands for the execution of the massacre's ringleaders would not go unsatisfied. On 5 August, İsmail Hakkı Paşa gave them the rough justice they sought, approving the public beheading of eleven men. The eleven men executed were, indeed, as Mehmed Namık suggested, sacrificial lambs. The group consisted of a tinsmith, a tobacconist, a coffee-house keeper, a banker, a shoemaker, a butcher, a blacksmith, a diver, a ship pilot, and two seamen. In short, whatever their respective roles, they were very obviously not the principal architects of the uprising.[62]

Reflecting on the bombardment and the executions, Captain Pullen would later write:

> In carrying out this business, my endeavor was to impress on the people of Jeddah that I had been sent to punish, and that they could not commit such deeds without paying for them. For I cannot banish the idea that they have fancied from their position, and almost in the character of a holy city, from its nearness to Mecca, that they might do many things with impunity. I trust this will be a lesson they will not soon forget…
>
> The bombarding happened at a time when no pilgrims were in the town; and they will be able to carry to all parts of the Mahometan world how England and France avenge the murder of their subjects and Representatives, and also how the hostilities ceased as much for their sakes as for other considerations. And taking into account the state of affairs in India it was one great reason why I insisted on the execution taking place in sight of the ships.[63]

As Pullen makes explicit, he viewed the Jidda massacre entirely through the prism of the Sepoy Mutiny and the ongoing security crisis in British India. With this in mind, on the day before the executions, Pullen had sent out an officer to instruct the Ottoman authorities on the exact spot where the punishments should be meted out. The spot was "a dry spit of coral reef, running out into the inner harbour, and so situated as to be

---

[62] TNA: FO 881/848, Vice-Consul Henry H. Calvert to Acting Consul General Green, 8 August 1858, pp. 98.

[63] TNA: FO 881/848, Captain Pullen to the Secretary of the Admiralty, 12 August 1858, p. 109.

visible from the town and from the merchant-vessels." At the time of execution, Pullen positioned the fully-armed crew of the *Cyclops* alongside the beach and order all Anglo-Indian ships in the port do the same. In so doing, Pullen's motive was to ensure that this spectacle of "retributive justice should be known in India."[64]

Although Captain Pullen officially declared that although there were "no doubt many murderers and instigators still unpunished," he considered any "further effusion of blood" to be "unnecessary." And with that he wrote to the governor to let him know that the demands of Great Britain and France had been satisfied. And yet, the matter did not end there. Pullen would eventually convince the British Ambassador that the principal instigators of the violence remained at large. Citing Article 42 of the Capitulations, which had originally be meant only to apply to cases in which an Englishman was accused of manslaughter, British authorities demanded that the case be reopened and tried by a mixed tribunal or international commission composed of British, French, and Ottoman representatives, which would operate independently from the Hijaz's provincial government. Under the rules stipulated therein, the British and French commissioners were to "take direct part, on the same footing with the Turkish authorities, in the trial of the accused." As we shall see later in this chapter, dueling interpretations of the applicability of Article 42 to the Hijaz and the Sharifate of Mecca were to become a principal source of conflict between Ottoman and British officials in subsequent decades.[65]

---

[64] TNA: FO 881/848, Vice-Consul Henry H. Calvert to Acting Consul General Green, 8 August 1858, pp. 96-97.

[65] BOA, HR. SFR (3), 39/11 (25 November 1848); TNA: FO 881/848, "Earl of Malmesbury, Foreign Office to Consul Walne, 25 November 1858, pp. 187-188.

Under pressure from the British and French, the Ottomans consented to the mixed tribunal and eventually concluded a fresh round of investigations in January 1859. The commissioners' final report concluded that the violence had been plotted with the knowledge and consent of Ottoman officials in the Jidda customs house. On the day of the massacre, it was discovered that kaymakam İbrahim Ağa, upon hearing of the consul's unilateral decision to remove of the Ottoman flag from the *Irani*, had called a meeting in the customs house. The muhtesib, Abdullah Ağa was tasked with gathering the meeting's principals: the 'Abd al-Qadir, the *Naqib al-Sadat* Sayyid 'Abd Allah Ba Harun, and the chief of merchants (*tüccarbaşı*) Sayyid Ba Gaffar. In the deliberations inside the customs house that day what ostensibly began as a more limited plot to intimidate the British consul eventually grew into a full-blown mob under the direction of the muhtesib, Abdullah Ağa.[66]

The muhtesib was implicated in ordering Shaykh Said al-'Amudi to rouse the Hadrami community. Following evening prayers, the Hadramis were armed and led to the docks to plot the massacre. After rallying the mob, the muhtesib then directed the group to the consulates.[67] Thus, it would appear that the muhtesib's long-running commercial conflicts over shipping concerns and the salt monopoly with Toma Sava and Jidda's other mostly Cairo-based, Greek-led firms, Faraj Yusr, and their connection to the British consulate lay at the heart of his dark motives. Commercial motivations also explain the strong Hadrami representation in the affair. Their opposition to British consular authority stemmed, in part, from Anglo-Ottoman efforts to abolish the slave

[66] BOA, İ. MMS, 14/597-1 (13 B 1275/25 February 1859); Osmanoğlu, "Hicaz Eyaletinin Teşekkülü, 1861-1864," 72-84.

[67] BOA, İ. MMS, 14/597-1 (13 B 1275/25 February 1859).

trade. The Hadrami colony in Jidda, numbering some 2,000 around 1850, was, like their compatriots in other Red Sea and East African ports, heavily involved in that lucrative trade. More generally speaking, Hadramis resented the damage being done to their share of the shipping and pilgrimage trades as a result of European-protected steampower in the Red Sea and Indian Ocean.[68]

In the end, on 2 January 1859 it was concluded that Abdullah Ağa and Shaykh al-'Amudi were the principal leaders of the violence. They were found guilty in the first degree and sentenced to death (*ceza-ı idam*). The kaymakam and the other notables present at the meetings where the plot had been hatched were found guilty in the second degree and sentenced to life imprisonment and exile to Ottoman Europe (*kayd-ı hayat ve kalebend olmak şartlarıyla Rumeli kitasında*). And those deemed guilty of abetting the violence indirectly or neglecting their official responsibilities to protect the Christian population were each given five-year prison terms (*beşer sene hapis olunmak*).[69]

A final critical detail, which seems to have eluded the attention of previous studies of these events, concerns the nationality of Salih Jawhar, the supposedly British Indian subject turned would-be Ottoman at the center of the boat registration fiasco. As consul Walne points out, Salih Jawhar was among those exiled and imprisoned on Chios.

---

[68] On the Hadrami diaspora, its commercial interests, and conflicts with British expansion in the Red Sea and wider Indian Ocean, see Ulrike Freitag, *Indian Ocean Migrants and State Formation in Hadhramaut: Reforming the Homeland* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Ulrike Freitag and William Clarence-Smith, eds., *Hadrami Traders, Scholars, and Statesmen in the Indian Ocean* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Engseng Ho, "Empire through Diasporic Eyes: A View from the Other Boat," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46 (2004): 210-246; Engseng Ho, *The Graves of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility across the Indian Ocean* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

[69] BOA, İ. MMS, 14/597-1 (13 B 1275/25 February 1859). On those found guilty in the second and third degree and exiled to Cyprus, Chios (Sakız), and Kos (İstanköy), and Rhodes, see also BOA, İ. HR, 172/9399 (11 Ca 1276/6 December 1859). Despite the life sentence imposed in 1859, those that did not die in prison were allowed to return to the Hijaz by 1866, but were ordered to reside in Mecca or Taif. According to Ochsenwald, Salih Jawhar would eventually resettle in India. Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 150.

Here, Walne admits that had Jawhar actually been a British subject, he would have found it "necessary to refer his case to Her Majesty's Government." However, during the inquiry before the Commission, it was discovered that Salih Jawhar was born in the Morea (Greece), was a Muslim claiming to be an Ottoman subject, and, thus, was "in no way subject to jurisdiction within Ottoman territory."[70] Rather surprisingly, this stunning about face and admission of consular overreach has repeatedly fallen through the cracks in previous studies.

Mutiny, Massacre, and the Ethnographic State: Mecca as the 'Natural Asylum' of 'Fanaticism'

Even the accurate identification of the massacre's ringleaders and the belated diagnosis of Salih Jawhar's case of ambiguous nationality were not the most revealing portions of the commission's investigations. Rather, the most telling portions of the proceedings are related to British officials' obsessive attempts to shoehorn the violence in Jidda into an Indian context and demonstrate its connection to the Sepoy Mutiny. One of the initial theories put forward by Captain Pullen suggested that a shaykh from Delhi, accompanied by some sixty followers, was somehow responsible for inciting the events in Jidda.[71] Fearing that similar attacks might be in store for Europeans stationed in Cairo and Suez, consul Walne remarked that "from the breaking out of the revolt in India, in which Moslems have taken such a prominent part, there has been reason to suppose that Indian and Persian partisans have done their best to increase, if not excite," anti-British sentiments across the region.[72] Thus, despite the overwhelming evidence that a more

[70] TNA: FO 881/848, Consul Walne, Jidda to the Earl of Malmesbury, Foreign Office, 14 January 1859

[71] TNA: FO 881/848, Captain Pullen to the Political Agent at Aden, 23 June 1858.

localized set of grievances had sparked the violence in Jidda, over time, the British conflation of the Jidda massacre with the Sepoy Mutiny would prove remarkably durable. British theories concerning the far-reaching dimensions of the diaspora of ex-Mutineers and Indian exiles in Mecca and the Red Sea region and their potential as a conduit for disseminating anti-British sentiment remained in circulation even decades later. As Bartle Frere, a former governor of the Bombay Presidency, observed in 1873, "the Hedja[z] is the natural asylum for fanatical Moslem exiles from India." And even though many of these exiles "pass their lives in a congenial atmosphere of fanaticism" their strong influence "cannot be safely disregarded either in Aden or in India."[73]

For the most part British officials labeled the Mutiny an example of Muslim fanaticism. Despite the oversimplified assumptions behind such views, much of the symbolism of the rebellion was undeniably Islamic. Upon capturing the Mughal capital of Delhi and collecting their would-be emperor, the mutineers fashioned the elderly Mughal emperor, Bahadur Shah, as leader of the revolt. Uprisings followed in predominantly Muslim areas, such as the North-West Frontier and the recently annexed province of Awadh. Therefore it is not surprising that contemporary British observers tended to conflate the rebellion with previous frontier jihads in India.

Such responses are best exemplified by the life and work of Sayyid Ahmad Barelwi (1786-1831). Like many India religious leaders dislocated by rapid changes in India's legal and educational systems, he took refuge in Mecca. During the 1820s, he twice performed the hajj and resided in Mecca from 1821 to 1824, where he is purported

---

[72] TNA: FO 881/848, Précis of Captain Pullen's Letter to the Secretary of the Admiralty, 25 June 1858; Consul Walne to Acting Consul-General Green, Cairo, 5 July 1858.

[73] Quoted in Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 147.

to have come under the influence of the militant Arabian reform movement of Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab (1703-1792). In his semiofficial history, *The Indian Musalmans* (1871), W.W. Hunter explicitly blamed Barelwi’s religio-political activism in North India as the inspiration behind the Sepoy Mutiny. Lacing his analysis with stereotypes and exaggerations, Hunter vividly described “Wahhabi” influence as a “chronic conspiracy” and a “standing rebel camp” threatening India’s frontiers and its internal security.[74] Although subsequent scholarship has proven that Wahhabism and the numerous nineteenth-century renewal and reform movements of India do not share a common ancestry, the terminology used to describe these groups was interchangeable from the perspective of colonial officials and an essential element of British fears concerning Indian contacts with the broader Islamic world.[75] As a consequence, Hunter’s readership was left to assume that external influences, rather than heavy-handed British policies, were the primary source for Muslim radicalism in India.

As colonial officials struggled to interpret the root causes of the Mutiny, they consistently chose to frame the rebellion as “an anthropological failure rather than as a political or economic event.” As Nicholas Dirks explains: “There was an explosion of ethnographic research, collection, and writing in the last decades of the nineteenth century, as the state sought to accumulate the knowledge necessary both to explain the

---

[74] W. W. Hunter, *The Indian Musalmans* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1871), 1, 11, 36; W. W. Hunter, *A Brief History of the Indian Peoples* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895), 222-229.

[75] Francis Robinson, *Islam and Muslim History in South Asia* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000), 188-189; William Roff, ed., “Islamic Movements: One or Many?,” in *Islam and the Political Economy of Meaning* (London: Croom and Helm, 1987), 31-52; Usha Sunyal, *Devotional Islam and Politics in British India: Ahmad Riza Khan and his Movement, 1870-1920* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996), 240-244.

occurrence of the rebellion and to assure that it would never happen again."[76] As Sayyid Ahmad Khan later explained in his famous counter to charges of Muslim disloyalty, "Government has not succeeded in acquainting itself with the daily habits, the modes of thought and of life, and likes, and dislikes and prejudices of the people."[77] By acquiring comprehensive ethnographic knowledge of Indian customs, religion, caste, and ethnic character, colonial officials believed that they could ultimately come to "know" the peoples and cultures of India and differentiate between loyal communities and those suspected of harboring fanatical tendencies. To do so, the government sought to systemize its production of ethnographic knowledge. Thus, in 1869 Hunter was appointed Director General of Statistics for the Government of India. He was tasked with visiting local governments to collect ethnographic works that had already been undertaken in order to draft a comprehensive plan for their compilation and publication in the form of provincial gazetteers. It was this transformation in the production of knowledge that marked the ultimate transition from the rule of East India Company to that of the British Crown. It signaled the birth of the "ethnographic state." The ethnographic state was driven by the conviction that India could be "ruled using anthropological knowledge to understand and control its subjects and to represent and legitimate its own mission."[78]

Despite Queen Victoria's 1858 proclamation of religious tolerance and non-interference declaring the end of aggressive missionary activity in India, the birth of the

---

[76] Nicholas Dirks, *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 148.

[77] Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, *History of the Bijnor Rebellion*, translated with notes and introduction by Hafeez Mallik and Morris Dembo (East Lansing: Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1972), 122-126, quoted in Dirks, *Castes of Mind*, 128.

[78] Dirks, *Castes of Mind*, 43-45.

ethnographic state would ultimately ensure that religion would constitute "the site of the colonial encounter."[79] Indeed, as the colonial state learned to "speak sharia" to its Muslim subjects, Islamic law and ritual would become both the tools as well as objects of colonial policing.[80] The colonial state's reliance on anthropology not only made it a consumer of such ethnographic knowledge pertaining to religion, increasingly this meant that the colonial state became the final arbiter of Islamic law and the protector of proper Islamic tradition and ritual. Thus, the notion that religion could genuinely be exempt from colonial interference was an unsustainable fiction because colonial officials so thoroughly conflated Islam with the causes of political subversion.[81]

In the immediate aftermath of the Mutiny and continued Muslim resistance, the British constructed their narrative of Muslim disloyalty around the notion of Wahhabi conspiracies. The "phantom" threat of Wahhabi plots sparked the so-called Wahhabi trials of the 1860s and early 1870s, which led to the transportation and exile of rebel leaders.[82] In this climate of fear, Muslim leaders accused of harboring jihadist sentiment were harassed and made to prove their loyalty. There were still those Muslim leaders

---

[79] Ussama Makdisi, *The Culture of Sectarianism: Community, History, and Violence in Nineteenth-Century Lebanon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 1-14; Wael B. Hallaq, *The Impossible State: Islam, Politics, and Modernity's Moral Predicament* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 98-138; Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 57-75.

[79] Dirks, *Castes of Mind*, 149-172

[80] Here, I refer to James Meyer's examination of how Tsarist Russian officials and Muslim subjects communicated social, economic, and political conflicts through the dominant political discourse of Islamic legal rhetoric. James H. Meyer, "Speaking Sharia to the State: Muslim Protesters, Tsarist Officials, and the Islamic Discourses of Late Imperial Russia," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 14, no. 3 (2013): 485-505.

[81] Dirks, *Castes of Mind*, 149-172.

[82] Julia Stephens, "The Phantom Wahhabi: Liberalism and the Muslim fanatic in mid-Victorian India," *Modern Asian Studies* 47, no. 1 (2013): 22-52.

who called for either jihad or *hijra*, citing Shah Abdul Aziz's famous *fatwa* of 1803, which declared British-controlled India to be *dar al-harb*.[83] However, British repression in the wake of the rebellion made it clear to most Indian Muslims that jihad was at best futile and at worst suicidal.[84] In tandem with the debate on whether or not Indian Muslims were religiously bound to wage war against non-Muslim government, the Crown's ethnographic approach to reestablishing social order came to the fore. As the debate unfolded, it became increasingly clear that the newly installed British Indian state would take up the tools of Islamic theology and law against its Muslim subjects. As the reality of British colonial rule set in, Indian discourse on jihad was reframed accordingly. A flood of *fatwas* challenged the validity of jihad, arguing that as long as Muslims were allowed to practice their religious duties without interference from the state, India could not be considered *dar al-harb*.[85]

In the post-Mutiny clamp down on Islamic resistance to British imperialism, direct confrontation with the British government became increasingly impractical. After 1857, Muslim intellectual discourse largely shifted from jihad to a pragmatic advocacy of principled accommodation to alien rule.[86] Many of those who refused to temper their dissent found themselves labeled by W.W. Hunter and the state's ethnographic apparatus as fanatics, outlaws, and fugitive mullahs. Some of these men were swept up in anti-Wahhabi show trials, while others were left to languish without trials in the penal archipelago of the Andaman Islands. The more fortunate were either deported or escaped

---

[83] Ayesha Jalal, *Partisans of Allah: Jihad in South Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 66-68.

[84] Özcan, *Pan-Islamism*, 19-20.

[85] Jalal, *Partisans of Allah*, 114-116, 136-139.

[86] Ibid., 176-177.

into exile in Afghanistan, Central Asia, Istanbul, the Ottoman Empire's Arab provinces, or the Hijaz.[87]

If, as Hunter suggested, Muslim anti-colonialism in India was subject to external influences from Arabia and the rest of the Islamic world, colonial officials also found it reasonable to assume that events in India might eventually have a similar impact on public opinion in the Hijaz, the Arabian Peninsula, and the wider Ottoman and Islamic worlds.[88] The Hijaz in particular accumulated a reputation among British officials as something of a haven for mutineers and murderers, placing them just beyond the reach of British surveillance and extradition. With the exception of Jidda, the Hijaz was, of course, forbidden to non-Muslims due to its sacred status. More importantly, Indian exiles seeking refuge in Mecca, Medina, or Taif also found shelter from British extradition because they became symbols of the Ottoman state's defense of its sovereignty over the Hijaz in the face of British extraterritoriality. Istanbul also came to understand the value of these men as inter-imperial middlemen.[89] Labeled convicts and outlaws by the British, to Muslim eyes these were often men of great religious authority and communal prestige, providing Ottoman officials in Istanbul with ready-made access to political influence over a variety Indian and Hadrami networks with tentacles stretching from the Hijaz and the wider Arabian Peninsula to India and Southeast Asia. Often these individuals became valued experts on India, the Hijaz, Yemen, the Red Sea, and the wider Indian Ocean. Thus, Istanbul's extension of official patronage to these

---

[87] Seema Alavi, "'Fugitive Mullahs and Outlawed Fanatics': Indian Muslims in nineteenth-century trans-Asiatic Imperial Rivalries," *Modern Asian Studies* 45, no. 6 (2011): 1337-1382; Özcan, *Pan-Islamism*, 18.

[88] Juan R. I. Cole, "Of Crowds and Empires: Afro-Asian Riots and European Expansion, 1857-1882," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31, no. 1 (1989): 106-133.

[89] Alavi, "Fugitive Mullahs and Outlawed Fanatics," 1338-1342.

figures allowed the Ottoman state to associate itself with their scholarly or evenly saintly credentials. They also provided a non-military means for the Ottoman state to subtly signal sympathy with Muslim resistance to European colonialism or to more aggressively disseminate anti-colonial propaganda across the Indian Ocean.

It was initially believed that one of these exiles was ultimately responsible for orchestrating the 1858 massacre of Jidda's Christian population. In the months following the violence in Jidda, British imaginings of an Indian connection ultimately coalesced around one personality, Sayyid Fadl bin 'Alawi (1824-1901).[90] Sayyid Fadl was born in Malabar to an elite Hadrami family. He was the son of Sayyid 'Alawi (1749-1843), who owing to his leadership in the 'Alawiyya *tariqa* had gained the status of a saint. His shrine at Mambram became a site of pilgrimage and a number of ceremonies related to the celebration of martyrdom and anti-colonial resistance. Following his father's death, Fadl used his family's status to mobilize Muslim peasants in violent protests against British land-tenure policies and the Hindu landlords they benefited.[91] In 1852 as a result of the so-called "Moplah Outrages," on the recommendations of the Malabar Commissioners, H.V. Conolly and Thomas Strange, Fadl was deported to the Hijaz. Later in 1855, Fadl was also accused of having orchestrated the murder of Conolly in revenge for his exile.[92]

---

[90] On the life and multiple careers of Sayyid Fadl bin Alawi, see Ş. Tufan Buzpınar, "Abdülhamid II and Sayyid Fadl Pasha of Hadramawt: An Arab Dignitary's Ambitions, 1876-1900," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 13 (1993): 227-239; Roger Allen, *Spies, Scandals and Sultans: Istanbul in the Twilight of the Ottoman Empire* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008), 141-142; Jacob, "Of Angels and Men," 40-73.

[91] Alavi, "'Fugitive Mullahs and Outlawed Fanatics': 1343-1344.

[92] Stephen Dale, *Islamic Society on the South Asian Frontier: The Mappilas of Malabar, 1498-1922* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1980).

As soon as Fadl arrived in the Hijaz, however, British authorities in India began to worry that the Hijaz actually lay at the heart of its interests. During 'Abd al-Muttalib's 1855-1856 revolt, consul Stephen Page, had raised the alarm in Aden and India that Fadl had "taken a very forward part in the bloody outbreak at Mecca" in resistance to the suppression of the slave trade. As Page warned prior to his murder in 1858, Fadl's influence was magnified by his proximity to Mecca and the hajj:

> I am convinced that his power for good or evil is rather increased than curtailed by his residence here, especially when it is borne in mind that we have at least some 2,000 pilgrims annually arriving from the Malabar Coast, all of who consider it incumbent on them to pay their respects to the Syed and receive his benediction; that the most unbounded confidence is placed in his words; that therefore any desire manifested by him would be almost certain to be carried out if possible on their return to their country….[93]

Page was also very much concerned by Fadl's 1853 visit to Istanbul, where he was reported to have been feted, given official recognition, and a stipend of 2,500 *kuruş* per month.[94] Thus, even as early as 1856, correspondence between India, Aden, and Jidda shows an increasing desire to have Fadl removed from the Hijaz. The acting magistrate of Malabar even recommended that the British Embassy in Istanbul should advocate for Fadl's removal to "Damascus, Broussa [Bursa], or elsewhere, where his conduct might be watched and his influence neutralized."[95]

Owing to these suspicions, during the investigations of the 1858 massacre Captain Pullen became fixated on the idea that Fadl must have played a leading role in the

---

[93] *Correspondence on Moplah Outrages for the Years, 1853-59*, vol. 2 (Madras: United Scottish Press, 1863), 390-392.

[94] Buzpınar, "Abdülhamid II and Sayyid Fadl Pasha of Hadramawt," 228-229. On Sayyid Fadl's first stay in Istanbul, his resettlement in the Hijaz, and the granting of his stipend, see also BOA, A. MKT. NZD, 68/90 (1 Ra 1269/13 December 1852); BOA, HR. MKT, 93/59 (7 Ra 1271/28 November 1854); BOA, MVL, 293/1 (17 N 1271/3 June 1855).

[95] *Correspondence on Moplah Outrages for the Years, 1853-59*, vol. 2, 386-388.

violence. During his investigations, the Political Agent at Aden, W.M. Coghlan, once again raised the issue:

> Since the massacre at Jeddah, Syud Fuzl [*sic*] has paid frequent visits to Mecca from Taif, where he habitually resides, an he has, as I now learn, in the most open manner expressed his hatred of the British, and inculcated the necessity of all true believers resist[ing] their authority, and exerting every means in their power to expel and destroy the Kafirs…
>
> I need not point out to you the danger of such conduct in a place like Mecca, where Mahometans from every part of our Eastern Possessions, flock in great numbers, and whence they return to their homes, imbued with the baneful doctrines they have acquired, and ready and willing to propagate them still further.

However, as Coghlan pointed out, the events in Jidda did present an opportunity to pressure Ottoman authorities into either surrendering Fadl to British authorities or to "deport him to some remote part of the Turkish dominions, where his evil influence will not be felt."[96]

Owing to Coghlan and Pullen's accusations that Sayyid Fadl had been one of the "chief instigators" of the violence at Jidda, the Foreign Office attempted to use the formation of the mixed tribunal at Jidda to kill two birds with one stone. Malmesbury instructed consul Walne to demand that Fadl be handed over so that he might be deported to Aden and dealt with by the Indian government. However, Malmesbury also wondered if there might not be sufficient evidence to prove that he had been privy to the conspiracy. If so, he recommended that Article 42 of the Capitulations be invoked. Thus, despite having exiled Fadl and branded him an outlaw, Malmesbury nevertheless considered him to be British subject and perhaps still within the reach of extraterritorial retribution. Malmesbury also makes it very clear that any proceedings against Fadl were to be a predetermined kangaroo court. If convicted, he recommended that Fadl be

[96] TNA: FO 881/848, W.M. Coghlan, Political Agent, Aden to Captain Pullen, enclosures 2-3 in no. 249, 21-23 October 1858, in 31 December 1859, pp. 174-175.

executed and that care be taken "that he is tried for the murder of someone whose friends will not accept blood-money [*diya*] in lieu of capital punishment." However, failing this outcome Malmesbury recommended that Walne insist on Fadl's removal "to some place situated in the Turkish dominions in Europe."[97]

As Consul Walne explained, however, there was simply no evidence incriminating Sayyid Fadl. Thus, Fadl's removal through Article 42 of the Capitulations was impossible. Nor was there any treaty of extradition through which he might be legally given up by Ottoman authorities for crimes committed outside of Ottoman territory. And as Mehmed Namık Paşa would inform Walne, Fadl's removal or forced expulsion could not possibly be achieved owing to his revered status in the Hijaz. To have attempted his removal would have caused enormous embarrassment to the Ottoman provincial government. However, the governor did suggest that "a simple invitation from the Sultan would probably suffice to induce that person to remove to Constantinople, where authorities could make such provision as to his future residence as would be satisfactory to the British Government."[98]

Although no proof of Sayyid Fadl's connection to the 1858 massacre in Jidda was ever uncovered, this did nothing to allay British anxieties. Sayyid Fadl would remain under British surveillance for decades and would repeatedly be denied permission to return to India. Although Fadl is perhaps most famous for his failed attempts to install himself as the ruler of Dhofar under Ottoman suzerainty in the late 1870s, in many

---

[97] TNA: FO 881/848, Earl of Malmesbury, Foreign Office to Consul Walne, Jidda, 25 November 1858.

[98] TNA: FO 881/848, Consul Walne, Jidda to the Earl of Malmesbury, Foreign Office, 31 January 1859. On Mehmed Namık Paşa's suggestion that Sayyid Fadl be summoned to Istanbul, see also BOA, A. MKT. MHM, 148/34 "Hindistan havalisinde Melbar ahalisinden olup Mekke-i Mükerreme'de ikamet eden Seyyid Fazıl Efendi'nin Dersaadet'e celbi hakkında görüş bildirilmesi" (1 Ca 1275/7 December 1858).

respects Mehmed Namık's suggestion that Sayyid Fadl be placed under Ottoman surveillance in Istanbul ultimately did come to pass. From 1880 onward, concerned that he might provoke a dangerous confrontation with British authorities, Abdülhamid kept Sayyid Fadl in Istanbul as an honored guest and occasional advisor on the questions related to the Hijaz, Yemen, Oman, and the Indian Ocean. This, of course, only served to contribute to his legend and further stoke British imaginings of his role in Abdülhamid's supposed Pan-Islamic cabal.[99] In this way, Sayyid Fadl, however accidentally, may ultimately have been the man most responsible for Britain's escalating obsession with the political surveillance of the hajj.

As the events surrounding the 1858 violence in Jidda became entangled and fused with semi-legendary narratives of the Mutiny in the minds of British officials serving in Jidda and India, both the Hijaz and the trans-oceanic process of making the hajj became identified as liminal spaces of colonial disorder and the most likely conduits for the spread anticolonial radicalism. As a result, it became apparent to colonial administrators from India to Aden that the policing of "dangerous" mobilities and potential security threats would not remain confined to the Indian subcontinent. Rather, surveillance would take on trans-regional and exterritorial dimensions. Neither Indian exiles nor the pilgrims with whom they came into contact would be left unmonitored.

In addition to the more nebulous fear of Indian exiles in the Hijaz, by the 1870s Austen Henry Layard, the British ambassador at Istanbul, and Lord Lytton, the viceroy of India, also began to worry that pro-Ottoman sentiment in India could be directed against the British in the event of a future deterioration of relations between London and Istanbul. In the decades between the Crimean War and the Russo-Ottoman War, Anglo-

[99] Buzpınar, "Abdülhamid II and Sayyid Fadl Pasha of Hadramawt," 238.

Ottoman relations were strongly aligned against Russia. On multiple occasions the British had actively encouraged pro-Ottoman sympathies in order to either bolster their own legitimacy or check Russian advances in Central Asia. As Lytton worried, however, "If either by pressure of public opinion at home, or political difficulty abroad, Your Majesty's Government should be forced into a policy of prominent aggression upon Turkey, I am inclined to think that a Muhammedan rising in India is among the contingencies we may have to face." Of course, Lyttton's worst fears would ultimately come true. When Russia invaded Ottoman territory in 1877 Britain did nothing to safeguard Ottoman sovereignty and territorial integrity. At this point Britain was no longer able to tout itself to Indian Muslims as the Sultan's staunch ally and protector. As a result of this anti-Ottoman turn in British foreign policy, even previously loyal Muslims became disillusioned and began to question why British support for he Ottoman Empire, considered sacrosanct in the 1850s, had abruptly ended during the 1870s. Undoubtedly, this sense of disillusionment led a great number of Indian Muslims back into the political arena, particularly into the embrace of Pan-Islam.[100]

Just as Lytton predicted, the deterioration in Anglo-Ottoman relations did inflame Muslim sentiment in India. In an attempt to square older concerns over Indian exiles in the Hijaz with newer concerns over Ottoman-sponsored Pan-Islam, Layard and his contemporaries eagerly embraced rather fanciful connections. As Layard once again warned in 1877, "ex-mutineer Indians at Mecca were in communication with the Porte

[100] M. Naeem Qureshi, *Pan-Islam in British Indian Politics: A Study of the Khilafat Movement, 1918-1924* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 20-25, 29.

and that through them the Ottomans could make an attempt to bring about a rising in India."[101]

This layered co-mingling of diplomatic and diasporic threats in the imaginations of colonial functionaries and consular authorities painted the hajj as something akin to an annual conference on Muslim resistance. In 1879, James Zohrab, the British consul in Jidda, wrote the following:

> The province of the Hedjaz is the centre to which the ideas, opinions, sentiments and aspirations of the Mussulman world are brought for discussion. The annual meeting at a fixed time ostensibly for the purposes of the Pilgrimage of Representatives from every Mussulman Community affords a means without creating suspicion to exchange opinions, to discuss plans, to criticize the actions of the European Governments and form combinations to resist the supremacy of the Christian Powers.[102]

As Layard and Zohrab's comments so vividly illustrate, by 1880 British officials had become convinced that more systematic intelligence gathering on pilgrimage-related activities was a necessity. However, those same officials were constrained by Queen Victoria's famous 1858 proclamation of religious tolerance and noninterference, which sought to allay both Hindu and Muslim fears that post-Mutiny India would be subject to aggressive Christian missionary activities. It was against these guarantees that British authorities had to weigh the need for greater political surveillance both in India and the Hijaz. Any governmental intrusions that could be perceived as an affront to the sanctity of the hajj or the religious freedom of India Muslims carried the possibility of a violent backlash.

---

[101] Özcan, *Pan-Islamism,* 90-93.

[102] TNA: FO 685/1, "Report on the establishment required to carry on the duty of Her Majesty's Consulate at Jeddah," in James Zohrab's Letter Book, September 1879, p. 442, cited in F.E. Peters, *Mecca: A Literary History of the Holy Land* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 340. It is worth noting that Zohrab's assessment foreshadowed Britain's long-term position on the matter. His comments are virtually identical to the passages from the 1919 Foreign Office handbook on the "Pan-Islamic Movement." TNA: FO 373/5/6, "The Rise of Islam and the Caliphate and the Pan-Islamic Movement," January 1919, p. 60.

The Union Jack over Mecca: Dr. Abdur Razzack and the Advent of the Muslim Vice-Consulate

Despite the perceived political and epidemiological threats now associated with it, officials deemed it too risky to overtly discourage Muslims form undertaking the hajj. Instead, Britain opted for a strategy of increased surveillance activities, in terms of both public health and politico-religious machinations. Following this logic, Zohrab recommended in 1879 that "in order to thoroughly sift the questions of aid and protection to pilgrims" the entire experience must be understood. Furthermore, "to do this effectively it is in my opinion necessary that a Confidential Agent of the consulate be sent to watch and follow this year's pilgrimage."[103] The British ambassador in Istanbul proposed in June of 1880 that the Indian government employ Muslim secret agents to infiltrate the holy cities. Although Layard's plan was rebuffed at the time, British agents at Aden, Istanbul, and Jidda were charged with monitoring Ottoman propaganda efforts. In the meantime, British intelligence continued to receive reports of Ottoman intrigues from French and Dutch sources as well as its own. At this point, all of the colonial powers were becoming increasingly suspicious of Muslim radicalism transmitted via the hajj. As a result of this common interest, in December 1880 the Dutch Foreign Minister proposed to Layard a program of intelligence sharing and political surveillance related to pilgrims traveling from India and Southeast Asia to Mecca.[104]

In September 1881, Lord Dufferin revived Layard's suggestions, arguing for the appointment of a "secret paid agent residing in Mecca." As it turned out, the ideal man for Dufferin's proposed "secret agent" was already at work in the region. In 1878, the

---

[103] Quoted in Peters, *Mecca*, 340-342.

[104] Özcan, *Pan-Islamism,* 90-93.

government of British India attached Dr. Abdur Razzack, assistant surgeon of the Bengal Medical Service, to accompany that year's pilgrimage from India. Dr. Abdur Razzack's appointment was made in the context of growing administrative and diplomatic questions associated with the repeated outbreaks of cholera in the Hijaz, the general welfare of pilgrims, the overcrowding on vessels carrying pilgrims, and the rising numbers of indigent pilgrims. Abdur Razzack was to report on the sanitary conditions of the hajj, a task he performed successfully in March 1879.

In light of the political concerns raised by Zohrab, Layard, and then Dufferin, however, in 1882 Abdur Razzack was chosen as the best candidate for a permanent program of political-surveillance activities in Mecca and the Hijaz. Abdur Razzack was said to be "an excellent man" and "altogether separated from the Delhi and Wahhabi schools… clever and ambitious." Although Abdur Razzack's primary duties were to assist Her Majesty's Muslim subjects, promote the health and comfort of pilgrims, and protect them in their dealings with Ottoman officialdom, he was also instructed that the consul in Jidda "may wish to avail himself of your assistance in obtaining trustworthy information regarding the course of affairs, and of public opinion, in Mecca and neighboring places." As Abdur Razzack pointed out in reply, he would need to frequently visit Mecca and to obtain such information, to take a house there to avoid arousing suspicion, and to have an allowance that would permit him "to give some small presents to some of the religious heads."[105]

In the end, Abdur Razzack would not remain a covert agent. Rather, in 1882 he was appointed as the Jidda consulate's first Indian Muslim vice-consul. Since Christian functionaries were unable to travel beyond Jidda to attend to the affairs of British subjects

[105] Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 147-148; Peters, *Mecca*, 340-342.

in Mecca, Abdur Razzack's status as a Muslim was meant to circumvent Ottoman objections to the extension of British consular representation to Mecca. This way Abdur Razzack could openly attend to public health questions and assist pilgrims, while also gathering intelligence and securing greater British influence in Mecca. In addition to securing Ottoman recognition for their Indian Muslim vice-consul, British authorities also hoped to secure permission for the consulate's *tercüman* (*dragoman* or translator), Yusuf Kudzi (Qudsi or Kudüslü) to act as a second officially sanctioned consular agent in Mecca.[106] They even believed that it might be possible to either have them reside there permanently or at least during hajj seasons.

In February 1881, Kudzi had travelled to Mecca at the request of consul Zohrab. However, he was expelled and sent back to Jidda by Sharif 'Abd al-Muttalib, who accused him of attempting to meddle "matters involving the internal politics" of the Amirate.[107] Upon learning of the incident, Zohrab pleaded the vital importance of maintaining the consulate's "right to send Mussulman employees" to Mecca. While the consul acknowledged the formal legal limits of British consular authority granted by *ferman* and *berat*, at the same time, he begins to sketch out the gray areas of informal precedent through which British claims on extraterritorial authority over Mecca would be advanced in the future:

> It is quite true that the Firmans recognize Consuls as being appointed only at Jeddah, but as no Grand Sheriff has hitherto thought of restricting their action and they have invariably received the agents sent to Mecca with courtesy and respect. They denied the right of Consuls to exercise jurisdiction in the holy cities *but they permitted it by*

[106] BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 4/72 (5 Za 1298/29 September 1881).

[107] BOA, Y. PRK. UM 4/37, "İngiliz Konsolosluğu'nun Mekke'deki tercümanı olan Yusuf Kutsi'nin [*sic*] Mekke Emareti'nin emriyle şehirden çıkarılmasının sebebinin bildirilmesi. Mekke Emareti'nin dahili işlerde yaptığı tasarruflarda ancak Babıali'ye açıklamada bulunabileceği ve hesap verebileceği" (13 Ra 1298/13 February 1881).

courtesy.

Here, the consul lays out the crux of an argument that both British and Ottoman authorities would continue to circle around all the way up to World War I. As he puts it, the use of Muslim agents in Mecca was a "question of whether precedent has not established the right."[108] Fearing that precedent would indeed become a right, Osman Nuri Paşa heartily supported 'Abd al-Muttalib's curt rebuff to the consulate's inquiries, reminding Zohrab that "all subjects which regard the interior policy of the Grand Sheriffate can only be rendered to the Sublime Porte."[109] In an odd twist, Osman Nuri, the man who was simultaneously attempting to dismantle the Sharifate of Mecca, would also come to appreciate the utility of defending the "internal" sovereignty of the Sharifate and deploy it as a strategic buffer against the European consulates' use of Muslim agents to extend extraterritorial protection to Mecca.

Osman Nuri immediately recognized the danger presented by Muslim consular agents having unfettered access to Mecca. As he made clear in his response to the *ferman* approving Abdur Razzack's appointment, he feared that the prolonged presence of British consular representatives in Mecca would inevitably set the stage for the opening of a full-fledged British consulate there, leading inexorably toward an ever-expanding threat of British espionage and political subversion.[110] Osman Nuri also emphasized how Abdur Razzack's appointment had agitated local public opinion. As the governor put it, the locals had taken to saying that once a Muslim consul is allowed in

[108] TNA: FO 195/375, Consul J.N.E. Zohrab to Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, 17 February 1881.

[109] TNA: FO 195/375, English translation of 'Abd al-Muttalib's reply, undated.

[110] TNA: FO 195/1415, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Acting Consul, Jidda to Lord Dufferin, 9 November 1882.

Mecca, inevitably the "the flag will be unfurled" (*bayrak açılacak*).[111] While the specter of the Union Jack being raised over Mecca might have been a bit of hyperbole, as Osman Nuri well knew, the legal consequences would be all too real. As the governor feared, once the British had established this precedent, all the other European powers would soon demand Muslim consular representation in Mecca as well.[112]

As it turned out, Osman Nuri's concerns proved prescient. During the process of Abdur Razzack's confirmation by the Ottomans, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Britain's acting consul at the time, cautioned Lord Dufferin that the British embassy should take care not to do anything to confirm Osman Nuri's suspicions:

> There is an evident objection on the part of the Vali, civilly and indirectly, but plainly expressed, to see the Jeddah Consulate supplemented by an officer who, with a Mussulman's right of visiting Mecca, has the opportunity of obtaining some increased influence there for Her Majesty's Government. I think there would be no advantage in giving this objection a warranty from the Turkish point of view, and that, having already the sympathies of some of the best of the religious authorities, and very considerable opportunities of adding to the strength of our position imperceptibly and without causing alarm, *we should for the present be content with the recognition of Dr. Abdool Razzack as Vice-Consul at Jeddah without any special reference to his right of protecting Her Majesty's Mussulman subjects elsewhere*.[113]

Moncrieff's comments provide a concise statement of Britain's strategy for expanding its extraterritorial influence via its newly appointed Muslim vice-consul. They also reveal the original terms of the Ottoman state's assent to such a representative. As Moncrieff's analysis makes clear, the Ottomans had not agreed to allow Britain's Muslim vice-consul any extraterritorial rights of protection or capitulatory interference in Mecca's judicial affairs. Yet, his statements accurately predicted a patient, stealthy enveloping of Mecca

---

[111] BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 5/80 (25 R 1300/5 March 1883).

[112] TNA: FO 195/1415, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Acting Consul, Jidda to Lord Dufferin, 9 November 1882.

[113] TNA: FO 539/21, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Acting Consul, Jidda to Lord Granville, no. 238, 15 November 1882; Moncrieeff to Lord Dufferin, inclosure in no. 238, 9 November 1882.

within the framework of the Capitulations. Indeed, this was precisely how well-informed Ottoman observers had come to view the presence of European consulates in Jidda. As Eyüp Sabri Paşa complains in his encyclopedic study of the holy places, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, while the growth of European consulates was ostensibly dedicated to managing the affairs of pilgrims hailing from Islamic countries under colonial rule, in his estimation the consulates had come to more closely resemble an intelligence operation.[114]

'The Consul of the Christians cannot help you': Two Indian Ladies, an Illicit Affair, and Public Morality as Proxy War

As Britain expanded its consular presence, over the course of the 1880s, a series of court cases involving Indian Muslims arrested or accused of crimes in Mecca placed the legal status of the Hijaz under a new level of scrutiny, producing a host of irreconcilable conflicts with international implications. The British Foreign Office repeatedly claimed that under Article 42 of the Capitulations, Britain's Indian Muslim subjects residing in Mecca or making the hajj had the right to be tried by a mixed tribunal in the presence of a consular officer or translator.[115] From the Foreign Office's perspective, Article 42 applied to the entirety of the Ottoman Empire and contained "no provision to except the Hedjaz or the holy cities from their stipulations."[116]

As early as 1861, the Ottomans had already begun to anticipate this very situation. In correspondence between provincial officials and the Special Council of Ministers

---

[114] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Bahriye Matbaası, 1301/1883), 51.

[115] Article 42 of the Capitulations: "That in case any Englishman, or other person navigating under their flag, should happen to commit manslaughter, or any other crime, or be thereby involved in a law-suit, the Governors in our sacred dominions shall not proceed to the cause until the Ambassador or Consul shall be present; but they shall hear and decided it together, without their presuming to give them any the least molestation, by hear it alone, contrary to the Holy Law and these Capitulations." TNA: FO 424/159, "Correspondence respecting the Interpretation of Article 42 of the English Capitulatons of 1675," May 1889, pp. 2, 16-17, 19-20, 22-23.

[116] Ibid., p.22.

(*Meclis-i Mahsus-ı Vükela*), the status of foreign *mücavirin* raised the vexed question of consular protection. As the ministers' response reveals, the highest levels of the Ottoman government understood the intractable nature of the problem. In light of the sacred status of the two holy cities, it was decided that the recognition of "foreign protection" (*himaye-i ecnebiye*) could not be deemed "legally permissible" (*tecviz*). At the same time, however, since the individuals concerned were Indian and Jawi subjects "in light of the requirements of international law it would not be feasible to not recognize [their] nationality at all" (*tabiiyeti hiç tanınmaması hukuk-i düveliye iktizasınca kabil olmayacağına mebni*). Owing to this conundrum, it was recommended that every effort should be made to overcome this problem as amicably as possible. At this stage the Council also seemed to have realized that the autonomous status of the holy cities could be used to deflect and circumvent the internationally binding requirements of the Capitulations and prevent the application of foreign protection beyond Jidda. They argued that since there were no mixed courts in the holy cities all cases involving non-Ottoman *mücavirin* should be handled in the courts of Mecca and Medina according to the procedures of the shari'a law.[117]

In 1883-1884, this Ottoman attempt to use the Sharifate's autonomy and the Hijaz's multi-layered sovereignty as a shield against consular interference would be put to the test. In March 1883, a British Indian subject named Abdul Aziz was arrested and imprisoned in Mecca. When the British consulate made inquiries on his behalf, citing instructions from the Ministry of the Interior (*Dahiliye Nezareti*), Osman Nuri argued that the Hijaz and the holy cities were, in fact, exempted from the Capitulations. Therefore, Indian subjects accused of a crime or imprisoned in Mecca could not avail themselves of

[117] BOA, A. MKT. UM, 511/80 (25 R 1278/30 September 1861).

consular protection, the presence of a translator, or be assured of being tried by a mixed tribunal. Here, Osman Nuri echoed the 1861 decision almost verbatim, explaining that "all foreigners who are in Mecca the Holy, whatever may be there nationality, and whether they are permanent residents, or stopping there temporarily, on the occasion of any claim made by or against them…" the case would be tried in the shari'a courts.[118]

However, "after much consideration" Osman Nuri eventually relented and allowed the British consulate to send Yusuf Kudzi to Mecca to assist in the proceedings and eventually secure Abdul Aziz's release. Although Osman Nuri and his superiors had firmly objected to the practice, they had attempted to find a *modus vivendi* through which cases of this nature could be expedited without risking further interference. From the British perspective, however, even this limited form of cooperation constituted a legal precedent establishing their future right to extend consular protection to British subjects resident in Mecca.[119]

As it turned out, the rather more amicable Abdul Aziz case was the prelude to an altogether more delicate and explosive affair in 1884. Not unlike the case of the *Irani*, which had ended in violence in 1858, the events that unfolded between September and November 1884 would also revolve around a complicated struggle over inheritance, real estate, and power of attorney, placing members of the Indian diasporic community in Mecca on opposite sides of the Anglo-Ottoman/Jidda-Mecca jurisdictional divide. Some twenty years prior, a wealthy British Indian subject, one Hajji Ibrahim 'Abd al-Sattar (Abdus Sattar in the English rendering), died in Mecca, leaving behind a wife and

---

[118] TNA: FO 195/1610, Cecil G. Wood, Consul, Jidda to Sir William A. White, Ambassador, Istanbul, inclosure no. 20 in no. 30, 14 December 1888.

[119] TNA: FO 424/159, "Correspondence respecting the Interpretation of Article 42 of the English Capitulatons of 1675," May 1889, pp. 16, 19-20.

daughter. Ibrahim ‘Abd al-Sattar’s will left the care of his family and considerable estate in the hands of Hussein Abdullah. Shortly before his death, Hussein Abdullah and the widow ‘Abd al-Sattar and her daughter transferred control of their cash and shops to a certain Abdul Wahed Yunis, a British Indian subject. According to British reports, Abdel Wahed Yunis in addition to being a wealthy merchant was also engaged in a number of large-scale financial transactions with Osman Nuri. In 1883, Abdul Wahed went away to Calcutta on business, leaving his son, Abdullah, in charge of his and by extension the ‘Abd al-Sattar family’s affairs.

At the time, Abdul Wahed had in his employ four brothers of the Zackaria family, all British Indian subjects. In his father’s absence, Abdullah went to Hudayda to check into one of the family’s business concerns. Upon arriving there, however, he had a falling out with the Zackaria brother managing the Hudayda operations. Upon his return, owing to his influence with Osman Nuri, Abdullah succeeded in having Zackaria arrested in Hudayda and conveyed to Aden. In the wake of their brother’s arrest, the remaining Zackaria brothers resigned from the service of the Abdul Wahed family. Two of the brothers remained in the Hijaz, Eyub Zackaria in Mecca and Cassim Zackaria in Jidda.

Meanwhile, the ‘Abd al-Sattar ladies had a disagreement with Abdullah Abdul Wahed Yunis and threatened to withdraw their money from his management. As it happened, the ‘Abd al-Sattars rented a flat from Eyub Zackaria and lived on the floor above his family. Allegedly, this connection made Abdullah suspect Eyub Zackaria of influencing the widow ‘Abd al-Sattar into transferring her estate to his care. Owing to these suspicions and his ongoing feud with the Zackaria brothers, Abdullah proceeded to

level shocking accusations of immoral and illicit sexual affairs between Eyub Zackaria and the ‘Abd al-Sattar women.[120]

As British consular authorities would discover during the Eyub Zackaria’s deposition, acting on these suspicions the governor had forbidden Zackaria from escorting the ‘Abd al-Sattar family on hajj, as was his family’s custom. He had also ordered Zackaria to discontinue living in the same building. Although Zackaria complied with the governor’s instructions relating to the hajj, for obvious reasons he refused to remove himself and his family from their home. As a result, he was summoned to the government offices, where he learned that Osman Nuri had decided to expel him from Mecca. As Zackaria claimed, the governor’s “ear had been poisoned against me” by his business associate, Abdullah. As the widow ‘Abd al-Sattar confirmed, during a stormy encounter with her agent, Abdullah warned her that he would have Osman Nuri expel Zackaria from Mecca if she did comply with his demands.[121]

When Eyub Zackaria informed the consulate of the situation, Osman Nuri confirmed that he had banished Zackaria from Mecca. According to Osman Nuri, Zackaria stood accused of “maintaining illicit relations with the two ladies, both mother and daughter.” As a flabbergasted consul Jago would write, this was “a most monstrous accusation in itself.” As he fumed, from the evidence gathered from the Indian Muslim communities in Mecca and Jidda, until their dispute with their agent “not a breath of suspicion had ever clouded their fair fame.” And as he tried to wrap his mind around the accusation, he noted that even as the case exploded into scandal only the most “foul-

[120] TNA: FO 195/1482, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Her Majesty’s Chargé d’Affaires, Istanbul, 4 November 1884; TNA: FO 195/1514, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Her Majesty’s Chargé d’Affaires, Istanbul, 20 March 1885.

[121] TNA: FO 195/1514, “Deposition of Eyub Zackaria,” Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda, 22 October 1884.

mouthed" among the Indian Muslim community "sought to attribute immorality to the mother," only to the more eligible 24 year-old daughter. To support his contention, in a rather humorous (if misogynistic) moment of bemusement, Jago declared that the mother's "age [only 40] and appearance necessarily precluded any such accusation."

Setting aside the question of the widow 'Abd al-Sattar's desirability, if Jago was unprepared to accept the first round of accusations, the second would only further strain credulity. Upon hearing Eyub Zackaria's plight, the consulate had sent Cassim Zackaria to Mecca to retrieve his brother's family and goods from his home. After his long ride from Jidda, Cassim went directly to his brother's shop on the ground floor of the building. However, it was not long before a policeman entered and ordered him to leave the building. It was at this point that Cassim Zackaria was also accused of "immorality with the ladies."[122]

As a result of this even more bizarre plot twist, Osman Nuri, who had previously favored the exile of the 'Abd al-Sattar women from Mecca, reversed his opinion. As he explained, the removal of the ladies to Jidda was deemed an undesirable threat to the "peace and morality" on the grounds of their possible contact with the brothers Zackaria.[123] As the British consulate complained, at first Osman Nuri had called for the banishment of the 'Abd al-Sattar women from Mecca and their departure for India on the first available steamer. However, owing to the alleged influence of Abdullah, "he invokes the same Law in aid of his prolonged detention of them." As Osman Nuri made clear, he was determined "for the good of the Moslem religion and to prevent

[122] TNA: FO 195/1514, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, Istanbul, 20 March 1885.

[123] Ibid.

disturbances" to hold the two women under house arrest until he had secured the consulate's agreement to exile the Zackaria brothers and the 'Abd al-Sattars from Jidda.[124]

And with that, the ladies 'Abd al-Sattar found themselves detained in Mecca in a legal no-man's land. As the British consulate inferred, Osman Nuri's determination to hold the women in Mecca was a pointed demonstration of his stated policy that even those Indians registered as British subjects with the Jidda consulate would be considered subject to Ottoman jurisdiction and shari'a-court justice while resident in Mecca.[125] Thus, in this environment the financial and sexual coercion of Amna 'Abd al-Sattar and her daughter would devolve into a proxy war in the emerging battle over the jurisdictional status of Mecca between the energetic centralization of Osman Nuri Paşa and the British consulate's attempt to dress consular authority and the Capitulations in the pilgrim's garb of its Muslim agents.

After her eventual release from Mecca in November 1884, Amna 'Abd al-Sattar offered the following account of her harrowing ordeal:

> Before Abdul Wahed left Mecca for Calcutta I asked him about money and he told me that his son Abdullah would give me money when he was away. He then gave me a letter to Abdullah, which I have still unopened and said he had told him to pay me. After his departure Abdullah gave me $500. Later I asked for more and he refused me…. I asked Abdullah several times for money and he refused, saying he would damage my character and he much insulted me. He said: "you shall only go to the Haj with me." I replied that I would go with the person I had gone every year. He said "you are a bad woman," and he used such insulting words to my daughter that I dare not repeat them. I then decided not to go to the Haj at all, and I did not go. He threatened me again because I would not go with him to the Haj and he used shocking language to me. I then forbade him my house, but he came again, and being refused

[124] TNA: FO 195/1482, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, Istanbul, 4 November 1884.

[125] TNA: FO 195/1482, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, Istanbul, 4 November 1884.

> entrance forced his way in, and threatened me, abusing my honour and character. The day after Eyoub Zackaria was exiled from Mecca, he, Abdullah, came to me with Mohamed Saleh, Zackaria Nutto, and Mousa Ali Mohamed and threatened to take my daughter away by force and marry her to himself; and they all abused me most unjustly. Abdullah said: "I will put men at your door and then who will help you."[126]

In response to Abdullah's threats, Amna 'Abd al-Sattar defiantly replied: "God and the Consul." Setting aside whether or not this dialogue might well have been the invention of consul Jago or vice-consul Abdur Razzack's translation from Hindustani, it certainly underscores the fact that the fate of these two women was entangled in a much larger Anglo-Ottoman legal dispute. In response to the widow's invocation of consular protection, Abdullah exploded. As 'Abd al-Sattar recounts, Abdullah "caught me forcibly by the hand" and warned: "the Consul of the Christians cannot help you." When 'Abd al-Sattar replied that she was a British subject, Abdullah was unfazed and said: "I have the power and will keep you in Mecca." He then demanded that the widow move into a house near him, which he said he had already taken specifically for her. When she refused his advance, he said that he would "take" her "by force." Then Abdullah warned that if she refused to obey him, he would have her exiled from Mecca just as he had done to Eyub Zackaria. He also promised that he would post police at her door.[127] Shortly after this confrontation two guards were placed at her door. One of the two men sent to threaten the 'Abd al-Sattar was Mohammed Saleh, a British Indian who had recently taken up Ottoman subjecthood. He was the nephew of the widow and a rejected suitor of her daughter. As the consulate theorized, his desire to marry the daughter by any means necessary was merely a rouse to strip them of their estate. If he were to succeed in

[126] TNA: FO 195/1482, "Deposition of Amna, widow of the late Hadji Ibrahim Abdus Sattar," Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda, 9 November 1884.

[127] Ibid.

forcing a marriage with the daughter, according to the consulate he would have been "entitled by Moslem law to three fourths of the entire property."[128]

When Amna 'Abd al-Sattar stated her intention to leave Mecca and seek the protection of the British consulate in Jidda, Abdullah and his coconspirators petitioned the shari'a courts to prevent their departure. As a result of the petition, a *fatwa* was secured prohibiting the women from departing Mecca except under the protection of a *mahrem* (a legally acceptable male guardian, generally a unmarriageable relative), dramatically narrowing the possibility of their escape. As the situation grew worse, the consul hatched a plot to rescue the two women from their house arrest. Jago instructed the *tercüman*, Yusuf Kudzi, to locate someone who could be put forward as a suitable *mahrem*. The only man that Kudzi could find to meet the legal conditions required to serve as the ladies' guardian was a cousin by the name of Habib Omar. As Jago admitted, he instructed Kudzi to secure the man's cooperation "by fair or foul means." Habib Omar, although initially on the side of the 'Abd al-Sattar ladies' captors, was tricked into cooperation with the consulate's scheme by Yusuf Kudzi, who held out the false promise that he would be given the disputed power of attorney over the 'Abd al-Sattar's assets in the event of their success. With Habib Omar in toe, Kudzi was able to successfully able to secure Osman Nuri's permission to extricate the women from their persecutors.

Upon their arrival in Jidda, the widow declared her intention to secure a new agent from her relatives in Bombay. However, as the consulate feared, her assets were likely a lost cause. Both in Calcutta and Mecca, Abdul Wahed Yunis and his son had

[128] TNA: FO 195/1482, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, Istanbul, 4 November 1884.

signaled their intention to use Mecca's jurisdictional exceptionalism to hold onto the widow 'Abd al-Sattar's property. For her part, the Amna 'Abd al-Sattar was most aggrieved by the damage done to her and her daughter's character. Indeed, the Indian gentlemen whose family had taken in the exiled women worried that the "constant strain and persecution" might very well induce the daughter to commit suicide.[129]

The 'Abd al-Sattar's tattered lives represented the human cost in the clash between Ottoman sovereignty and British extraterritoriality. The tragic outcome of this case raised serious questions about the future position of vulnerable British subjects, such as widows and orphans. It was also an indication of the growing determination on the part of the Ottoman state keep (or pry) the Hijaz's real estate and wealth out of the hands of any non-Ottoman Muslims who might wish to avail themselves of consular protection.

Despite Osman Nuri's firm objections to the presence of Muslim consular agents in Mecca, in the British recording of events even Yusuf Kudzi's limited role in the 'Abd al-Sattar case would repeatedly be sighted as legal precedent. As a result, Osman Nuri and his successors would find themselves fighting a protracted battle to shelter Mecca from the Capitulations. In 1888, when a case against an Indian accused of assault arose, frustrated by the governor's spirited defense of the principals enshrined by Osman Nuri, the Foreign Office accused the governor of merely "pretending that the Capitulations did not apply to the Holy Cities." However, when the issue was brought to the level of the Grand Vizier, he concurred with the precedent set by Osman Nuri, arguing that the Hijaz was not included in the Capitulations.[130] Although it is patently clear that British Muslim

[129] TNA: FO 195/1514, Consul T.S. Jago, Jidda to Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, Istanbul, 20 March 1885.

agents would continue serve as the go-betweens and fixers in this fraught relationship, Osman Nuri's defense against the Capitulations was to remain the official position of the Ottoman state throughout its remaining decades.

Courteous Procedures Unknown to International Law

This protracted stalemate over protection, Muslim consular agents, and the status of British Muslim subjects in the Hijaz dragged on until the very end of Ottoman rule in Arabia. In 1910, four British subjects were tried and convicted of assault in Mecca. As the British Embassy once again complained, the "local authorities appear to have been guided in this case by the theory that the principles that apply to British subjects by virtue of the Capitulations do not apply to subjects in cases where they find themselves resident in the Holy Cities." Again, the British claimed that Ottoman provincial authorities in the Hijaz had knowingly refused consular representation to their subjects and blatantly violated the terms of the Capitulations. The embassy communiqué goes on to claim that the authorities at the Sublime Porte "do not hesitate to admit" that no "exception of this sort" has ever been established, "neither through the text of the treaties in question nor through any subsequent agreement." The Embassy's complaint also points out that Istanbul had already "recognized more than one time that British subjects who find themselves in the Holy Cities have the right of protection from the Consulate of His Majesty in Jidda."[131] Here, the document presents precedents from 1884, 1888, and 1896 when the Jidda consulate's translator had been allowed to act on behalf of British subjects

---

[130] TNA: FO 424/159, "Correspondence respecting the Interpretation of Article 42 of the English Capitulatons of 1675," May 1889, p 16.

[131] BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/7 (28 Z 1328/31 December 1910).

held in Mecca.[132] In light of these precedents, the British Embassy insisted on the enforcement of "the principle of the Capitulations," which "ought to apply to the Holy Cities just as the other parts of the Ottoman Empire." Thus, they argued that in future cases, "a Muslim representative of His Majesty's Consulate in Jidda" should always be invited "to assist in all of the proceedings" and be allowed to act in the "capacity of the Consular Authorities."[133]

The complaint was referred to the Office of Legal Counsel (*Hukuk Müşavirlği İstişare Odası*).[134] In response, the Office of Legal Counsel's files on the status of the "Capitulations in the Hijaz" (*Hicaz'da imtiyazat-ı ecnebiye*) spelled out what might be regarded as the empire's final position on the matter. As the empire's most senior international legal experts reiterated, although it had long been the practice of the local Ottoman government to assist the consulates of European states in Jidda with questions pertaining to their subjects in Mecca and Medina, such assistance was given as a matter of "courteous procedure" (*muamele-i hatırşinasane*) and was undertaken in a strictly "non-official" (*gayri resmiye*) capacity at the discretion of the provincial government. While they acknowledged that it had become customary for some Muslim officials of the consulates, such as the vice-consul or the dragoman, to visit Mecca during hajj season in order to attend to the "civil and criminal" (*hukuk ve ceza*) affairs of their respective subjects, they made clear that the Ottoman government considered such individuals as

---

[132] For the precedents supporting Britain's claims, see also BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/8 (8 C 1329/6 June 1911); BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/11 (27 M 1330/17 January 1912).

[133] BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/7 (28 Z 1328/31 December 1910).

[134] Founded in 1883, this consultative body, attached to the Foreign Ministry (*Hariciye Nezareti*), was staffed with experts capable of moving between Ottoman and international legal concepts. Their mandate was to issue legal opinions advising the government on how best to minimize threats posed by foreign states and their subjects to the empire's juridical rights and political sovereignty. *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi*, 381-382; Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, 260, 322-33.

acting "in a private capacity" (*suret-i hususiye'de*). As a result of this conceptual distinction, these British representatives were not regarded as officially sanctioned consular agents. To emphasize this distinction between official and unofficial cooperation, the provincial authorities pointed out that all information given was "completely verbal" (*tamamiyle şifahen*).[135] More importantly, while the Office of Legal Counsel's interpretations underscored that these "unofficial" communications were carried out in a spirit of cooperation and in the best interests of the pilgrims, they cautioned that these niceties were observed "under conditions *unknown* in international law" and "without being bound by formal international commitments."[136] In short, such communications were not linked to any legally binding "exceptions" (*istisnaat*) or "privilege" (*imtiyaz*).[137]

In its correspondence with the Foreign Ministry (*Hariciye Nezareti*) and the Office of Legal Counsel, the provincial administration in the Hijaz also articulated their perception of the threat posed by the British expansion of extraterritorial rights. As local officials pointed out, the British consulate had repeatedly attempted to employ Ottoman subjects in order offer various forms of "intervention and protection" (*müdahale ve himaye*) to their subjects in Mecca and were trying to do the same in Medina. They also claimed that the British consulate frequently acted "outside the bounds of its official position" (*hazve-i memuriyeti haricinde*) and involved itself in the "seizure and sale of goods and real estate" (*haciz ve füruht-i emval ve emlak*), interfering "within the holy

[135] BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/10 (28 L 1329/22 October 1911).

[136] BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/5 (2 N 1332/25 July 1915).

[137] BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/10 (28 L 1329/22 October 1911); BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 201/47 (27 Ca 1329/26 May 1911).

lands of the Hijaz" (*arazi-yi mukaddese-i Hicaziye dahilinde*). As officials on the ground saw it, giving in to British efforts to extend their exterritorial reach into the holy cities would only "facilitate the consulate's wide-ranging influence and lead to a further swelling of their demands" (*konsoloshanelerin tevsi nufuz etmelerin tehsil ve tervicini intibac edecek*).[138]

For the Ottomans, the Hijaz's sacred status and exceptional legal character were so self-evident that they deserved little explanation. As a result, Ottoman responses to British demands never put forward any complicated chain of precedents. It is also clear that like many other aspects of the Capitulations, which had originally been granted from a position of strength during the early-modern period, their manipulation by European powers during the nineteenth century so completely contradicted the original spirit of the concessions that the entire enterprise required an almost perverse suspension of common sense and reason. Article 1 of the original Capitulations granted to France in 1535 granted individual freedom of trade, travel, navigation, residence, and worship. However, travel and residence in the Hijaz were explicitly exempted.[139] There were also later precedents beyond the Capitulations themselves. Istanbul's attempt to construct the Hijaz as an exceptional space, deemed unfit for many of the secularizing reforms of the Tanzimat, provides useful clues. For example, the Hijaz was exempted from the 1857 *ferman* calling for an empire-wide prohibition on the African slave trade.[140] Similarly, when the Ottoman government lifted the ban on foreign real estate (*emlak*) or

---

[138] BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 200/10 (28 L 1329/22 October 1911).

[139] Nasim Sousa, *The Capitulatory Régime of Turkey: Its History, Origin, and Nature* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933), 71; Alice May Bovard, "The Abolition of the Capitulations in the Ottoman Empire" (M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1926), 3.

[140] Toledano, *The Ottoman Slave Trade and Its Suppression*, 129-135.

"immovable property" (*gayri-menkul mülkiyet* or *taşınmaz mal*) ownership throughout the empire in 1867, the Hijaz was also exempted.[141]

Complicated Subjects: Non-Ottoman Muslims as Potential Fifth Columns

At the most basic level the granting of consular jurisdiction was originally meant to excuse Christians from being tried according to shari'a court proceedings. Obviously, since Christians were already forbidden from traveling beyond Jidda there was little real danger of this situation arising anyway. But during the nineteenth century most of the Islamic world fell under European control and became colonial subjects of European states. As a result of this previously unthinkable scenario, a paradoxical rift in the fabric of the Capitulations was opened. The Capitulations had always been predicated on the logic that the foreign subjects being excused from Ottoman jurisdiction would be non-Muslims. Muslim colonial subjects of European states were obviously free to travel and reside in the holy cities. However, as colonial subjects of European states, Ottoman authorities were forced to grapple with the absurdly hypocritical claim that pilgrims, sojourners, and non-Ottoman residents in Islam's holiest cities needed the protection of their colonial masters in order to avoid the "uncivilized" dictates of shari'a-based Islamic jurisprudence.[142] International legal justification for humanitarian interventions claiming to protect the Ottoman Empire's Christian subjects had long cited Ottoman despotism, corruption, and the arbitrary nature of Islamic jurisprudence. Thus, in many respects, it

[141] The law, *Tebaa-yı Ecnebiyenin Emlakı Mutasarrıf Olmaları Hakkında Kanun* was promulgated on 10 June 1867 (7 S 1284). However, article 1 explicitly specifies that foreigners are eligible to own real estate anywhere except the Hijaz. See H. Nedjib Chiha, "Osmanlı Devletinde Gayrimenkul Mülkiyeti Bakımından Yabancıların Hukuki Durumu," translated by Halil Cin, *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 24 (1967): 246-274. See also Sousa, *The Capitulatory Régime of Turkey*, 81-82, 321.

[142] Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 60.

was a natural progression for these concepts to gradually be applied to Muslim colonial subjects as well.[143]

As in other parts of the Ottoman Empire, where European manipulation of the Capitulations and the Tanzimat reforms effectively placed Christian protégés and protected persons beyond the reach of Ottoman justice, the extension of extraterritoriality raised the troubling prospect of European powers claiming to protect their Muslim colonial subjects and even Islam itself from the corruption of Ottoman rule. As Selim Deringil has suggested, even prior to the Hamidian period the Ottoman state had begun to fear "that the Muslim subjects of foreign powers could act as potential fifth columns and infiltrate the holy land of the Hicaz." In an attempt to anticipate some of the problems that the colonial element in Mecca might present, significant thought was put into squaring the Hijaz's exceptional status with the Tanzimat attempt to redefine Ottoman subjecthood and nationality. Taken as a whole, the Tanzimat reforms had worked to undermine traditional Ottoman legal distinctions between Muslims, *dhimmis* (Christian and Jews), and non-Muslim foreigners. The leveling of these older categories was formalized in 1869 by the Ottoman Law of Nationality (*Osmanlı Tabiiyet Kanunnamesi*). Under the new law, the most important differentiating criterion was no longer whether one was Muslim or Christian. The 1869 law changed the practice whereby any non-Muslim converting to (Sunni) Islam on Ottoman soil was to be considered an Ottoman citizen. After 1869, the bond between confessional and civic identities was radically altered and secularized. From 1869 onward, the operative question became whether or not one was Ottoman. In addition to formalizing the non-denominational legal status of "Ottoman," which replaced the old distinction between Muslims and *dhimmis*, another

[143] Rodogno, *Against Massacre*, 29-35, 38-41, 43-47.

new concept was necessary to balance the equation. The law also introduced a new category, *ecnebi* (foreigner), which included all foreign nationals regardless of religious affiliation. Because the distinction between Ottoman and foreigner essentially replaced the old divide between Muslim and *dhimmi*, this also necessitated the creation of new category for non-Ottoman Muslims (*ecnebi müslüman*). And since the majority of the nineteenth-century Islamic world had fallen under British, Dutch, French, or Russian rule, this placed non-Ottoman Muslims under a similar cloud of suspicion as non-Muslims claiming the capitulatory protection of foreign states.[144]

During the early 1880s, against the backdrop of the British occupation of Egypt and swirling rumors of British support for an Arab caliphate, Ottoman suspicion of the potential dangers posed by non-Ottoman Muslims in the Hijaz gained a new sense of urgency. In 1882, the British consulate estimated that in Mecca alone the Indian colony numbered over 15,000. At that time, Ottoman authorities estimated that at least one-eighth of the Hijaz's real estate was already in the hands of non-Ottoman Muslims, most notably British Indian and Dutch Jawi subjects.[145] As Osman Nuri Paşa lamented, even this estimate told only part of the story. As he pointed out, foreign subjects living in the Hijaz operated in a tax-free environment and enjoyed a virtual monopoly over every sector of productivity and commercial resources in the region.[146] While Osman Nuri's reasons for curtailing the sale of real estate to foreigners was partly couched in terms of

---

[144] Selim Deringil, *Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire*, 181-182; *Düstûr*, 1 Tertip, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1289/1872), 16-18.

[145] BOA, İ. DH, 1295-2/102011 (2 R 1299/21 February 1882).

[146] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu," 13-14.

fiscal responsibility and economic productivity, as he acknowledges, the other primary motivation for the ban was driven by the constant threat of consular interference.[147]

In response to these anxieties, between 1880 and 1883 Ottoman state moved to completely ban the sale of land and other real estate to non-Ottoman Muslims, especially subjects of European powers.[148] As the British consulate reported, this policy had been in the works since around 1876. Between 1876 and 1880, however, it would appear that these measures were easily evaded through bribes.[149] Because shari'a court judges and officials counted fees and duties (*harc* and *rüsum*) from real estate transactions as a significant source of illegitimate profits (*istifadat-ı gayri meşru*), the prohibition was apparently repeatedly overlooked.[150] According to Cezmi Eraslan, between 1870 and 1882 officials in the Hijaz still approved the sale of some 290 properties in Mecca and Medina to Muslim subjects of other empires.[151] From 1880 in Jidda and 1881 in Mecca, however, judges came under increasing pressure to refuse official assistance to Indians, Jawis, and other non-Ottoman Muslims unless they produced proof that they had petitioned to seek refuge as Ottoman nationals (*tabiiyet-i sultanat-ı seniyeye dehalet arzu ve istidası*).[152] Owing to the persistence of corruption surrounding the law, in 1882 it was proposed that non-compliant judges be tried and punished and that their replacements be

---

[147] BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 5/57 (21 S 1300/1 January 1883).

[148] BOA, Y. EE, 88/67 (11 M 1298/14 December 1880); BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 5/57 (21 S 1300/1 January 1883).

[149] TNA: FO 539/21, Acting Consul Moncrieff, Jidda to Earl Granville, 7 May 1882, p. 110.

[150] BOA, İ. DH, 1295-2/102011 (2 R 1299/21 February 1882); BOA, Y. A. RES, 15/38 (17 Ca 1299/6 April 1882).

[151] Cezmi Eraslan, *II. Abdülhamid ve İslam Birliği: Osmanlı Devleti'nin İslam Siyaseti, 1856-1908* (İstanbul: Ötüken, 1991), 31.

[152] BOA, Y. EE, 88/67 (11 M 1298/14 December 1880); BOA, İ. DH, 1295-2/102011 (2 R 1299/21 February 1882); FO 539/21, Acting Consul Moncrieff, Jidda to Earl Granville, 7 May 1882, p. 110.

provided with salaries sufficient to ensure that they would not flout the law to pursue illegitimate revenue streams.[153] Again, in 1885, however, Osman Nuri would complain that because the government had not shown the necessary sensitivity in curtailing this corruption and encouraging non-Ottoman Muslims to take up Ottoman subjecthood, real estate would continue to pass into foreigners' hands.[154] In this context, even the prospect of property changing hands through marriages between Ottoman women and non-Ottoman men in the Hijaz came to be viewed as loophole in need of closing.[155]

Osman Nuri's repeated warnings coincided neatly with the Ottoman center's growing concern that the Hijaz's foreign Muslims were destined to become stalking horses for European political subversion and extraterritorial control. In 1882, a memorandum produced by the Council of State (*Şura-yı Devlet*) warned:

> If we remain indifferent to the accumulation of property by devious means in the hands of foreign Muslims, with the passage of time we may find that much of the Holy Lands have been acquired by the subjects of foreign powers. Then, the foreigners, as is their wont, after lying in waiting for some time, will suddenly be upon us at the slightest opportunity and excuse and will proceed to make the most preposterous claims.[156]

The ban was to remain in force through World War I despite the ongoing problem of actually enforcing it. At face value this law seemed to radically contradict the Hamidian state's Pan-Islamic attempts to cultivate loyalty to the Caliphate among foreign Muslims. It is also clear that the ban did not go unchallenged on religious grounds. As

---

[153] BOA, Y. A. RES, 15/38 (17 Ca 1299/6 April 1882).

[154] Somel,"Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu," 13-14.

[155] BOA, İ. MMS, 104/4442 (24 Ş 1306/25 April 1889). Such restrictions were paralleled by similar restrictions concerning marriages between Iranians and Ottoman subjects in Iraq. See Karen M. Kern, *Imperial Citizens, Marriage and Citizenship in the Ottoman Frontier Provinces of Iraq* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2011), 89-113.

[156] BOA, Y. A. RES, 15/38 (17 Ca 1299/6 April 1882), quoted in Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 56.

one dissenting opinion (*muhalif bir rey*) submitted to the Council of State in 1903 pointed out, although the fundamental political concerns over Indian and Jawi colonial subjects were reasonable enough, the logic behind singling out these groups was unsustainable. As the author quips, what of the territories recently ceded (*terk olunan mahaller*) to Russia, Romania, Greece, and Serbia? Were Muslims from those territories not also foreign subjects? Whatever the possible dangers posed by a few Indians or Jawis, the petitioner reasoned that it could not possibly equal the negative influence (*su-i teesir*) of this ban. As he chides, the right to settle (*temekkün*) in the holy cities is guaranteed under Islamic law (*İslam hukuk-i diniyece*). And, in any case, the vast majority of those who choose to settle in the *haremeyn* seek only "to collect a heavenly reward" (*tahsil-i mesubat*) and "have no other intention" (*başka maksadları olamayacağını*). Without the holy places, he worried that there would no longer be a place for the Islamic world to gather (*bir merkez ve nokta-ı ictimaları yoktur*). Moreover, to prohibit settlement in the holy places would almost certainly break their ties to the center of the Caliphate (*eğer bu emakin-i mukaddesede temekkün muhalefet olunursa merkez-i hilafete olan rabitaları ihlal olunmuş olur*). After all, as the author challenges, did the Caliph not claim leadership as the spiritual head of all Islam (*şamil bir riyaset-i ruhaniye*) and not just Islam in his own domains (*yalnız kendi memalikinde bulunan İslamin değil*) regardless of their nationality (*kangı devlet tabiyetine mensub*)?[157]

Conclusion

The petition's indignation at the yawning chasm between the religious rhetoric of the Caliphate and the Hamidian state's actual exclusionary policies correctly identifies

[157] BOA, Y. PRK. ŞD, 3/34 (29 Z 1320/29 March 1903). Unfortunately, the author's stamp is indecipherable.

the contradictions inherent in the paradoxical pursuit of Pan-Islam universalism and territorial sovereignty at the same time. However, this paradox is, perhaps, an artificial one, merely an artifact of our insistence on thinking of Pan-Islam as a religious discourse. As the attempt to restrict real estate sales to foreign Muslims underscores, Hamidian Pan-Islam was, more often than not, a set of policies and discourses defined as much by sovereignty and international legal considerations as by Islamic legitimacy. As the career of Osman Nuri Paşa demonstrates, the loftier foreign-policy objectives of Pan-Islam were constantly being weighed against and frequently subordinated to projects designed to shelter Ottoman sovereignty from the corrosive effects of autonomy, extraterritoriality, and their intersection.

As this dissenting opinion seems to ask, was the prohibition of land sales to foreign Muslims a case of the oft cited, though rarely thoughtfully examined, "paranoia" of the Hamidian era? Had the state conjured an unrealistic demon? If not, however, what kind of "preposterous claims" of consular protection did Osman Nuri and the Council of State fear? Taken in isolation, this kind of legal maneuvering might appear to be little more than a quotidian footnote. However, the British Foreign Office's persistent logic regarding the application of Article 42 provides a fuller context of the predicament that the Capitulations presented for Ottoman sovereignty in the Hijaz. As the Foreign Office's inquiry into the question of consular protection in Mecca concluded:

> … as the Capitulations contain no provision to except the Hedjaz or the holy cities from their stipulations, Her Majesty's Government can admit no such exception. The only grounds on which Her Majesty's Government could be justified in renouncing at Mecca the rights of protection conceded by the Capitulations for the Ottoman Empire generally would be a distinct declaration from the Porte that that city had ceased to be (in the language of Article 42) "a portion of the Sultan's sacred dominions," *in which case it would be necessary to make such arrangements as might be possible with the*

Grand Shareef as an independent authority…[158]

As Salisbury's comments suggest, the stakes of these questions extended well beyond the protection of pilgrims accused of crimes in Mecca. Rather, they are a reflection on how the Capitulations and the internationally binding character of the linkage between the Tanzimat reforms and the Treaty of Paris defined Ottoman sovereignty from Britain's perspective. By this logic, if the Ottomans claimed that they could not enforce the Capitulations and implement Tanzimat-style governance in a given territory, then the Ottoman state would not be considered fully sovereign there. The inability to ensure judicial reforms or extraterritorial protections provided a pretext for European intervention or, as Salisbury hints, the search for an alternative sovereign. In this case, the independent alternative was the Sharif of Mecca.[159]

[158] TNA: FO 424/159, "Correspondence respecting the Interpretation of Article 42 of the English Capitulations of 1675," May 1889, p. 22.

[159] Rodogno, *Against Massacre*, 1-62.

Chapter 3

Quarantine and the Global Crisis of Cholera: The Ottoman Sanitary State and Its Limits

> Cholera is a disease native to India. There has never been a time when it has not been from that region…. Cholera *always* comes to the Hijaz from the outside and enters with the pilgrims.
>
> -Kasım İzzeddin, *Rehber-i Zabıta-i Sıhhiye*, 1311 (1912-1913)[1]

> The registration of the pathological must be constantly centralized. The relation of each individual to his disease and to his death passes through the representatives of power, the registration they make of it, the decisions they take on it.
>
> This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed places, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and the periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure, in which each individual is constantly located, examined and distributed among the living beings, the sick and the dead—all this constitutes a compact model of the disciplinary mechanism.
>
> -Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*[2]

The Observation, Death, and Burial of Samsunlu Hacı Mustafa Efendi

On 19 September 1891 the postal steamer *Nimet-i Hüda* arrived in Istanbul. The steamship had completed its return journey from the Hijaz after the conclusion of the hajj. One of the passengers onboard was a man named (Samsunlu) Hacı Mustafa Efendi.[3] The following day it was reported that Hacı Mustafa had been laid up in bed with a suspected case of cholera. Hacı Mustafa Efendi lived on a side street off Çeşme Meydanı Caddesi in Galata, placing him in the middle of Istanbul's second most populous district behind Fatih, home to some 220,000 souls, roughly a quarter of the city's urban

---

[1] İzzeddin, *Rehber-i Zabıta-i Sıhhiye*, items 31 and 35, pp. 11-12.

[2] Foucault, *Disciple and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 196-197.

[3] BOA, İ. DH, 1242/97329 (16 S 1309/21 September 1891); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 251/138 (20 S 1309/25 September 1891).

population.[4] In the span of three or four days, the panic induced by Hacı Mustafa's symptoms, whereabouts, and contacts would attract the attention of Ottoman officials of virtually every level and description from the municipal authorities (*şehremaneti*) in Beyoğlu, the police, and *jandarma* to the international delegates on the Board of Health, Health Ministry, Naval Ministry, the Grand Vezier, and even the Sultan himself.[5]

As the case began, an Austrian physician was dispatched to Hacı Mustafa's home to examine him. Suspecting cholera, the alarm was raised. Copies of his examination were forwarded to the Ministry of Health. The Mutassarıf of Beyoğlu called in the police and *jandarma* to place the patient under guard (*taht-ı muhafaza*) and a sanitary cordon (*kordon*) was established. The guards placed outside the door would, in turn, discover that there were several women suffering inside the home. The municipal government was then called in to provide assistance for bread and other necessities (*ekmek ve saire vermek gibi muavenet ifası*). Meanwhile, the Naval Ministry was instructed to tow the *Nimet-i Hüda* either outside of Fenerbahçe or Yenikapı and place the vessel under a 10-12 day quarantine. Likewise, the crew of the steamship was to be rounded up and placed under quarantine as well. There was also the need to locate and examine as many of Hacı Mustafa's fellow passengers as possible. With the approval of the Sultan special instructions were also sent to the Mutassarıf of Beyoğlu and the Zabtiye Nezareti (Ministry of Police) urging that extreme care be taken in the event of the Hacı Mustafa's death. Thus, it was recommended that his corpse (*naaş*) be taken far outside of the city and buried in a very deep grave and lined with lime (*şehir haricinde uzak bir mahalle*

---

[4] This population figure is based on the 1882 census. Murat Gül, *The Emergence of Modern Istanbul: Transformation and Modernisation of a City* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009), 42.

[5] BOA, İ. DH, 1242/97329 (16 S 1309/21 September 1891); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 251/138 (20 S 1309/25 September 1891).

defn ettirilmesi ve mezarının derin kazdırılıp üzerine kireç dökldürülmesi). In addition to the removal of the corpse, it was also ordered that all of his personal items should be disinfected (*tebhir*) or burned (*ihrak*).[6]

In the midst of these frightening precautions, in his correspondence with the Ministry of Health the Grand Vizier candidly spelled out his fear that this case might be the start of the next devastating epidemic in Istanbul. He reflected back on the 1865 (1282) outbreak. As he explained, it had only taken one instance of negligence to allow an infected steamer to enter the Goldern Horn (*Haliç-i Dersaadet*), visiting disaster (*felaket* ve *musa'ib*) on the population.[7] In the 1865 outbreak, cholera had come to Istanbul aboard an Ottoman *korvet* (small warship) transporting a tuberculosis-stricken official, one Osman Paşa. Although communication between the infected ports of Egypt and Istanbul had been placed under strict quarantine measures, on its return journey the crew had thrown two cholera victims into the sea. The *korvet* went straight into the Haliç to the navy yard at Tersane and that very same evening two soldiers were admitted to the Tersane hospital. Within days cholera had spread to the surrounding neighborhoods of Hasköy and Kasımpaşa.[8] The outbreaks would rage on for four months, killing as many as 1,000 per day at its height, and leaving a death toll of as many as 30,000 by epidemic's end.[9] Thus, as Ahmed Cevad reviewed the precautions being taken, he could not help but

---

[6] BOA, Y. A. HUS, 251/138 (20 S 1309/25 September 1891).

[7] Ibid.

[8] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 14.

[9] Ahmed Midhat, "Devlet-i Aliye-i Osmaniye'de Karantina Yani Usul-ı Tahaffuzun Tarihçesi," 468; Mesut Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera: İstanbul Örneği (1892-1895)* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2007), 28-29.

wonder whether Hacı Mustafa and the *Nimet-i Hüda* might not be the source of the city's next great catastrophe.

In light of the anxieties produced by this case, a scientific committee composed of members of the Board of Health and faculty from Imperial Medical College (*Mektebe-i Tibbiye-i Şahane*) were assembled to evaluate the case. Despite all of the precautions requested by the Ministry of Health, according to the medical commission, Hacı Mustafa did not in fact have cholera. Rather, they argued that it was only a case of dysentery (*mezemmet-i disanteri*) and extreme exhaustion (*hem yolculuk sefaletinden mutehassıl zafiyet-i umumiye'ye duçar olduğu*) from the three-month journey to the Hijaz and back. As the committee pointed out, due to the impoverished and unsanitary state of the home the patient could not be properly treated and should be transferred to a hospital for treatment. Within three days of their report, however, Hacı Mustafa was dead and buried in accordance with the protocols laid out for a cholera death. Although the Grand Vezierate would later complain of how "very absurd" (*pek abes*) these measures had been even after it was determined that the victim had only suffered from a diarrheal illness (*ishal mezemmet*), even the confusion, bureaucratic infighting, international ramifications, and second-guessing surrounding this single suspected case of cholera provide us with a sense of the epidemiological anxiety that must have hung like a fog over *fin de siècle* Istanbul.

The documentary record surrounding Hacı Mustafa, his body, family, home, and ultimately the preparations for his death, corpse, and burial offers a succinct, yet panoramic vignette of the social and administrative life of the Ottoman Empire during the multi-decade reign of epidemic cholera. It also provides a starting point for unpacking

the disciplinary mechanisms that cholera helped to produce. As Michel Foucault explains, it is the examination that places "individuals in a field of surveillance." It "situates them in a network of writing." And ultimately, "it engages them in a whole mass of documents that capture and fix them." It is through the examination and all its associated documentary techniques that the individual is made into a "case." Each individual case can be located both physically and in the state's records. And thus, each case is an opportunity for the state to learn and adjust its overall calculations.[10]

As the panicked correspondence surrounding Hacı Mustafa's illness and the disposal of his potentially hazardous remains make clear, by 1891 both the Hijaz and Istanbul were living in perpetual terror of the next microbial disaster. Between 1881 and 1895 a global cholera pandemic smoldered continuously from India to the Mediterranean and beyond. During this period, cholera remained in constant circulation, flaring up for extended periods in virtually every corner of the Ottoman Empire.[11] By the 1890s, however, tragic scenes of human loss and the social and administrative confusion that came in their wake had been repeated with alarming regularity throughout the nineteenth century. The Hijaz had seen outbreaks of varying severity in 1831, 1834, 1836-1840, 1846, 1851, 1856-1858, and 1860. Then there was the great *Hacc-ı ekber* outbreak of 1865, which had killed between 15,000 and 30,000 pilgrims and sparked a global pandemic. The 1870s witnessed outbreaks in 1872, 1876, and 1877-1878. In the 1880s and 1890s cholera's visitations would only continue to intensify. Cholera broke out during every hajj season between 1881 and 1883. In 1883, the outbreak once again spread to Egypt killing approximately 50,000. And again, four of the six pilgrimage

[10] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 189-191.

[11] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 17-33.

seasons between 1890 and 1895 would produce outbreaks, reaching a gory crescendo in 1893. Also a *Hacc-ı ekber* year, estimates of the 1893 death toll range from 30,000 up to as many as 50,000.[12] In the fallout from the carnage of 1893, cholera also afflicted Istanbul, claiming some 1,340 souls between outbreaks in 1893-1894 and 1895. Although it was nothing compared to the devastation visited upon Istanbul in the 1865 epidemic, the outbreaks of the 1890s would mark a turning point in the maturation of the sanitary organization of both the Red Sea and the empire as a whole.[13]

The anxieties and past mistakes dredged up by Hacı Mustafa's 1891 case concisely illustrate a pattern that was to become all too familiar to Ottoman and European physicians and officials during this period. Each time that cholera struck the Hijaz it exponentially raised the likelihood that the disease would bloom across the width and breadth of the empire and beyond as pilgrims returned to their homes, unwittingly carrying the devastating microbes with them. Returning pilgrims had a way of bringing the frontier home to the imperial center, laying the frontier's biopolitical insecurity at the feet of power. Cholera annihilated the presumed difference between a modernizing Istanbul and the backward Arabian frontier. As we shall see, the mechanisms of sanitary discipline and documentary practices necessary to contain the death and destruction produced by cholera collapsed time and space and intimately bound the imperial capital to its unruly frontiers. In this sense, discipline and governmentality in Istanbul were only as effective as their application at the margins of empire. Put slightly differently, cholera had a way of generalizing the frontier. Quarantine was not just a matter of building

---

[12] Hamdi bin Aziz, *Kolera*, 5-12; İzzeddin, *Mekke-i Mükerreme'de Kolera ve Hıfzıshha*, 77-80; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 67.

[13] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 457.

sanitary fortresses on desert islands in the Red Sea. As Foucault puts it, the seemingly extraordinary measures of quarantine, isolation, examination, registration, and documentation on the frontier would also become "de-institutionalized" and "emerge from the closed fortresses in which they had once functioned." These measures would be "broken down into more flexible methods of control," which could be "transferred and adapted." Thus, the defenses built up and directed outward against the Red Sea invasions of cholera-carrying Indian Ocean pilgrims would also promote and further refine the kinds of "swarming disciplinary mechanisms," which would also be reproduced and turned inward on Istanbul and the rest of the empire.[14] Likewise, by the 1890s the Hijaz was by no means exempt from the increasingly invasive biopolitical controls being imposed on the residents of Istanbul and the core of the Ottoman state. New technologies of bacteriological science, disinfection, and water safety tested in Istanbul rapidly found their way to the Hijaz and other quarantine sites in the Red Sea.

Typically the Ottoman state's position in the question of quarantine and international sanitary regulation has been eclipsed and overshadowed by the concerns of Europe. The nexus between the Hijaz, pilgrimage, and quarantine has generally been narrated almost exclusively from the perspective of Europe, Egypt, and British India. In this historiography, the Ottoman Empire appears only as a reluctant sentry posted at the gates of the Red Sea and the Suez Canal. The internationalized, capitulatory nature of the Ottoman Board of Health is generally seen as proof that the application of quarantine regulations against the hajj was almost wholly a product of European coercion. In this narrative, the erection of the sanitary state is a resolutely European project. The Ottoman Empire is positioned as a semi-civilized buffer, the last line of defense standing between

[14] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 211.

Europe and teeming hordes of cholera-carrying pilgrims of the Indian Ocean basin. And thus, the interests and challenges facing the Ottoman Empire are immaterial.[15] By contrast, this chapter poses a different set of questions: What was the Ottoman response to the global crisis of cholera? Why did the Ottoman state take such a central role in the erection of international quarantine systems during the late nineteenth century? What goals might the Ottoman state hoped to have achieved through its participation in international quarantine regulations directed against the Red Sea and the hajj? What role did cholera and the erection of the Red Sea quarantine system play in the late Ottoman resurgence in the Arabian Peninsula? Was quarantine another manifestation of Ottoman frontier technopolitics deployed in service of increasing disciplinary power and territorial sovereignty? Was this a case of what Birsen Bulmuş has described as "centralisation through sanitation"?[16] And most critically, what were the limitations of Ottoman sanitary discipline on its Red Sea frontiers?

Before turning to answering these questions, first we must understand how cholera came to play such a defining role in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Equally importantly, we must set the Hijaz, Istanbul, and the Ottoman Empire against the backdrop of the ecological and demographic collapse gaining momentum in British India.

Spillover: British India's Ecological and Demographic Collapse and the Origins of the Globalized Cholera

From 1865 through World War I, India experienced what Ira Klein describes as "a woeful crescendo of death." A staggering death rate of 41.3 per 1,000 in the 1880s, already high by contemporary European standards, would eventually rise to 48.6 per

[15] See especially, Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe*, 226-243. Even Valeska Huber's more recent work on this subject, *Channelling Moblities*, offers minimal improvement.

[16] Bulmuş, *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire*, 5.

1,000 between 1911 and 1921.[17] The causes of these appalling figures are multi-faceted, but collectively they point the blame squarely at the environmental consequences of British imperialism. Much attention has focused on the balance of advancements and limitations in the way that Western medicine and sanitation were being applied to nineteenth-century Britain and India.[18] Some have stressed the colonial state's wholesale disregard for local environmental knowledge and the radical alteration of the Indian landscape through the construction of massive irrigation networks, roads, and deforestation.[19] Similarly, disruptions to drainage systems created giant nurseries of mosquitoes in which malaria reigned unabated.[20] Others have pointed to the roles of British military campaigns and the expansion of capitalism and modern systems of trade and food distribution, reorganized by the introduction of rail and steam connections, as the primary sources of cholera's increased mobility.[21]

In *Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño and the Making of the Third World* (2001), Mike Davis paints an all-encompassing portrait of colonial India's ecological and demographic implosion. He recasts India's exorbitant levels of mortality primarily as a

---

[17] Ira Klein, "Death in India, 1871-1921," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 32, no. 4 (1973): 639-659.

[18] David Arnold, "Cholera and Colonialism in British India," *Past and Present* 113 (1986): 118-151; Arnold, *Colonizing the Body*. For a broader overview of this literature, see also David Arnold, *The Cambridge History of India: Science, Technology, and Medicine in Colonial India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[19] Rohan D'Souza, "Water in British India: The Making of a 'Colonial Hydrology'," *History Compass* 4, no. 4 (2006): 621-628; David Gilmartin, "Scientific Empire and Imperial Science: Colonialism and Irrigation Technology in the Indus Basin," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 53, no. 4 (1994): 1127-1149; Michael M. Mann, "Ecological Change in North India: Deforestation and Agrarian Distress in the Ganga-Jamna Doab, 1800-1850," *Environment and History* 1, no. 2 (1995): 201-220.

[20] Klein, "Death in India," 646.

[21] McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples*, 267-279; Mike Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño and the Making of the Third World* (New York: Verso, 2001), 10, 26-27; Headrick, *The Tools of Empire*, 129-149; 180-181; Daniel Headrick, *The Tentacles of Progress: Technology Transfer in the Age of Imperialism, 1850-1940* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 18-96.

function of the large-scale famines that resulted from the deteriorating economic, social, and environmental conditions created by Britain's exploitation of the subcontinent's land and resources. Davis argues that while natural factors, such as the failure of the monsoons, might have contributed to nineteenth-century India's catastrophic mortality rates, the synergistic relationship between drought, famine, malaria, plague, and cholera were in fact man-made crises, born of colonial India's unjust agrarian, environmental, economic, and political systems.[22]

Regardless of whether one places more emphasis on human, technical, or environmental factors, the death tolls are undeniable. According to David Arnold, between 1817 and 1865 rough estimates suggest that at least 15 million Indians died from cholera. After 1865, more systematic, if politically tainted, mortality statistics began to be collected. From 1865 until 1947, a further 23 million deaths were recorded. As Arnold points out, however, it is highly likely that many more cholera deaths went unrecorded for purely political reasons. Many cases of cholera were either downplayed to avoid the threat of international quarantines being imposed on Britain's lucrative India trade. As a result, they were falsely recorded as dysentery or "famine diarrhea."[23]

Extended periods of drought followed by intense famines ravaged the Indian countryside from the 1860s through World War II. Though statistics vary widely, it is estimated that the 1876-1879 and 1896-1902 famines alone produced between 12 and 29 million victims.[24] In the midst of these repeated waves of drought and famine, India

---

[22] Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts*, 1-59.

[23] Arnold, *Colonizing the Body*, 161. Extrapolations of military and civilian death totals between 1817 and 1831, suggest estimates as high as 40 million deaths. See Christopher Hamlin, *Cholera: The Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 64.

became fertile ground for the incubation of cholera, malaria, and a host of other epidemic diseases. Years of failed monsoons pushed villagers to seek water from contaminated sources. Chronic malnutrition combined with changes in diet and behavior worked to weaken immune systems and raise the risks of infection. Starvation led to desperate searches for sustenance, leading people to consume roots, leaves, and other marginal food sources, which resulted in diarrhea and other complications.[25] Whether victims of famine or disease, many attempted to flee villages and towns, while others were concentrated in relief camps and emerging urban slums. As a result of both the mobility and concentration of victims, normal family and community standards of care-taking and hygiene repeatedly collapsed into poverty, dislocation, and chaos.[26]

Working in tandem, the vicious cycles of famine, dislocation, and cholera in India set into motion a public health crisis that would assume global proportions for the better part of the long nineteenth century. Though cholera had long been endemic in Bengal, over the course of the nineteenth century it rapidly transgressed its previous boundaries. The disease first came to the attention of Britain and Europe in 1817 when there was an outbreak in the environs of Calcutta. Unlike the outbreaks of pre-colonial times, new patterns of British trade and military movement allowed the disease to burst beyond its previous endemic range. Pre-colonial patterns of cholera outbreaks were thought to have revolved around pilgrimage and festival circuits. Large crowds of celebrants would contract the disease and carry the infection back home, where it would run its deadly but

---

[24] Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts*, 7; Tim Dyson, "On the Demography of South Asian Famines: Part I," *Population Studies* 45, no. 1 (1991): 5–25,

[25] David Arnold, "Social Crisis and Epidemic Disease in the Famines of Nineteenth-Century India," *Social History of Medicine* 6, no. 3 (1993): 385–404.

[26] Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts*, 33-47; Watts, *Epidemics and History*, 201-202.

still endemic course. From 1817 onward, however, cholera transmission dramatically expanded its reach. British troops brought the disease overland to Nepal and Afghanistan by 1818 and by the 1820s British ships would spread it to East Africa, the Persian Gulf, Iraq, Anatolia, China, and Southeast Asia.[27] This period would mark the first of five colonial-era global cholera pandemics: the first from 1817 to 1824, the second from 1829-1851 (counted by some as three semi-distinct events), the third from 1852-1859, the fourth from 1881-1895, and the fifth from 1899-1923.[28]

By the second pandemic wave during the 1830s and 1840s cholera seemed to fan out in all directions with little discernible pattern. For example, in 1830 cholera reached Moscow. The Russian army then spread it Poland.[29] In turn, the disease found its way to Istanbul for the first time, killing as many as 6,000.[30] Between 1831 and 1833, cholera would spread across the Baltic to England and Paris. It would reach Canada in 1831 and the United States the following year.[31] In 1831, cholera also reached the Hijaz, killing an estimated 20,000 and spreading the outbreak to Egypt and Tunis.[32] The disease was spreading overland and sea in an almost indiscriminate pattern. Thus, although the swamps of the Bengal delta had already become widely known as the principal fount of

---

[27] McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples*, 266-276.

[28] Hamlin, *Cholera*, 4.

[29] Ibid., 47.

[30] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 10, 23.

[31] Hamlin, *Cholera*, 47.

[32] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 23.

cholera, through the 1850s there seemed to be no special connection between cholera pandemics, Indian maritime traffic, and the hajj.[33]

When cholera devastated the Hijaz again in 1846, wiping out approximately 15,000, the situation was much the same. This time cholera likely made its way from Iran or Baghdad.[34] In 1847, outbreaks had swept across Aleppo, Kars, Erzurum, and Trabzon. At the end of October 1847 cholera broke out among troops stationed in Mosul and was then spread to Aleppo, Diyarbakır, and Harput. And in 1848 and 1849, cholera would continue to crisscross Anatolia, eventually making its way into the Balkans, Russia, Prussia, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Britain.[35]

In these examples, cholera's spread was so generalized that its exact pathways were virtually impossible to track. Thus, it is no great surprise that when the first international sanitary conference was convened in Paris in 1851 no special recommendations or precautions were made to control Indian commercial traffic or the pilgrimage to Mecca. However, the 1865 pilgrimage outbreak would prompt a very different response. Over the previous three decades, the thickening webs of railroads and steam navigation had transformed the world. Between the 1830s and 1870s, in many cases journey times between destinations had been halved. Travel had also become more direct. Railways in India were bringing pilgrims out of the subcontinent's interior more rapidly and in greater numbers than ever before. Likewise, even before the opening of the Suez Canal, the rail connections between Suez, Cairo, and Alexandria had melted

---

[33] Harrison, *Contagion*, 140-142.

[34] John Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island, 1882-1914," *Studies in the History of Medicine* 2 (1978): 10; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 2.

[35] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 23-25; Hamdi bin Aziz, *Kolera*, 8.

away all barriers between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean. Thus, unlike previous pilgrimage-related outbreaks when the means of transmission had been slow and circuitous, the new infrastructures of steam and rail travel had quickened the pace of cholera's spread to such a degree that its routes had become all too legible. There was also a greater sense that the world had been transformed and rendered interdependent by technology. No individual state could hope to protect itself without international collaboration.[36]

Hosting the Family of Nations: International Quarantine Regulation and Sanitary Extraterritoriality

As the global pandemic of 1865-1866 unfolded, attention was to focus squarely on the Orient. In an age of sanitarian reform, Western Europe had already begun to take halting steps toward the environmental reorganization of cities, water supplies, and waste disposal. These projects, although still operating without the benefit of proper germ theory, had nevertheless begun to push adult mortality rates downward. On the other hand, European observers saw no such progress in the Ottoman Empire, Iran, and points farther East.[37] Istanbul had been ravaged by the 1865 outbreak, but that was only half of the story. Throughout southern Anatolia and Greater Syria there had been at least another 40,000 deaths. Beirut had seen 2,000 deaths out of a population of 80,000, but in Jerusalem 2,000 deaths had occurred out of a population of just 20,000. Jaffa and Nablus also had 2,000 deaths each. Tarsus and its surrounding villages lost over 5,000 or one-fifth of its population. Adana lost 5,000 too, roughly a sixth of its population.[38] Owing

[36] Harrison, *Contagion*, 139-173.

[37] Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe*, 211-243.

to these appalling figures, in European eyes the Ottoman Empire had begun to look less like a victim of India's repeated epidemic waves and more like a cholera breeding ground in its own right. Thus, if Europe hoped to protect themselves from cholera's predations, it would also have to encourage new sanitary reforms on Europe's Mediterranean frontiers, especially in Egypt and the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, if Europe wished to avoid the application of stringent quarantines and embargoes, it would have to displace such measures to its Eastern frontiers. As Peter Baldwin puts it: "Liberality here rested on exclusion outward and as European nations sought to ease measures domestically, their attitude toward the Orient became less hospitable."[39]

In 1866, the French Emperor Napoleon III attempted to breathe new life into the previous decade's inconclusive international conferences on quarantine and sanitation. In response to the French government's call for a conference to discuss the sanitary conditions of the East, Sultan Abdülaziz agreed, but only under the condition that the conference be held in Istanbul. And thus, the 1866 Istanbul international sanitary conference was hosted at the Galatasaray Lisesi (*Lycée de Galatasaray*). The Tanzimat statesman and Foreign Minister Ali Paşa gave the opening and closing addresses. Invitations were extended to sixteen governments, all of which accepted except for the United States of America. In total, the conference would host 39 delegates (including 3 Ottoman representatives) for a total 44 meetings spanning seven months.[40] Over the course of the conference a new era of international sanitary interventionism emerged.

---

[38] Charles Issawi, *The Fertile Crescent, 1800-1914* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 51-53.

[39] Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe*, 227.

[40] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 15-16; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 15; Süheyl Ünver, "Osmanlı Tababeti ve Tanzimat Hakkında Yeni Notlar," *Tanzimat*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: MEB Yayınları, 1999), 949.

The delegates took a strongly "contagionist stance," concluding that cholera was "communicable from the diseased to the healthy." Moreover, they "affirmed Asiatic cholera to be endemic in India, and in no other country." As for the mode of transmission, the delegates pointed to the squalid conditions of Hindu pilgrimage centers within India, as well as of the "hajj to Mecca, seen as the second state by which cholera was relayed from India to Europe."[41]

From an Ottoman perspective, the conclusions of this international body were meaningful in two obvious respects. First and foremost, the 1866 conference established an international consensus that India was the source of cholera and that it did not originate from within Ottoman domains. As the Ottoman bacteriology expert and professor at the Imperial Medical College, Hamdi bin Aziz points out in his 1893 (1311) cholera treatise, mobilizing international consensus around this point was a critical goal for Ottoman delegates. They needed to combat the claims of British physicians who put forward the hypothesis that the 1865 outbreak had first originated in Jidda and had subsequently spread by returning pilgrims to Peshawar and Kashmir and moved on land via Afghanistan and Iran en route to Europe. As Aziz complains, although all of the other delegates rejected these claims, British intransigence in the face of unanimous international consensus was to remain a major obstacle to Ottoman sanitary security for the remainder of the century.[42]

The second major result of the 1866 conference was the conference's collective decision to adopt rigorous quarantine measures designed to inspect the health of all

---

[41] Arnold, Colonizing the Body, 186; "The Cholera Conference," *The London Quarterly Review* CXXII, no. CCXLIII (January 1867), 26.

[42] Hamdi bin Aziz, *Kolera*, 10, 12.

pilgrims arriving in the Hijaz and, if necessary, to restrict the movement of infected pilgrims and the vessels carrying them. Although it would take a decade and a half for these plans to even partially materialize, the proposals laid out in 1866 would eventually lead to the establishment of an archipelago of quarantine stations stretching from the southern mouth of the Red Sea to the Suez Canal. This system was to be anchored by a flagship quarantine station at the mouth of Red Sea, positioned in the vicinity of Bab al-Mandab in order to intercept the growing influx of Indian Ocean pilgrims before they could reach Jidda.[43] Although its staffing and administration were to be handled by the Ottoman state, it would also be subject to international supervision of the Ottoman Board of Health.[44]

Between 1831 and 1838, Mahmud II had experimented with a number of temporary quarantine measures designed to protect Istanbul and the army from cholera and plague outbreaks spreading from either the Mediterranean or Black seas.[45] In 1838, Mahmud II moved to place quarantine measures on a more permanent footing. Based on a *layiha* prepared by the Austrian physician Anton (Antuvan) Lago, Mahmud II's creation of a Quarantine Board (*Karantina Meclisi*) signaled the Ottoman Empire's long-term adoption of European-style quarantine measures and commitment to following the latest scientific advances in contagion-based public health reforms.[46] However, the Sultan's attempt to impose quarantines on foreign vessels immediately encountered

---

[43] BOA, İ. MMS, 37/1555 (25 Ca 1286/2 September 1869).

[44] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 15-31.

[45] For an overview of Mahmud II's role in the Ottoman adoption of quarantine procedures, see especially Gülden Sarıyıldız, "Karantina Meclisi'nin Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetleri," *Belleten* 222 (1994): 329-376.

[46] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 381; Bulmuş, *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire*, 97.

resistance from the European powers. Thus, when the British set the liberalizing commercial terms of the Treaty of Balta Liman in August 1838, they demanded that the Quarantine Board be placed under the supervision of a body composed of all the major European powers. Under extreme duress from both Mehmed Ali's rogue Egyptian empire and the Russian Navy, Mahmud II had no choice but to consent.[47] With that, the Ottoman Quarantine Board would be transformed into the foreign-dominated Board of Health (*Meclis-i Umur-ı Sıhhiye* or the *Conseil Supérieur de Santé de Constantinople*), itself a capitulatory branch of the Foreign Ministry (*Hariciye Nezareti*).[48] Originally the board was supposed to be composed of six Ottoman delegates and six foreign delegates. However, by the 1880s and 1890s the board's European representation would swell to as many as fourteen members versus just two to four Ottomans.[49] As a result, the board was to remain an enduring symbol of capitulatory extraterritoriality and foreign interference right down to its abolition in Article 114 of the 1921 Lausanne Peace Treaty.[50]

Despite the unequal, often humiliating, treatment received by the Ottoman Board of Health members and delegates at the international sanitary conferences of the late nineteenth century, at the 1866 Istanbul conference there was still much to be gained, or at least safeguarded, from an Ottoman perspective. Since signing the Treaty of Paris in 1856, the Ottoman state had ostensibly gained begrudging acceptance as a member of the European family of nations. As Turan Kayaoğlu points out, the Ottoman Empire was the

---

[47] Bulmuş, *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire*, 108-113.

[48] The Ottoman quarantine administration was variously referred to or lumped under the following bodies: *Karantina Meclisi*, the *Sıhiyye Meclisi*, the *Meclis-i Tahaffuz*, *Sıhhiye Nezareti*, and *Karantina Nezareti*. Here, I have opted for the most common name, *Meclis-i Umur-ı Sıhhiye*.

[49] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 383-388.

[50] M. Cemil Bilsel, *Lozan*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: Ahmet Ihsan Matbaası, 1933), 156-158; Uludağ, "Son Kapitülasyonlardan Biri Karantina," 445-467.

first non-European country to join intergovernmental organizations and from the 1850s onward the Ottoman state would remain extremely active in such bodies, in part, because their participation was a material demonstration of their belonging to European international society and international public law.[51] As in other diplomatic venues, Ottoman officials were at pains to present themselves as civilized, energetic modernizers, capable of carrying out the necessary hygienic reforms needed to combat the spread of cholera. For the Ottoman Empire this process of self-presentation was also magnified because it was applying for financial support from the other governments in attendance.[52] To finance the project, it was agreed, at least in principle, that the Board of Health would oversee the collection of a tonnage-based quarantine fee.[53]

Apart from the immediate question of insulating Europe and the rest of the Ottoman Empire from pilgrimage-related cholera outbreaks, the 1866 international sanitary conference also spoke very directly to core Ottoman concerns over territory and sovereignty. By taking primary responsibility for the sanitary policing of the Red Sea, the Ottoman state received a degree of international legitimation for its attempts to strengthen and expand its presence in the Red Sea and Arabian Peninsula. The establishment of a quarantine station near Bab al-Mandab was consistent with the wider Ottoman effort to ward off further British, European, and Egyptian designs on Yemen and the southern Red Sea. However, as Isa Blumi reminds us, it is critical to keep sight of the often insurmountable gulf between the elaborate visions of Tanzimat-era state building as imagined in Istanbul and the "small-scale challenges to imperial rule,"

---

[51] Kayaoğlu, *Legal Imperialism*, 108-110.

[52] Huber, "The Unification of the Globe by Disease?," 463-464.

[53] Ahmed Midhat, "Devlet-i Aliye-i Osmaniye'de Karantina Yani Usul-ı Tahaffuzun Tarihçesi," 468-469.

especially in distant Red Sea locales like the Hijaz and Yemen, which "marked the physical, logistical and political limitations of these reforms."[54]

False Starts: Quarantine and the Limits of the Tanzimat Resurgence in the Red Sea

In late 1865, the Ottoman Board of Health and the Grand Vizierate (*Sadaret*) had already begun to outline an initial strategy to respond to the horrific mortality of the 1865 pilgrimage season. Out of these discussions, the Board of Health adopted three main areas of reform, all of which would remain major areas of concern for the remainder of the century. First, because the outbreak was thought to have first originated among pilgrims gathered in Mina, special attention was paid to locations associated with the sacrifice (*zebh olunan mahaller*) for *Kurban Bayramı* (*Eid al-Adha*). It was argued that steps should be taken to better handle the disposal of animal carcasses and the smells that their putrification produced.[55] As a result, in subsequent years Mina's slaughter sites were to be relocated.[56] In addition to providing enough pits (*kuyular*) for the disposal of the offal, this initial report also pointed to the cleanliness of the water supply at Mina.[57] A second priority was the sale of potentially hazardous food and drink. For example, Ottoman authorities would attempt to prohibit the sale of certain raw fruits (*ham meyveler*), especially melons (*karpuz* and *kavun*) or drinks made from them.[58] And

---

[54] Isa Blumi, "Thwarting the Ottoman Empire: Smuggling through the Empire's New Frontiers in Yemen and Albania, 1878-1910," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 9, no. 1-2 (2003), 251-252.

[55] BOA, İ. MMS, 31/1286 (3 Ş 1282/22 December 1865).

[56] BOA, İ. MMS, 34/1387 (16 L 1283/21 February 1867).

[57] BOA, İ. MMS, 31/1286 (3 Ş 1282/22 December 1865); BOA, İ. MMS, 34/1387 (16 L 1283/21 February 1867).

[58] BOA, İ. MMS, 34/1387 (16 L 1283/21 February 1867). See also Gülden Sarıyıldız and Ayşe Kavak, eds. *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti: Dr. M. Şakir Bey'in Hicaz Hatıraları* (İstanbul: Timaş, 2009), 91.

finally, there was, of course, the considerably larger question of how best to examine and monitor the health of pilgrims, especially those from India.

Prior to 1865 there had been essentially no public health oversight in Mecca and the other ports of the Red Sea. After the 1865 pilgrimage outbreak, however, annual public health commissions to the Red Sea were sent during each hajj season from 1866 through 1868.[59] From reports produced by these three commissions the basic outlines of an ambitious project of environmental management and biopolitical discipline would begin to take shape. Collectively, these reports would begin a decades-long analytical process of breaking the urban landscapes of the Hijaz and the hajj down to their most minute parts. And even before the revolution in bacteriology unlocked the mysteries of cholera's spread, sanitarian questions of miasmas, waste products, and overcrowding had already begun to suggest that efforts to combat cholera would lead the Ottoman state deeper into the day-to-day affairs of the Hijaz than ever before.

Not unlike the sanitarian transformations taking place at the same time in Europe, the commissions attacked the poor environmental conditions of Mecca's urban landscape and impoverished population, its congested and waste-strewn streets, and the poor state of pilgrimage-related housing options. In 1867, the public health commission would remain focused on similar questions, advocating the widening of Mecca's streets and the demolition of poorly constructed additions to shops and homes that constantly clogged the city's thoroughfares and contributed to congestion. By the calculations of the 1867 commission, in Mecca and its environs there were something like 3,000 temporary huts and market stalls (*aşe* or *salaşhane*) made of rush matting (*hasırdan yapılmış*) and

[59] BOA, İ. MVL, 562/25242 (8 C 1283/18 October 1866); BOA, İ. MMS, 35/1448 (12 N 1284/7 January 1868).

lacking any toilet or water closet facilities (*abdesthanesiz*). These temporary dwellings allegedly sheltered the city's vagabonds (*serseri*) and unemployed (*bekar*). They also hosted large populations of Indians, Jawis, and Takruris (Sudanese) living cheek-by-jowl. The commission recommended that these huts should be torn down and relocated a safe distance from Mecca in order to widen the streets and alleviate traffic congestion.[60]

Another theme that would persist for the remainder of the century was the fate of Mecca's impoverished pilgrims and *mücavirin*. As the 1867 commission complained, the pious foundations in Mecca and Medina distributing bread and soup had unintentionally encouraged the accumulation of large populations of vagrants lying about the streets and congregating around entrances to the *haremeyn*. Pointing to an assumed golden age of respect for Islamic juridical technicality just over the horizon of living memory, they suggested that eighty or perhaps a hundred years earlier the Islamic legal conditions of *istitaat* had still applied and those without sufficient funds (*mali kudret*) would not have attempted the journey. In order to combat this problem, they reasoned that an examination performed in Yanbu' or Jidda might be able to identify those with sufficient funds for the journey. Thus, only those with enough funds would receive a *tezkire* or visa permitting them to continue inland. Another suggestion was that pilgrims should not be given permission to make extended visits, which would only increase their chances of "falling into misery" (*sefalete duçar* [*olmak*]). As we shall see in Chapter 5, by the 1880s and 1890s the so-called "pauper pilgrim" debates would increasingly become a central axis of international debate on pilgrimage regulation.[61]

---

[60] BOA, İ. MMS, 34/1387 (16 L 1283/21 February 1867).

[61] BOA, İ. MMS, 34/1387 (16 L 1283/21 February 1867). For a comprehensive summary of the 1867 commission's report, see also Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 19-22.

In addition to reorganizing the Hijaz's urban landscape and disciplining its marginal populations, there remained the wider question of the Red Sea quarantine system. However, before the Ottoman state could make any progress toward implementing the recommendations of the 1866 international sanitary conference, it would have to fend off a challenge from Egypt. Since 1831, Egypt had had its own capitulatory, mixed-membership quarantine administration, *Le Conseil Sanitaire Maritime et Quarantenaire d'Alexandrie*.[62] Despite Egypt's continued status as an autonomous province of the Ottoman Empire, from the perspective of the international quarantine board in Alexandria it was functionally independent. Thus, in November 1866, the Egyptian board decided to move forward with its own Red Sea public health and quarantine measures. The board proposed that all ships coming from India would require clean bills of health. If cholera was discovered in the port of departure or appeared during the journey, the vessels would be diverted to Masawwa for a fifteen-day quarantine. Even passengers travelling on vessels with clean bills of health would be required to spend a five-day quarantine at al-Tur (el-Tor) or Qusayr. If cholera were found among the pilgrims in the Hijaz, all communication with Egypt would immediately be suspended. Even pilgrims traveling by caravan would be required to complete quarantine at al-Wajh in the northern Hijaz, which prior to the 1880s was still held by Egypt. The Egyptian board also prepared a report for the Khedive complete with plans to send doctors to Jidda, Mecca, Yanbu', and even to Mocha in Yemen. As Dr. Bimsenstein, the Ottoman representative to the Egyptian board reported, the Egyptian plan to transfer the Hijaz province's sanitary administration to Egypt was a flagrant

[62] On the international quarantine board in Alexandria, see LaVerne Kuhnke, *Lives at Risk: Public Health in Nineteenth-Century Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 92-111.

violation of the Ottoman state's rights and political sovereignty. As the Egyptian proposal made its way to the Ottoman Board of Health and the Foreign Ministry, the plan was ardently opposed on the grounds that the Alexandrian board and Khedival Egypt more broadly had no right to send officials beyond their own borders.[63] The quarantine question appeared to provide a new avenue for Khedive İsmail (r. 1863-1879) to augment his expansionist policies in the Red Sea. In 1865, İsmail had negotiated the transfer of Massawa and Suakin from Jidda's provincial administration to Egypt's in exchange for a modest lump-sum payment, a 5,000-*ardeb* wheat shipment, and certain considerations related to the slave trade.[64] In the end, Istanbul would retain control of quarantine operations in the southern Red Sea. However, this initial clash would ultimately presage the tense the post-1882 divide between British-occupied Egypt's approach to quarantine arrangements at Suez and the Ottoman administration of traffic in the southern Red Sea.

Another set of limitations that would not improve significantly until the 1880s revolved around questions of communications, transportation, and logistics. Particularly during the period prior to the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, Istanbul's ability to communicate with the Hijaz and Yemen faced serious limits. During the late 1860s, the Ottoman navy's Red Sea presence consisted of only one *korvet*, the *İzmir*, which had been transferred from the Basra docks in 1867 in a feeble attempt to assert the empire's claims of sovereignty over the ports of Shihr and Mukalla and to maintain at least some presence to counter British naval dominance. In addition to patrolling for slave traders and gunrunners, the *İzmir* was also placed at the disposal of the Hijaz's health

[63] BOA, İ. MMS, 34/1387 (16 L 1283/21 February 1867). For a comprehensive summary of the 1867 commission's report, see also Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 24-25.

[64] Ochsenwald, *Religion Society, and the State in Arabia*, 163.

commissioners in 1868. The multiple roles played by this vessel highlight the threadbare nature of the Ottoman navy and its inability to protect the empire's interests from mounting European and Egyptian interest in the region. The *İzmir* would remain the only permanent Ottoman naval presence until two more gunboats arrived in 1883. As a result, even the transport and supply of Ottoman armed forces in the region was frequently achieved by hiring civilian ships.[65] The lack of regular steamship service to its Red Sea ports also choked the speed of postal communications to and from the Hijaz. In an attempt to address both of these problems, in October 1868 Istanbul proposed contracting with Khedive of Egypt and the newly founded Egyptian 'Aziziyya steamship company in order to facilitate both regular steamship services and to extend the range of services offered by the Ottoman postal services.[66]

Following the 1866 conference, the Ottoman government had realized that there was not enough time to set up a quarantine station near Bab al-Mandab before the next hajj season.[67] Instead, they opted for the imposition of temporary quarantine procedures in the principal ports of the Red Sea. By October 1868, the Ottoman Board of Health had collected enough information from the commissions dispatched to the Red Sea in order to place the Hijaz's public health administration on a more permanent footing. In order to provide a certain level of integration between the Hijaz's sanitary operations and the *vilayet*, Fevzi Efendi was simultaneously named as the head of the sanitary service and

---

[65] BOA, BEO, Ayniyat Defterleri, 871, (9 Za 1284/3 March 1868), in *Murasalat al-Bab al-'Ali ilá Wilayat al-Hijaz (Makkah al-Mukarrama- Madinah al-munawwara), 1283-1291 H.* (The Correspondences of the Ottoman Sublime Porte to al-Hijaz Province, Makkah and Madinah, 1283-1291 H.), Arabic translation and annotations by Suhail Saban (London: al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation, Encyclopedia of Makkah and Medina Branch, 2004), 122. See also Ochsenwald, *Religion Society, and the State in Arabia*, 158-164.

[66] Ibid., (9 B 1285/ 26 October 1868), 143.

[67] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 20.

the provincial treasurer (*defterdar*).[68] The Hijaz sanitary administration placed under his leadership would be responsible for the construction and staffing of a central quarantine station in Jidda with satellite branches in Mecca, Medina, Jidda, Qunfudha, Rabigh, Lith, and Yanbu‘. A further network of quarantines would also operate in the Yemeni ports of Hudayda, Mocha, Luhayya, and Jizan.[69]

Despite the appointment of some forty-plus staff members to operate makeshift quarantines across the principal ports of the Red Sea, it was still doubtful that quarantine procedures carried out in Jidda and the other ports would actually insulate them from the spread of cholera. After all, one of the principal goals of the 1866 international sanitary conference had been to find a suitable location for a central quarantine station at the mouth of the Red Sea, which could keep cholera at a safe distance from the ports of the Red Sea. Originally, the conference participants believed that Perim Island (a British possession since 1857) was the best site for the quarantine facility because it commanded the narrow entrance to Red Sea at Bab al-Mandab. However, both British delegates to the 1866 conference, Doctors Dickson and Goodeve, opposed Perim and abstained from voting on the matter on the grounds that they were "ignorant of the views of the British Government as to permitting this island to be used as an international inspecting station." Britain's cool reception effectively killed the Perim Island proposal. In any case, Perim was eventually deemed too small and lacked both the necessary supply of water and anchorage to accommodate the volume of pilgrims and vessels that would ultimately need to be processed. While the Ottoman delegates preferred a quarantine station near

[68] BOA, A. MKT. MHM, 427/6 (4 Ş 1285/20 November 1285).

[69] BOA, İ. DH, 583/40599 (25 B 1285/11 November 1868); BOA, A. MKT. MHM, 390/46 (5 Ca 1284/24 August 1868); BOA, A. MKT. MHM, 436/58 (13 Za 1285/25 February 1869). See also Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 27-29.

Bab al-Mandab, British hostility to the Perim proposal forced them to fall back on the suggestion of Kamaran Island, some 160 miles north of Bab al-Mandab. As Goodedve complained, the Kamaran Island site "neutralizes… the advantages of inspection at Perim, because, if vessels are to be allowed to go 160 miles up the sea to Camaran, there is no guarantee that they may not communicate with the shore at other places on their way, as at Mocha or Hodeida." As a result, one of the key objectives of the conference, namely forbidding any vessel from entering the Red Sea before being inspected, was in serious jeopardy.[70]

In 1867 one of the principal objectives of the Ottoman commission dispatched to the Hijaz was to conduct a thorough survey of possible Red Sea quarantine sites and report back to the Ottoman Board of Health. During the commission's tour of the southern Red Sea, virtually every port and island between Jidda and Aden, including Lith, Qunfudha, Luhayya, Kamaran, Hudayda, Mocha, Shaykh Sa'id, Shaykh Malou, Perim, and Obukh, was ranked in terms of logistical convenience, climate, anchorage, water supplies, and isolation from population centers. The commission concluded that Kamaran Island was the best option because of its large, sheltered anchorage, its abundance of wells (all in disrepair at the time), and the ability to easily patrol any attempts at contact between quarantined pilgrims and the Yemeni mainland port of Salif. However, as the reports from the 1867 and 1868 commissions indicated, concerns over the long distance between Kamaran and the mouth of Red Sea remained.[71]

---

[70] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 20; Great Britain, Naval Intelligence Division, *Western Arabia and the Red Sea* (Oxford: Naval Intelligence Sub-Centre, 1946), 139-141.

[71] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 20-26.

In October 1868, although the Board of Health had acknowledged the apparent superiority of the Kamaran Island option, the Ottoman government was interested in pushing the quarantine site down to the mouth of the Red Sea or even beyond. Thus, the Ottomans also began to consider an alternative site at Hisn Ghorab, located between Aden and Mukalla. In correspondence between Istanbul and Mecca, it was requested that the Sharifate act as an intermediary and obtain the local skaykh's permission to erect a quarantine facility and agree to formally cede the territory to the Ottoman government.[72] When this proposal came up for discussion among members of the Board of Health in April 1869, it was supported by the Dutch delegate. However, the proposal was opposed by the French, who preferred another site at Ras al-'Arab, located between Aden and Bab al-Mandab. In addition to French opposition, largely based on the lack of potable water, this plan was doomed from its very inception because of Britain's consistent opposition to any Ottoman claims of sovereignty farther south than the mouth of Red Sea in the Gulf of Aden or the Hadrami littoral. As a result of the lack of consensus among the Ottomans and their European counterparts on the Board of Health, it was decided that pending a decision on the permanent location of the quarantine station, contaminated ships would most likely be sent to Kamaran Island.[73] Yet, as one British representative huffed, what provisions beyond "a few health officers" and "a scanty supply of tents" would meet those unlucky souls?[74]

---

[72] BOA, BEO, Ayniyat Defterleri, 871, (8 B 1285/ 25 October 1868), in *Murasalat al-Bab al-'Ali ilá Wilayat al-Hijaz*, 141-142.

[73] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 27-28; Ochsenwald, *Religion Society, and the State in Arabia*, 164.

[74] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 28.

After 1869, however, plans for a quarantine station on Kamaran Island were shelved until 1882. By and large, John Baldry's hypothesis that Istanbul likely preferred to staff inexpensive quarantine stations along the Hijazi and Yemeni coasts on an *ad hoc* basis is essentially correct.[75] In 1868 an additional 10-kuruş quarantine fee on each pilgrim was imposed. This additional fee was designed to augment the tonnage-based sanitary tariff, which was eventually passed by the Board of Health in 1872, but only after stiff resistance from Britain. However, as Gülden Sarıyıldız shows, the revenues collected from these fees were not enough to cover the expenses of the Red Sea quarantine network. Thus, in the decade between 1872 and 1882, Red Sea quarantine expenses outstripped revenues in seven of the ten years.[76]

However, money was not the only factor. From an Ottoman perspective, it is clear that the 1866 international sanitary conference's Indian Ocean quarantine proposal represented a golden opportunity to plant the Ottoman flag at the southern end of the Red Sea or even as far away as Hadramawt. In effect, quarantine provided international sanction for the extension of Ottoman control to one or another strategic islands or outposts near Bab al-Mandab. This goal fit neatly into the state's wider strategic efforts to reconquer Yemen and create a buffer between the Hijaz and British encroachment beyond Aden. Interestingly, at the 1866 conference, the Ottoman Empire seems to have encountered no resistance to its claims over Yemen. Regardless of the legitimacy of Ottoman claims on Yemen, however, the empire's actual ability to secure territory along the Red Sea coast before 1872 remained shaky at best.

---

[75] Ibid., 29.

[76] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 29-32; Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 388.

In the sixteenth century the Ottoman Empire had conquered Yemen in order to discourage the Portuguese domination of the Red Sea. By 1635, however, the Ottomans found themselves in full retreat, leaving Yemen in the control of local rulers. Although it would be two centuries before the Ottomans returned to Yemen, they never gave up their traditional claims of sovereignty over the region.[77] In a belated response to the British bombardment of Mocha in 1820 and seizure of Aden in 1839, after 1849 the Ottoman center fought a protracted campaign to reassert its claims over Yemen.[78] In reality, however, Ottoman rule was largely confined to the coastal plains of Tihama and would not be extended to the highlands until after 1872. Until then, even the Ottoman base of operations in Hudayda and Tihama remained extremely vulnerable.

To the very limited extent that previous studies of the steamship-era hajj and its connection to the globalization of cholera have even thought of Yemen's position in the proposed Ottoman system of quarantines, generally medical and colonial histories have operated under the implicit assumption that the Ottoman Empire was actually in control of northern Yemen. Here, I would stress the need to think of the development of the Ottoman Hijaz and Red Sea quarantine system and the reassertion of Ottoman rule in Yemen as concurrent, overlapping works in progress. Therefore, until effective control of Yemen and the adjacent region of 'Asir could be achieved the prospects of building and administering a large pilgrimage quarantine facility on the coast of Yemen remained limited at best.

---

[77] On the Ottoman reconquest of Yemen, see Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference*, 31-51; Caesar Farah, *The Sultan's Yemen: Nineteenth-Century Challenges to Ottoman Rule* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2002), xii-82.

[78] R.J. Gavin, *Aden under British Rule, 1839-1967* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1975); Farah, *The Sultan's Yemen*, 1-29; *Osmanlı Arşiv Belgelerinde Yemen* (İstanbul: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2008), 346-356.

Although the opening of the Suez Canal did allow the Ottomans to move reinforcements to Yemen with greater ease, this did not mean that local resistance to direct rule would be easily overcome.[79] Throughout the 1860s and early 1870s, Ottoman forces augmented by Khedive İsmail's Egyptian and Sudanese troops struggled and repeatedly failed to contain 'Asiri rebels led by Muhammad bin 'A'id.[80] In 1871, 'Asiri forces once again invaded Tihama and very nearly forced a complete Ottoman evacuation. They reached as far south as Zabid, reduced Mocha to ruins, and laid siege to Hudayda, confining all Ottoman forces there.[81] As the campaign in Yemen unfolded in January 1871, in light of the advances of the 'Asiri rebels, any plans to locate an appropriate site for a quarantine station near Bab al-Mandab or on Kamaran Island were indefinitely postponed.[82] Tihama and the Ottoman seat of government in Hudayda would have to be secured before any talk of new quarantine facilities would be feasible.

Between 1871 and 1873, the combined forces of Mehmed Redif Paşa and Ahmed Muhtar Paşa would eventually pacify Tihama and 'Asir. Typically the pacification of coastal Yemen during this period has been narrated as an almost inevitable outcome of the opening of the Suez Canal. Although the opening of the Suez Canal did allow

---

[79] Ridwan, *al-Dawlat al-'Uthmaniyya wa Gharbi al-Jazirat al-'Arabiyya ba'da Iftitah Qanat al-Suways*, 72-103.

[80] On the use of Egyptian-Sudanese troops forced in the Hijaz and Yemen, see for example BOA, A. MKT. MHM, 381/24, "Yemen ve Hicaz için Mısır'dan her sene verilegelmekte olan Sudan askerlerinin iki yıllık tertibat olarak değil, istihdamlarının güçlüğü sebebiyle, yalnızca bir yıllık mürettebat olarak gönderilmesi gerektiği" (2 M 1284/6 May 1867).

[81] BOA, İ. MMS, 40/1639, "Yemen'de bulunan aşiretlerden Asir Kabilesi'nin Emiri Mehmed Paşa'nın tecavüzkarane niyetlerine dair" (23 Ş 1287/18 November 1870); Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, vol. 3 (İstanbul: Bahriye Matbaası, 1306/1888), 290-291; Ridwan, *al-Dawlat al-'Uthmaniyya wa Gharbi al-Jazirat al-'Arabiyya ba'da Iftitah Qanat al-Suways*, 87; Dahlan, *Tarikh Ashraf al-Hijaz*, 56; Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference*, 44.

[82] BOA, BEO, Ayniyat Defterleri, 871, (8 Za 1287/30 January 1871), in *Murasalat al-Bab al-'Ali ilá Wilayat al-Hijaz*, 237-238.

Istanbul to free itself from its dangerous dependency on Egyptian military assistance and made it easier to transfer troops by sea, these strategic advances tell only part of the story of the dramatic change in Ottoman fortunes between 1871 and 1873. An overlooked factor was the circulation of cholera. For example, in 1872, in the span of just twelve days nearly 300 Ottoman troops died of cholera in the 'Asiri port of Qunfudha.[83] However, cholera did not discriminate between Ottoman and 'Asiri forces. As Ahmad bin Zayni Dahlan claims, it was not the 15,000 Ottoman troops alone that repelled Muhammad bin 'A'id's 'Asiri forces. Rather, cholera first decimated the 'Asiris and rolled back their advance. Mehmed Redif Paşa's forces merely "delivered the *coup de grâce*" that finished off the ailing rebel fighters.[84]

'Those Who Love Quarantine, Hate England': British India and The "Science" of Anti-Contagionism

The reconquest of Yemen was a necessary step toward the creation of the 1866 international sanitary conference's proposed Red Sea quarantine station. After 1871, however, Ottoman momentum on the quarantine question had been lost. To be sure, the looming expenses involved likely soured Ottoman enthusiasm. There was also the creeping complacency that came with cholera's prolonged absences. Between 1865 and 1877-1878, there were no major outbreaks in the Hijaz. On the one hand, there was a sense that basic sanitarian reforms, including street cleaning campaigns, improved hospital conditions, the increased presence of physicians, and safeguards surrounding the slaughtering pavilions and cisterns at Mina taken in the wake of the 1865 outbreak had

[83] BOA, BEO, Ayniyat Defterleri, 871 (17 Za 1288/28 January 1872), in *Murasalat al-Bab al-'Ali ilá Wilayat al-Hijaz*, 294-295.

[84] Dahlan, *Tarikh Ashraf al-Hijaz*, 56.

been a success. And on the other hand, there was also the ruthless resistance of Britain and India's medical establishments to all discussion of contagion and quarantine.

Again in 1874, another international sanitary conference was held in Vienna. The conference took as its highest priority the adoption of a "uniform system of preventative measures," to be instituted in all of the participating nations and their colonial possessions. However, little had changed since the previous sanitary conference. Despite the protests of British delegates, cholera was still considered to be contagious by the majority of conference delegates and India was still blamed as its primary source. And though it was recommended that the controversial quarantine measures be adopted by all the participating nations, in the end it was recognized that individual states could opt for a less robust system of medical inspection.[85]

Under the system proposed in 1874, arrivals from an infected port were to be observed for a period of one to seven days depending on the severity of the outbreak. In the ports of the eastern Mediterranean or under exceptional circumstances the period of observation might be extended to ten days. If cases or suspected cases occurred while at sea, the period of observation for uninfected persons was set at seven days from the time of their isolation. The sick, however, were to be landed separately for medical care, while the vessel and infected items onboard were subject to a rigorous disinfection process. Even arrivals from a port that was merely considered suspect, despite having no reported cases of infection or having been given free passage at another port of call, were subject to an observation period of five days. The boldest regulation of all, however, was concerned with "vessels considered particularly dangerous," which specifically targeted

[85] TNA: FO 7/982, "International Sanitary Convention, Commission of Enquiry, Permanent Council, vol. 1, Proposals for Preventing the Spread of Cholera," December 1874-December 1876; TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, pp. 3-4.

ships carrying pilgrims and emigrants. Any vessel carrying passengers labeled as such would be subject to "special precautions," which essentially meant that they could be held in quarantine for longer periods than other vessels.[86]

Having left sanitary measures largely to "the discretion of individual states," it was proposed that the conclusions reached in Vienna should be formalized as an International Convention. In the years following, however, both the representatives of Britain and British India repeatedly showed a preference for more flexible systems of medical inspection and intelligence sharing.[87] British India also sought to implement its own package of sanitary and pilgrimage-related reforms rather than assenting to any permanent agreements or surrendering any sovereignty to an international body. Therefore, it was no great surprise when in 1876 the Government of India formally declared that it "declined to be fettered in their legislation by any such Convention."[88]

The prevailing policy of the late nineteenth century was perhaps best described by the Foreign Office's own internal history of the quarantine question:

> …although it is quite true that at Conferences each country is equal, it is true that each country is independent. The Resolutions of an International Congress are not binding on the Governments represented without the assent of the latter. The interests of any one State are not submitted to the votes of the others without the consent of that State. Her Majesty's Government have never consented to a majority of the Board exercising any authority over their subjects or their ships other than that which can be exercised under the Capitulations… They have never consented to submit the interests of Her Majesty's subjects in matters of quarantine to the votes of the Representatives of other

[86] TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, pp. 3-4.

[87] TNA: FO 7/982, "International Sanitary Convention, Commission of Enquiry, Permanent Council, vol. 1, Proposals for Preventing the Spread of Cholera," December 1874-December 1876.

[88] TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, p. 4. See also F.O. 881/5011, W. Maycock, "Memorandum respecting the Quarantine Restrictions adopted by Foreign Countries in consequence of the Outbreak of Cholera in Europe," 30 September 1884, p. 2.

Powers.[89]

Though the precise cause of cholera remained hotly contested until at least the mid 1880s, a working hypothesis concerning the transmission of cholera had already been worked out and publicly stated as early as 1849 by John Snow. Snow, an anesthetist by training, who had worked with cholera victims in the coal mines near Newcastle-upon-Tyne during Britain's first cholera epidemic in 1831-1832, became famous for exposing the fecal-oral link between cholera and contaminated water from the infamous Broad Street Pump in London in 1854. Snow's groundbreaking research went part of the way toward identifying the causal agent, "the morbid poisons," of cholera. He also identified its principal modes of transmission through the victim's "dejecta" (*vomit* and *feces*) and through the movement of people. Snow even explained how the provision of clean, uncontaminated drinking water could block the spread of the disease.[90]

Snow's conclusions played an important role in the consensus reached by mainstream European scientists participating in the 1866 sanitary conference, concerning how best to halt cholera's advance at the global level. Moreover, Snow's research would eventually be confirmed and refined by the findings of the German bacteriologist, Robert Koch. Through his investigations of cholera in both Egypt and India, Koch was able to discover the causal agent of cholera, the comma bacillus *Vibrio Cholerae*, in a Calcutta

---

[89] F.O. 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, p. 42.

[90] Hamlin, *Cholera*, 179-191; Sheldon Watts, "From Rapid Change to Stasis: Official Responses to Cholera in British-Ruled India and Egypt, 1860 to c. 1921," *Journal of World History* 12, no. 2 (2001): 326; Watts, *Epidemics and History*, 169.

water tank in 1884. However, Koch's findings would meet a ferocious campaign of denial and resistance from British authorities in Britain and especially in India.[91]

The Government of India's Sanitary Commissioner, Dr. J.M. Cunningham, serving from 1868 to 1884, built his career around the denial of contagion theory and the obstruction of international quarantine efforts.[92] Cunningham, a disciple of English sanitarians like Edwin Chadwick and Thomas Southwood Smith, insisted that cholera was caused solely by local sanitary imperfections.[93] Cunningham remained convinced that some "miasma" or "mysterious influence" in the state of the atmosphere, a particular "season" or the "fermentative products of the soil" were responsible for cholera outbreaks. He held that such imperfections in India's environment were caused by the "unwholesome surroundings" or the "filthy habits" of Indians, not by any "specific communicable germ."[94] Throughout his tenure he repeatedly argued that quarantine measures based on "contagionist theory" were "no more logical or effectual than it would be to post a line of sentries to stop the monsoon."[95] Rather, Cunningham espoused that the only truly appropriate response to cholera was a strict regimen of "pure air, pure water, pure soil, good and sufficient food, proper clothing, and suitable healthy employment for both mind and body."[96]

---

[91] "The Cholera Bacillus," *Science* 3, no. 66 (1884): 574-576; William Coleman, "Koch's Comma Bacillus: The First Year," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 61 (1987): 315-342.

[92] Watts, "From Rapid Change to Stasis," 347-356; Jeremy D. Issacs, "D.D. Cunningham and the Aetiology of Cholera in British India, 1869-1897," *Medical History* 42 (1998): 281-283.

[93] On English anti-contagionism and miasma theory, see Hamlin, *Cholera*, 158-159.

[94] TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, p. 5; Watts, *Epidemics and History*, 205.

[95] J.M. Cunningham, *Cholera: What Can the State Do to Prevent It?* (Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India, 1884), 24.

Although Cunningham's localist approach to the etiology of cholera had been popular among medical authorities in India since the early nineteenth century, their ideas were also reinforced from the 1860s onward by the work of the German miasma-specialist Max von Pettenkofer.[97] Pettenkofer, Koch's long-time rival, put forth a soil-based theory, which stated that the presence of a specific germ and susceptible victim could not alone produce cholera symptoms. Rather, cholera required the presence of specific soil conditions. Only then would the germ acquire its pathogenic qualities and produce and epidemic. As an anti-contagionist, Pettenkofer was naturally opposed to the European and Ottoman consensus calling for quarantines and *cordons sanitaires* in response to cholera outbreaks. As a result, his theories, despite their unpopularity among the scientific community in continental Europe, proved a valuable tool in British India's battle against quarantine regulation.[98] Pettenkofer's denial of contagion theory was so ardent that in 1892 he actually swallowed a culture of cholera vibrios, apparently without any effect, in an attempt to disprove Koch's theories.[99]

Following Koch's discovery of the cholera bacillus in 1884, his research was predictably attacked by his archrival Pettenkofer. While Koch was able to publicly refute Pettenkofer's localist position in 1885, Britain's deeply institutionalized opposition to

---

[96] Ibid., 130.

[97] Max von Pettenkofer, *Cholera: How to Prevent and Resist It*, translated by Thomas W. Hime (London: Ballière, Tindall, and Cox, 1875). In addition to being something of a "quack scientist," Pettenkofer also appears to have been an unbalanced man. He eventually committed suicide in 1901 by shooting himself in the head. See Watts, "From Rapid Change to Stasis," 354.

[98] Isaacs, "D.D. Cunningham and the Aetiology of Cholera in British India," 281-290.

[99] Ibid., 282; Richard J. Evans, *Death in Hamburg: Society and Politics in the Cholera Years, 1830-1910* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 497-498.

contagion theory would survive for nearly another decade.[100] Indeed, in his last days as India's Sanitary Commissioner, Cunningham expressed both "patriotic pique as well as professional chagrin that an outsider like Koch should presume to unravel the mystery which had baffled India's own medical service for more than sixty years."[101] Similarly, as Sir Joseph Frayer, Surgeon-General at the India Office Council in London, put it: "I am also very anxious to avert the evil consequences that may accrue from the effects of this so-called discovery on our sea traffic and international communication." Moreover, Frayer was determined that Britain would not take Koch's discovery lying down. Frayer convinced the Indian government to engage its own team of scientists to refute Koch's claims.[102] As a result of Frayer's campaigning, Drs. Edward Emanuel Klein and Heneage Gibbes were dispatched to conduct their own "independent investigation." To the great relief of the government of India and the India Office, in 1885 Klein and Heneage reported that Koch's bacillus was actually innocuous and could not be the sole cause of cholera."[103]

Armed with the Klein-Gibbes report, "An Enquiry into the Etiology of Asiatic Cholera," Frayer managed to almost single-handedly derail the 1885 international sanitary conference in Rome. The British government had threatened not to participate in the conference unless India was allowed to send a separate delegation with full voting

---

[100] Mariko Ogawa, "Uneasy Bedfellows: Science and Politics in the Refutation of Koch's Bacterial Theory of Cholera," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 74, no. 4 (2000): 671-707.

[101] Arnold, *Colonizing the Body*, 194.

[102] Quoted in Ogawa, "Uneasy Bedfellows," 687.

[103] Ibid., 694-699. See also TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, pp. 34-39. The report by Klein and Gibbes was originally a government report, TNA: FO 881/5172X, Drs. H. Gibbes and E. Klein, "An Enquiry into the Etiology of Asiatic Cholera," 1885. The report was subsequently published under the title, "The Official Refutation of Dr. Koch's Cholera and Commas," in the *Quarterly Journal of Microscopial Science*.

rights to the conference. The two men chosen, Frayer and Timothy Lewis, were both implacable opponents of post-1866 contagion-based framework of the international sanitary conferences.[104] Through Frayer and Lewis's connivance with an Italian delegate Koch was prevented from defending his research at the conference.[105] In fact, it was even agreed that matters surrounding Koch's theory should not be discussed at all. By excluding Koch's work on cholera from the diplomatic conversation, Frayer and his Italian ally advanced a pro-British, anti-contagionist agenda calling for the relaxation of the quarantine restrictions and fees being imposed at Suez and on Indian Ocean pilgrims entering the Red Sea. As a result of the aggressive Anglo-Indian strategy pursued at Rome, the conference fell apart with no binding resolution. Even after the conference, the Foreign Office instructed their *Chargé d'Affaires* in Istanbul to continue pressing Abdülhamid for changes in Ottoman quarantine policies.[106]

With the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, the ideological gulf between the Ottoman and British empires over contagion and quarantine provided another index of their deteriorating relations. Almost immediately after the occupation, Sir Evelyn Baring (later Lord Cromer) had set about reorganizing the Alexandria Board in order to subjugate it to British demands that the Suez Canal's commercial traffic be completely unfettered.[107] In this climate, quarantine was to become both a way for the Hamidian state to underline its own sovereignty in the Red Sea and the Hijaz and an extension of

---

[104] Mark Harrison, "Quarantine, pilgrimage, and colonial trade: India 1866-1900," *The Indian Economic and Social Review* 29, no. 2 (1992): 127-131.

[105] Ogawa, "Uneasy Bedfellows," 701.

[106] See also Harrison, "Quarantine, pilgrimage, and colonial trade," 129-130.

[107] TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, pp. 1-3, 39. See also Harrison, "Quarantine, pilgrimage, and colonial trade," 127-131.

Ottoman diplomatic protests over Egypt. Enraged by Britain's manipulation of the Rome conference and the occupation of Egypt as leverage on the Red Sea quarantine question, Abdülhamid retaliated by announcing that all vessels traveling from India would be subject to ten days of quarantine instead of five.[108]

As a result of their continuing denial of the overwhelming evidence in favor of contagion theory, by the 1880s France and Germany had become increasingly frustrated with Britain's sanitary gamesmanship. Likewise, Ottoman public health officials, who had been early and enthusiastic adopters of the revolutionary ideas being put forth by Koch and Pasteur, repeatedly expressed their total dismay at the brazen intellectual dishonesty of their British interlocutors.[109] Despite these shared sentiments, however, no alliance of European states was able to fully counterbalance British obstructionism "through the weak apparatus of internationalism."[110]

As every Briton knew, since the era of the Continental Blockade imposed by Napoleon, Britain's prosperity had depended on its mercantile fleet and the world-wide expansion of liberal free trade policies.[111] Owing to the intermingling of these historical and ideological perspectives on cholera, quarantine, naval supremacy, and free trade, Britain would remain decidedly less concerned with controlling cholera's transmission from India to Europe than with the protection of her Indian trade route against quarantine restrictions. Thus, by the time the Ottoman state was finally prepared to open the long-

---

[108] On the Ottoman retaliation at the Rome conference, see BOA, MV, 5/70 (15 M 1303/24 October 1885); BOA, MV, 6/12 (7 S 1303/15 November 1885); BOA, MV, 6/58 (9 Ra 1303/16 December 1885).

[109] For Ottoman glosses on Koch's discoveries, see Hamdi bin Aziz, *Kolera*, 82-97; Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 252-263.

[110] Huber, "The Unification of the Globe by Disease?," 466.

[111] Watts, *Epidemics and History*, 192.

awaited Kamaran Island quarantine station in 1882, British resistance to contagion and quarantine had reached the level of a nationalist paranoia. In the September 1883 edition of the British medical journal, *The Lancet*, the fervor over pilgrimage-related quarantine was bluntly spelled out: "those who love quarantine and hate England fall back on the assumption that cholera comes from India, and although the links in the chain of communication cannot be discovered, they are perfectly willing to assume their presence."[112]

Kamaran: An Island of Discontent in a Sea of Suffering

Between 24 December 1877 and 7 January 1878, 845 people died in Mecca and Jidda from cholera. The normal death rate in Jidda ranged between five and ten per day under normal circumstances. During hajj season, the death rate climbed to between ten and twelve. However, at the end of 1877 pilgrimage as many as 50 persons per day were dying in Jidda and Mecca.[113] The cholera outbreak coincided with severe flooding in Mecca, which in addition to dumping feet of mud around the Ka'ba had also filled Mecca's waterworks with sand and debris. Broken water pipes, cisterns filled with brown sediment-laden water, and a lake of standing water in the Haram had turned Mecca into a veritable cholera incubator.[114]

While the 1877-1878 cholera outbreak was not nearly as a catastrophic as some past or future outbreaks, it would begin to refocus Ottoman attention on sanitary reform, environmental management, and quarantine in the Hijaz. Efforts to ameliorate the

---

[112] *The Lancet* (15 September 1883): 482.

[113] Ochsenwald, *Religion Society, and the State in Arabia*, 67.

[114] John F. Keane, *Six Months in Mecca: An Account of the Muhammedan Pilgrimage to Mecca* (London: Tinsley Brothers, 1881), 176-186.

region's ailing water infrastructure and impose tighter public health regulations would not achieve results immediately, nor would they come fast enough to avert further catastrophes. However, both Ottoman and global attention to pilgrimage-related cholera were reawakened in the late 1870s and early 1880s. In 1878 and 1881 alone, official British statistics from India tallied over 317,000 and 161,000 cholera deaths.[115] These outbreaks were only the leading edge. Between 1881 and 1895, the globe would be convulsed by its fourth global cholera pandemic. International sanitary conferences to address the reemergence of the scourge were held in 1881, 1885, 1892, 1893, and 1894. During this period, Ottoman public health reforms in the Hijaz would also gain new levels of urgency, consistency, and continuity. And over the next two decades, Ottoman sanitary discipline would begin to mature and make its presence felt in the Hijaz and beyond like never before.

At the end of August (Ramadan) 1881, during an outbreak in Aden, cholera made its way to Mecca just in time for the height of the hajj season.[116] In what would become a running theme during these years, Ottoman officials repeatedly expressed their dismay as to why British officials were consistently allowing their vessels to leave Aden with clean bills of health (*temiz patent* or *temiz pratika*).[117] By the time that Istanbul was informed of the outbreak in Mecca it had already claimed 130 lives and by September cholera was

[115] Hamdi bin Aziz, *Kolera*, 11-12.

[116] BOA, Y. A. HUS, 168/98 (25 Za 1298/19 October 1881).

[117] BOA, Y. A. HUS, 168/98 (25 Za 1298/19 October 1881). For Ottoman complaints of British incompetence or even accusations of purposeful withholding of information as the cause of outbreaks in the Hijaz in 1881-1882 and 1890, see especially Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 60-62, 150, 248, 297-300.

burning through the estimated 80,000 pilgrims assembled for hajj.[118] By the end of December, the official numbers recorded by Gregory Wortabet, the chief Ottoman quarantine physician (*enspektör*) in Jidda, counted some 4,500 deaths throughout the Hijaz.[119] However, as the British consulate speculated, the official statistics likely told only part of the grim tale. As they hypothesized, the real mortality was very likely in the vicinity of 8,000 to 10,000.[120]

As outbreaks of this magnitude and speed unfolded, terrified victims would inevitably attempt to flee from whatever epicenter of morbidity and mortality they might have found themselves. In their fruitless attempts to flee from Mecca and Mina, many would be stricken and die along the way. In theory, the victims were supposed to be brought to the public health authorities in Mecca in order to be examined and receive an official death certificate (*ruhsat*). However, under these extreme conditions many victims were hastily buried by their friends, family, or pilgrimage guides.[121] During especially catastrophic outbreaks, often the mortality was so overwhelming that the normal procedures for washing the bodies of the deceased and their proper burial

---

[118] BOA, Y. A. HUS, 168/98 (25 Za 1298/19 October 1881). On the 1881-1882 outbreak, see also BOA, İ. DH, 1295-2/101952 (4 Za 1298/28 September 1881); BOA, İ. DH, 1295-2/101955 (20 Za 1298/14 October 1881); BOA, Y. A. HUS 168/80 (16 Za 1298/10 October 1881); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 169/16 (8 M 1299/30 November 1881); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 169/17 (9 M 1299/1 December 1881) BOA, Y. EE, 43/145 (28 Za 1298/22 October 1881); BOA, Y. EE, 43/146 (11 Za 1298/5 October 1881). Here, I take the estimate of 80,000 pilgrims present at Arafat from Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in* Arabia, 61.

[119] For Dr. Wortabet's cholera-related mortality statistics for the 1881-1882 hajj season, see Gülden Sarıyıldız, "XIX Yüzyılında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kolera Salgını," *Tarih Boyunca Anadolu'da Doğal Afetler ve Deprem Semineri* (İstanbul: Globus Dünya Basımevi, 2000), 317; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 62.

[120] TNA: FO 195/1415, "Table showing Number, Date and Place of Deaths by Cholera in the Hedjaz from September 16 to December 30, 1881. According to the Returns obtained from the Jeddah Health Office." Consul Lynedoch Moncrieff, 25 January 1882.

[121] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 22-38, 80-82; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 13-14, 61; Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in* Arabia, 58-73.

collapsed. Those responsible for handling corpses were among the most likely to be infected in the course of carrying out their work. As they too began to flee or die, bodies would accumulate at the cemetery. And then there were those left unburied (and uncounted) along the roadsides, leaving the region's principal arteries strewn with decomposing corpses.[122]

To make matters worse, as the carnage in Mecca unfolded, the Egyptian quarantine authorities announced that pilgrims travelling toward Suez would not be allowed to depart from Jidda until fifteen days after the disease had completely died out there. Pilgrimage vessels were being placed in quarantine at al-Wajh for fifteen days and then a further ten at al-Tur before ever reaching the Suez Canal. As the Egyptian restrictions slowed the departure of pilgrims from Jidda, shortages of food and water began to add fuel to the fire, placing poorer pilgrims in increasing danger. As the number of stranded pilgrims mounted, Osman Nuri Paşa called on the authorities in Istanbul to reverse the Egyptian measures and take the necessary steps to get traffic moving through the canal and to send steamships to help evacuate the remaining pilgrims.[123]

Although a decade and a half had lapsed since the disasters of 1865, much had changed since then. In 1881, the Hijaz was on the cusp of a dramatic spasm of state building and centralization under Osman Nuri Paşa's energetic governorship. The Hijaz and the Arab frontier more generally had begun to take on a greater strategic and symbolic value in the eyes of the emerging Hamidian state. And unlike the late 1860s and early 1870s, Ottoman attention was not being sapped by a grinding insurgency in

---

[122] TNA: FO 195/1415, "Report on the Cholera in the Hedjaz, 1881," Consul Lynedoch Moncrieff, 25 January 1882.

[123] BOA, İ. DH, 840/67562 (5 M 1299/27 November 1881); BOA, İ. DH, 841/67635 (11 M 1299/3 December 1881); Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 62-63.

Yemen. By the early 1880s, the post-1866 policy of sending an annually appointed public health commissioner to oversee the sanitary preparedness for hajj season was once again revived.[124] Likewise, plans for the long-delayed Red Sea quarantine station were also being dusted off.[125]

In late 1881, the construction of the Kamaran Island quarantine station (*tahhafuzhane*) was finally underway. Kamaran is a barren strip of sand and rocks located just off of the northern Yemeni coast some 28 kilometers north of Hudayda and 180 nautical miles from the Straits of Bab al-Mandab.[126] It was sparsely populated by a handful of villages on the northern and southern ends of the island and its well-sheltered port could accommodate up to twenty ships at a time.[127] At its height, the station was capable of accommodating up to 30,000 pilgrims per year and up to 6,000 at one time.[128] However, in 1882 the number of shelters provided could accommodate only two

---

[124] As Saffet Paşa warned, if the Ottoman state did show that it was fully complying with the 1866 international sanitary conference's agreement that a sanitary official should be sent to the Hijaz each year, it was increasingly likely that the European powers might seek to take further action in the name of public health. BOA, Y. EE, 143/46, "Aden'de zuhur eden koleranın hacılar vasıtasiyle hertarafa yayılması ihtimali olduğundan önce Fransa İmparatoru Napolyon zamanında alınan karar mucibince Mekke-i Mükerreme'ye bir memur izamı aksi halde sıhhat-ı umumiye namına Avrupalıların sıhhi komisyon göndermeleri mahzuriyetinin tevellüt edeceği hakkında Saffet Pasa'nın tezkiresi" (28 Za 1298/22 October 1881). See also BOA, Y. A. RES, 7/29 (25 N 1297/31 August 1880); BOA, Y. A. RES 21/4 (9 N 1300/14 July 1883); BOA, Y. A. RES, 23/30 (1 B 1301/27 April 1884).

[125] BOA, İ. DH, 892/70972 (27 L 1300/31 August 1883); BOA, İ. ŞD, 69/4058 (7 N 1301/1 July 1884). Later two more quarantine sites, Ebu Saad and Vasıt, were built on the islands surrounding Jidda to accommodate pilgrims from other Egypt, North Africa, and other non-Indian Ocean points of departure. See BOA, İ. ŞD, 84/4992 (14 Ca 1304/8 February 1887); BOA, İ. ŞD, 93/5545 (5 S 1306/11 October 1888).

[126] On the history of the history and geography of Kamaran Island and its quarantine station, see Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island"; Great Britain, Naval Intelligence Division, *Western Arabia and the Red Sea*, 464-472; "Kamaran," in Ahmad Jabir 'Afif, ed., *Mawsu'at al-Yamaniyya*, 2nd ed., vol. 4 (San'a': Mu'assasat al-'Afif al-Thaqafiyya, 2003), 2456-2457.

[127] In 1884, it was estimated that Kamaran's population consisted off roughly 200 households and a total population of roughly 1,200. BOA, İ. ŞD, 72/4233 (10 Ra 1302/28 December 1884).

[128] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 54-60.

shiploads at a time, leaving others to wait aboard their steamers.[129] Whatever its geographical attributes as a port and relative isolation, from the perspective of human comfort and environmental capacity it is difficult to imagine many more miserable places.

Without British support for its establishment, the expenses for the construction of Kamaran fell squarely on the Ottoman government. The revenues generated by the sanitary tariff approved by the Board of Health in 1872 were insufficient to cover the 542,000 kuruş construction costs or its subsequent upkeep and improvement.[130] At the outset, it was unclear whether Kamaran was even going to be a permanent operation.[131] Responsibility for Kamaran's funding and upkeep was to become a running battle between the Ottoman Finance Ministry and the Board of Health. And although Kamaran was of enormous political concern to the Hijaz province and directly dependent on the medical expertise of the Board of Health, appropriations and oversight for construction, maintenance, and local workers flowed through the *sancak* of Hudayda.[132] Owing in part to the muddled nature of Kamaran's financial and bureaucratic chains of command, it was often unclear exactly who was in charge. As a result, for over a decade Kamaran operated without many of human resources and physical infrastructure it actually needed.

---

[129] TNA: FO 195/1414, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 November 1882.

[130] BOA, İ. ŞD, 69/4058 (7 N 1301/1 July 1884); Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 54-60.

[131] In 1888 and 1889, Ottoman documents begin to refer to Kamaran as the permanent quarantine site (*mevki-i tahaffuz-ı daimi*) for Indian Ocean pilgrims. BOA, İ. DH, 1072/84075 (9 C 1305/22 February 1888); BOA, İ. DH, 1072/84075 (29 Ca 1306/31 January 1889).

[132] Noting the quarantine station's newfound importance, a new administrative sub-district (*nahiye*), which united Kamaran and the adjacent port of Salif, was created under the control of the *sancak* of Hudayda. BOA, İ. ŞD, 72/4233 (10 Ra 1302/28 December 1884).

And in order to recoup the costs of construction and staffing, pilgrims were subjected to (allegedly) exorbitant quarantine and disinfection fees.[133]

The problems began even before the pilgrims had set foot on the island. The captains calling at Kamaran warned that the approaches to the island were unsafe for large vessels. Without buoys, the passages between the treacherous reefs surrounding the island were completely invisible under windy conditions.[134] And almost immediately after the first Indian pilgrims landed the British consulate in Jidda received a deluge of complaints.[135] Pilgrims and ship captains alike complained that the quarantine fees were excessive. Rather pitiful specimens of vegetables were occasionally procured from Hudayda, but were very expensive. Supplies of dried vegetables, olive oil, butter, and other foodstuffs were generally shipped in from Port Said or Suez. Because everything had to imported foodstuffs, firewood, and cooking fuel were all prohibitively expensive. Likewise, pilgrims repeatedly complained about the island's scarce supply of brackish well water, which although hardly palatable, was tightly controlled. Of particular annoyance was the closure of the station's water tanks from ten in the morning until four in the afternoon.[136]

As a result of the rationing of the water supplies, when water was distributed it attracted large crowds. In the ensuing crush, the local guards, primarily drawn from fisherman living in the area, could not control the crowds and on several occasions

---

[133] See also Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 32-45.

[134] On the provision and upkeep of the buoys marking the approach to Kamaran, see BOA, BOA, İ. DH, 1137/88673 (1 N 1306/1 May 1889); BOA, MV 64/25 (6 N 1308/15 April 1891).

[135] For a representative example of the nature of the complaints, see BOA, İ. DH, 1120/87579 (1 B 1305/14 March 1888); BOA, DH. MKT, 1500/73 (30 B 1305/12 April 1888).

[136] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 32-45; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 54-60.

resorted to beating them back with cane poles. As Dr. Abdur Razzack reasoned, the rough treatment of the pilgrims was likely not a product of any overtly evil intent on the part of the overzealous local staffers. Rather, it was, first and foremost, a product of the mutual language barrier between the Arabic-speaking guards and their Indian charges. As he pointed out, all of this could have been avoided had the Ottoman authorities provided even one interpreter.[137]

The scarcity of the food and water was further compounded by the island's deplorable accommodations. The pilgrims were herded into communal Tihama-style thatched sheds (*barakalar* or *arişler*), provided by the provincial authorities in Hudayda. The sheds were constructed from date palm branches (*hurma dalları*). Due to Kamaran's distance from Istanbul and its extreme climate, the costs and desirability of bringing in craftsmen and materials from Europe were deemed out of the question. As a result, brick and mortar construction methods were generally not available. Thus, Kamaran's initial physical infrastructure was constructed from local clay and thatched roofing.[138] As pilgrims complained, the roofs were too thin to keep out the sun, while the openings for ventilation were too small. Dr. Abdur Razzack estimated that at a maximum 40 pilgrims might be safely housed in each shed. However, up to 100 pilgrims at a time were being assigned to each of the seven structures.[139] The station's supervising physician optimistically calculated that each pilgrim would have had approximately 11.3 square feet of space. This cramped space offered essentially no relief from the cramped

---

[137] TNA: FO 195/1514, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 November 1882.

[138] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 54-60.

[139] TNA: FO 195/1514, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 November 1882; Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda to the Earl of Dufferin, British Ambassador, Istanbul, 24 November 1882.

conditions that pilgrims endured between decks while onboard the steamers that brought them there. Given the sizzling year-round temperatures for which Kamaran is infamous, this amount of space proved positively suffocating for healthy pilgrims, let alone sick or elderly ones.[140] As one physician who accompanied the pilgrims to Kamaran commented, "the shelter which is meant for their short imprisonment is totally unfit for such a place as Camaran, where sometimes the heat (sultry) is even greater than Muscat, and the poor pilgrims have to keep themselves half scorched under their cow-sheds until relieved."[141]

In addition to concerns over shelter, there were also repeated complaints about the woefully inadequate number and condition of the camp's latrines. There were also no arrangements made for the segregation of the sexes. Relaying the complaints of his fellow countrymen, Dr. Abdur Razzack expressed his astonishment at the total lack of forethought about any sort of separate accommodations for female pilgrims, most of whom he described as terrified, "all huddled together like sheep in a fold." The lack of separate housing for the better classes of female pilgrims, used to the security and seclusion of the "zenana," was further exacerbated by the Ottoman quarantine physicians' insistence that the women uncover their faces for the required medical examination. As Abdur Razzack complained, simply looking at the face of these women would yield little information helping one ascertain whether or not they might have contracted cholera or not. In any case, once ill the symptoms would be virtually impossible to conceal. As a

---

[140] TNA: FO 881/4942X, Egypt, "Unfinished Report by the late Consul Moncrieff on the Quarantine Treatment of Indian Pilgrims at Camaran," 1883; TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, p. 26.

[141] TNA: FO 195/1730, in "Correspondence printed in the Times of India," 26 July 1891, *Records of the Hajj*, vol. 9, 217.

compromise, Abdur Razzack suggested that the Ottoman quarantine examination might be conducted by checking the pulse or examining the tongue, neither of which would require female pilgrims to reveal their full facial features. From his perspective, such problems were an unavoidable byproduct of having European physicians staff the quarantine station. Although Abdur Razzack saw no ill intent and attributed the problem to Dr. Duca's ignorance of Muslim sensitivities, the use of Christian physicians on Kamaran Island and other Red Sea quarantines was to remain an endless source of resentment and mutual misunderstanding for years to come.[142]

In his report on the 1882 pilgrimage season, Abdur Razzack coyly suggested the inherent contradiction between the Ottoman Sultan's professed solicitude for the welfare of the pilgrims and their mistreatment at the hands of abusive local guards and Christian doctors on Kamaran Island. As he ventriloquized on behalf of his countrymen, he cautioned: "I only repeat their sentiments." Many of pilgrims openly "wondered why he… who had toiled and travelled for six or eight months to reach the Holy place should be turned aside and brought to this uninviting island to sigh for the necessities of life even for a day by the servants of the 'Padishah' (sovereign) who called himself 'the servant of the Holy places'."[143]

A Clean Bill of Health?

In addition to the primitive conditions encountered by pilgrims during Kamaran Island's first pilgrimage season, the station failed in a more fundamental respect. It failed

---

[142] TNA: FO 195/1514, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 November 1882.

[143] Ibid. On Ottoman complaints about the continued use of Christian, especially Greek, inspectors on Kamaran Island, see also BOA, Y. A. RES, 56/10 (11 M 1309/17 August 1891); Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 89.

to stop cholera from reaching the Hijaz. Kamaran's poor performance only seemed to provide more ammunition to the anti-quarantine lobby in India. Complaints were so numerous that the Indian government conducted an enquiry into the conditions on the island. The commission found that pilgrims had been "subjected to oppression and extortion amounting to positive cruelty." Moreover, the report argued that the sanitary measures ostensibly designed to protect the holy places from cholera would "only serve to predispose" pilgrims "to sickness and lay them open to the attacks of cholera generalized in the Hedjaz… The whole of the arrangements at Cameran seem indeed to be devised for the pecuniary benefit of the Turkish authorities and can serve no other possible end."[144] Thus, when cholera broke out in the Hijaz during the 1882 season, British observers attributed the outbreak to the local conditions on Kamaran Island and the Hijaz instead of India itself. Despite Kamaran's failure to stop cholera from entering the Hijaz, it did have a certain clarifying effect. The tighter tracking of India's pilgrimage vessels made it considerably easier for Ottoman and international observers to identify precisely where and when cholera was entering the Red Sea. However, even this evidence did little to combat Britain's entrenched miasma-based anti-contagionist ideology. In response to the rather obvious evidence that the 1882 outbreak had been transported from India to Kamaran and the Hijaz via Aden, as the British consulate in Jidda cautioned, it would be "rash to assume its importation." Rather, the consul continued to argue that cholera was likely "latent" in Mecca and Mina "perennially, liable to excitement when the aggregation of unwholesomely living people occurs at the Haj."[145]

---

[144] TNA: FO 195/1451, quoted in Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 33-34.

From the Ottoman medical establishment's perspective, the situation looked very different. As in the case of the horrific 1881 outbreak, in 1882 cholera had once again been detected in Aden prior to making its way into the Hijaz. As a result, Ottoman officials had become increasingly wary of the veracity of the bills of health provided by Bombay and Aden. Ottoman officials accused British authorities of concealing cholera cases and sending vessels into the Red Sea with clean bills of health (*temiz pratika*) even though they had been detained in Aden. This is precisely what happened in 1882. When the steamship *Hesperia*, carrying 500 pilgrims, arrived in Aden, cholera was discovered and the vessel was place under quarantine for ten days. Under the regulations imposed at Kamaran, five days' quarantine was imposed on all ships originating from Bombay and additional days were imposed for each death occurring from any cause after landing on shore. Upon landing the *Hesperia* was placed under a ten-day quarantine. During that period, another cholera death occurred. On top of that no vessel was allowed to depart for the Hijaz until it had spent ten days free of cholera.[146] As a result, the *Hesperia* would spend 47 days in quarantine on Kamaran. During this period, another British vessel, the *Columbian*, arrived at Kamaran. However, as Ottoman officials would claim, unbeknownst to them the *Columbian* had undergone a fifteen-day quarantine in Aden, which had inexplicably been concealed. Thus, although the *Hesperia* had brought cholera to Kamaran, its lengthy detention should have ensured its safety. However, as a result of the British failure to reveal the *Columbian*'s previous cholera cases, Ottoman authorities at Kamaran had allowed the vessel to continue on to the Hijaz after only ten days. As the Ottoman epidemiology expert Dr. Mehmed Şakir Bey sarcastically chirped,

---

[145] TNA: FO 195/1451, Consul Lynedoch Moncrieff, Jidda to G.H. Wyndham, Istanbul, 2 January 1883.
[146] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 33.

this was most definitely not a coincidence (*Tesadüf bu ya!*). The pattern was clear. From Istanbul's perspective, the constant presence of cholera onboard vessels from Bombay was being downplayed through the issuance of intentionally misleading bills of health at Aden.[147]

According to Mehmed Şakir, in 1890 the story was much the same. That season cholera broke out onboard the Indian vessel, the *Deccan*. In the course of the *Deccan*'s hellish 72-day quarantine on Kamaran Island 52 Indians died of cholera. During this period, the disease would spread to the local villagers on Kamaran as well as passengers from other steamers. Thus, although the long-detained *Deccan* did not even make it to the hajj, the damage had already been done. While in quarantine, the disease infected pilgrims traveling on the *King Arthur* and was subsequently spread to Jidda and Mecca.[148]

Cholera's Climax: 1893

By the early 1890s the Hijaz and Kamaran Island were ripe for change. The carnage of the early 1890s was a tipping point both within in the Ottoman Empire and internationally. For the 1890 pilgrimage season, the Hijaz's official death toll was estimated at 4,578. However, estimates ran as high as 10,000.[149] In 1891 the story was much the same. Once again, cholera broke out onboard a British steamer from Bombay and spread to Kamaran Island, Tihama, and the Hijaz.[150] The 1891 season claimed 2,942

---

[147] Sarıyıdız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 61-62, 150.

[148] Ibid., 60-64, 297-298.

[149] Ibid., 172. See also Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 40.

[150] On the case of the ill-fated journey of the Indian steamship vessel, the *Sculptor*, and the 1891 outbreak on Kamaran, see BOA, İ. DH, 1229/96213 (8 L 1308/17 May 1891); TNA: FO 78/4406, "Pilgrimage Traffic, 1891."

victims in the Hijaz alone.[151] While the 1892 season was quieter, it would prove to be the calm before the storm.

In the wake of the 1890 and 1891 outbreaks, the 1893 pilgrimage season was approached with a tremendous anxiety about the potential for food shortages, extreme overcrowding, and the increased potential for cholera. The 1893 season was once again a *Hacc-ı ekber* season. With predictions that the hajj census would be multiplied several times over the normal numbers, in the run-up to the start of the pilgrimage Abdülhamid called for the creation of special commission raise aid money for the Hijaz (*İane-i Hicaziye Komisyonu*). A one-percent draft (*kesinti*) was taken from military wages. The funds were earmarked for the transfer of enough basic supplies and foodstuffs like bread, rice, butter, oil, and vinegar from Istanbul and Egypt.[152] Despite these efforts, once again the bill for the hajj season would be measured in human lives more than in treasury ledgers.

In the month leading up to the hajj in May 1893 cholera had already been reported among the Indians at Kamaran Island and later among a group of Yemeni pilgrims. Although in the months leading up to the hajj, the Board of Health had imposed five- and even ten-day quarantines against communication with Yemen, the measures had failed. And although Sultan Abdülhamid had immediately authorized up to 150,000 kuruş for emergency sanitary expenses, by the time that the pilgrims had reached Arafat, the outbreak had begun. By the second day at Mina, pilgrims were informed that the shari‘a rules mandating a three-day stay there had been suspended. On the request of the public

---

[151] İzzeddin, *Mekke-i Mükerreme'de Kolera ve Hıfzıshha*, 39.

[152] BOA, BEO, 217/16272 (26 Za 1310/11 June 1310); BOA, BEO 218/16322 (25 Za 1310/10 June 1893); BOA, BEO, 222/16584 (3 Z 1310/18 June 1893); BOA, Y. MTV, 79/6 (1 Z 1310/16 June 1893); BOA, Y. MTV, 79/117 (19 Z 1310/4 July 1893); Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 87.

health authorities, the Sharif of Mecca ordered the caravans to remove the pilgrims early.[153] By then, however, there was little that could be done.

As ʻAbd al-Hamid Shafi, a physician who had witnessed the devastation firsthand, reported back to the Egyptian Board of Health, the crisis had moved so rapidly that in Mina private residences were being converted into makeshift hospitals. However, because the proper facilities and supplies needed to treat patients were completely non-existent (*külliyen mefkud*) such scenes quickly devolved from triage to hospice. In Mina alone, the death toll was topping 1,000 per day. However, Shafi speculated the totals for Mina and Mecca might actually have actually reached 2,500 or 3,000 per day. As he points out, in many neighborhoods corpses (*cenazeler*) were being buried without notifying the public health authorities (*tabibe malumat verilmeksizin defn ediliyor*). Likewise, local families had abandoned the cemeteries and were burying their dead themselves in the courtyards and gardens of their homes (*kendi hanelerinin avlusuna*). As the corpses multiplied the porters (*hammallar*) responsible for burying the dead either died themselves or fled. Similarly, those tasked with burying the animal sacrifices at Mina also deserted. The dreadfully disgusting smell (*rayiha-i kerihe*) was pervasive.[154] In an attempt to clear the corpses and lift the fog of death the Hijaz's commanding officer Diyarbakırlı Ferik Osman Paşa and his troops were left to bury the dead. As a result, the commander would also succumb to cholera just days later.[155]

As thousands of pilgrims attempted to escape, the disease fanned out in all directions with the Bedouins and on the caravans to Yemen, Najd, and Medina.

---

[153] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 65-67.

[154] BOA, Y. PRK. SH, 6/55 (7 Ra 1310/29 September 1310).

[155] İzzeddin, *Mekke-i Mükerreme'de Kolera ve Hıfzıshha*, 80.

Likewise, those pilgrims attempting to make their way back to Jidda were also stricken. In much the same fashion as in Mina, a handful of houses outside of Jidda were turned into makeshift hospitals in an attempt to keep the sick from entering the city. As ‘Abd al-Hamid Shafi recounts, however, there was little that could be done. The sick were left waiting on rugs or on the ground, without treatment, waiting to die (*yehasir ve yahut toprak üzerinde bırakılarak tedavisiz bi-ilaç kalmakta ve ölümü intizar etmekte eden*). They were stricken with all of the symptoms of “Asiatic cholera” (*Asya kolerası*). Ravaged by severe diarrhea (*ishal*), vomiting (*istifrağ*), unquenchable thirst (*teşnegi*), and chills (*vücutun teberrüd umumisi*), victims might survive for days or die in as little as a few hours. As victims succumbed to the disease’s characteristic “rice water” diarrhea, they could expect to lose anywhere from three to five gallons of fluids per day. The ceaseless diarrhea would rapidly lead to catastrophic dehydration and crashing electrolytes. As a result, within a few hours victims’ skin loses its turgor, producing wrinkles, sunken eyes, and an overall cadaverous appearance. As severe dehydration ensued, just as Shafi observed, the victims’ skin, especially the fingernails, turned a characteristic bluish-purple color (*ciltin ve tirnakların mor bir renk kesb etmesi*).[156]

Similar scenes of horror were recounted by Dr. Oslchanictzki, the chief disinfection officer at Kamaran, who had been transferred to Jidda to assist:

> I was sent from Qamaran to Jidda with a colleague to supervise the return of the pilgrims. All was quiet in the city, but we knew that Mecca there was a veritable hectacomb of pilgrims; more than a thousand were being reported dead daily. An initial convoy of 5,000 camels brought 15,000 pilgrims to Jidda. The ill had to be kept outside the city and only the healthy were admitted. I went with my colleague to the place and e began our medical inspection, which lasted from 4 a.m. till noon. The sight was terrible: everywhere were the dead and the suffering, the cries of men, women and children mixed with the roaring of the camels, in short, a terrifying scene which will never be blotted out of my memory.

[156] BOA, Y. PRK. SH, 6/55 (7 Ra 1310/29 September 1310).

As Oslchanictzki recollected his brush with mortality, he admited that he and his colleague were so frightened by the "lightning-swift death" all around them that they fell into a ritual of bidding farewell to each other in the evenings out of fear that they themselves might not make it through the night. Ultimately, Oslchanictzki lived to tell the tale, but at least 30,000 pilgrims and locals were not so fortunate.[157]

Disinfection Insurrection: Reform and Resistance, 1890-1895

Even before the 1893 outbreak, by this stage in the global pandemic of 1881-1895, regardless of the international visibility of the hajj, it was by no means the only means of cholera's circulation. By 1892, cholera was already raging in Yemen, Russia, Iran, Iraq, Anatolia, and had struck Istanbul itself.[158] The disease had also reached France and Germany and even spread as far as the Americas. 1892 also witnessed the iconic Hamburg epidemic.[159] Hamburg has, of course, long been held up as the "good" epidemic, the one that made a difference and "forced" change.[160] The Hamburg epidemic is generally thought to have produced a decisive victory for Koch's laboratory-based microbial science over Pettenkofer's miasma-based theories. Hamburg helped to push forward a revolution in water supply, revealing the false consciousness of sanitarian prattle about fetid air and predisposing threats posed by impoverished, mobile populations. In the near future, the more general nineteenth-century sanitarian obsessions with street cleaning and poor relief would no longer be adequate. Rather, in the coming

---

[157] Unpublished memoir, quoted in Peters, *The Hajj*, 303.

[158] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 61-75.

[159] Hamlin, *Cholera*, 232.

[160] Christopher Hamlin, "Cholera Forcing: The Myth of the Good Epidemic and the Coming of Good Water," *American Journal of Public Health* 99, no. 11 (2009): 1946-1954.

years the struggle against cholera would increasingly depend on disinfection technologies and safe, reliable supplies of drinking water and, more specifically, the technical expertise and infrastructure needed to support them.[161]

With the benefit of historical hindsight, it might be more accurate to say that the Hamburg outbreak was the decisive battle over cholera prevention *within* Europe. However, for at least for several more years international attention and conflict over cholera prevention remained focused on the Hijaz and the archipelago of Red Sea quarantines from Kamaran to Suez. A rather simplistic reading of the 1890s attributes the reform of Ottoman quarantine and public health procedures to the withering international pressure brought on by a succession of international sanitary conferences in Venice (1892), Dresden (1893), and especially Paris (1894). By contrast, I would argue that the Ottoman archival record shows that the administration of public health affairs in the Hijaz and Istanbul had their own antecedents, institution builders, timelines, and limitations. Between 1890 and 1895, Istanbul, the Ottoman Red Sea, and the empire more generally would experience their own sanitary turning points. With cholera reigning in the Hijaz, Istanbul and Europe, local, imperial, and international sources of reform would converge and ping back and forth between metropole and periphery. In this period, the clearly ineffectual reliance on lengthy quarantines would increasingly be revamped and paired with newer technologies and procedures of isolation, disinfection, and water filtration.

One measure of the gathering momentum for reform can be traced through a series of proposals and commissions, which ultimately culminate in a completely overhauled and greatly expanded Ottoman sanitary administration in Mecca and the Hijaz

[161] Hamlin, *Cholera*, 230-234.

from 1895-1896 onward.[162] In 1890, Mehmed Şakir Bey, an epidemiology expert at Istanbul's Haydarpaşa military hospital, traveled to the Hijaz and produced a lengthy report on the sanitary conditions of the Hijaz and the reforms needed to improve them.[163] His report was by far the most wide-ranging and detailed survey of the Hijaz's public health conditions to date. In a sense, it was an encyclopedic summation of all the knowledge accumulated over the course of the previous three decades about the urban Hijaz's sanitary and infrastructural deficiencies. In Jidda and Mecca, he outlined the need for permanent, segregated quarantine facilities. He also stressed the need for dedicated hospitals and shelters for indigent pilgrims. He outlined the urgent need for proper sewerage systems and secure sources of drinking water. In more remote locations like Arafat and Mina, he once again reiterated the need for constant vigilance in the placement and maintenance of the latrines. In Mina, he recommended the presence of a veterinarian to inspect all animals slated for slaughter. He made a number of suggestions on the need for new cemetery spaces and reformed burial procedures. He even calls for the construction of railway running from Jidda to Mecca and on to Arafat. Taken together, these and a myriad of other proposals in his *layiha* read like a roadmap for the next two decades of infrastructure building and public health reforms in the Hijaz. In one

---

[162] The 1895 *layiha* outlining the comprehensive reforms was prepared by Mecca's then chief physician (*Mekke Sıhhiye Tabibi*), Dr. Kasım İzzeddin on behalf of a special commission composed of members of the Ottoman Board of Health. See BOA, DH. MKT, 57/34 (19 Ra 1313/9 September 1895).

[163] Mehmed Şakir's *layiha*, *Hicaz'in Ahval-i Umumiye-i Sihhiye ve Islahat-ı Esasiye-i Hazırasına Dair Bazı Müşahedat ve Mülahazat-i Bendeganemi Havi Layiha-i Tıbbiye* was originally prepared in 1890. Sarıyıdız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*. See also BOA, Y. A. HUS, 58/8 (17 Ş 1309/17 March 1892).

form or another the majority of these reforms would be implemented and refined between 1895 and World War I.

In addition to a growing sense of coherency, confidence, and technical precision in the Ottoman dissection of the mechanics behind cholera's circulation in the Hijaz, Mehmed Şakir's reform proposal also conveys the palpable frustration with the repeated importation of cholera from British India as well as the constant threat of European intervention in the region's intertwined sanitary and political affairs. As Mehmed Şakir warned, in addition to European oversight of the Kamaran Island quarantine station, by the early 1890s, the repetition of hajj-related cholera outbreaks had provided European states with the political cover to begin questioning whether Ottoman officials within the Hijaz proper were doing enough to prevent cholera from spreading overland via the caravans from 'Asir, Baghdad, Basra, Najd, Syria, and Yemen. Under the guise of protecting the masses of colonial subjects making the hajj each year, the French consul had proposed the formation of mixed commission of doctors (*Heyet-i Tıbiyye-yi Mühtelite*) to monitor the hajj caravans each year. As in the case of Britain's use of Muslim consular agents, the French consul acknowledged that Christian doctors would naturally not be able to travel inland to Mecca and Medina. Instead, he proposed that each year France, Britain, Russia, the Netherlands, and Austria should each send young, capable Muslim doctors from among their respective colonial subjects to accompany the hajj caravans. At the conclusion of their respective journeys, the consul even thought it might advantageous to have representatives meet and convey their suggestions to their home states. The consul even brazenly suggested that the doctors might be accompanied and protected by their own government's soldiers. In 1892, the consul forwarded the

plan to the French ambassador. Not surprisingly, the Ottoman members of the Board of Health were extremely opposed to this radical attempt to internationalize the internal administration of the Hijaz.[164] However, despite their effective resistance to this idea, as the Ottoman state prepared to import new technologies and procedures for biopolitical and environmental management, which had previously only been applied to pilgrim populations in quarantine settings, to Jidda and even Mecca itself, their application to Hijazi locals was increasingly perceived as both an attack on local autonomy and the illegitimate product of European extraterritorial intervention. As a result, not unlike the violent resistance to the prohibition of the slave trade in the 1850s, in the 1890s questions sanitation and biopolitical surveillance increasingly became the new symbols of Ottoman-Turkish alterity, Europe-ness, and anti-Islamic innovation in the Hijaz.

To be sure, there is in some truth in the Hijazi perception that public health reforms depended on the importation of new ideas and technology from Europe. However, this imagining of European extraterritorial manipulation of Ottoman policy was only partly a critique of Western power. On the other hand, it was also a reflection on the widening civilizational gulf between a modernizing Istanbul and the empire's Arabian frontiers. In this sense, the man at the center of the tangled, overlapping projects of Ottoman sanitary reform from Istanbul to Kamaran Island offers a perfect encapsulation of that gaping chasm. A Polish refugee born in Istanbul in 1841, Charles Bonkowsky Paşa (1841-1905) studied chemistry and pharmacy in Paris.[165] Upon

---

[164] Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 279-296; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 94-98.

[165] For more on Bonkowsky's career, see Feza Günergun, "XIX. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Osmanlı Kimyager-Eczacı Bonkowski Paşa, 1841-1905," *I. Türk Tıp Tarihi Kongresi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1992), 229-248.

returning from his studies, he taught at the Mekteb-i Tıbbiye. He became the first president of the Istanbul Society of Pharmacists (*Dersaadet Eczacıyan Cemiyeti*). However, it was during Istanbul's struggle with cholera from 1892 to 1895 that Bonkowsky would truly make his mark. During those years, Bonkowsky emerged as something like an Ottoman equivalent of Koch or Pasteur. As his star rose, in 1893 he was promoted to Mirliva and given the title of paşa. And in 1894, he was honored as the Sultan's head chemist (*Saray Serkimyageri*). During this period, Bonkowsky was also named the chief health inspector for Istanbul (*Dersaadet ve Bilad-ı Selase Sıhhiye Başmüfettişi*). He would work closely with the newly formed *Hıfzısıhha-i Umumi Komisyonu* (General Sanitation Commission) and Istanbul's municipal government (*şehremaneti*) in order to manage the environmental health and hygiene of the imperial capital. With cholera raging throughout the city, Bonkowsky's mandate seems to have been almost limitless. His interventions ranged from issues as large as the inspection of housing, food safety, and trash removal to questions as minute as coffee shops' handling and disposal of dirty water from nargile pipes.[166] He was also instrumental in the reorganization and modernization of Istanbul's sewer system and water supply.[167]

During this period, Bonkowsky Paşa would serve as an Ottoman representative at the 1893 Dresden and 1894 Paris international sanitary conferences. Thus, in addition to his wide-ranging responsibilities in Istanbul, he was also one of the moving forces behind the modernization of the Ottoman quarantine system during this period. Even as early as August 1891, Bonkowsky had begun to point out the necessity of equipping quarantine

[166] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 295-319.

[167] Ibid., 347-366. See also İlhami Yurdakul, *Aziz Şehre Leziz Su: Dersaadet (İstanbul) Su Şirketi (1873-1933)* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2010), 29.

stations with the newest tools, appliances, and methods for disinfection and water safety procedures. Working alongside the French representative to the Ottoman Board of Health, Dr. Mahé, Bonkowsky composed several reform proposals for Abdülhamid's consideration. Bonkowsky and Mahé argued that the existing Ottoman quarantine system was inadequate. They pleaded that if the Sultan wished to avoid cholera's increasingly annual damages to the empire's population, commerce, and agricultural output, it would be necessary to invest in rebuilding the empire's quarantine facilities.[168] But without raising more funds through sanitary tariffs, there was little likelihood of this plan succeeding. With Mahé's assistance, however, their proposal managed to convince Britain to approve more funds for the quarantine system and separate budget for Kamaran.[169]

With these additional funds, Bonkowsky envisioned that Kamaran and the rest of the Ottoman quarantine system would be outfitted with cutting-edge disinfection stations, equipped with large autoclaves or disinfection stoves, designed to sterilize the pilgrims' clothing items.[170] During this period, Bonkowsky would become intimately familiar with the latest disinfection techniques working alongside Dr. Andre Chantemesse, an assistant of Louis Pasteur's, who had been dispatched to Istanbul to assist with the 1893 cholera outbreak. Through Chantemesse, the necessary disinfection machinery and accessories were ordered from Paris and in late 1893 and in 1894 Bonkowsky and his colleagues in

---

[168] BOA, İ. DH, 1238/96943 (26 Z 1308/2 August 1891); BOA, Y. A. RES, 56/10 (11 M 1309/17 August 1891).

[169] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 399-400; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 88-89.

[170] The disinfection machines were variously described as *etüv* or *tebhir makineleri* or the apparently smaller-sized *pülverizatör* model. For representative examples of the orders for Istanbul and Hijaz, see BOA, BEO 185/13815 (30 N 1310/7 April 1893); BOA, DH. MKT, 368/60 (3 Za 1312/28 April 1895).

the *Hıfzısıhha-i Umumi Komisyonu* began establishing disinfection facilities across Istanbul.[171]

Thus, contrary to previous studies, which have drawn a straight line between the horrendous 1893 outbreak in Mecca and the application of international pressure at the 1894 international sanitary conference in Paris, in reality, it would be more accurate to think of the strengthening of the Ottoman quarantine system in the Red Sea as more of a byproduct of the intense biopolitical and environmental reorganization of Istanbul that had been sparked by the 1892-1895 cholera epidemic there. Between 1892 and 1894, a special quarantine reform commission was also at work. Headed by Koçoni Efendi, the commission strove to reorganize the Kamaran Island station and make it a model facility that could be reproduced in the empire's other Red Sea, Mediterranean, and Black sea stations.[172] The technopolitical frontier was about to come full circle.

As a result, of the technical experience that Bonkowsky had built up battling cholera in Istanbul, by the time the 1894 international sanitary conference met in Paris he was armed with a list of reforms for Kamaran Island. Among the highlights of this list, Bonkowsky announced that the newly redesigned quarantine would be equipped with disinfection stoves, sterilizing machines, water filtration (condenser) machines, an ice-making machine, and mobile receptacles for the safe removal of feces from the camp. Second, Bonkowsky also promised the construction of a new bacteriological laboratory, allowing physicians to accurately identify cholera and constantly monitor the quality of the water supply. Bonkowsky also called for the construction of some 50 or 60 shower

---

[171] Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 308-323.

[172] BOA, İ. MMS, 127/5443 (22 C 1309/23 January 1892); BOA, İ. MMS, 129/5506 (14 B 1309/13 February 1892); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 291/15 (18 Ş 1311/24 February 1894). See also Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera*, 399-400.

stalls (complete with an adequate supply of soap!). And in addition to reorganizing the camps and hospital facilities in order to keep the sick and well from comingling, Bonkowsky also announced the evacuation of Kamaran's local inhabitants in order to ensure that cholera would not have a ready supply of human victims to fuel further outbreaks.[173]

The results of these interventions were quite remarkable. After 1895, apart from one major outbreak in December 1907, when cholera victims did find their way to Kamaran Island individual cases no longer metastasized into epidemics. According to Dr. Crendiropoulo, director of the Kamaran station, after 1895 the average mortality among pilgrims on Kamaran plummeted from 3.37 per 1,000 to 1.04. As Crendiropoulo argued, for years Kamaran's wells and water tanks had been veritable cholera incubators. However, after the instillation of the island's water condenser system, cholera could finally be contained and isolated.[174]

However, the same could not be said for the Hijaz itself. Unlike the controlled environment of the quarantine island, the Hijaz was a much larger and more complicated puzzle of overlapping social, technical, environmental, and biological challenges. The Hijaz's water systems remained very much vulnerable to cholera. As we shall see in the next chapter, Ottoman attempts to revitalize the Hijaz's crippled water infrastructure and wrest its hydraulic economy from local hands would be confronted with a determined program of resistance and sabotage. Although Ottoman hydraulic interventions certainly upset powerful political and economic interests in favor of autonomy, they were not

---

[173] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 52-54, 62; Hamza 'Ali Luqman, *Tarikh al-Juzur al-Yamaniyya* (Beirut: Matba'a Yusuf wa Filib al-Jumayyil, 1972), 10; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 87-94, 102-111.

[174] Baldry, "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island," 62.

viewed as inherently alien or anti-Islamic innovations. After all, the use of state power for the construction and maintenance of hydraulic infrastructure, such as aqueducts and fountains, fit neatly into well-understood traditions with long and illustrious Islamic pedigrees. On the other hand, the introduction of the kinds of disinfection technologies being applied in Istanbul and Kamaran lacked all such claims on Islamic credibility. Thus, as the 1895 hajj season unfolded Istanbul's stepped-up war on microbes quickly sparked a violent local insurgency.

In 1894 and 1895, a new era of Ottoman sanitary discipline in the Hijaz had begun in earnest. Prior to 1894, the principal axis of local discontentment with tightening Ottoman hygienic measures had revolved around attempts to restrict the sale of unsafe drinking water by local tank owners. In 1894, however, the installation of disinfection machines at Jidda and Mecca provided powerful new symbols for local resistance. What was different about these new measures was that unlike the remote quarantines enforced in the Red Sea, Ottoman disinfection procedures within the Hijaz did not distinguish between foreign pilgrims and locals or make exceptions for Bedouins or women. Foreign pilgrims had been subjected to the inconveniences and indignities of the state's medical examinations for years. However, this level of invasive biopolitical discipline had never been attempted on Hijazi locals.

While the object of the disinfection process was to sterilize clothing items, the mysterious nature of the machinery and the culturally unthinkable notion of officials requiring men and women undress stoked the imagination. As Dr. Achille-Adrien Proust explained, in short order this exotic procedure gave rise to wild rumors that the victims of this process (rather than just their clothes) would be stripped naked and placed inside the

disinfection machines. Even though two female attendants had been secured to oversee the process, upon hearing these frightening rumors, many female pilgrims reportedly refused to travel farther than Jidda during the 1894 season. As he warned, regardless of the desires of the international community, the Ottoman state could do not possibly do more than it already had. If Istanbul moved too far, too fast, he believed that the Hijaz might very well turn into another insurgency-riddled Yemen.[175]

In 1895, local anger over disinfection procedures reached a boiling point. As Jules Gervais-Courtellemont narrates the events, a number of influential shaykhs went before Sharif 'Awn al-Rafiq to address the public outrage surrounding the disinfection machines. They asked why the Sharif had stood idly by while Ottoman officials had dared to strip their women under the pretext of washing their clothes. They chided that if he could not stand up to this indignity he did not deserve the title of Sharif. Challenging both his legitimacy and manhood, they proclaimed that they had sharpened their daggers (*poignards*), were carrying their burial shrouds (*linceuls*), and were ready to die (*prêt á mourir*) for the cause. [176]

Aside from insulting the honor of Hijazi women, among both the Bedouin and urban populations of the Hijaz, the disinfection machines and newly reorganized quarantine hospitals had given credence to popular conspiracies surrounding cholera. As the British consul, William Richards explained:

> It appears that a deep-rooted conviction exists among large masses of the Bedoween… that cholera has been introduced into the country by the quarantine doctors through the medium of the disinfecting machines! Moreover, it was correctly reported and firmly

[175] Quoted in Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 120. On the disinfection regulations and female attendants, see TNA: FO 78/4692, "Rapport de la commission de hygiene du Hedjaz presenté au Conseil Supérieur de Santé, le 24/5 Novembre 1895," p. 12.

[176] Jules Gervais-Courtellemont, *Mon voyage á la Mecque* (Paris: Hachette, 1896), 120-121.

> believed among large masses of the population of Mecca, that though many sick persons were seen to go into the hospital none were ever known to come out again alive the, to them natural, deduction being that they were purposely killed by the doctors in charge of that establishment.[177]

Whatever the veracity of Gervais-Courtellemont's retelling of the confrontation between local shaykhs and the Sharif and by extension his implied prior knowledge of said attacks, the threat of violence was real enough. On 30 May 1895, a mob of 'Utayba tribesmen and local Meccans attacked the disinfection equipment and completely destroyed the offices housing it. That same evening a group of foreign consular officials had gone for a walk roughly a half a mile beyond Jidda's city walls. The group was attacked and shot by a Bedouin party, who quickly fled by camel. George Brandt, the acting Russian consul was seriously wounded. William Richards, the British consul, and Charles Dorville, the chancellor of the French consulate were both lightly wounded. However, the long-serving British vice-consul Dr. Abdur Razzack was killed. Later, Jidda's disinfection facilities were ransacked by a party of Bukharan pilgrims, forcing the instillation's inspectors to flee in search of refuge aboard vessels in the harbor. And two days later, Mecca's hospital was also looted and vandalized.[178]

When word of the anti-sanitarian violence reached Istanbul, Abdülhamid was left to contemplate the very real possibility of another bombardment of Jidda like 1858 or perhaps a more lasting international military occupation. The situation was so sensitive that the Sultan's war cabinet (*Divan-ı Harb*) had to be convened to discuss the possibility of European military intervention. There was also concern that any action to punish the local population might provoke further international attention. Taking punitive measures

---

[177] TNA: FO 78/4788, Consul William Richard, Jidda to Philip Curie, Istanbul (Therapia), 17 June 1895.

[178] TNA: FO 78/4788, Turkey: Disturbances at Jeddah, Murder of V. Consul Abdur Razzak, Indemnity, May to August, 1895; Ochsenwald, *Religion Society, and the State in Arabia*, 196-197.

against Hijazi locals was deemed too dangerous because of the difficulty in anticipating precisely which locals were Ottoman subjects and which could claim foreign protection or nationality. In the meantime, sanitary operations within the Hijaz ground to a halt. Construction on the new hospitals in Jidda and Mecca were also suspended. Indeed, it was even suggested that the still unfinished buildings be demolished to appease the mob. European consuls and foreign subjects were taken onboard a British cruiser to ensure their security. Jidda's harbor was rapidly populated by British, Dutch, French, and Russian warships. In light of the inadequacy of the local garrison, troops had to be called in from Yemen. Citing the nightmare scenario of a foreign occupation of Jidda during hajj season, the Sultan implored governor Hasan Hilmi Paşa and the Sharif to go immediately to Jidda to reestablish public safety.[179]

In the wake of the violence, the true identities of Abdur Razzack's murderers were was never determined. Despite an onslaught of diplomatic pressure from the British and French embassies weeks turned into months. Neither the Sharif nor the authorities in Istanbul caved to foreign pressure. Indemnities were paid for the casualties and their dependents. However, justice remained elusive. Hasan Hilmi was relieved from his governorship. Likewise, the *muhtesib* was dismissed for having allegedly spread anti-public health propaganda citing the Ottoman state's impotency in the face of the European-dominated "mixed" Board of Health (*meclis-i mühtelit*).[180]

---

[179] BOA, BEO, 633/47468 (8 Z 1312/2 June 1895); BOA, BEO, 637/47717 (7 Z 1312/1 June 1895); BOA, BEO, 637/47727 (14 Z 1312/8 June 1895); BOA, BEO 638/47787 (15 Z 1312/9 June 1895); BOA, İ. HUS, 38/4 (16 Z 1312/10 June 1895); BOA, İ. HUS, 38/5 (16 Z 1312/10 June 1895); BOA, İ. HUS, 38/7 (20 Z 1312/14 June 1895); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 329/98 (8 Z 1312/2 June 1895); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 329/156 (12 Z 1312/6 June 1895); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 329/163 (13 Z 1312/7 June 1895); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 330/19 (16 Z 1312/10 June 1895); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 330/71 (21 Z 1312/15 June 1895); BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 32/27 (16 Z 1312/10 June 1895); TNA: FO 78/4788, Turkey: Disturbances at Jeddah, Murder of V. Consul Abdur Razzak, Indemnity, May to August, 1895.

As the British ambassador argued, responsibility for the investigation should have rested with the governor. However, because the culprits were allegedly Bedouins the affair conveniently fell under jurisdiction of ‘Awn al-Rafiq. ‘Awn al-Rafiq placed the blame on the Sahhaf branch of the Harb tribe and launched an ineffectual campaign of collective punishment. As the British consulate theorized, however, given the enmity between ‘Awn al-Rafiq and the Sahhaf, placing the blame for the attack on them was merely an expedient way to settle old scores.[181] The consulate believed it considerably more likely that the Bedouin culprits were merely the instruments of the Sharif. Though the consular community could marshal no proof other than rumors from the bazaar, they were convinced that Abdur Razzack had been specifically targeted by the Sharif.

As the investigations unfolded, two competing narratives emerged. As Hasan Hilmi concluded, the alleged Bedouin assailants had mistaken the consular officials for Ottoman quarantine officers, who were the focal point of local anger over the new disinfection procedures. However, from the perspective of the European consular community this theory did not add up. They believed that the attack had been premeditated. As proof, they reasoned that the attackers would have required specific intelligence about the consular officials’ evening walks outside the city walls. And thus, those responsible for feeding this intelligence would have known very well that the quarantine officials did not frequent the location where the shootings took place. Rather, it was the opinion of the consuls that the attack was overtly “political, prompted and organized by the Grand Shareef of Mecca.” As the consul explained, Abdur Razzack had “incurred the hatred of the Grand Shareef,” who “would have himself shot Mr. Razzack

---

[180] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 119-120.

[181] Ochsenwald, *Religion Society, and the State in Arabia*, 198-200.

had opportunity offered." Abdur Razzack had served the consulate for over a decade, during which time he had energetically worked to expose and contest 'Awn al-Rafiq's brazen extortion and abuse of British subjects and pilgrims more generally, placing him at odds with the most powerful financial interests in the province, a string of Ottoman officials, and the Sharif himself.[182]

Conclusion

During his first visit to the Hijaz in 1879, Dr. Abdur Razzack had made the hajj as a British spy. He predicted that had his covert mission been discovered he very likely would have been murdered for secretly working on behalf of a Christian government. In the end, after over a decade and a half of service in the Hijaz, at just forty-five years of age, Abdur Razzack's morbid premonition of his own demise was finally fulfilled. In the interim, Abdur Razzack had become one of, if not, the longest serving officials in the Hijaz. During that time, he had seen scores of Ottoman governors and European consuls come and go and even the depositon of a Sharif. If 'Awn al-Rafiq was in fact responsible for Abdur Razzack's death, in a sense, it would have been fitting. Despite their very different roles and unequal statuses, they were arguably the most influential representatives of the late Ottoman Hijaz's two dueling political forces, autonomy and extraterritoriality.

It is a great irony that the events that ultimately precipitated the doctor's murder did not involve any European conspiracy or great scandal involving a British subject arrested in Mecca. Despite the popular imaginings of Hijazi locals, the implementation of disinfection procedures could not be attributed solely to the European powers or the

[182] TNA: FO 78/4788, Turkey: Disturbances at Jeddah, Murder of V. Consul Abdur Razzak, Indemnity, May to August, 1895.

"mixed" Board of Health. If anything, an equal case could be made that the reforming energies of Ottoman technocrats like Bonkowsky Paşa had pushed the Board of Health toward more aggressive measures rather vice versa. While it is clear that international pressure certainly a role in the evolution of Ottoman public health controls in the Hijaz and the empire more generally, as this chapter has argued, extraterritorial interference in the Ottoman Empire's sanitatary state building was a more complicated story than most have allowed. Just as the erection of Red Sea quarantines had lent international legitimacy to a revitalized Ottoman presence in the Hijaz and Yemen in 1866, the overhaul of the Hijaz's sanitary administration in 1894-1895 should not be read exclusively as a product of international pressure. Instead it might be more useful to think of disinfection machines, quarantine hospitals, and the increasing visibility of public health officials in the Hijaz as a natural manifestation of Istanbul's technopolitical modernization reaching into the empire's Arabian frontier and reproducing itself.

Despite this violent episode, between 1895 and World War I the Ottoman public health presence in the Hijaz would continue to swell. Indeed, outside of the construction of the Hijaz Railway between 1900 and 1908, the growing presence of physicians, pharmacists, secretaries, technical personnel, guards, and other ancillary staff would make public health officials the most visible organs of the provincial government aside from the Ottoman garrison itself.

Chapter 4

Nature or the Nature of the State?: Infrastructure and the Environmental Imaginaries of Pilgrimage and Potable Water

> Techno-politics is always a technical body, an alloy that must emerge from a process of manufacture whose ingredients are both human nonhuman, both intentional and not, and in which the intentional or the human is always somewhat overrun by the unintended. But it is a particular form of manufacturing, a certain way of organizing the amalgam of human and nonhuman, things and ideas, so that the human, the intellectual, the realm of intentions and ideas seems to come first and to control and organize the nonhuman.
>
> -Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*[1]

Duel of Experts

In 1881, James Zohrab, the British consul in Jidda, had samples of Zamzam water sent to London for chemical analysis. The samples were tested by Dr. Edward Frankland, a professor at the Royal College of Chemistry. Frankland's gruesome findings were published in *The Times*, and later reproduced by *The Lancet* in 1883:

> The water is slightly turbid and saline in taste. 100,000 parts of it contain in solution the very large proportion of 828.24 parts of solid matter, of which a considerable amount is organic and of animal origin. The water also contains an enormous quantity of nitrates—the usual product of the decomposition of animal excreta. The previous animal contamination calculated from the proportion of nitrogen as nitrates and nitrites shows that the liquid supplying the well contains a given volume nearly six times as much animal matter as is found in the same volume of strong London sewage.[2]

Having made the shocking claim that the holy water of the Zamzam Well was six times more contaminated by animal waste than London sewage, Frankland puts forward the hypothesis that Mecca's system of waste removal, or lack thereof, had led to the contamination of the groundwater feeding the Zamzam Well. As he explains:

---

[1] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 42-43.

[2] Edward Frankland, "The Cholera and Hagar's Well at Mecca," *The Lancet*, 11 August 1883, 256-257.

> These latrines empty themselves into pits dug outside the houses. When these get filled they are emptied into other pits, which are made in the streets or any convenient spot, and then covered over with earth… This system of burying foul matter in every direction has been pursued for centuries; it is not, therefore, surprising that the ground in and around Mecca is surcharged with excrementitous matter… Hagar's well is not a spring, but its water is supplied by filtration—that is, by rainwater passing down through an overlying mass of foul matter. But there is yet another cause for the pollution of Hagar's well, this is the thousands of pilgrims, diseased or sound, who daily wash beside it, the water they use naturally finding its way back into the well.[3]

As Frankland concludes:

> Such being the surroundings of this holy well, and the composition of its water, there can be no doubt that here is the most potent source of cholera poison, for the evidence is most conclusive that cholera is propagated by a specific poison contained in the alvine discharges of persons suffering from the disease. Hagar's well, therefore, must according to Mr. Zohrab's description, constitute an efficient collector of the poison, and it would scarcely be possible to devise a more effective means for the diffusion of this poison throughout Mahomedan countries.
>
> I presume it would be quite impossible to get this well closed; but in the interests of the health of Europe and Asia efforts ought to be made to guard the water from this abominable and dangerous pollution.[4]

Later that year, the Dutch representative to the Ottoman Board of Health, Dr. Stekoulis, published a treatise in French and Ottoman Turkish on cholera and the hajj featuring Frankland's results.[5] This attack on Zamzam water was perceived as a deeply offensive work of anti-Islamic propaganda by the Ottoman medical establishment. Mehmed Şakir Bey was so outraged that he enlisted Charles Bonkowsky Paşa and Ahmet Efendi, a professor of chemistry at the Ottoman War College, to conduct their own chemical tests.[6]

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 77. Dr. Stekoulis's treatise, *Mekke'nin Hacılığı ve Hicaz'ın Kolerası* (1883) inspired Mehmed Şakir Bey to publish a bruising rebuttal, *Hicaz Hacılığı Hakkında Şireli Doktor Stekoulis Cehl ve Hatası* (1308/1888).

[6] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 77.

Bonkowsky wrote a scathing letter to Dr. Frankland admonishing Frankland for his "mistakes and quite bizarre conclusions" (*hataları ve pek acaib neticeleri*) and expressing his deep dismay at the professor's obliviousness to the "most severe indignation" (*en şiddetli infialat*) that his comparison of these holy waters with London sewage would arouse among the world's 300 million Muslims. He reported that his own sample of Zamzam water was colorless, odorless, slightly saline, and had a slightly basic pH value. In short, it was harmless. He even notes that it could be bottled for up to a year without spoiling. Bonkowsky cites a long list of chemical differences between his sample and Frankland's, explaining that the salinity observed in Frankland's results was so high that it resembled seawater. He attempts to explain to Frankland the difference between the sources of Zamzam water and Mecca's main supply of drinking water, 'the Ayn Zubayda aqueduct. He also attempts to disabuse Frankland of the idea that pilgrims bathed anywhere near the Zamzam Well. As Bonkowsky points out, this is physically impossible since the building housing the well is only seven square meters. Bonkowsky concludes with a pointed question, "If Zamzam were cholera's source, wouldn't one suppose that cholera would appear in Mecca every year" (*Zemzem koleranın menba'ı olsaydı her sene Mekke'de kolera zuhuru gerekmez miydi*)?[7]

Bonkowsky and Mehmed Şakir were convinced that the sample provided to Frankland could not have been authentic Zamzam water or else it had been tampered with prior to testing. In his *Lancet* article, Frankland alluded to his concerns over the sample's authenticity and even included consul Zohrab's reply to his inquiries. As Zohrab explains, the sample was procured by a "Mahomedan gentleman in whose good faith I

[7] Mehmed Şakir Bey, *Hicaz Hacılığı Hakkında Şireli Doktor Stekoulis Cehl ve Hatası*, 106-112, cited in Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 77-79.

have implicit confidence."[8] Bonkowsky and Mehmed Şakir suspected that Zohrab's Muslim associate was actually Yusuf Kudzi, the translator for the British consulate in Jidda. Kudzi's original surname was Mendelbaum and was of Russian-Jewish origin. Prior to his birth in 1838, his family had immigrated to Jerusalem where his father had registered as a British-protected person. Prior to surfacing in Jidda in 1870 at thirty-two years old, Kudzi claims to have spent years to India and China and to have converted to Islam.[9] However, as Bonkowsky and Mehmed Şakir's mention of his conversion suggests, the Ottomans were highly suspicious of Britain's use of Muslim consular employees, most notably Kudzi and the vice-consul Dr. Abdur Razzack, as intelligence operatives in Mecca. The nature of their work aroused suspicions that these men were not "genuinely" Muslims.[10] Kudzi likely raised further suspicions on account of his notorious reputation for corrupt dealings in the pilgrimage steamship industry. Thus, as Mehmed Şakir explains, they theorized that prior to handing the samples over to Zohrab, Kudzi had introduced some sort of foreign matter into the bottles in order to produce the embarrassing test results.[11] Although Bonkowsky and Mehmed Şakir's accusations are impossible to prove, their skepticism regarding the objectivity of Dr. Frankland's analysis was well founded.

---

[8] Frankland, "The Cholera and Hagar's Well at Mecca," 256.

[9] TNA: FO 78/4335, Turkey: Protected Subjects in Turkey, Answers to Circular of Nov. 1, 1886 and Other Papers, 1886-1890, "Statement Regarding Mr. Yuseff Kudzi's protection, furnished by himself," Jidda, March 1887.

[10] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 77-79, 121. Similar suspicions applied to Dr. Abdur Razzack, whose official self-representation as a Muslim was referred to in Ottoman documents as a "great sham" (*fesad-ı azime*). See BOA, İ. HUS, 30/60 (19 R 1312/20 October 1894); BOA, BEO, 499/37373 (21 R 1312/22 October 1894).

[11] Ibid., 79.

In the wake of repeated pilgrimage-related cholera outbreaks, at the 1866 international sanitary conference in Istanbul, the hajj had leapt to the center of European hygienic consciousness.[12] Taking a strongly "contagionist" stance, conference delegates identified the steamship-going hajj from India as the primary conduit for the globalization of cholera.[13] Following their recommendations, the Ottoman state had been tasked with organizing a Red Sea quarantine system to halt cholera's progress before it could reach the Suez Canal and Europe's Mediterranean shores.[14]

For the next three decades British officials struggled to deny India's image as an exporter of cholera and worked to obstruct the imposition of quarantine regulations. They feared that interference with this pillar of the Islamic faith would spark a backlash in India and that strict quarantine measures might be punitively applied to vessels from India, threatening the free flow of trade. Britain and the Anglo-Indian medical establishment became deeply invested in "anti-contagionist" or "localist" theories of cholera's etiology, which claimed that mysterious influences in the atmosphere, fermentative products of the soil, miasmas caused by festering human waste, or other predisposing causes were to blame for cholera.[15] According to localists, the presence of a specific germ and susceptible human victim could not alone produce cholera symptoms. Rather, they hypothesized that cholera required the presence of specific soil or groundwater conditions. This idea was especially attractive because it offered an environmental explanation for spontaneous outbreaks of disease, which were seen as

---

[12] Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe*, 228-231.

[13] TNA: FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, "History of Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878, April 1885.

[14] Huber, *Channelling Mobilities*, 204-238.

[15] On British anti-contagionism, Watts, "From Rapid Change to Stasis," 321-74.

evidence of the inefficacy of quarantines.[16] These were the theories that formed the intellectual backdrop to Frankland's findings.

In 1883-1884, at the same time that Frankland was attacking Zamzam water as a source of "cholera poison," the German bacteriologist Robert Koch was conducting research in Egypt and India that would provide definitive proof of cholera's causal agent, the comma bacillus. Koch's discovery of the role played by the human intestinal tract in the life-cycle of the bacterium and his confirmation of cholera's waterborne transmission through infected human waste products, should have brought the scientific debate surrounding cholera's spread to a screeching halt.[17] And yet, throughout the 1880s and into the 1890s, British scientists remained stubbornly wedded to their anti-contagionist views. Even as late as 1895, anti-contagionist Zamzam articles continued to circulate in Britain and India.[18] And in the context of the simultaneous struggles to control the repeated cholera outbreaks in Istanbul from 1892 to 1895 and the devastation of the 1893 outbreak in the Hijaz, even some Ottoman officials briefly embraced the Zamzam theory. Ottoman army and navy physicians sent to inspect Mecca's health conditions proposed a temporary ban on drinking Zamzam water. However, the proposal was vetoed by the Sharif of Mecca, who controlled access to the well.[19]

---

[16] Michael Worboys, *Spreading Germs: Disease Theories and Medical Practice in Britain, 1865-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 38-9.

[17] Coleman, "Koch's Cholera Bacillus," 315-42.

[18] For more examples of attacks on Zamzam water, see C.W. Heaton, "Hagar's Well at Mecca: Analsyis of the Water" and Stanley Lane Poole, "Traditional History of the Well," in *The Lancet*, 5 Jaunary 1884; Dr. John Wortabet, "The Holy Places of Arabia: Their Water-Supply and General Sanitary Conditions," *The Lancet*, 14 May 1892; "Dr. Hart in Hyderabad: Failure of Dr. Harte's Mission," *The Moslem Chronicle*, March 1895, in BOA, Y. A. HUS, 323/84 (9 L 1312/5 April 1895).

[19] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in* Arabia, 196. On Istanbul's simultaneous outbreaks, see also Ayar, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera.*

What are we to make of this duel of experts? In light of Koch's discoveries, the ideological character of anti-Zamzam polemics becomes more evident. But are we to read this episode as a footnote in the struggle between advocates and opponents of contagion and quarantine? Or are we missing an opportunity by allowing water to be reduced to a proxy in Britain's anti-contagion campaign? In a sense, Frankland's sanitarian concerns were not unfounded. Mecca's water systems actually were on the verge of a massive overhaul. However, as we shall see, the ways in which Ottoman administrators understood and prioritized the management of Mecca's water resources suggests a very different story than the one Frankland imagined.

While European observers viewed Mecca primarily through the international lens of cholera and quarantine, for Ottoman administrators an additional, yet inextricably linked, responsibility was the provision of enough safe, potable water for both pilgrims and permanent residents. As a result, Ottoman analyses of the Hijaz's public health often moved along a more localized set of axes, dedicating as much or more attention to the Hijaz's "water supply" (*su tedariki*) and the repair and upkeep of the region's aqueducts, water tanks, cisterns, pipes, and fountains. Ottoman reporting also conveys a much stronger sense of the mutually reinforcing relationship between the region's susceptibility to water scarcity and its vulnerability to water-borne disease.[20]

In many respects, potable water was a microcosm of Istanbul's incomplete projects of modernization and state building on the empire's Arab peripheries. Water questions sat at the intersection between international pressures surrounding cholera, drought, Wahhabi and Bedouin disorder, and the inability of the state to impose its will on the semi-autonomous Amirate of Mecca. To be sure, Ottoman public health reforms

[20] İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 39-51.

and increased attention to water infrastructure were partly a product of the intense international attention generated by cholera and the capitulatory nature of the Ottoman Board of Health. However, like other projects with more overt military and strategic implications, most notably the Hijaz telegraph and railway, the Ottoman state also saw an opportunity to harness the increasing medicalization of the hajj and the Hijaz's environment to serve a broader set of efforts to consolidate the empire's most vulnerable frontier provinces.[21]

From the 1880s onward, Ottoman administrators began to envision an ambitious re-spatialization of the empire's Arab tribal frontiers. Modern engineering, technology, and ethnographic approaches to the particularities of local populations were taken up as the keys to solving the frontier's biopolitical problems. Armed with this emergent techno-scientific vision, they set out to manage human life and the resources needed to sustain it, improve Arabia's defective nature, transform Bedouins into proper subjects, and gradually replace autonomous forms political life with more rigorous territorial power. By taking this broader assemblage of concerns as a whole, this chapter traces the making of a very different brand of provincial administration, a nascent frontier technostate.[22]

Repairs Needed: Environmental Imaginaries of Wahhabism and Water Infrastructure

Diana K. Davis defines an "environmental imaginary" as "a constellation of ideas that groups of humans develop about a given landscape, usually local or regional, that commonly includes assessments about that environment as well as how it came to be in

[21] On "centralization through sanitation," in the Hijaz and Iraq, see Bulmuş, *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire*, 5, 152-76.

[22] Hecht, *The Radiance of France*, 12, 15.

its current state." Environmental imaginaries often assess blame and reveal "who wins and who loses when that imaginary is operationalized."[23] Thus, while European observers may have seen Mecca through the prism of their own hygienic concerns, from an Ottoman perspective the decline of the Hijaz's urban water systems was imbedded in environmental imaginaries of the empire's tribal frontiers.

In June 1880, Eyüp Sabri Paşa, an Ottoman naval officer and avid historian of the Hijaz, Wahhabism, and the wider Arabian Peninsula, wrote a series of articles in the semi-official newspaper, *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*.[24] In both these articles and in an expanded version in his *magnum opus*, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn* (1883-8), he alerts readers to the plight of Mecca's ʿAyn Zubayda water system and attempts to publicize the recent efforts of a partnership between Hijazi notables and the Ottoman administration, known as the ʿAyn Zubayda Commission, formed to restore the aqueducts.[25]

For Eyüp Sabri, this was more than a public-works project. It represented the exorcism of the ghosts of Istanbul's quintessential tribal *bête noire*, the Wahhabis. In the wake of the Wahhabi occupation and the wider crises set in motion by Mehmed Ali's empire-building at the expense of the Ottoman center during the 1830s, Ottoman control would not be restored until 1841 when Mehmed Ali's Egyptian troops were forced to withdraw from the Hijaz and Syria in accordance with the terms of the 1840 Convention of London. During these occupations the region's water systems were badly damaged

---

[23] Diana K. Davis, "Imperialism, Orientalism, and the Environment in the Middle East," in Diana K. Davis and Edmund Burke III, eds., *Environmental Imaginaries of the Middle East and North Africa* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2011), 3.

[24] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, 9 B1297 (17 June 1880); 13 B 1297 (21 June 1880); 14 B 1297 (22 June 1880); 15 B 1297 (23 June 1880); 16 B 1297 (24 June 1880); 17 B 1297 (25 June 1880). For more on Eyüp Sabri, see Fidan, *Eyüp Sabri Paşa ve Tarihçiliği*.

[25] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, 3 vols. (İstanbul: Bahriye Matbaası, 1301-1306/1883-1888).

and their upkeep neglected. The damage sustained during this period formed the backdrop to a decades-long struggle to repair and expand the province's water supplies to meet the increasing demands posed by the greater accessibility of the steamship-era hajj. In his narration of the environmental and infrastructural history of the Hijaz, the Wahhabi occupation of Mecca and Medina represents the beginning of an era of overlapping social, technical, and natural collapse, providing an alternative reading of the uneven restoration of the Ottoman Hijaz. This construction of the past provides a blameworthy old regime against which he favorably compares the "civilizing" zeal of the Hamidian-era reassertion of Ottoman power in the Hijaz in the late 1870s and early 1880s.[26] Thus, interest in the region's water infrastructure cannot be understood solely as a response to water scarcity. It was also as a measure of the provincial administration's increased capacity.

As Eyüp Sabri Paşa explains, the waterworks take their name from Zubayda, wife of the great Abbasid Caliph Harun al-Rashid, whose philanthropy funded the network of aqueducts needed to bring the waters of Wadi Nuʿman and Wadi Hunayn to Mecca in order to provide a reliable source of potable water for both the local population and pilgrims. Completed in 810, the project was said to have cost some 1.75 million dinars, or, as Zubayda is said to have remarked with only slight exaggeration, "a gold dinar for every stroke of the pickax."[27] After the Hijaz came under Ottoman suzerainty in the sixteenth century, a major effort to repair and expand the ʿAyn Zubayda system was

[26] Although Eyüp Sabri was an ardent anti-Wahhabi polemicist, his opinions are far from unorthodox. Official government treatments of the ʿAyn Zubayda are remarkably similar. For example, see Selman Soydemir, Kemal Erkan, and Osman Doğan, eds., *Hicaz Vilayet Salnamesi, H. 1303/M. 1886* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008), 115-120.

[27] Gerald DeGaury, *Rulers of Mecca* (New York: Dorset Press, 1991); Peters, *Mecca*, 135-137.

undertaken by Sultan Süleyman I's daughter Mihrimah Sultan.[28] Following this overhaul, Eyüp Sabri provides a detailed summary of the Ottoman state's subsequent efforts to maintain the aging watercourses and to repair damages sustained during the occasional floods experienced in Mecca and its environs. As he explains, the last major repairs to the system before the Wahhabi occupation were carried out in the late 1760s. The next round of repairs would not take place for nearly a half-century until after the Wahhabis were driven out of the Hijaz by the governor of Egypt, Mehmed Ali.[29]

In Eyüp Sabri Paşa's narration of the environmental history of the Hijaz, the Wahhabi occupation of Mecca and Medina represents the dawn of a new era of water insecurity. Partly due to the "destruction" (*hedm ü harab*) directly caused by the Wahhabis and partly due to their neglect during the occupation, the aqueduct system was "broken in many places" (*bir çok yerleri bozulup*) and the local population had begun to suffer from "water scarcity" (*su müzayakası*), which was only compounded during the hajj season. Around 1820, Sultan Mahmud II ordered Mehmed Ali to repair the crippled waterworks. However, due to the extent of the damage and the considerable cost of the renovations, "the repairs were [only] of a partial sort" (*tamirat-ı cüz'iye kabilinden idi*).[30]

Eyüp Sabri Paşa's narrative is corroborated by Johann Ludwig Burckhardt's account of his three-month sojourn in the Hijaz in 1814-1815. As Burckhardt explains:

> I have heard that it had not been cleaned during the last fifty years; the consequence of this negligence, is that most of the water is lost in its passage to the city through apertures, or slowly forces its way through the obstructing sediment, through which it flows in a full stream into the head of the aqueduct at Arafat. The supply it

[28] BOA, HRT. h, 541 (29 Z 1264/26 November 1848). See also Söylemezoğlu, *Hicaz Seyahatnâmesi*, 144.

[29] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, 17 B 1297 (25 June 1880), 3; Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn,* vol. 1, 748.

[30] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, vol. 1, 748-50; BOA, HAT, 344/19624 (29 Z 1232/9 November 1817).

> affords in ordinary times is barely sufficient for the use of the inhabitants, and during the pilgrimage sweet water becomes an absolute scarcity…

Burckhardt also provides support for Eyüp Sabri's claim that the damage to the waterworks was not merely a product of decay and neglected maintenance, but a direct result of the Wahhabi occupation of Mecca. According to Burckhardt, "During the late siege the Wahhabis cut off the supply of water from the aqueduct; and it was not until some time after that the injury which this structure then received was repaired."[31]

Wahhabi attacks on Mecca's water system were not an isolated incident. While most sources dwell on the Wahhabi vandalism of tombs and sacred spaces, little attention has been paid to their exploitation of the Hijaz's water infrastructure as a tool to terrorize the local population into submission during the 1805 siege of Medina. According to Eyüp Sabri Paşa's *Tarih-i Vehhabiyan* (1879), as soon as the Syrian pilgrimage caravan and its accompanying soldiers had departed and distanced themselves from Medina, the Wahhabis promptly laid siege to the city's fortifications, occupied several surrounding villages, and fortified and sealed off all access in and out of the city. After thoroughly surrounding the city, the final touch was "the destruction of the 'Ayn Zerka watercourse, by which the people of Medina were subjected to calamitous famine and drought" (*Aynü Zerka mecrasını hedm ü harab ve bu süretle ehl-i Medine'yi duçar-ı bela-yı kaht ü gala ve ab eyledi*).[32] In the months that followed, reports to İstanbul confirmed the destruction of Medina's defenses. However, the most critical need cited was the repair of 'Ayn Zerka, whose output was now unpredictable and "sometimes did not arrive at all, producing great hardship" (*bazı evkatta ma-i merkumun adem-i vürudıyla meşakkat hasıl*

[31] Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia*, vol. 1 (London: Henry Colburn, 1829), 194-195.

[32] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Tarih-i Vehhabiyan* (İstanbul: Kırk Ambar Matbaası, 1296/1879); reprint, edited by Süleyman Çelik (İstanbul: Bedir Yayınevi, 1992), 62.

olduğu). Again, however, the Ottoman center could do little more than promise to send assistance via Mehmed Ali Paşa from Egypt.[33]

Between 1820 and 1878, Eyüp Sabri highlights only one major initiative to improve Mecca's water supply, but it was not undertaken by the Ottoman state. In 1847, Elmas Agha, an Indian philanthropist oversaw a project to connect the waters of ʿAyn Zafran to the ʿAyn Zubayda system to increase its output.[34] Here, Eyüp Sabri's narrative somewhat exaggerates the level of neglect. There were a variety of repairs carried out by Ottoman authorities during this period.[35] Despite Istanbul's efforts to raise the necessary funds for a permanent solution on several occasions, however, their annual allocations from the imperial *evkaf* for "cleaning the ducts" (*tathir-i mecra*) were insufficient to tackle a project of this scale. There is also evidence to suggest that these annual funds were not always used for their intended purpose.[36]

According to Eyüp Sabri Paşa, due to the combination of the long periods during which the aqueducts were "neglected and left completely without cleaning or repair" (*bakılmayıp hiç bir tarafı tathir ve tamir edilmemiş*) and Mecca's vulnerability to "frequent flooding" (*sık sık zuhur eden seylâb*), more and more of Mecca's water supply was leaking away. Although Mecca receives only around four inches of annual rainfall, torrential downbursts are not uncommon. And due to the region's aridity there is little

---

[33] BOA, HAT, 1359/53403 (29 Z 1220/20 March 1806).

[34] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, vol. 1, 748.

[35] For examples of the repairs from the 1840s to the 1860s see, Ömer Faruk Yılmaz, *Belgelerle Osmanlı Devrinde Hicaz*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008), 145, 172-173, 188-189; ʿAdil Muhammad Nur ʿAbd Allah Ghubashi, *al-Munshaʾat al-maʾiyya li-khidmat Makka al-Mukarrama wa-al-mashaʿir al-muqaddasa fi al-ʿAṣr al-ʿUthmaani: Dirasa hadariyya* (Makka: al-Mamlakat al-ʿArabiyya al-Saʿudiyya, Wizarat al-Taʿlim al-ʿAli, Jamiʿat Umm al-Qurá, 2005), 227-232.

[36] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 73.

soil to absorb the runoff. Local wells were inadequate substitutes. Thus, seasonal and hajj-related shortages became a regular occurrence, inspiring "fear and dread" (*havf ve dehşet*) among the locals that "the waters of 'Ayn Zubayda would completely run dry" *(Ayn-ı Zübeyde suyunun bütün bütün inkıta edeceği*).[37] Although Eyüp Sabri does not provide specific examples of floods or assign them the same agency or weight as Wahhabi predations, it is highly likely that the cumulative damages caused by severe floods in 1861 and 1877 exacerbated the earlier blockages and leaks incurred during the Wahhabi occupation and its aftermath.

In 1861, Mecca experienced its most "disastrous flood" (*sel felaketi*) of the century. The flooding destroyed or damaged hundreds of homes, particularly affecting the flimsy dwellings inhabited by the city's poor, sparking a drive to collect charitable donations to aid the flood victims and their families in rebuilding their homes. Both the Haram and the city's water system were "filled" (*doldurmuş*) with debris. In the flood's immediate aftermath, the need to repair the Haram was obvious, but there was also grave concern that if the city's damaged pipelines were not quickly repaired, they would be "completely filled with sand" (*olur ise bütün bütün kum ile dolmamak*) in the event of further rain.[38]

Flooding was also a trigger for waterborne epidemics. According to Keane, the 1877 flood, occurring just after the conclusion of the hajj, was the first major flood since the 1861 disaster. Though Keane describes the flood as an ordinary event by Meccan standards, the extent of the damage was still horrific. According to Keane, the whole of

---

[37] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, vol. 1, 748-750.

[38] BOA, İ. DH, 486/32805 (19 Ş 1278/19 February 1862); BOA, A. MKT. UM, 548/17 (14 N 1278/15 March 1862); BOA, A. MKT. NZD, 407/65 (17 N 1278/18 March 1862).

the Haram was "turned into a lake, the water lying about three feet deep in the western arcades, six feet around the Ka'ba." The next morning, "in every place where the water had been it left a layer of about six inches of tough springy earth cutting like clay—in many places it was much thicker: round the Ka'ba it was eighteen inches deep." Despite the "great supply of labor," it would take "three days to clear it all out." However, as Keane points out, the pollution of the water supply was the most dangerous aspect of the flood:

> For many days after the flood the water in all the wells was brown and muddy, and if left standing all night would not be more than half settled in the morning. The taste of all the wells was altered, the ordinary water tasting like Zamzam, and the Zamzam itself much weakened…

As a result of the contamination of the water, "cholera, small pox, and typhus epidemics broke out and raged wildly for about three weeks."[39]

As Eyüp Sabri Paşa's narrative suggests, the deterioration of Mecca's water supply was a hybrid product of social and natural forces. Whatever its ultimate causes, however, it is likely that intense flooding likely triggered the heightened sense that the total collapse of Mecca's water infrastructure was imminent. By the late 1870s, it had become clear that dramatic steps would be needed to ensure Mecca's future water security. In 1878, the Indian shaykh ʿAbd al-Rahman Siraj, the Hanafi Mufti of Mecca at the time, took on the enormous task of restoring ʿAyn Zubayda. For two months, he was able to raise a work force of 200 to 300 men per day, composed of Indian pilgrims and Bedouins. Following the positive results of Siraj's initial efforts, later that year Abdülhamid issued a decree calling for the formation of a "repair commission" (*tamirat*

[39] Keane, *Six Months in Mecca*, 176-186.

komisyonu) to raise money and oversee a thorough overhaul of the aqueducts.[40] Initially headed by ʿAbd al-Rahman Siraj, the commission was composed of local notables from Mecca and Jidda, *ulema*, Ottoman officials, and local Indian notables (*mücavarin-i Hindiye*).[41] Naturally, members of the commission and other local elites were enthusiastic contributors to the effort. Significant contributions also came from Egypt. However, as the composition of the commission itself suggested, the largest donations came from India. Kalb ʻAli Khan Bahadur, the Nawab of Rampur, gave 100,000 rupees in 1880 and would later contribute a further 70,000 for restoration of the pipeline connecting ʻAyn Zafran with the main ʻAyn Zubayda aqueduct. The Nawab of Dhaka, Khwaja Abdul Ghani Bahadur, and his son contributed 40,000 rupees.[42] The ruler of Bhopal, Shah Jahan Begum, added 20,000. In addition to these large donations from the rulers of Indian princely states, the Indian agent for the pro-Ottoman newspaper, *al-Jawa'ib*, was able to solicit smaller donations bringing the total collected from India alone to 1,625,000 kuruş.[43] In many respects, Indian enthusiasm for this earlier round of pilgrimage-related infrastructure building may have offered a blueprint for later fundraising efforts surrounding the Hijaz railway project.[44]

In 1880, once the fundraising had begun to yield such impressive results, the Sultan promised to make up the difference should the costs of the repairs exceed the total

---

[40] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn,* vol. 1, 748-51.

[41] BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 5/96 (30 Ca 1300/8 April 1883).

[42] BOA, YA. RES 6/68 (19 Ra 1297/1 March 1880); BOA, YA. RES 9/91 (19 Ra 1298/19 February 1881); TNA: FO 195/1514, Vice-Consul Dr. Abdur Razzack to Consul Thomas Jago, Jidda, 10 January 1885.

[43] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 73.

[44] For an explicit linking of Osman Nuri's fundraising for the Hijaz's water infrastructure with later plans for rail construction, see especially BOA, Y. PRK. AZJ, 22/41 (29 Z 1309/25 July 1892).

donations. As the repairs continued throughout the 1880s, the project's funding continued in much the same manner. Donations from local and foreign (mostly Indian) notables comprised the core of the commission's revenues, while contributions from the imperial treasury were used as a backstop to ensure the completion of the various construction projects.[45] Despite the important role played by local notables in launching the commission, given the technical and engineering challenges involved, as the project progressed a construction committee (*inşaat kısmı*) composed of the then governor of the Hijaz, Osman Nuri Paşa, the commission's chief engineer Sadık Bey, and a number of other members of the Ottoman military's general staff (*erkan-ı harbiye*), would eventually emerge as the commission's driving force.[46] However, it was Osman Nuri's name that would ultimately come to accumulate an almost mythical status across both the empire and the wider Islamic world for having rescued the Holy Places from their looming water crisis. For Osman Nuri, however, the pious purposes of the project were perhaps secondary. The reconstruction of 'Ayn Zubayda fit neatly into his far-reaching technopolitical vision for simultaneously taming and re-spatializing the Hijaz's environment and making its inhabitants into proper Ottoman subjects.

Beginning from 'Ayn Zubayda's source at Wadi Nu'man, approximately 30 kilometers northeast of Mecca, more than 3,000 workers labored for four years to refurbish the ancient waterworks.[47] Work began by opening a new channel roughly 400 meters from the old one. The new duct was more durable and wider, making it easier for

---

[45] BOA, İ. DH 800/64862 (22 Ra 1297/4 March 1880); BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 5/96 (30 Ca 1300/8 April 1883); BOA, İ. DH 901/71633 (4 M 1301/5 November 1883).

[46] BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 5/96 (30 Ca 1300/8 April 1883). See also el-Mekki, *Osmanlı Padişahlarının Haremeyn Hizmetleri*, 25-26; *Hicaz Vilayet Salnamesi, H. 1303/M. 1886*, 51-52.

[47] el-Mekki, *Osmanlı Padişahlarının Haremeyn Hizmetleri*, 25.

workers to move freely and carry out the needed repairs. Following the original channel toward Mecca, the sections that could be salvaged were repaired, the exterior of the duct was resealed, and in those places where the damage was too severe new channels were opened. In some sections along the way, pools and access shafts were opened for easier access and repair. As a result of the restoration of the ducts, Mecca's water output was greatly enhanced, yielding 5,000 *kıyye* or approximately 6,140 liters per minute, leading to a dramatic drop in the "exorbitant price" (*fahiş fiat*) being charged for freshwater during hajj season.[48] Taking advantage of the restored flow, nine reserve cisterns and several other storage depots were built, new ablution facilities were established around the perimeter of the Haram, and new fountains were built across all quarters of the city. The improved water supply also ensured that the hospital and soup kitchens for the poor, the pharmacy, government offices, military barracks, printing press, police stations, laundry facilities, and bathhouses all had taps installed.[49]

The Milieu of Tanks of Toilets

Despite these improvements, the ʿAyn Zubayda system remained extremely vulnerable to microbial contamination. Although repairs were also made to smaller branch pipelines and basins serving Arafat and Mina, the aqueduct was not a closed system. In a number of places the Bedouins had opened sections of the main pipeline in order to draw water. The main aqueduct also had to first pass through the stations of the pilgrimage at Arafat and then Mina before arriving in Mecca.[50]

---

[48] *Hicaz Vilayet Salnamesi*, 120; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 72-74.

[49] el-Mekki, *Osmanlı Padişahlarının Haremeyn Hizmetleri*, 25-26; Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 72-74.

[50] İzzeddin, *Mekke-i Mükerreme'de Kolera ve Hıfzıshha*, 96-101.

Even before the revolution in bacteriology yielded the secrets of cholera's etiology, sanitarian questions of miasmas and filth associated with the overcrowding and human waste had already placed the non-urban portions of the hajj circuit in Arafat and Mina under suspicion. Although the 1880s was a decade of flux between older miasmic understandings of human waste and more precise bacteriological analyses of contagion, Ottoman and European colonial officials had already begun to map cholera's movements through Mecca's water supply.[51]

In 1885, Osman Nuri ordered a thorough cleaning of the open tanks and basins at Arafat and Mina, which had been implicated as potential cholera hotspots.[52] At Arafat, he ordered a military cordon to protect the basins and open sections of the watercourse from being fouled by pilgrims bathing or washing clothes in the water. However, as Mehmed Şakir notes, preventing pilgrims from bathing in the basins remained a perennial struggle. He cites Bedouins, Indians, and Yemenis as frequent offenders.[53]

In light of the inadequate latrines in both locations the need to police this behavior becomes clearer. In 1878 the government of India appointed an Indian Muslim physician, Dr. Abdur Razzack, to surreptitiously make the hajj and report on the sanitary conditions of the Hijaz. Abdur Razzack is stunned by the omnipresence of human waste in Arafat. "Except taking care of the drinking water, there was no other arrangement for the pilgrims. Everyone had a temporary privy near his tent, while the poorer people, having nothing of the sort, did not hesitate to answer the calls of nature wherever they

---

[51] On pre-bacteriological understandings of waste disposal and public space, see David S. Barnes, *The Great Stink of Paris and the Nineteenth-Century Struggle against Filth and Germs* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 78-82.

[52] TNA: FO 195/1514, Vice-Consul Dr. Abdur Razzack to Consul Thomas Jago, Jidda, 10 January 1885.

[53] Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 130-131.

found it convenient." His depiction of the situation in Mina was even gorier. The latrines consisted of shabbily stacked rock partitions enclosing sand pits "with no arrangement for the water to run off, every particle thereof being supposed to be absorbed by the sand." In short order, the pits were saturated until the latrines were abandoned and "then the space around the body of the building itself was made use of, not to speak of all the nooks and corners formed by the tents and litters in every part of the field." Owing to this, "Inside the town it was the same thing again; excepting the main street, all along the walls of the houses in every lane and corner there was human excrement lying and covering the whole place, which made it almost impossible to walk through." Finally, the danger posed by Mina's latrines was further compounded by their proximity to the ritual slaughter of animals performed there in accordance with the hajj.[54]

At Mina, Osman Nuri ordered that the water tanks be filled no more than a week prior to the hajj.[55] He had a steam-powered pump installed to bring freshwater to Mina, which sat about 150 meters above the main water ducts.[56] Despite his efforts to provide clean water and guard against its contamination, ʿAyn Zubayda water was not the only source in circulation. Stagnant rainwater was also sold. As Mehmed Şakir explains, before the repair of ʿAyn Zubayda, a highly profitable system of water profiteering had taken root across the Hijaz, but especially in Mina and Jidda. Privately-owned tanks and cisterns (*sahrınçlar*) were used to collect rainwater and distributed to water carriers to sell to pilgrims at inflated prices. In Mina, tanks housed in local homes were

[54] British Library, Asia, Pacific, and Africa Collections, W 4087, "Report by Dr. Abdur Ruzzack on the health and sanitation of pilgrims to Mecca, 24 June 1879," 22-24.

[55] TNA: FO 195/1514, Vice-Consul Dr. Abdur Razzack to Consul Thomas Jago, Jidda, 10 January 1885.

[56] TNA: FO 686/68, "Mecca Water Supply and Egyptian Ministry of Wakfs Grant," 1920.

ubiquitous.[57] But the water from these tanks was often stored for up to six months or a year before hajj season. Low-lying tanks placed beneath the ground level were especially dangerous. While some tanks were housed on rooftops, others were vulnerable to organic debris from flash flooding and runoff carrying excrement and refuse from the streets.[58] And finally, the water was served from unhygienic water-skins (*kırbalar*) used by the town's water carriers to transport their wares. As Ottoman officials lamented the product provided by Mina's water carriers was invariably "fetid" (*müteaffin*) and "microbe-filled" (*mikroplu*).[59]

As Ottoman officials discovered, their attempts to manage and sustain human life in the face of water scarcity and cholera would necessitate new and more precise understandings of water as a complex *milieu* of social and biological pathologies.[60] Even after the supposed victory of bacteriological science by the 1890s, older sanitarian efforts to alter the "pathogenic terrain" of cholera continued to play their part.[61] Mecca's water supply presented a tangled web of hybrid processes, blurring any assumed boundaries between technical, natural, and human elements. Thus, efforts to provide potable water were not merely public works. They were radical restructurings of the existing social and economic organization of the hajj, which would be met by local elites with an equally determined campaign of resistance.

---

[57] Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 165-167.

[58] Abdul Qaddous al-Ansari, *History of Aziziah water supply, Juddah & Glimpses on Water sources in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia,* translation by Fayez Audeh Ilyas (Jidda: Administration of the Aziziah Water Supply, 1972), 157-158.

[59] Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 165-167, 243-272. Mehmed Şakir's 1890 report explicitly cites Koch's findings on the cholera bacillus.

[60] On the notion of *milieu* and the social mediation of nature, see Paul Rabinow, *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 31-34.

[61] Bruno Latour, *The Pasteurization of France* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 23.

'Tyrants in Fear of Civilization': Profiteering and Pipeline Sabotage in Jidda

In addition to Abdur Razzack's attention to Arafat and Mina, his account also paints a grim picture of Jidda's almost total dependence on rainwater. In 1853, Faraj Yusr, the prominent Indian merchant and banker who had been at the center of the controversies leading to the violence in Jidda in 1858, had raised funds and successfully rehabilitated a Mamluk-era well and canal bringing water from a spring twenty kilometers east of town. By the 1880s, however, it had fallen into disrepair, leaving Jidda without a reliable source of running water. This dependency on rainwater had concentrated enormous power in the hands of the city's rainwater tank owners, giving rise to an ugly system of water profiteering. As Abdur Razzack explains, the population of Jidda suffered at the "caprice and whims of those who are the owners of the *sehreejes* or tanks for collecting rainwater." Large stone tanks dotted the landscape just outside the city's walls. Their "proprietors" were among the "first men in the place." Each tank owner was allotted "a certain number of tanks and a plot around a particular set is hollowed out, and the earth that is thus dug up is formed into banks all around, so that the rain that falls over one hollow does not run off into another man's tanks, but flows in those around which the embankment is formed." The water was either sold by slaves or the tanks were leased to water carriers. As a result of this system, during times of drought "the owners of these tanks make immense profits, and they can whenever they choose cause the townsmen the greatest sufferings."[62]

As Eyüp Sabri Paşa confirms, the landscape just outside of Jidda en route to Mecca was dotted with these mounds or hills, some rising as high as 80 meters. This

[62] British Library, Asia, Pacific, and Africa Collections, W 4087, "Report by Dr. Abdur Ruzzack on the health and sanitation of pilgrims to Mecca, 24 June 1879," 18, 40.

system of "reservoir hills" (*sahrınç tepeleri*) was the province of Jidda's elites. Not only was their control over rainwater collection lucrative, it became a representation of their social identity. As Eyüp Sabri relates, the area came to function as something of a hill station for Jidda's wealthy. Owing to the mountain views and lower humidity, many of the *tepe* system magnates summered in this area and built lavish apartments, kiosks, and gardens. According to Eyüp Sabri, the leading figure in this trend was Sayyid 'Umar al-Saqqaf (al-Sagoff).[63]

The al-Saqaff family was a Hadrami trading outfit that had made its fortune in the transition from sail to steam in Singapore.[64] In the process, they had also cornered the Southeast Asian market on pilgrimage transport and financial services.[65] In the early 1880s, 'Umar al-Saqqaf emerged as one of the leading figures in a sophisticated pilgrimage-services monopoly operating in the Hijaz with the blessing of the Sharif of Mecca. The monopoly aimed to control every aspect of the pilgrimage travel experience from steamships and boatmen to pilgrimage guides and camel brokers. With the organization of this system competition was restricted, prices were rigged, and the resulting profits were shared among the members of the pool.[66] Another notable tank owner was 'Umar Nasif.[67] Nasif was also one of the principals in the pilgrimage transport ring. In light of Saqaff and Nasif's wide-raning operations, to which we will

---

[63] Eyüp Sabri Paşa, *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*, vol. 3, 194-195.

[64] Syed Mohsen Alsagoff, *The Alsagoff Family in Malaysia: A.H. 1240 (A.D. 1824) to A.H. 1382 (A.D. 1962)* (Singapore, 1963), 9-11; Freitag and Clarence-Smith, *Hadhrami Traders, Scholars, and Statesmen in the Indian Ocean, 1750s-1960s*, 288, 298-300.

[65] Tagliacozzo, *The Longest Journey: Southeast Asians and the Pilgrimage to Mecca*, 72-75.

[66] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 101-102.

[67] Ibid., 109.

return to in the next chapter, the constellation of local interests lurking behind the cartelization of Jidda's water resources and their resistance to Ottoman interference comes into sharper focus.

As Mehmed Şakir recounts, Abdur Razzack's investigations caused considerable embarrassment for the Ottoman government. Following its release in 1879, Dr. Dickson, the British delegate on the Ottoman Board of Health, drew on the report in his scathing indictment of Jidda's water supply in the *Gazette Medical D'Orient* (*Ceride-i Tıbbıye-i Şarkiye*). In the years following Abdur Razzack's damning report, Jidda's water security became a top priority. As Mehmed Şakir explains, great pains were taken to "silence the foreigners' objections" (*ecanibin dehn-i itirazı kapanmış*) by preventing "the sale of the harmful and infested waters of the local profiteers' tanks and basins to the pilgrims and local residents at high prices" *(...yerli ahalisinden menfaatperestânın sarnıçları ve havuzlarındaki muzır ve kurtlu hüccac ve ahaliye yüksek fiyatla satmak...*). Thus, during the early 1880s great pains were taken to "silence foreigners' objections" by preventing "the sale of the harmful and infested waters of the local profiteers' tanks and basins to the pilgrims and local residents at high prices."[68]

On the heels of successful restoration of Mecca's water supply, Osman Nuri Paşa set Jidda's water supply as the 'Ayn Zubayda Commission's next project. In order to provide Jidda with a reliable and safe supply, he proposed bringing water from a well sunk at 'Ayn Waziriyya (Ayn-ı Veziriye), located approximately 10 kilometers (or two and half hours' distance) from Jidda. Construction began in 1885.[69] However, having already exhausted many of their potential sources of funding during the restoration of the

[68] Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 62-4.

[69] Soydemir et al., *Hicaz Vilayet Salnamesi*, 120.

‘Ayn Zubayda aqueduct, the ‘Ayn Waziriyya project’s funding proved somewhat more difficult. In addition to funds raised from local notables, Osman Nuri also received permission to solicit donations from average pilgrims. While Ottoman documents referred to these funds as charity (*iane*), British consular reports reveal that these contributions were actually made compulsory by Osman Nuri. As Abdur Razzack complained in his report on the 1885 pilgrimage season:

> Another indirect tax was also levied by the Vali himself through the Motowwafs [*sic: Mutawwifin*] or religious guides who were instructed to demand from the pilgrims a dollar [riyal] per head as contribution in aid of the Jeddah Waterworks, the commencement of which I had referred to in my report on the Haj of 1884, and I know that orders have been already issued to demand it again from the Indian pilgrims this year. This annual levying of one dollar per head from pilgrims through the agency of Motowwafs and brokers if not objected and put a stop to by some means will become an established custom and when the waterworks are finished it may likely be transformed into a permanent indirect tax under some equally plausible name.[70]

According to Abdur Razzack, each pilgrim was given a receipt for his or her contribution. Although in the end the scheme was abandoned as unenforceable, Osman Nuri’s original intent was supposedly to have guards posted at Mecca’s city gates to check that each pilgrim entering Mecca on camel had contributed. As Osman Nuri’s writings on the Hijaz’s untenable lack of tax revenues make clear, he believed that pilgrims and foreign sojourners should also be responsible for sharing the burden of financing the Hijaz’s exploding infrastructural needs.[71] Acting on this conviction, he attempted to generate new revenue streams through the imposition of municipal taxes, boat fees, and additional

[70] TNA: FO 78/4094, “Report of Vice-Consul Dr. Abdur Razzack on the 1885 Pilgrimage Season,” Jidda, 27 February 1886.

[71] Somel,“Osman Nuri Paşa’nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu,” 11, 25-6.

passport charges. Ultimately, after Osman Nuri's removal from office in 1886, however, a review of these taxes found them unlawful.[72]

Despite the aggressive collections from pilgrims over the course of four hajj seasons, as late as 1887 the project remained stalled with only two-thirds of the pipeline complete.[73] Although less difficult than the 'Ayn Zubayda restoration, Jidda's waterworks still required a workforce of over 3,000 and took roughly three and a half years to finish.[74] It would also eventually require additional funds from the Sultan to complete the port's new ornamental fountain, ablutions station (*şadırvan*), water depot (*mahzen*), and distribution reservoir (*maksim*).[75] When the project was finally completed in 1888, it appeared that Jidda had been rescued from the clutches of the city's water profiteers.[76]

Writing just two years later during his visit to prepare a *layiha* on the public health conditions of Hijaz, Mehmed Şakir Bey describes his first impressions of the improvements to Jidda's water infrastructure, which he had seen on a previous trip en route to Yemen. He recalled how the port's main square now featured a beautiful, octagonal fountain, bearing the name of the Sultan, complete with taps on all sides. On his return in 1890, however, the fountain's previous flow had been greatly diminished and it was becoming increasingly difficult to fill the recently established water depot and

---

[72] BOA, Y. MTV, 25/26 (29 R 1304/25 January 1887); BOA, DH. MKT, 1441/70 (3 Z 1304/ 23 August 1887); BOA, MV, 23/60 (9 Z 1304/29 August 1887); BOA, DH. MKT, 1454/6 (23 M 1305/11 October 1887).

[73] BOA, MV, 21/65 (19 L 1304/11 July 1887); BOA, DH. MKT, 1456/90 (5 S 1305/23 October 1887); BOA, YA. HUS, 207/103 (17 S 1305/4 November 1887).

[74] el-Mekki, *Osmanlı Padişahlarının Haremeyn Hizmetleri*, 26.

[75] BOA, MV, 21/65 (19 L 1304/11 July 1887); BOA, DH. MKT, 1456/90 (5 S 1305/23 October 1887); BOA, YA. HUS, 207/103 (17 S 1305/4 November 1887).

[76] *Hicaz Vilayet Salnamesi* (1305), 214-219.

distribution reservoirs. As Mehmed Şakir makes clear, the rapid decline of ʻAyn Waziriyya's output was not the result of any ordinary malfunction. Because the local tank and cistern owners had been prevented from selling their stagnant, disease-infested rainwater, they had hatched a plot to "cancel" (*iptal etmek*) the benefits brought by the Jidda's new source of freshwater by purposefully "clogging the water pipes" (*...su borularına bazı şeyleri tıkadıkları ara sıra vukua geliyor.*)[77]

Mehmed Şakir Bey's accusations of sabotage were far from isolated. Writing in 1907, the British representative to the Ottoman Board of Health, Dr. Frank G. Clemow, observed that the drought-stricken Jidda of 1906 was again limited to tank water and the brackish water from wells dug just outside the city walls. As Clemow points out, there were four springs nearby, but only one was serviceable. However, its water had to be transported by camel or donkey. The pipes leading from the other three, including ʻAyn Waziriyya, were constantly sabotaged. As Clemow suspected, the city's influential tank owners, whose interests had been damaged by the construction of the water pipes, had directed Bedouin agents in a campaign to cripple the pipelines and retain their monopoly.[78]

El-Hac Hüseyin Vassaf's narrative of his 1905-1906 pilgrimage paints a vivid picture of the Turkish center's frustration with the locals' stubborn refusal to accept the gifts of the civilizing mission started during the governorship of Osman Nuri Paşa:

> The now deceased Osman Paşa brought water here from a far-away source. He established a thriving fountain providing sweet drinking water for the pilgrims and the locals free of charge. However, the Arab notables who own the tanks were financially harmed by the establishment of the waterworks, and are suspected of damaging the watercourses. They extort heavy fees from the people and the pilgrims. They are

[77] Sarıyıdız and Kavak, eds., *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 62-64.

[78] Bulmuş, *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire*, 165.

> ignorant and oppressive men. For personal gain they prefer to harm the general welfare. They are tyrants in fear of civilization and public health. As a result of the water here, there is unbearable drought. Due to the worm-infested and microbe-filled water and the brackish water of the wells, diseases and infirmities, especially cholera and diarrhea, are endless.
>
> The capable and much-celebrated governor called 'Topal Osman Paşa' made the Arabs tremble. However, with his passing away, the Arabs have gotten out of control; what he built up, they have destroyed.
>
> …Thanks to their destruction of this great work of charity, his multi-tiered fountain, the pilgrims were subjected to hardship and inconvenience. When I saw it in ruins my heart ached…[79]

From the perspective of the sweeping vision of "authoritarian high modernism" guiding both Europe's colonial powers and the Ottoman center, Osman Nuri Paşa was a hero who had struggle to rationalize both nature and human activity in the Hijaz. Yet, in the end, his technopolitical re-imagining of the Hijaz failed and local Arab resistance would recast the future of Ottoman hydropolitics in the Hijaz.[80]

Drinking the Sea: The Ottoman Turn to Desalination

By the early 1890s the sabotage of Jidda's pipelines once again reduced the city to dependence on rainwater. The magnitude of this setback was made painfully clear as the 1890s emerged as a decade of escalating drought in both Jidda and Yanbuʿ.[81] Recognizing both the severity of the drought and their inability to protect their freshwater pipelines from tampering, as early as 1894-1895 Ottoman officials began to explore the feasibility of importing European equipment in order to distill sea water.[82] Although local authorities had identified a source of spring water located six hours' distance from

---

[79] El-Hac Hüseyin Vassaf, *Hicaz Hatırası*, edited by Mehmet Akkuş (İstanbul: Kubbealtı, 2011), 71-72.

[80] James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 94.

[81] During the 1890s, water scarcity was exacerbated by the coincidence of the hajj season falling between April and August.

[82] BOA, İ. HUS, 20/68 (26 R 1311/2 February 1894); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 294/41 (13 Ş 1311/19 April 1894); Ömer Faruk Yılmaz, *Hicaz'da Deniz Suyu Arıtma Tesisleri Projesi* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2012).

Yanbuʿ, the severity of the drought facing the town rendered long-term planning obsolete. Without rain it was feared that the town was headed for disaster during the upcoming hajj season. The Hijaz *vilayet* requested that the Naval Ministry (*Bahriye Nezareti*) import two machines capable of producing freshwater from seawater (*denizden tatlı su yapmak üzere iki makina*).[83] In the meantime, they pleaded that a steamship like those located at Suez, capable of producing desalinated freshwater (*su yüklü bir vapur*), be sent to Yanbuʿ as soon as possible. As an additional precaution, all hajj traffic for the upcoming season was prohibited from landing in Yanbuʿ and rerouted to Jidda.[84]

Throughout the 1890s and 1900s emergency operations became the new normal. As the situation worsened, pilgrims arriving in Jidda were transferred to the nearby Ebu Saad quarantine station in order to ease the strain on the city's resources. A tugboat (*römorkör*) equipped with a distillation machine capable of producing five tons of drinking water per day was ordered from Geneva. This vessel, aptly named the *Zülal* (meaning pleasant to drink), became the coastal towns' emergency reserve. In 1899, this floating desalination unit provided relief to pilgrims arriving in Yanbuʿ from Medina. A fifty-ton iron container was shipped in so that it could be filled with potable water produced by the *Zülal*. Concerned that even this would not stave off a catastrophe, each of the *İdare-i Mahsusa* steamship service's three departures between Jidda and Suez were ordered to bring drinking water to Yanbuʿ as well.[85]

In 1900, a twenty-four-hour burst of rain half-filled the town's tanks, rescuing Jidda from the brink of disaster. However, during the protracted crises in Jidda and

---

[83] BOA, BEO, 577/42360 (29 Ş 1312/25 February 1895).

[84] BOA, BEO, 571/42805 (21 Ş 1312/17 February 1895).

[85] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina*, 127.

Yanbuʿ the European consuls had grown increasingly concerned for the safety of their colonial subjects and demanded a more permanent solution. In light of the tremendous improvements that resulted from the installation of a water filtration machine (*taktir makinası*) at the Kamaran quarantine station near the mouth of the Red Sea, it was decided that a similar machine could solve the chronic shortages facing the Hijaz's port cities. However, the cash-strapped Ottomans were unable to finance the 9,000-lira cost of the two filtration machines requested by the Hijaz *vilayet*. In 1900, the Grand Vizierate requested that the Board of Health loan the necessary funds. However, the Board of Health refused on the grounds that the money would be better spent on the quarantine system. Again in 1903, the Sultan approved the amount, but in 1905 his *irade* was nullified (*hükümsüz*). The bureaucratic infighting in Istanbul continued until the Board of Health finally relented in 1907 and decided to install filtration machines at Jidda and Yanbuʿ.[86]

This first experiment with desalination produced mixed results. As Dr. Kasım İzzeddin, who became the Director General of the Hijaz Sanitary Administration in 1910, explained, the original machine's water had a disgusting smell and was hardly palatable. In any event, the machine's capacity was insufficient and soon broke down. Thus, Jidda's water saga dragged on until the Hijaz Sanitary Administration secured a loan from the Board of Health in 1911 to cover the cost of a new water filtration machine and the facilities to house them. Under İzzeddin's direction, a filtration machine capable of producing one hundred tons per day was purchased for Jidda.[87] This was the culmination of a decades-long struggle and occasion for celebration. As İzzeddin recalls, the opening

[86] Ibid., 127-128.

[87] İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 39-51.

of the facility housing the condenser, filtration apparatus, ice machine, coal depot, and electric generators was marked by a joyful ceremony:

> In January 1329 [1911], they completed installing the ice machines and electricity generators [in Jeddah]. The government officials had a ceremony with the consulates of the foreign powers, local notables and steamboat agents. They slaughtered rams and prayed that the Caliphate of Islam's glory may be increased. They also wished for the prosperity of the Hijaz Sanitary Administration. The opening day of the ice and electric generators was a joyful one for the people of Jeddah. They opened the doors of the factory to the public and all the people around came to see the machines and were happy.[88]

Although the machines were undoubtedly a novelty, the plant itself was of equal import. Pipeline sabotage was partly overcome by relocating water production to a secure site or "technological zone" that could be policed in ways that Jidda's watercourses had not been. A technological zone is "a space within which differences between technical practices, procedures or forms have been reduced." Thus, the plant represented a "border" distinguishing between an outpost of internationally accepted technical expertise and the unwanted corruption of the local economy and society outside."[89]

Conclusion

As Timothy Mitchell explains, "Infrastructures arrange the interaction of human lives with nature." Even the most mundane public works deploy the "politics of nature." It is through these infrastructures that "nature is produced" and experienced. The "spaces, flows, measures, and calculations out of which infrastructures are built create the

---

[88] İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 51, quoted in Bulmuş, *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire*, 166.

[89] Andrew Barry, "Technological Zones," *European Journal of Social Theory* 9, no. 2 (2006): 239, 241, 246.

most common forms in which humans encounter and measure the reserves of nature—or experience their lack."[90]

Bearing this basic dictum in mind, was it drought or increased demand from the steamship-era pilgrimage or water profiteering and pipeline sabotage that produced water scarcity? Put slightly differently, was it nature itself or the nature of the state's approach to infrastructure, centralization, and governmentality that produced resistance and exacerbated scarcity? In other words, while the late Ottoman state embarked on a series of ambitious water projects, the state was ultimately unable to instrumentalize that infrastructure.

Ottoman hydraulic projects were hobbled and reshaped by local resistance. Although Ottoman administrators were unable to provide enough freshwater to eliminate demand for rainwater, they remained in open conflict with the Hijaz's tank owners and water carriers. Not unlike their Bedouin counterparts, who frequently attacked the Hijaz's rail and telegraph lines, these urban elites waged their own campaign of sabotage against Ottoman water infrastructure. In a sense, all of these technologies represented "points of vulnerability" providing the "infrastructure of political protest" for locals to resist Ottoman centralization.[91] Ultimately, the Ottomans proved incapable of governing the spaces that these projects traversed. Thus, while the state was able to execute ambitious technological feats, it was never able to fully leverage its expertise as a means to produce the intensity of territoriality or the thickness of biopolitical control over the

[90] Timothy Mitchell, "The Life of Infrastructure," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 3 (2014): 438.

[91] Timothy Mitchell, *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil* (London: Verso, 2011), 103.

population, whether Bedouin or urban, necessary to eliminate autonomous forms of frontier political life.

Chapter 5

The Sharif's Share:
Pauper Pilgrims, Passports, and the Failed Regulation of Indian Ocean Mobilities

In 1892, the Muslims of Madras presented the following petition (*arzuhal*) to the Ottoman Consul-General (*Başşehbender*) in India, Hacı Mehmet Kadri Bey:

> We venture to take this opportunity to lay before your Honor, certain facts connected with the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, which cause much inconvenience and suffering to the Indian pilgrims, with the sanguine hope that Your Honor will be pleased to bring them to the august notice of your Imperial Master with a view to steps being adopted for prevention. The troubles of Indian pilgrims commence from Bombay. The pilgrim vessels are allowed to be so much thronged with passengers and the sanitary arrangements are so defective and unsatisfactory that not occasionally Cholera breaks out in the ships as soon as they leave Bombay… The appearance of Cholera necessitates the vessels being placed in quarantine, the period of which sometimes exceeds the Haj season,—with the result that the pilgrims return to their homes disappointed, dejected in mind and broken-hearted. Although our British Government with its usual sincerity of action and solicitude for the welfare of its subjects has framed rules regulating the traffic of pilgrim vessels, who wish to promote their own interests regardless of the convenience and comfort of the passengers, or enforced by those responsible for the rules being carried out. The only remedy therefore lies in such vessels being carefully inspected on reaching their destination, by Turkish Officials, and any violation of the rules or shortcomings adequately dealt with.
>
> The whole Moslem world is aware that His Imperial Majesty the Sultan spends annually crores of dollars from his own pocket and from the Imperial Treasury for the well being and comfort of the pilgrims and that the Turkish Officials spare no pains in contributing to the same, but owing to the unfortunate malpractices of the Sheriff of Mecca, his interference in every matter of administration, and above all his hostile attitude towards all reforms introduced by the Turkish Government of Hejaz,—all of which are prompted by motives of pure self interest—disturb the administration and peace of the Hejaz and cause considerable suffering to all the pilgrims. Those who understand the situation know that the Sheriff is responsible for such state of affairs, but others, who form the majority of pilgrims and who are not acquainted with the Sheriff's tactics, form an unfavorable impression of the local Turkish Government which is prejudicial to the reputation of His Imperial Majesty's rule.
>
> The Indian Mussalmans alone number about 60,000,000 and those from other parts of the world exceed this number. We are sure that His Imperial Majesty will not allow such a large body of the Faithful to entertain other than the most loyal and respectful sentiments towards his Government and that the "Ameerool Momineen," whose kindheartedness, foresight and desire to do good to all, are proverbial, will order the adoption of necessary remedial measures, which may tend to secure for the

pilgrims all necessary safety and convenience.[1]

At first glance, this petition seems a perfect example of the Ottoman state's successful cultivation of the pan-Islamic cult of personality surrounding Abdülhamid II. Despite the petition's admiring and reverential tone, however, there is a thinly veiled warning that Indian Muslims' attachment to the Caliphate was far from unconditional. While the petition acknowledges positive steps taken by both the British and Ottoman administrations, it nevertheless raises the question: who was ultimately responsible for the perilous conditions of the steamship-era hajj? Although the lion's share of their complaints are leveled at the Sharif of Mecca, the petition makes it plain that if the public health crises, security risks, and naked corruption plaguing the pilgrimage experience were not remedied, the situation would likely taint Indian perceptions of the Ottoman administration in the Hijaz and the Sultan-Caliph would shoulder the blame. As this document demonstrates, the Hamidian regime's emphasis on Abdülhamid's role as protector of the holy places created some unintended consequences. The crafting of this image succeeded in imbuing Abdülhamid with greater spiritual significance in the eyes of Indian and other non-Ottoman Muslims. However, this public persona was also meant to convey a sense of temporal power in the Hijaz and competence in securing the health and safety of pilgrims.[2] Thus, it also raised expectations for material, legal, and administrative changes that the Ottoman state found difficult or undesirable, if not impossible, to fulfill.

The petition's authors paint a vivid picture of the failure of all parties involved to regulate the pilgrimage transportation industry. Despite the deplorable conditions of the

[1] BOA, Y. PRK. AZJ, 22/41 (29 Z 1309/25 July 1892).

[2] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State," 345-359.

steamship-era pilgrimage having been an issue of international concern for nearly three decades, the question of how to guarantee the health and safety of the masses of pilgrims moving across imperial and administrative borders remained unresolved. Despite Indian calls for the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph to act decisively, by the latter half of the nineteenth century the Ottoman state could no longer act as the sole protector of the hajj. The caravans of old had given way not only to steamships, but, more importantly, the conduct of the hajj had become a globalized, deeply interdependent marketplace and mobility regime requiring coordination and cooperation between the Ottoman Empire, the Sharifate of Mecca, British India, and the rest of the European colonial world. As a result, the hajj became ensnared in an inter-imperial web of conflicting regulations and practices governing passports, quarantines, shipping firms, pilgrimage guides, camel drivers, and even the legal interpretation of Islamic ritual itself.

In this internationalized climate, Pan-Islam was a double-edged sword for pilgrims. Rather than inspiring dramatic reforms, Pan-Islam often undermined Ottoman efforts to impose modern forms of governmentality, underscore the empire's territorial sovereignty, and fully apply biopolitical documentary practices and border controls. For the Indian Ocean pilgrims caught in middle, it was precisely this Gordian knot of legitimacy, binding the two great "Muslim" empires of the colonial era, each vying to burnish their credentials as protectors of the faithful and patrons of the pilgrims, which ensured caution and mutual inaction. Neither side was willing to mandate reforms that might have been perceived as preventing pilgrims from fulfilling their sacred obligations to perform the hajj. Thus, the failure of inter-imperial governmentality provided the space for the institutionalization of suffering and corruption on local and global scales.

As the Madras petition continues, its authors make clear that they favored a more muscular Ottoman administration in the Hijaz. They strongly advocated for the narrowing of the Sharifate's autonomous privileges. They also shared Osman Nuri Paşa's conviction that improving the material and public health conditions of the hajj could be best achieved through technopolitical solutions designed to insulate pilgrims from interactions with the Hijaz's Bedouin population. The petition's authors praised and encouraged Osman Nuri's recent infrastructural interventions to alleviate Mecca and Jidda's strained water supplies. Here, they take the special tax that Osman Nuri levied on pilgrims for the construction of Jidda's waterworks as a model, which they believed could be used to underwrite the construction of a rail link between Jidda, and Mecca and possibly even Mecca and Medina, designed to allow Indian Ocean pilgrims to avoid the arduous caravan journeys, the coercive business practices of pilgrimage guides and camel hires, and the threat of Bedouin raiding in the Hijaz's interior.[3] Thus, as Nile Green points out, the growth of steam and rail travel led to inevitable comparisons between the Hijaz and the colonial world, the comparative under-development of Mecca and the more orderly, clean and controlled spaces and modes of transport through which pilgrims had passed *en route*.[4]

While the connection between the Sharifate, corruption, and Bedouin disorder in the Hijaz itself is clear enough, Ottoman inability to curtail the autonomy of the Sharif would also have consequences well beyond the Hijaz's caravan routes. By the early 1880s, the Sharif of Mecca, 'Awn al-Rafiq, had consolidated his position at the center of

[3] BOA, Y. PRK. AZJ, 22/41 (29 Z 1309/25 July 1892).

[4] Nile Green, "The Hajj as its Own Undoing: Global Infrastructure and Integration on the Muslim Journey to Mecca," *Past & Present* 226, no. 1 (2015): 193-226.

a vast Indian Ocean syndicate affecting virtually every aspect of the pilgrimage experience from steamship ticketing and boatmen to pilgrimage guides and camel brokers. With the organization of this monopoly, competition for transporting pilgrims was restricted, prices were rigged, and the resulting profits were shared by the pool's principal participants.

This chapter explores how the fissures between Ottoman and British approaches to passports, documentary practices, and steamship regulation facilitated the metastasis and institutionalization of this monopoly system. It will also demonstrate how these fractured systems of inter-imperial regulation were repeatedly evaded and even conditioned through the collaboration of the Sharif of Mecca, Ottoman provincial officials, European steamship companies, elements within the European consular community in Jidda, and the trans-oceanic networks of Indian and Hadrami commercial interests controlling the pilgrimage transport and brokerage industries linking Mecca and Jidda with India, Singapore, and Java.

Indigence and İstitaat: Pauper Pilgrims and the Question of 'Misguided' Charity

Perhaps more than any other form of economic or cultural contact, the pilgrimage to Mecca exemplified how rapidly Muslims adapted to the globalizing landscape of transportation opportunities brought by colonialism and the advent of the age of steam. With the contraction of space and time through quicker and cheaper travel, the hajj provided a powerful demonstration that while the power of steam might have been a "tool of empire" it could also be used in ways that European empires had not anticipated.[5]

From the 1860s onward the mechanics of an "industrializing" pilgrimage transportation industry emerged as a major concern for European empires with large

[5] Gelvin and Green, *Global Muslims in the Age of Steam and Print*, 3.

Muslim populations. This was especially true of the British and Dutch administrations in South and Southeast Asia, from which the largest contingents of pilgrims hailed. In addition to fears that the steamship-era pilgrimage played a role in stoking anti-colonial and pan-Islamic sentiments, it was also characterized as the primary vehicle responsible for the globalization of epidemic diseases, most notably cholera. At the numerous international sanitary conferences held to address this threat, poverty was presented as an essential predisposing cause of cholera. Ever since the 1866 conference in Istanbul, international attention had focused heavily on the squalid conditions of Hindu pilgrimage centers in India, as well as the hajj, which it was argued was the second stage by which cholera was spread from the subcontinent to Europe. In particular, India's so-called "pauper pilgrims" were singled out as the most likely carriers of cholera.[6]

With the dawn of the steamship era and the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, the volume of oceangoing traffic between India and the Red Sea increased exponentially. As a result of the shift from sail to steam, pilgrims were finally freed from the rhythms of the monsoon cycle, leading to a dramatic decrease in both the cost and duration of passage. Thus, while previous generations of pilgrims had consisted mainly of *nawabs*, wealthy merchants, and members of the *ulema*, the relative affordability of the steamship-era made the journey possible for Muslims of modest means.[7]

In this brave new era of mass pilgrimage, however, a new class of ordinary pilgrims, the poorest of which set out for Mecca with less preparation and spare cash than ever before, found themselves negotiating a volatile new system precariously balanced

---

[6] "The Cholera Conference," *The London Quarterly Review*, CXXII, no. CCXLIII (January 1867), 26; David Arnold, *Colonizing the Body: State Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth-Century India* (Berkeley: California University Press, 1993), 186.

[7] Low, "Empire and the Hajj," 269-271.

between the commercialization of steamship travel and pilgrimage-related charity. On the one hand, increased competition among shipping agents put the cost of a steamship ticket to the Hijaz within reach of the poor. On the other hand, the emergence of this new market brought a wave of exploitation and scandal in its wake. In Bombay, pilgrimage brokers were accused of luring prospective pilgrims to the docks with the promise of inexpensive fares, only to delay embarkation and raise prices as the hajj drew closer. In other cases, larger vessels, eager to pack as many passengers as possible onboard in order maximize profits, would sell off their excess tickets at bargain rates just before departure. Coupled with the notoriously disorderly embarkation procedures at Bombay, this system allowed brokers and steamship operators to load numbers well in excess of the legal limits imposed by the Government of India.[8]

Many of these pilgrims were dependent on the munificence of prosperous Muslim merchants and shipping agents seeking to acquire merit by helping their less fortunate brethren.[9] In some cases this assistance took the form of small amounts of cash, but often it came in the form of special discounted or free tickets provided by Muslim shippers. As this pattern emerged more clearly during the 1870s and the 1880s, the much-maligned figure of the "pauper pilgrim" became a stock character in the correspondence of Indian newspapers, government officials, and Muslim charitable organizations. Such pilgrims were consistently described as backward illiterates, duped by rapacious brokers, and ignorant to complexities of the brokerage schemes with which they were dealing. To be

---

[8] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp, 49-55; Oishi Takashi, "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility: British Colonial Management of the Hajj and Reaction to It by Indian Muslims, 1870-1920," in Kuroki Hidemitsu, ed., *The Influence of Human Mobility in Muslim Societies* (London: Kegan Paul, 2003), 163-167.

[9] Saurabh Mishra, "Beyond the Bounds of Time?: The Haj Pilgrimage from the Indian Subcontinent, 1865-1920," in Bisamoy Pati and Mark Harrison, eds., *The Social History of Health and Medicine in Colonial India* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 31-32.

sure, many of them were cheated and taken advantage of. However, there is also ample evidence suggesting that many of these pilgrims were attracted by rumors of the commercial and charitable practices surrounding the pilgrimage industry and were actually savvy consumers prepared to pursue whatever means were necessary to make their hajj as cheaply as possible.[10]

Another dimension of the question of charity that has seldom been highlighted is the practice of hajj by proxy (*bedel hacc*). According to this Islamic legal provision, pilgrims who cannot perform the hajj themselves due to lack of physical or financial ability (Ottoman Turkish: *istitaat*; Arabic: *istita'a*) may send a proxy to perform the rituals on their behalf. However, from a strictly legal perspective this practice is highly circumscribed. The grounds for sending a proxy must be permanent infirmity, generally due to old age or chronic disease. Likewise, to qualify as a proxy, the person elected to make the hajj must have already performed the pilgrimage on his or her own behalf.[11] However, as one British handbook on the administration of the hajj argued, even if these basic conditions are met: "Any person desiring to perform the pilgrimage by proxy *(Hajj-i-Badal*), cannot expect to acquire merit thereby, unless he assures himself that his proxy has adequate funds to maintain himself in good condition till his return."[12] As the Ottoman expert on public health and pilgrim affairs, Kasım İzzeddin, explained, however, in practice pilgrimage by proxy frequently did not conform to the legal conditions described above. As he suggests, it had less to do with actual ability to make

[10] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp," 54; Takashi, "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility," 163-65.

[11] For a discussion of the conditions of *istita'a*, see Wael B. Hallaq, *Sharī'a: Theory, Practice, Transformations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 238.

[12] IOR, V/26/844/6, *Report of the Haj Inquiry Committee* (Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch, 1930), 17.

the hajj than as an expression of class divisions. From his perspective, this practice was a major contributor to the rising numbers of destitute pilgrims because it was commonly mishandled by "men of wealth" electing to send their "poor coreligionists" as representatives in order "get the rewards of the hajj."[13]

From the perspective of the consulate in Jidda, part of the problem was that the economics of inexpensive steamship tickets had divorced hajj-related charity from the theoretical rules governing *bedel hacc*. Another contributing factor was that the suffering of pilgrims financed by India's booming marketplace of hajj-related charity happened on the other side of the Indian Ocean. As the Jidda consulate complained to the authorities in India:

> These Mahomedan gentlemen who distribute free tickets think that as soon as they have give[n] away the tickets their duty is finished. Charity it certainly is to facilitate the journey of those who want to go on religious mission, but a more mistaken, misapplied, and misguided charity than the one in question cannot be conceived. The distributors of these free tickets think not and care not how these poor creatures, whom they have loaded in a ship without any money, provisions and clothing, are going to keep themselves alive for about 20 days on board the ship and 10 days at Cameran in quarantine. The suffering and troubles which await their arrival in the Hedjaz and the difficulties experienced by these poor wretches for going back to India are matters which happen on the other side of the seas and therefore cannot tax the brains of the Indian charitable Mahomedans. The poor people thus sent to the Hedjaz by the inconsiderate, well-to-do Mahomedans of India always prove a great nuisance to the masters of the ships and other well-to-do passengers on whose charity their live depend.[14]

Of particular concern for both European and Ottoman administrators was the significant number of pilgrims able to muster only enough cash to purchase a steamship ticket for their outgoing journey from Bombay to Jidda. In addition to begging their way to Mecca and back, a more serious problem emerged when these pilgrims could not

---

[13] İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 56, 60-62.

[14] TNA: FO 78/4882, Turkey, Pilgrim Traffic, January to May 1897, Phillip Currie, Acting Consul, Jidda to Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, 4 Sept 1896.

afford the cost of a return ticket once their hajj was completed. As a result, Indian pilgrims gained a reputation for professional mendicancy, marking them as a public nuisance in the eyes of Hijazi locals, British and Ottoman officials, and even many of their wealthier Indian coreligionists.[15]

This reputation led British officials, elite Indian Muslims, and the press to stigmatize poor pilgrims. Their harsh rhetoric is exemplified by the *Times of India*'s 1885 exposé, "The Pilgrim Trade":

> Many people leave India with a passage ticket (obtained by begging), a few dirty rags, and perhaps two days' food. What becomes of these people? may be asked. Why, they starve to death. That many pilgrims die every year through starvation is a well-known fact. And again, there are amongst the pilgrims the very old and weak—people who are hardly able to come on board. Why should these people be allowed to undertake a voyage they totally unfit for? All this is against the Koran. Generally the latter end of these old people is a sickening sight and not fit to be described in print.[16]

As another observer lamented, "It is a common sight after *Haj* to see people lying about the beach under the shade of the rocks, without money, without clothes, and without food or water, dying of disease and starvation."[17] As a result of the pathogenic danger posed by this subset of pilgrims, states across Europe and the Islamic world were called upon to ensure that "beggars trusting to the charity of their richer brethren" were discouraged from undertaking "so long and expensive a business as the Haj."[18]

---

[15] For Ottoman complaints of poor pilgrims disturbing local public order in the Hijaz, see for example BOA, DH. MKT, 1349/101 (7 N 103/9 June 1886).

[16] Thomas Cook Group Archives (hereafter TC), Guardbook no. 27, Appendix no.2, extract from the *Times of India*, 9 November 1885 in John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894.

[17] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Appendix no.2, extract from the *Times of India*, 9 November 1885 in John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894.

[18] TC, Guardbook no. 27, "The Mecca Pilgrimage," *The Excursionist*, 26 March 1887.

According to Radhika Singha, "Enlightened Muslims" were encouraged by the government to repeat the basic logic of this argument. Because British officials were keenly aware of their severe legitimacy deficit when it came to religious issues, they invited Muslim elites to declare to their poorer brethren that making the hajj without being physically and financially able was a violation of Islamic law.[19] Indeed, this oft-repeated legal justification for restricting the mobility of the poor was instrumental in securing support from Muslim elites, many of whom sympathized with the zeal of their coreligionists, but still agreed that their actions were not permissible.[20]

In 1886, the Government circulated a letter outlining Ottoman complaints about "the large influx into the Hedjaz of destitute British Indian Muhammadan subjects." The letter was distributed to Muslim notables in order to solicit their opinion regarding what steps might be taken to alleviate the situation. Writing on behalf of the Central National Muhammadan Association, Ameer Ali wrote a blistering condemnation:

> …from the experience of many of the members of this Association who have themselves been to Hedjaz, there appears to be considerable truth in the complaint of the Turkish Government. A large majority of the destitute Indian Muhammadans who go to Mecca are actuated more by the worldly motive of making a livelihood from the charity of the richer pilgrims; and in many cases they prove themselves a nuisance to their well-to-do fellow compatriots. Under the Muhammadan law no person is entitled to make the *huj* unless he has the means of paying for the journey to and fro, and maintaining himself at the same time.[21]

While other responses stopped short of accusing the poor of being motivated by the prospect of pecuniary gain, there was wide agreement that because the hajj was not obligatory for the poor and that steps to ensure that intending pilgrims had the necessary

---

[19] On the highly selective nature of this consultative approach, see Slight, "The Hajj and the Raj: From Thomas Cook to Bombay's Protector of Pilgrims," 118.

[20] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp," 50, 63

[21] TNA: FO 78/4094, Ameer Ali to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, 12 August 1886, in de L. Rush, ed., *Records of the Hajj*, vol. 3, p. 616.

resources to complete the journey were in keeping with the spirit of Islamic law. In his response, Maulvi Abdul Jubbar gently attempts to refute the most outrageous accusations leveled against India's poor pilgrims. However, he too agrees that their actions were out of step with the Islamic law.

> It is true that many destitute Indian Muhammadans yearly proceed to the Hedjaz on pilgrimage, but I do not think that they go there with the object of subsisting on the public charity. Arabia is a poor country, and the Indian Muhammadans know it well that its inhabitants expect gifts from foreign pilgrims. The latter therefore do not go there in the hope of obtaining any pecuniary help. They are led to the holy shrines in that country by religious enthusiasm, which prevents them from looking into the difficulties of a journey undertaken without sufficient means to pay the travelling charges. The ecclesiastical law of the Muhammadans does not make pilgrimage obligatory upon an individual who is not able to pay the costs of a journey to and from Mecca. I think every pilgrim may, before embarkation, be required to satisfy the authorities that he possesses the means of travelling. What minimum amount will be sufficient for the purpose may be determined by correspondence with the Turkish Government.[22]

Ottoman officials in the Hijaz also agreed that the behavior of India's indigent pilgrims was pushing past the boundaries set by Islamic jurisprudence. In 1890, Dr. Mehmed Şakir Bey, recorded his first-hand observations of the problem in a *layiha* prepared for the Sultan. In his report, Mehmed Şakir could not help but express his sympathy for the zeal and religiosity of the Indian pilgrims, which, as he points out, was at least partially a product of their devotion to the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph.[23] As he explains, it is as a result of "their pure belief that they come flocking to the holy ground of the Hijaz."[24] He even praises Indian Muslims for their unique capacity to be satisfied with their lot in life and the dignity with which they bear their poverty and misfortunes.

---

[22] TNA: FO 78/4094, note by Maulvi Abdul Jubbar, Deputy Magistrate and Deputy Collector, 19 April 1886, *Records of the Hajj*, vol. 3, p. 616.

[23] Sarıyıdız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 300.

[24] Ibid., 301.

Despite these positive comments, however, Mehmed Şakir, not unlike both the British and his better-off Indian coreligionists, notes that their behavior was unacceptable both from a religious and a sanitary point of view. From a religious perspective, he concedes that their begging was not technically a sin since it was necessary for their survival.[25] However, as he points out, the Qur'an specifies that the "pilgrimage is a duty which men owe to Allah whoever can find a way to it" (*vallahu ale'n-nasi haccü'l-beyt min istita' ileyhi sebila*). In his opinion, India's poor pilgrims were clearly unable satisfy the legal conditions that intending pilgrims should have both the financial and physical means (*istitaat-ı maliye ve kudret-i bedeniye*) to complete the journey.[26]

Thus, despite his admiration for their religious zeal, Mehmed Şakir could not completely conceal his disdain for the pathogenic risk they posed to the Hijaz. He describes the disembarkation of Indians as if Jidda were being besieged by "a mob of beggars and a naked and needy gang of the infirm" (*seele güruhu ve aceze takımı olmakla çıplak ve muhtaç oldukları*). Once the authorities were satisfied that they could not produce the landing or visa fee (*ayak bastı* or *mürur tezkeresi*) the pilgrims were allowed to proceed to Jidda. Armed with an "old tin mug" or a "dervish's bowl," they immediately begin to beg, crying out for mercy, "their voices fill the spaces of the neighborhoods and markets," but the "people of the Hijaz's ears became so accustomed to their voices that from the cradle they become indifferent and just observed rather than helping them." As Mehmed Şakir concludes, "their wasting away in the streets and their fouling the markets and the town, day and night, with their natural needs [i.e. their bodily

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid., 302. Here, Mehmed Şakir quotes from *Surat al-'Imran*, Qur'an 3:97. Four decades later this same verse is also cited as the principal basis for British regulations regarding destitute pilgrims. See also IOR, V/26/844/6, *Report of the Haj Inquiry Committee*, 15.

functions], exposes many people to epidemic and deadly diseases" (*…yollarda telef ve esvak ve biladı leylen ve neharen ihtiyacat-ı tabiyeleri ile telvis etmeleri ve bunca ıbadı emraz-ı müstevliye ve mühlikeye maruz bırakmalarına…*). He complained bitterly that these pilgrims constituted a danger to the Hijaz that no amount of "Islamic piety" or "Ottoman medicine" could ever "silence." However, despite his harsh analysis, Mehmed Şakir conceded that the Ottoman government's unwillingness to take steps to prevent paupers from making the hajj was partially motivated by fears that such measures might damage non-Ottoman Muslims' attachment to the Caliphate.[27]

In an interview with the British vice-consul at Jidda, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Mehmed Şakir bluntly outlines his concerns. As he explains, the manner in which India's poor pilgrims make the hajj was not only against shari'a law and immoral, but that their mendicancy had risen to the level of corruption. Mehmed Şakir then asks Abdur Razzack what ideas he had for solving the problem. Here, Abdur Razzack explains that although he had raised the issue with the Viceroy four years earlier, the response that he had received was merely a restatement of Britain's commitment to religious freedom, which prevented the government from restricting poor pilgrims' access to the hajj (*Aldığım cevab; 'İngilizler meyanında din ve mezhep pek serbest olduğundan fukaranın hacca gitmelerine asla mani' olamam' mealinde olup mahfuz duruyor*). As Mehmed Şakir points out, however, the Viceroy's position was in fact motivated by post-Sepoy Mutiny fears of provoking a "great rebellion" (*bir büyük fesad ve kıyam*). As a result, rather than restricting access to the hajj, the British were offering their Indian subjects "every kind of

[27] Ibid., 300-304.

welfare assistance" (*her türlü teshilatına muavenette bulunuyorlar*) in making the journey.[28]

Here, Mehmed Şakir correctly identifies the mindset driving British resistance to restrictions on pious mobility. British officials were convinced that any attempt to interfere with a fundamental Islamic tenet like the hajj would be likely perceived as a violation of Queen Victoria's 1858 promise of non-interference in Indian religious affairs (given in the wake of the Sepoy Mutiny) and might very well incite another violent uprising among Indian Muslims. In 1886, W. H. Wilson, the Acting Commissioner of Police for Bombay, succinctly described the paralysis that this dilemma created:

> … a large number of Indian Pilgrims are no doubt very poor, and go to the Hedjaz not so much with the intention of maintaining themselves by begging, which they could do better in India, but on account of the sanctity of the place and with a feeling that if they die there they will go straight to Paradise. Some stay on waiting till death overtakes them, and others having no funds to return to India are forced to beg, but beyond warning them; it seems impossible to prevent them from going there. Any interference in this matter on the part of the British Government would certainly be taken as an interference in their religion.[29]

In his 1892 pilgrimage narrative Süleyman Şefik Söylemezoğlu arrives at much the same conclusion. However, Söylemezoğlu interprets a much more sinister, practically eugenic, program of social engineering behind British pilgrimage policy. As Söylemezoğlu observes, European colonial regimes had begun to take note of the growing spiritual prestige and influence of the Caliphate. In particular, the British had begun to take special care and attention to address this question. In comparison, he notes that in other colonial settings like Australia the British treated the Aborigines like dogs (*ahali-i kadimeye köpek muamelesi ettiği*), nor was any there any favorable treatment of

---

[28] Ibid., 299.

[29] TNA: FO/4094, Report by Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. Wilson, Acting Commissioner of Police, Bombay, 3 April 1886.

Parsees (*Mecusiler*) in India. By contrast, the rights of Indian Muslims aroused ceaseless anxiety. As a result, the British found it useful to lavish Indian Muslims with all manner of honors in order to keep the populace contented. Thus, from the British perspective, promoting the hajj "killed two birds with one stone" (*bir taşla iki kuş vurmaktadır*). In addition to tamping down the potential of Muslim social unrest, the "useless and lazy" (*işe yaramaz tenperver*) could be "sent on hajj with their entire families" (*bunları çoluk çocuklarıyla meccanen hacca göndermekte*). On the one hand this was a means of "cleansing the country of a pack of invalids" (*memleketini bir takım amelmandelerden tathir*) and on the other it served as a means to make "many a happy fool" (*birçok humaka-yı tatyib*). As a result of this targeted charity, Söylemezoğlu argues that the Hijaz was being inundated with thousands of beggars (*dilenciler*) and that this group was ultimately responsible for the spread of all manner of epidemic diseases (*enva-ı ilel ve emraz*) and vermin (*haşerat*) to Ottoman domains.[30]

Although annual estimates vary, it would appear that between the 1880s and World War I the percentage of Indian pilgrims classified by either the Ottoman or Indian government as "paupers" or "*fukara*" (those claiming to have insufficient funds for quarantine fees, landing fees, and/or return transportation) fluctuated between 20 and 50 percent.[31] However, even these appalling figures may have been too low. Although the Ottoman Board of Health found that between 1882 and 1888 the number of pilgrims unable to pay their quarantine fees at Kamaran Island rose from eight to twenty-six

[30] In 1890, Söylemezoğlu traveled to the Hijaz with his father Ali Kemali Bey, who had been appointed as *Surre Emini*. In 1892, the manuscript was submitted to the Sultan. See BOA, Y. MTV, 68/81-1 (18 Ra 1310/10 October 1892). Söylemezoğlu, *Hicaz Seyahatnamesi*, 151-152.

[31] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp," 53; Takashi, "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility," 164.

percent, by 1896 official Ottoman statistics recorded that the number of pilgrims landing at Jidda who were unable to pay for the required Ottoman *mürur tezkeresi* (landing fee or visa) had risen to 48 percent (5,354 of 11, 131).[32] However, even this figure was likely a poor indication of the pilgrims' overall financial health and a poor predictor of whether or not the pilgrims would ultimately have enough money to feed themselves and finance their entire journey. According to Mehmed Şakir's estimation, from among the roughly 10,000 Indians landing in Jidda in 1890 approximately "two in three were found to be in need of bread money and starving" (*Hindistan hücacının üçte ikisi parasına muhtaç aç ve bi-ilaç güruhundan bulunduklarını beyandır*) before their eventual departure.[33]

The culmination of the pilgrims' suffering came at the end of the hajj. Each year at the conclusion of the hajj, crowds of stranded Indian pilgrims, sometimes numbering as many as 1,500, descended upon the British consulate in Jidda pleading for assistance. Despite the considerable consternation and embarrassment caused by these stranded pilgrims, consular officials were generally able to rely on the assistance of steamship agents to offer reduced or free tickets for destitute pilgrims at the end of every hajj season. Over time this ritual gained a level of predictability. Wealthier pilgrims would pay a premium to depart early while the poor would wait until free or discounted fares became available. As Radhika Singha explains, "Having creamed off the solvent customers, shipping agents would give reduced or free return passage at the very end of

---

[32] İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 51-52; TNA: FO 78/4777, Turkey, Pilgrim Traffic, January to July 1896, "Mouvement général du pèlerinage du Hedjaz par les ports de la Mer Rouge, Année de l'Hégire 1312/1894-95," presented to the Conseil Supérior de Santé by Dr. Cozzonis Efendi. However, figures based on the fees collected in Jidda were likely inflated by pilgrims purposefully concealing their money in order to declare themselves indigent and avoid pay the required fees. See TNA: FO 78/4882, Turkey, Pilgrim Traffic, January to May 1897, Phillip Currie, Acting Consul, Jidda to the Government of India (Home Department), 4 Sept 1896.

[33] Sarıyıdız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 304.

the season. This made business sense—it maintained goodwill and the shipper's reputation for piety, and encouraged pilgrims to come out again." While British officials on both sides of the Indian Ocean complained bitterly about this systematized fusion of commercial gamesmanship and "reckless" charity, they could do little to stop it. In fact, on some level they ultimately came to embrace it because neither the Jidda consulate nor the government of India wanted give the impression that it would provide free transport back to India, thereby encouraging even more pilgrims to expect repatriation free of charge. In essence, cooperation with the shipping agents was preferable to making free repatriation official policy. British officials in both Bombay and Jidda repeatedly stated that they were under no international legal obligation to repatriate stranded pilgrims. The government of India even printed this warning on pilgrimage passports.[34]

In the wake of the devastating cholera outbreak of 1893, the debate on pauper pilgrims took center stage at the 1894 international sanitary conference in Paris. Surveying Ottoman sanitary reforms and hajj policies from the 1850s through the reforms recommended in 1894, Kasım İzzeddin recounts both the Ottoman's state's vision of the Islamic jurisprudence underpinning hajj regulation and the opinions of their European counterparts. In his view, Islamic law, as defined by the conference attendees, raised serious questions about the legality of the poor pilgrims' attempts to make the hajj. By reconstructing the debates between Ottoman, Austrian, British, Dutch, Egyptian, and French delegates to the 1894 sanitary conference, İzzeddin's account shows that both the Ottomans and their European counterparts understood that international mobility controls applied to pilgrims could only be justified politically by squaring them with the relevant aspects of hajj-related *fiqh*. Since as early as the 1866 international sanitary conference

[34] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp," 51-55.

the idea of imposing a "means test" to restrict the mobility of poor pilgrims had been posited as the most obvious solution to the problem. As Dr. Proust, the French delegate reminded the 1894 delegates, "the aforementioned conference demanded that some measures be taken concerning pilgrims moving by steamship and that special local modifications be made to the law and applied particularly to India." Furthermore, "it might be made mandatory for each pilgrim going on the hajj to have enough funds for their departing and return journeys and enough money to sustain their families during their absence." Finally, he added, "the Islamic shari'a recommends this anyway." Thus, if intending pilgrims fail to meet the minimum deposit required by their home government, they would be prohibited from making the hajj.[35]

As İzzeddin points out, as early as 1851 the Dutch administration in Java had applied a deposit system. Similar schemes had also been imposed in French in Algeria, Austrian-controlled Bosnia, and Russian territories in Central Asia.[36] And eventually France, the Netherlands, and Russia all adopted mandatory systems of return tickets in order to prevent indigent pilgrims from becoming stranded in the Hijaz without enough cash for their passage home.[37] Even other British possessions, including Egypt and the Straits Settlements, eventually adopted similar deposit and ticketing systems as the Dutch.[38]

---

[35] İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 52-66.

[36] Ibid., 52-59.

[37] Anthony Reid, "Ninteenth Century Pan-Islam in Indonesia and Malaysia," *Journal of Asian Studies* 26, no. 2 (1967): 267-283; Daniel Brower, "Russian Roads to Mecca: Religious Tolerance and Muslim Pilgrimage in the Russian Empire," *Slavic Review* 55, no. 3 (1996): 567-584.

[38] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp," 50.

In response to this proposal, the government of India's delegate, Dr. Cunningham, cunningly replied that if such a financial requirement were considered consistent with Islamic jurisprudence, as Dr. Proust argued, the Government of India would be willing to investigate whether the measures could be applied. However, he thought that this would only be possible if the "Sultan and Caliph of all Muslims" agreed to "declare it to be necessary and proper." As he explained, without the Sultan's approval the Indian government would hesitate to accept such measures. And "since the government of India gives complete freedom to every religious community in every colonized land, I have no doubt that they would not have a law which would put its Muslim subjects in a lower position than Muslims in any other countries."[39] In response, the Ottoman delegate, Turhan Paşa, could do little more than recite a list of the Sultan-Caliph's recent benevolent acts to alleviate the sufferings of poor pilgrims in Mecca. Turhan Paşa pointed to sanitary reforms already being imposed and the construction of a 6,000-person guesthouse (*misafirhane*) and improved hospital and pharmacy facilities dedicated to indigent pilgrims.[40] After citing these precautionary measures, he went on to make it clear that the Ottoman state could not legally (or politically) justify preventing pilgrims from meeting their religious obligations.

In essence, Cunningham and the British had handcuffed the Ottomans with their own pan-Islamic rhetoric and framed the government of India as the defenders of Muslim

---

[39] İzzeddin, *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye*, 56.

[40] Ibid., 55-58, 64. On the construction of the *misafirhane* for poor pilgrims, see BOA, BEO, 376/28172 (13 N 1311/20 March 1894); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 283/67 (25 Ra 1311/5 November 1893); BOA, Y. A. HUS, 283/75 (24 Ra 1311/4 November 1893); BOA, MV 78/91 (16 Za 1314/18 April 1897). See also Gülden Sarıyıldız, "II. Abdülhamid'in Fakir Hacılar İçin Mekke'de İnşa Ettirdiği Misafirhane," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 14 (1994): 121-145. As İzzeddin points out, however, the *misafirhane* never functioned properly because it was located to far from the city center. Thus, beggars continue to congregate around the heavily trafficked areas around the Haram. Later in 1908, the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) turned the facility into a military barrack.

freedom of religion. By emphasizing Abdülhamid's role as Caliph and spiritual leader of all Muslims, Cunningham set him up as the ultimate arbiter of Islamic jurisprudence. Thus, in the event that the Ottomans agreed to the proposed financial restrictions on poor pilgrims the British were well prepared to lay the blame solely at the feet of the Sultan.

The Purposes of Passports: Bodies, Borders, and the Sovereign Right of Exclusion

According to Mark Salter, the process of making international borders is "constituted by the decision to include/exclude." It is "a dialogue between body and body politic requiring the confession of all manner of bodily, economic, and social information." As he explains, "the act of confession before the vanguard of governmental machinery is crucial to both the operation of the global mobility regime and the operation of sovereign power." It is "in those first acts of examination" that "the fundamental relationship between sovereign and subject, between body politic and a particular body" are established.[41] As Michel Foucault explains, the modern system of documentation and identification "places individuals in a field of surveillance." It "situates them in a network of writing; it engages them in a whole mass of documents that capture and fix them."[42] Thus, passports and visas are meant to tether the individual body "to an entire series of files chronicling movements, economic transactions, familial ties, illnesses, and much else besides—the power/knowledge grid in which individuals are processed and constituted as administrative subjects of states."[43] And yet, in Foucault's work the elaboration of disciplinary societies and technologies of surveillance

---

[41] Mark B. Salter, "The Global Visa Regime and the Political Technologies of the International Self: Border, Bodies, Biopolitics," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 31, no. 2 (2006): 168-170.

[42] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 189.

[43] John Torpey, "Coming and Going: On the State Monopolization of the Legitimate Means of Movement," *Sociological Theory* 16, no. 3 (1998): 248.

are packaged in national boxes and generally stopped at the borders of the state. But in reality biopolitical surveillance did not halt at the water's edge.[44] With the imposition of the passport, the mobile body also appears as an object of international surveillance.

By demanding the biopolitical data that passports and visas entail, states have generally sought to access risk and limit entry to non-nationals deemed to pose epidemiological or financial risks. It is through the collection of this information that modern states have gradually achieved "the monopolization of the legitimate means of movement." Thus, while passports and visas may allow temporary or even relatively long-lasting membership to a territory, in this system, "the fundamental right of the sovereign is to be able to exclude and define the limits of its population with little reference to other states or sovereigns."[45] As Carl Schmitt argues, "the essence of the state's sovereignty [is] not the monopoly to coerce or rule." Rather, it is "the monopoly to decide."[46]

For Timothy Mitchell, the makings of the modern state are embodied in the technopolitical nature of territory: "Frontiers are demarcated as fixed lines, the movement of population and goods across those lines is controlled in unprecedented ways, and marginal forms of political life, where allegiance to the central authority was graduated or variable, increasingly give way to more uniform and rigorous methods of control."[47] In

---

[44] On the policing as the art of managing life and the well-being of populations, see especially, Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*, 311-362. On the limitations of Foucualdian analyses of borders, see Salter, "The Global Visa Regime," 179; Adam McKeown, *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 270-271.

[45] Salter, "The Global Visa Regime," 175-176; Torpey, "Coming and Going," 256.

[46] Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985), 5.

order to achieve the kind of territoriality and the mechanisms of governmentality that Mitchell describes, states need to be able to sort out who belongs and who does not. Thus, sovereignty, territory, and the biopolitics of boundary maintenance are inextricably linked.

But what does it mean when a state dramatically fails or even consciously opts not to enforce its own passport laws or fully exercise its sovereign rights of exclusion? While the failure of the Ottoman and British empires to circumscribe the mobility of the poor was partly conditioned by debates over Islamic law governing the hajj and the mutually-constructed fears produced by Hamidian Pan-Islamism, it was also intimately tied up with the vexed question of the pilgrimage passport and the threat of European extraterritorial jurisdiction.

From 1860s onward, British consular officials in Jidda had repeatedly suggested the need for a compulsory passport linked to some sort of means testing or pre-paid deposit system. From their perspective the potential benefits were clear. This system could provide a more accurate means accounting of calculating the number of pilgrims making the hajj each year. It would also have provided a firmer statistical basis for tracking epidemic outbreaks and detecting the overloading of pilgrimage vessels. Once in the Hijaz, a compulsory passport would have also provided pilgrims with documentary proof of British nationality, which in turn could be used to extend the extraterritorial protection of the consulate in Jidda in the event that pilgrims ran afoul of the law. And, of course, it held great potential as an instrument of political surveillance. As Dr. Abdur Razzack put it:

To know with something like exactness how many of its Muhammadan subjects leave

[47] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 12.

> India every year, how many return and the number of those who do not; besides which Government will be able to keep a check on the movements of those who are suspected or disaffected.[48]

Despite its potential as a technology of biopolitical surveillance, curiously, the pilgrimage passport was never fully embraced by the government of India. Instead, it was the Ottoman state that first sought to impose passport regulations on the hajj. In 1880, British officials were informed that henceforth passports would be required of all pilgrims. During the Tanzimat period the Ottoman state erected a series of internal and external passport regulations fleshed out in three major pieces of legislation: the 1841 *Men'-i Mürur Nizamnamesi*, the 1844 *Memalik-i Mahruse-i Şahane'de Mürur ve Ubur*, and the 1867 *Pasaport Odası Nizamnamesi*.[49] In essence, all of these laws demanded that foreign travelers carry passports and apply for what might loosely equate to a visa (*mürur tezkeresi*) from an Ottoman consul in order to gain entry into Ottoman domains. However, these requirements had previously not been applied to pilgrims.[50] British officials were warned that articles 7 and 8 of the 1844 passport law would be enforced.

---

[48] TNA: FO 194/1451, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 April 1883.

[49] On Ottoman passport legislation, see Musa Çadırcı, "Tanzimat Döneminde Çıkarılan Men'-i Mürur ve Pasaport Nizamnameleri, *Belgeler* 25, no. 19 (1993): 169-181; Hamiyet Sezer, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Seyahat İzinleri (18-19. Yüzyıl)," *Tarih Araştırma Dergisi* 21, no. 33 (2003): 105-124; Nalan Turna, *19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Osmanlı Topraklarında Seyahat, Göç ve Asayış Belgeleri: Mürur Tezkereleri* (İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları, 2013).

[50] Generally, the term *mürur tezkeresi* has been framed as the centerpiece of the Ottoman internal passport system. As David Gutman points out, a more accurate translation would be "document of passage." However, as he concedes, the idea of an internal passport system does "better capture the fact that their systemic use during the nineteenth century and the rules governing their issuance were much more evocative of a modern passport system." David Gutman, "Armenian Migration to North America, State Power, and Local Politics in the Late Ottoman Empire," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 1 (2014): 177.

Under these rules, pilgrims traveling without passports and visas were theoretically subject to expulsion.[51]

In practice, however, the enforcement of the regulations as outlined in the aforementioned articles proved impossible. As Abdur Razzack pointed out, the notion that visas should be secured by Ottoman consuls at the ports of embarkation was absurd. It "overlooked the fact that except in Bombay there is no Turkish Consul in any of the ports of India whence pilgrims start for the Haj."[52] Thus, when pilgrims showed up for the 1881 hajj season without visas and many without passports, none of them were turned away and by 1882 the law appears to have "existed only in name and the passports were not thought of."[53] Instead, the required *mürur tezkeresi* was made readily available when pilgrims landed in Jidda. The Ottoman state's failure to enforce its own regulations raised puzzling questions as to precisely what the Ottomans had hoped to achieve in the first place. The consulate in Jidda theorized that the sale of *mürur tezkeresi* was likely the law's "chief object" and "was evidently designed to make this a source of income." At 8 piasters (kuruş) per head, the consulate estimated that the charges totaled some 40,000 rupees per hajj season, providing the provincial administration with a much needed revenue stream.[54]

---

[51] TNA: FO 195/1451, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda to Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, 13 May 1883; Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 April 1883.

[52] TNA: FO 195/1482, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to the Earl of Dufferin, British Ambassador, Istanbul, 15 July 1884.

[53] TNA: FO 195/1451, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 April 1883.

[54] TNA: FO 195/1451, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda to Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, 13 May 1883. On the role of the *mürur tezkeresi* as a post-Tanzimat revenue generator, see also Çoksun Çakır, *Tanzimat Dönmi Osmanlı Maliyesi* (İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2001), 53.

As the British consulate complained, however, this visa system did not function as an effective instrument of border control, nor did it provide additional guarantee of safety:

> … the officials engaged in the work do not think perhaps worth their while, to ask for and look at the passports. Most probably they consider that the intentions of the Reglement are amply fulfilled when they provide the pilgrims with the Tezkir Moroor. Practically the passports are of no use whatever at least not for the purpose for which they were intended.

From Abdur Razzack's vantage point, the passports should have been used as policing tool, allowing the Ottoman administration to offer pilgrims greater protection from the Hijaz's other mobile population, the Bedouin. Instead, he argued:

> These Tezkirah prove of no service to the pilgrims after they have once passed through the gates of Jeddah. The movements of large bodies [of] pilgrims across the country is never questioned by the authorities during the Haj; as for the Bedouins they have so very little reverence for the Turks themselves, outside the towns, that the Tezkireh is not likely to prove a safeguard to the pilgrims if they are not bent upon mischief.

In 1884, a new Ottoman passport law (*Pasaport Nizamnamesi*) was once again promulgated.[55] Again, the law called for pilgrims to furnish passport complete with visas from Ottoman consuls. European consular officials were provided detailed a schedule of fees (*harç*) for the visas as well as a series of fines and punishments for those in violation of the law, sparking years of running objections from the British, Dutch, and Russian embassies.[56] The European powers repeatedly complained about what they considered exorbitant prices targeting largely poorer travelers. They lobbied for a reduced-price of six kuruş or even that free (*ücretsiz*) visas be granted to pilgrims en route to Mecca and

---

Indeed, later visa charges were a substantial source of revenue used to fund the Hijaz Railway. See Turna, *Seyahat, Göç ve Asayış Belgeleri*, 210-215.

[55] BOA, A. DVN. MKL, 25/25 (15 R 1301/14 January 1884).

[56] BOA, Y. A. RES, 33/19 (2 B 1303/6 April 1886).

Jerusalem.[57] Again, however, the procedures described in the law were not fully implemented, despite repeated attempts.[58] Ottoman authorities continued to charge for *mürur tezkeresi*, but did not expel or punish pilgrims who could not (or claimed to be unable to) pay the visa fees.[59] Over time, Ottoman documents show that the state even came to understand these visa-less or even passport-less (*vizesiz* or *pasaportsuz*) pilgrims as category unto themselves. As Abdur Razzack put it, Ottoman administrators on the ground, readily admitted "that it is impossible to repulse a person simply for not having a passport when he is dressed in the pilgrim's garb and sings out "Allah hooma labaik" (Oh God I am here)…"[60] Moreover, in his capacities as Sultan-Caliph and *Khadim al-Haramayn* Abdülhamid could not be perceived to have been responsible for turning away intending pilgrims landing in Jidda. Thus, the maintenance of the Hamidian state's pan-Islamic image and the imposition of more rigorous forms of governmentality and biopolitical exclusions were irreconcilably conflicted.

---

[57] In 1895, there was a renewed effort to impose the visa fees and penalties described in the *Pasaport Nizamnamesi*, but Britain secured an exemption for Indian pilgrims. Similarly, when the Ottoman state attempted to raise visa fees from 6 to 12 kuruş, the British Embassy intervened. BOA, HR. HMŞ. İŞO, 235/37 (29 N 1311/11 May 1895); BOA, ŞD, 2675/18 (4 L 1314/8 March 1897); TNA: FO 195/2350, Abdur Rahman, Acting Vice-Consul, Jidda to the British Embassy, Istanbul, 26 August 1910. See also Turna, *Seyahat, Göç ve Asayış Belgeleri*, 212-213.

[58] Even as late as 1910, the CUP government attempted to fully implement the *Pasaport Nizamnamesi*'s call for visas to be secured from an Ottoman consulate prior to departure. There was also an attempt to raise the visa fee to 20 kuruş. Once again, however, the full implementation of the rules was deemed impracticable. For Ottoman deliberations concerning the intractable problems leading to the non-application (*tatbik olunmaması*) of the *Pasaport Nizamnamesi*, especially to Indians, other British subjects, and Central Asian pilgrims, see BOA, BEO, 3820/286466 (5 Za 1328/8 November 1910); BOA, MV, 151/10 (4 R 1329/4 April 1911). See also TNA: FO 195/2350, Abdur Rahman, Acting Vice-Consul, Jidda to the British Embassy, Istanbul, 26 August 1910.

[59] TNA: FO 195/1482, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to the Earl of Dufferin, British Ambassador, Istanbul, 15 July 1884.

[60] TNA: FO 195/1451, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda, 17 April 1883.

The Ottoman state's attempt to erect firmer border controls and documentary practices turned out to be a double-edged sword. As the British consul in Jidda at the time, Lynedoch Moncrieff, read it, the Ottoman state's *volte face* on the compulsory nature of the passport was intimately connected to fears of European extraterritorial claims:

> Altogether it is almost certain that the Turkish Government will not allude again to the necessity of Passports , for although some new Governor General might possibly consider himself bound to put in force standing orders which he found, the Hejaz is more and more ruled from Constantinople and Passports which must give an increased sanction for the protection of their subjects by foreign states issuing them are a contradiction to the well known policy of the Sultan.[61]

Although Moncrieff recognized that passports might provide British subjects with a modicum of protection against potential abuses at the hands of the justice system or the Sharifate of Mecca, from a broader perspective it most likely would not matter whether the pilgrim had a passport or not. Thus, if the Ottoman state was treating passports as "optional," he questioned "whether there were any advantages in maintaining it?" Sensing an opportunity, he recommended that intending pilgrims "be most clearly made to understand that his own Government does not *oblige* him to take a Passport."[62] Here, Moncrieff suggested that the Indian administration should issue pilgrimage passports "unconditionally" and "without any fee or deposit." By doing so, he argued that "the entire odium of passport regulations" could be laid at the feet of the Sultan.[63]

Taken together Pan-Islam and European consular extraterritoriality fundamentally altered and inverted the normal logics of border maintenance and governmentality. Thus,

---

[61] TNA: FO 195/1451, Lynedoch Moncrieff, Consul, Jidda to Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, 13 May 1883.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Quoted in Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp," 56.

legally reserving the right to demand passports, but not actually doing so appeared to better serve the interests of Ottoman sovereignty. And yet, the ceremony of admission through which pilgrims presented themselves before a representative of the "Exalted Caliphate" remained, preserving at least the illusion of the state's sovereign rights of exclusion.[64] Ultimately, this dynamic would prove to be one of the most intractable paradoxes of the colonial-era hajj. Despite the seemingly obvious desires of Ottoman and European states to impose more intrusive forms of surveillance and biopolitical documentary practices, the Ottoman state stopped checking passports and the government of British India continued issuing them, but refused to make them compulsory.

Breaking the Brokers: The Pilgrimage Transportation Industry and the Logic 'Indirect' Intervention

For nearly three decades following the 1866 international sanitary conference, Britain declined to submit to any international agreements proposing stricter quarantine procedures or an integrated system of compulsory documentary and ticketing practices. Instead, the government of India pursued an entirely separate package of reforms. Due to their discomfort with the possibility that international quarantine regulations might be manipulated by foreign powers to harm British commercial interests as well as their concern that fees attached to either passports or mandatory return tickets might be interpreted by Indian Muslims as a government attempt to bar poorer Muslims from making the hajj, the British sought a less direct path to pilgrim reform.

In an attempt to thread the needle between these seemingly irreconcilable concerns, the government of India formulated a doctrine of "indirect" intervention. Rather than imposing restrictions on individual pilgrims, British officials attempted to

[64] Deringil, "Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State," 351-352. On "ceremonies of admission," see also McKeown, *Melancholy Order*, 270-272.

reform the business of the hajj. As a result, British efforts to reform the hajj were primarily aimed at cleaning up the pilgrimage shipping industry and its associated networks of ticketing brokers. On the one hand, colonial administrators hoped that by tightening their regulation of the pilgrimage transportation industry they could eliminate the worst instances of overcrowding and squalid conditions, which had been identified as one of the greatest factors contributing to the spread of cholera en route to Mecca. On the other hand, by licensing ticketing brokers they hoped to provide pilgrims with a measure of consumer protection against aggressive touts, pricing scams, and coercive monopolies. More importantly, this strategy required ship owners to make major capital investments in their vessels in order to meet the legal requirements imposed by the government. As the following letter to the Bombay Gazette, aptly written under the pen name "Oliver Twist," points out:

> … the effect of increasing space [per pilgrim on board ships] would be simply that the Hadj would become a more expensive thing than it already is, and philanthropically disposed as the Government may be, it has no more right to legislate in that direction than it has to make it law that no one shall go home except in a first-class P. & O. steamer.[65]

As this critique of the government's strategy makes clear, requiring cleaner, larger, and better-equipped steamships would necessarily lead ship owners to raise ticket prices. As we shall see, whether colonial officials admitted it or not, raising and fixing prices was the cornerstone of the their doctrine of "indirect" intervention. If direct measures prohibiting poor pilgrims from setting out for Mecca were deemed too dangerous, the only other option was to raise the standards of travel in such a way that either eliminated unsanitary conditions or priced the poorest pilgrims out of the market altogether. Although poor pilgrims were certainly victims of this strategy, they were

[65] *Bombay Gazette*, 31 August 1886, quoted in Harrison, "Quarantine, pilgrimage, and colonial trade," 132.

actually not the enemy in this equation. The true targets of this plan were the intertwined Muslim shipping firms and its allied networks in the pilgrimage brokerage industry.

The centerpiece of British India's steamship legislation was the Native Passenger Ships Act of 1870 and its subsequent amendments in 1872, 1876, 1883, and 1887, culminating in the 1895 Pilgrim Ships Act.[66] These regulations were primarily designed to restrict the number of passengers per vessel in the hopes that by alleviating instances of over-crowding the risk of cholera outbreaks would also be mitigated. These acts established clear limits on the maximum number of passengers according to each ship's registered or estimated tonnage. Likewise, they set guidelines that gradually increased the minimum superficial space per passenger according to their accommodation in the upper or lower decks. In addition to addressing the most basic question of overcrowding, these acts also stipulated mandatory provisions for the safety and welfare of passengers and the obligations of the shipping company and crew's obligations to its passengers. These included access to cooking fuel, clean water, proper ventilation and fresh air, clean latrines, and medical supplies. To ensure the compliance of shipping companies and in order to allow for easier surveillance of sick pilgrims during their journey, it was also required that ships carrying more than one hundred pilgrims have a qualified medical officer.[67]

In 1880, the Ottoman Board of Health drafted a similar piece of legislation, the *Hacı Nakleden Sefaine Dair Nizamname* (Law Concerning Pilgrim-Carrying Vessels). The law was consciously framed to agree with the recommendations of the 1886 Istanbul

---

[66] Takashi, "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility," 169-171.

[67] TC, Guardbook no. 27, John Mason Cook, *The Mecca Pilgrimage*, 6-7; FO 78/4093, *Manual for the Guidance of Officers and Others concerned in the Red Sea Pilgrimage Traffic* (Simla, India: Government Central Branch Press, 1884).

and 1874 Vienna sanitary conferences. It was also explicitly modeled on British India's Native Passengers Act.[68] At that time, all of the European representatives also shared their own governments' regulations to the Board of Health.

This marked the beginning of the Board of Health's efforts to forge a unified set of internationally recognized standards for pilgrimage vessels. In many respects, however, the Board of Health's legislation counted for little. A decade later in 1890 both the British Foreign Office and government of India still viewed such efforts with a wary eye. The Foreign Office feared that laws drafted by the Board of Health, composed of both European and Ottoman members, were in a sense "international and intended to be bind on the Powers."[69] It was the opinion of the Foreign Office that foreign ships and the subjects they carry should not be bound by Ottoman legislation unless they are in Ottoman territory. Thus, despite the Ottoman Board of Health's mixed membership, laws drafted by that body were regarded by Britain and India as Ottoman not international law.

Without the strong cooperation of the states producing the most pilgrims, Ottoman legislative efforts were doomed to fail. For example, in 1882, 45 of the 75 pilgrimage vessels arriving in the Hijaz sailed under British flags and roughly the same ratio of pilgrims originated from either India or Southeast Asia.[70] In light of the

---

[68] BOA, İ. MMS, 65/3071 (19 S 1297/1 February 1880). For an account of British reform efforts in the Native Passenger Ships Act and a parallel discussion of Ottoman regulations see also TNA: FO 881/3079, "Correspondence respecting Turkish Regulations for Pilgrim Traffic, 1875-1877," inclosure 3 in no. 13, Extract from the *Bombay Government Gazette*, 20 April 1876. For its amending act of 1883, see *Manual for the Guidance of Officers and Others Concerned in the Red Sea Pilgrimage Traffic* (Shimla: Government Central Branch Press, 1884) in TNA: FO 78/4093, Pilgrimage Traffic, 1884-1885. For British efforts to force the Ottoman Empire to agree to coordinate its regulations with those of the Native Passenger Ships Act, see also TNA: FO 79/4094, "Turkey, Pilgrimage Traffic, 1886-1887."

[69] TNA: FO 78/4328, Turkey, Pilgrim Traffic, 1890.

dominance of British shipping, if the standards of the pilgrimage transport industry in the Indian Ocean were not addressed at their point of origin, Ottoman legislation governing the ports of the Red Sea was unlikely to make a dramatic impact.

With the 1883 Native Passengers Act, sailing vessels, which had long been in decline, were officially banned from the pilgrimage trade. While the prohibition on sailing vessels may have been a redundancy, the ban may be taken as indication of the long-term direction of British regulation. The most dramatic example of this process came when Britain, relenting to decades of international pressure and against the government of India's vehement protests, signed the convention produced by the 1894 Paris international sanitary conference. The convention stipulated that the minimum space for each adult pilgrim be raised from 9 to 21 superficial feet. In order to meet the new international standards for superficial space, India's 1895 Pilgrim Ships Act required that all vessels be at least 500 tons and be able to achieve a speed of at least 8 knots under monsoon conditions. As government standards for shipboard fittings, anchors, cables, nautical instruments, safety equipment, overall tonnage, and speed during monsoon conditions were gradually raised, shipping companies were forced to either update their existing vessels or obtain newer ones. Although the government framed these reforms as either the products of international pressure or their own promotion of the best interests of pilgrims, scholars have generally underemphasized the extent to which this legislation was at least partially designed as a challenge to Muslim-owned shipping companies. While European shipping companies had little problem meeting the progressively tightening standards, Muslim shippers with comparatively limited access to capital and correspondingly older, less well-appointed, and smaller vessels struggled to comply with

[70] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 40.

these regulations. During this period, Muslim shippers made several strategic adjustments. First, they found a niche in the market by catering to a lower-end clientele. Second, smaller individual or family-owned firms pooled their resources either to charter a ship for the pilgrimage season or to raise enough capital to stave off European competitors. By consolidating their resources, Muslim shippers were able to acquire larger, second-hand ships from European shipping companies like Peninsular and Oriental and Lloyd's.[71]

At the same time, the Government of India also engaged in a parallel attack on Bombay and Calcutta's pilgrimage brokers. Ship owners depended on large networks of touts and petty brokers to attract business and sell tickets. Working for a commission, these brokers were repeatedly accused of fleecing pilgrims through a mixture of misinformation, intimidation, and bait-and-switch pricing scams. Worse still, they also conspired with ship owners to pack in more pilgrims per ship than was legally permitted. Here, *The Times of India* sketches a typical interaction between pilgrim and broker in Bombay:

> … on arriving at the port, some by rail, some by local steamer, and others on foot, they are all more or less waylaid by what sailors call crimps, but who term themselves *Haj* brokers or runners, &c., and any person who knows the ins and outs of Bombay, or any large seaport town, will understand that these individuals make all kinds of fair promises, &c., to entice the pilgrims to their master's house, and once there, with their luggage of course, they cannot very well leave without buying a passage ticket from the master of the house.[72]

As this pattern became more familiar, the rapacious broker became the most ubiquitous villain in official descriptions of the pilgrimage trade. As one government official put it,

---

[71] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp," 51, 62-63; Takashi, "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility," 171-172.

[72] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Appendix no.2, extract from the *Times of India*, 9 November 1885 in John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894.

pilgrims are "entirely at the mercy of a class of men very like the Liverpool crimps who charge them extortionately and rob them at all ends."[73]

In an attempt to protect pilgrims against the unscrupulous brokers, in 1883 Bombay passed the Pilgrim Protection Act, which required all brokers to obtain a license from the Bombay Police Commissioner. In conjunction with these licensing measures, a new position called the Protector of Pilgrims was created. Stationed at the port, this Muslim official was instructed to act as a special advocate, providing information and assistance to intending pilgrims.[74] In addition to the measures taken in Bombay, British officials also began to understand that they need greater representation on the other side of the Indian Ocean. In 1878, Dr. Abdur Razzack had been sent to accompany India's pilgrimage contingent for that year. Abdur Razzack was then appointed as the Muslim vice-consul of Jidda in 1882 and two years later additional Muslim vice-consuls were stationed at the Kamaran Island quarantine and the nearby Yemeni port of Hudayda.[75]

Just as the compulsory pilgrimage passport, ticketing systems, and means tests employed by the Dutch increasingly became an internationally recognized model for regulating the hajj, Southeast Asia also provided a model for Bombay's Protector of the Pilgrims. Only six years earlier in 1877, the Straits Settlements government passed strikingly similar pieces of legislation, the Chinese Immigrants Ordinance and the Crimping Ordinance. These acts created the office of the Protector of the Chinese. This

---

[73] FO 78/4094, A. Akin Higgins, Agent to Messrs. Thomas Cook and Son to the Secretary of the Political Department of the Government of India, Simla, 10 October 1884, in *Records of the Hajj*, vol. 3., 595.

[74] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Appendix no. 1, in John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894.

[75] FO 881/5155X, H. Hill to India Office, History of the Quarantine and Cholera in Europe from 1878," April 1885, p. 7-8; Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 147-148; Takashi, "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility," 165.

office was created to curb abuses associated with the Chinese "coolie" traffic, such as defrauding and kidnapping. Depots were set up by the government for the reception of arriving and departing migrants. The protectorate was responsible for overseeing written contracts for service both in the colony and in neighboring countries. In order to prevent the worst abuses associated with the coolie trade, the coolie brokers and recruiting agents were to be licensed. Because most of these immigrants were generally poor and traveled via the credit-ticket system, with the understanding that upon their arrival they had to pay their passage-money and other expenses to the coolie broker, they were forced into over-crowded depots, held against their will, and forced to pay the coolie broker there or four times the cost of their passage. Under this system, the Chinese laborer was often completely at the mercy of the coolie broker and the associated Chinese secret societies.[76]

In both the pilgrim trade and indentured labor practices, British officials did not identify the individual migrant as the root of the problem. Rather, it was the complex of brokers "who exploited their cultural ties and the ignorance of their countrymen for the sake of profit" that British officials blamed for the suffering of poor pilgrims.[77] Thus, in many respects British attacks on trans-national pilgrimage brokerage systems fit neatly into a larger legal framework aimed at regulating Asian labor migration and the experimentation with more effective border controls during the same period.

As Adam McKeown explains, parallel debates over Asian indenture and the coolie trade spawned a discourse about the dangers of brokers which would ultimately become the organizing principles of all modern travel regulation and border controls.

---

[76] Edwin Lee, *The British as Rulers: Governing Multiracial Singapore, 1867-1914* (Singapore: National University of Singapore, 1991), 69-71, 75-99; Ng Siew Yoong, "The Chinese Protectorate in Singapore, 1877-1900," *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 2, no. 1 (1961): 76-99.

[77] McKeown, *Melancholy* Order, 113.

Accounts of Asian indenture articulated a growing "suspicion of unregulated intermediaries, recruiters, and transport companies as sources of unfreedom." Brokers, ethnic recruitment networks, informal credit arrangements, and even village or familial systems were "pushed underground or criminalized." These systems were replaced by government bodies, such as the Protector of the Pilgrims and Protector of the Chinese. These institutions "attempted to isolate individual decision makers as the object of regulation. Thus, the "free individual migrant, far from being a natural phenomenon that emerged most fully in the absence of government regulation, was the product of extensive intervention into the organization of human mobility."[78] Taking McKeown's description of the creation of the "free migrant" as our model, passports would not have been the first or the most critical step toward alleviating the problem of the pauper pilgrim. Rather, like their indentured cousins, indigent pilgrims could only be made "free migrants" through the regulation or even the elimination of the brokers that coerced them and set the terms of their journey. As a result, British regulation of the pilgrimage trade mirrored and reproduced institutions that had originally been conceived to deal with indentured labor flows. This connection is made explicit the Native Passenger Ships Act, which notes that the rules governing pilgrimage shipping were assimilated with those governing the transport of emigrants (i.e. indentured laborers) to the French and British Colonies.[79] As we shall see, the connections between these two seemingly disparate forms of mobility went well beyond the realm of British legal taxonomies. Indeed, in some cases these systems became intertwined.

---

[78] Ibid., 68.

[79] TC, Guardbook no. 27, John Mason Cook, *The Mecca Pilgrimage*, 6-7.

In spite of British efforts to grapple with the pilgrimage brokerage industry in Bombay and their attempts to better represent pilgrims once they arrived in the Hijaz, British officials in India still failed to fully grasp the interconnected nature of the brokerage systems and their links to the highest levels of both Hijazi society, the Ottoman administration, the European consulates in Jidda, and ultimately to the Sharifate of Mecca. In the Hijaz, pilgrimage guides known as the *mutawwifin* (or among Indians *mu'allims*) exercised almost total control over the hajj experience. Technically speaking, the term mutawwif refers to a guide for the circumambulation of the Ka'ba, known as the *tawaf*. In reality, their duties were in fact much broader. At the most basic level, they were responsible for guiding non-Arabic speaking foreigners through the required prayers and rituals of the hajj. However, the mutawwifs were also responsible for shepherding their customers through every aspect of their stay in the Hijaz. From the moment that the pilgrims disembarked in Jidda until the time they returned home they under were under the constant supervision of their mutawwif. As soon as the pilgrims arrived in Jidda, they were met by the mutawwif's agent (*wakil*). The agent arranged for their camel transport and protection from marauding Bedouins and delivered them to their mutawwif in Mecca. Once in Mecca, the mutawwifs instructed the pilgrims on how to properly perform the rituals of the hajj, acted as interpreter, arranged their lodging, and facilitated their purchases.[80]

The mutawwifin were organized by a guild system subdivided along national, regional, and/or linguistic lines. Each branch of the guild was headed and policed by a shaykh appointed by the Sharif. With the help of pilgrims from foreign lands who had

[80] Fu'ad al-Hamid 'Anqawi, *Makkah: al-Hajj wa-al-tawafah* (Saudi Arabia, 1994), 273-278, 299-303; Shakib Arslan, *al-Irtisamat al-litaf fi khatir al-Hajj ila akdas mataf* (Cairo, 1931), 71-80; Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka in the Latter Part of the Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 24.

settled in the Hijaz each branch of the guild system gained expertise in the language and culture of their assigned region.[81] Thus, in addition to their duties in the Hijaz, they also sent their deputies to India to advertise, recruit, and act as intermediaries between the Indian countryside, the pilgrimage industry in Bombay, and their operations in the Hijaz. Because the expertise of the mutawwifs and their local deputies was so specific to each language and region they served, generally membership in this professional guild was passed down from generation to generation. As a result, these agents possessed an enormous genealogical knowledge of who had or had not performed the hajj. Working in concert with local religious leaders, these recruiters not only sought to attract new clients but also to inspire more members of families that they had previously served to make the journey. Thus, as the government of India would eventually discover, regulating steamship agents and pilgrimage brokers in Bombay attacked only one link in a much larger chain.[82]

Despite these timid first steps toward reform, the 1880s emerged as a decade of pilgrimage-related scandals, exposing both the dark underbelly of the Indian Ocean pilgrimage shipping industry and the virtual paralysis of the government. Undoubtedly the best-known scandal occurred in August 1880. The steamship *Jeddah*, which belonged to Muhammad bin Ahmad al-Saqqaf, the managing partner of the Singapore Steamship Company, set sail under a British flag carrying nearly a thousand Malay and Indonesian pilgrims on board. In addition to the pilgrims, Muhammad's nephew Sayyid 'Umar al-Saqqaf was also en route to the company's Jidda branch. After enduring some difficult storms, the ship began taking on water, and sprung a heavy leak just off Cape

[81] 'Anqawi, *Makkah: al-Ḥajj wa-al-tawafah*, 278-282; Ibrahim Rif'at (Pasha), *Mir'at al-Haramayn*, vol. 1 (Cairo: Dar al-Kutub al-Masriyya, 1925), 63-64.
[82] Michael Miller, "Pilgrims' Progress: The Business of the Hajj," *Past and Present* 191, no. 1 (2006), 199.

Guardafui, at the mouth of the Gulf of Aden. With the water rising rapidly, al-Saqqaf, the captain, and the ship's European officers panicked and abandoned the passengers to their fate, an apparently certain death. Escaping with one of the ship's few emergency crafts, al-Saqqaf and the Europeans were picked up by another vessel and were taken to Aden. Astonishingly, however, given that the *Jeddah* and its passengers had been left for dead, the *Jeddah* herself arrived in Aden some twenty-four hours later, having been towed by a French vessel. The pilgrims had courageously worked the pumps and kept their vessel afloat until help arrived, while the steamship magnate and European crew showed great cowardice in abandoning their charges to die.[83]

The official inquiries that followed sparked an international scandal, which effectively shamed British authorities from Aden to Singapore. In 1898, this great "scandal of the Eastern seas," would eventually provide the basis for Joseph Conrad's famous novel, *Lord Jim*.[84] Conrad's fictional pilgrimage vessel, the *Patna*, was essentially a literary recreation of the conditions onboard the *Jeddah*.[85] Like most pilgrim ships of the time, the *Patna* was small, inhumanely overcrowded, and completely lacking emergency equipment, proper sanitation facilities, and access to medical attention. Even the space demanded by law at that time was a mere nine superficial feet per adult. Perhaps no other description of the period captures the ominous sense of foreboding that must have accompanied pilgrims as they set out for Mecca:

---

[83] Michael Gilsenan, "And you, what are you doing here?," review of *A Season in Mecca: Narrative of Pilgrimage*, by Abdellah Hammoudi, trans. By Pascale Ghazaleh, *London Review of Books* (19 Oct. 2006), 3; Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 151.

[84] Joseph Conrad, *Lord Jim* (Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Sons, 1900; repr. ed. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover, 1999), 88.

[85] For the most authoritative analysis of Conrad's depiction of the hajj in *Lord Jim*, see Tagliacozzo, *The Longest Journey: Southeast Asians and the Pilgrimage to Mecca*, 109-132. Curiously, however, Tagliacozzo is silent on the role of 'Umar al-Saqqaf in the events of the *Jeddah* scandal.

> They streamed aboard over three gangways, they streamed in urged by faith and the hope of paradise, they streamed in with a continuous tramp and shuffle of bare feet, without a murmur, or a look back; and when clear of confining rails spread on all sides over the deck, flowed fore and aft, overflowed down the yawning hatchways, filled the inner recesses of the ship—like water filling a cistern, like water flowing into crevices and crannies, like water rising silently even with the rim.[86]

However, the *Jeddah* incident did not immediately move British officials in India to take drastic steps. Some five years later the issue of overcrowding and the plight of the indigent pilgrim remained unresolved and returned to the public eye with a vengeance. In November 1885, *The Times of India* ran a scandalous eyewitness account of the entire ordeal endured by India poor pilgrim masses titled "The Pilgrimage Trade." Like Conrad's fictional account, the article's harrowing scenes of men, women, and children, sea sick, clinging to their belongings, "all packed like sardines in a box," conjures images reminiscent of the "Middle Passage."[87]

Confronted with these graphic details, many observers came to see the disorder of the pilgrimage industry and government's refusal to directly intervene as further proof of the government's indifference to the suffering of the poor rather than an expression of Britain's commitment to religious freedom. As *The Times of India*'s reporting made clear, the underlying flaw in both the Native Passenger Ships and the Pilgrim Protection Acts was the government's refusal to impose any fees or conditions directly on the mobility of pilgrims themselves. As the article's author chided, both the French and Dutch had imposed restrictions on the poor. Yet, as he put it, "It seems to me, and many

---

[86] Conrad, *Lord Jim*, 7; Roff, "Sanitation and Security," 151.

[87] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Appendix no.2, extract from the *Times of India*, 9 November 1885 in John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894.

are of the same opinion, that our Government are afraid that if they do not allow our poor old natives of India to go to the *Haj*, they will keep them out of Heaven."[88]

Not surprisingly, however, poorer pilgrims continued to prefer the cheapest available fares. Thus, despite the government's increased regulation of the hajj, there continued to be a strong correlation between inexpensive prices and the unsanitary and overcrowded conditions that the government had sought to eliminate in the first place. Because the government feared imposing any passport fees, mandatory deposits, or return tickets, they could not directly deter intending pilgrims regardless of how poor they might have been. The only avenue that remained available was to manipulate the price and quality of pilgrimage services by introducing an outside stimulus into the market. Having arrived at the conclusion that the entire complex of indigenous shipping interests and brokers was an inherently unscrupulous system, responsible for widespread and often deliberate neglect of the government's evolving pilgrimage-shipping regulations, the government of India sought out a private partner willing to enforce its legislation and documentary practices, raise the overall conditions of the industry, and wrest market share away from the existing competition.

'The Infidel Piloting the True Believer': Thomas Cook as the Official Travel Agent of the Hajj

On 4 January 1886, the government of India passed a resolution making Thomas Cook and Son the official travel agent of the hajj. After some five years of private correspondence between Cook's and high-ranking British officials and roughly two years of protracted negotiations, reconnaissance, and on-the-ground preparation, the firm was

[88] Ibid.

handed total control of all government functions related to the hajj.[89] As the conditions of the agreement between the two parties made clear, the government of India attempted to foster a government-backed monopoly over the pilgrimage transportation industry for Thomas Cook and Son while simultaneously ceding responsibility for the regulation of that industry to the firm as well. The effect of this ambitious privatization scheme was Cook's employees were given the authority to act" precisely the same as though they were in service of the Government."[90] In addition to the enormous operational latitude given to Thomas Cook and Son, they were also to be indemnified against any losses that they might incur while administering the hajj for first three years.

Between 1886 and 1890, Thomas Cook's growth was remarkable. The government expressed its satisfaction with the progress that Cook's shipboard representatives made in ensuring that the ships it chartered met all legal requirements for medical surveillance and sanitation. Cook's introduced a fixed price system for the Bombay to Jidda journey, allowing for no reduced-price tickets. The firm's dates of departure were fixed and publicized in advance for and were generally observed. This allowed pilgrims making their way from inland destinations to purchase all-inclusive tickets for rail and steamship travel in advance. Even as the Cook's experiment soured in subsequent years, the government still claimed that Cook's introduction into the pilgrimage market had encouraged greater competition, forcing Muslim shipping agents

---

[89] TC, Guardbook no. 27, John Mason Cook, *The Mecca Pilgrimage*, 4-5; John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894, p. 3. See also Piers Brendon, *Thomas Cook: 150 Years of Popular Tourism* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1991), 205-206; John Pudney, *The Thomas Cook Story* (London: Michael Joseph, 1953), 221-224.

[90] TC, Guardbook no. 27, John Mason Cook, *The Mecca Pilgrimage*, 5-6.

to take measures to better their services, which had in turn raised the overall safety and comfort of the industry and led to an overall reduction in the opportunities for extortion.[91]

More importantly, with regard to the question of the "pauper pilgrim," the firm's indirect intervention did precisely what the government had wished to accomplish but feared doing itself. Cook's entrance into the pilgrimage-shipping industry immediately altered the price structure, ticketing procedures, and flexible timetables that Muslim shipping agents, brokers, and poor pilgrims depended upon.

For wealthier pilgrims fixed fares did likely place limits on extortionist pricing schemes. At the same time, however, fixed prices dramatically narrowed the options of poorer pilgrims. Poorer pilgrims preferred flexible timetables that allowed them to either arrive at Bombay early to secure a cheap fare or to hold out until the last minute to take advantage of reduced or even free fares offered by Muslim shipping agents. Likewise, while the government and Cook's discouraged extended stays in Bombay, for poor pilgrims this was often a critical stage in their journey. Bombay was often where pilgrims generated enough funds to either purchase a one-way ticket or where they replenished their funds after purchasing a ticket through labor, selling petty goods, or by begging. In other words, fixed prices and departure times impeded poor pilgrims' access to the kinds of charitable structures, sliding-scale pricing, and reduced or free fares they had come to rely upon. It is also very doubtful that these pilgrims would have opted to purchase more expensive round-trip fares which would have eliminated the possibility of

[91] TC, Guardbook no. 27, John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894, pp. 5-6; *Bombay Gazette*, 16 January 1895.

waiting for a last-minute reduced fare at the end of the hajj season once shippers had sold enough full-price tickets to meet their operating expenses.[92]

Bearing these questions in mind, it is doubtful that Cook's services were actually an attractive option for customers or whether the firm's gain in market share between 1887 and 1890 was simply the byproduct of the overwhelming government support that it received. It is also difficult to tell whether Cook's fixed-price system absorbed any appreciable share of the indigent population it aimed to eliminate or if the firm's increasing market share was merely a matter of attracting those pilgrims who could already afford full-price fixed fares and round-trip tickets. Leaving aside these unknowns, however, the firm's results were undeniable. In their first year of operation the firm was able to attract nearly 20 percent of the market. That figure rose steadily to 29.3 percent in 1888, 38.6 percent in 1889, and peaked in 1890 at 44.5 percent. It appeared that Cook's was on its way to dominating the pilgrimage trade.[93]

Despite the initial promise shown by the Thomas Cook project, these early gains proved illusory. In 1891, Cook's market share fell for the first time to 37.2 percent. That downward trend would continue until Cook's agreement with the government was terminated following the 1893 pilgrimage season when the firm failed to book even 10 percent of the total Indian pilgrim contingent.

It is difficult to say exactly what caused this precipitous collapse or to account for its timing. In the final years of their collaboration with the government, Cook's was

[92] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and india-rubber stamp," 52-53.

[93] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Extract from the Proceedings of the Government of India in the Home Department (Sanitary), Calcutta, 11 January 1895.

accused of overbooking their ships.[94] There were complaints that the firm had been unwilling to provide the necessary privacy for "respectable" women.[95] Worse still, as many customers pointed out, the difference between ships chartered by Cook's and those captained by their competition was increasingly negligible. In fact, since Cook's contracted with companies like Hajji Cassum & Co., customers began to take note of the fact that Cook's steamers often offered no advantages over other steamship offerings.[96] Most damaging of all, however, was the outbreak of cholera on the Thomas Cook-chartered steamship, the *Deccan*, in 1890. As Mehmed Şakir explains, as a result of severe overcrowding on the *Deccan* some fifty pilgrims passed away during their quarantine on Kamaran Island. While in quarantine, the disease infected pilgrims traveling on the *King Arthur* and was subsequently spread to Jidda and Mecca.[97]

While it is tempting to attribute Cook's plummeting market share in the years after 1890 to these embarrassing incidents, as John Mason Cook understood, the firm's problems were more systemic. In his final reports to the government in 1894, he identified two areas that were likely the sources of his troubles in Bombay. First, Cook's chartered the appropriate number of steamships to accommodate the pilgrims it booked each year, but the firm did not own its own fleet. As Cook would complain once the project began to break down, "nothing short of a special service of steamers would enable them to compete successfully with the shippers who had controlled the pilgrimage traffic

---

[94] Harrison, "Quarantine, pilgrimage, and colonial trade," 133.

[95] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and india-rubber stamp," 59.

[96] Takashi, "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility," 167.

[97] Sarıyıdız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 60-64, 297-298; TC, Guardbook no. 27, Report of the Arrangements carried out by Thos. Cook and Son in connection with the movement of Pilgrims for the Hadj of 1890; John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894, p. 6.

before they themselves had come on the scene."[98] This leads to the obvious conclusion that although Muslim ship owners' market share had initially been damaged by the tremendous advantages conferred upon Thomas Cook by the government, in subsequent years they had made the necessary changes to compete, undercut Cook's prices, and successfully rallied to recapture their customers. In addition to owning their own ships, Muslim shipping agents could also still count on their superior networks of brokers in the districts to steer business away from Cook's.[99]

Thus, despite Cook's confidence that he could not only reform the pilgrimage industry but also achieve profitability, the profits never materialized. Even though the firm had been given almost total control of the government's documentary and regulatory apparatus and continued to receive an annual subsidy of £1,000, by 1891 "the firm expressed their conviction that the business could never be self-supporting, and they inquired whether the Government were prepared to guarantee them against actual monetary loss." In 1893, Cook's once again inquired as to whether or not the government intended to continue their annual subsidy. A report was called for by authorities in Bombay. The report revealed that despite all of the advantages of state sponsorship, the firm had failed to monopolize the pilgrimage-travel industry and marginalize indigenous Muslim shipping interests.

At peak of their intervention in 1890, the firm chartered four of the eleven steamships making the journey to the Hijaz, carrying 4,220 of the 9,953 pilgrims leaving from Bombay that year. Despite achieving approximately 45 percent of the market share that year, in 1892-1893 their percentage dwindled to just 14 percent. In 1893, Thomas

---

[98] TC, Guardbook no. 27, *The Pioneer*, 16 January 1895.

[99] Singha, "Passport, ticket, and india-rubber stamp," 59.

Cook and Son finally turned a profit, bringing in nearly Rs. 4,300. In order to achieve that modest gain, however, the percentage of pilgrims traveling on steamers chartered by the firm fell to an abysmal 9.5 percent (1,656 out of 11,896), rendering the firm's services all but useless to the government.[100] As *The Pioneer* reported in their January 1895 postmortem of the Thomas Cook project, "These figures proved that the experiment was a failure, and the Government had no other course than reluctantly to notify that the indemnity from loss could not be continued."[101]

In November 1893, the agreement between Thomas Cook and Son and the Government came to an acrimonious end. In his final report to the government, John Mason Cook complained bitterly about the forces that had conspired against his firm.[102] And although one Muslim correspondent for the *Bombay Gazette* explained that the waning of Cook's "popularity was owing to the fact that a Mussulman has sentimental objections to being helped by "unbelievers" in his pilgrimage," as John Mason Cook's allegations make clear, it was not so much the pilgrims themselves but the complex web of Indian Ocean shipping, brokerage, and political interests that Thomas Cook and Son had failed to conquer.[103] At an even more fundamental level, John Mason Cook also seems to have understood that his agreement with the Government of India, which had ultimately been a personal negotiation with the Viceroy, was never fully supported by

---

[100] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Extract from the Proceedings of the Government of India in the Home Department (Sanitary), Calcutta, 11 January 1895, pp. 3-4.

[101] TC, Guardbook no. 27, *The Pioneer*, January 1895. For similar coverage of the demise of the Thomas Cook experiment, see also *The Indian Daily News*, 14 January 1895; and the *Bombay Gazette*, 16 January 1895.

[102] TC, Guardbook no. 27, John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894, p. 7-8.

[103] TC, Guardbook no. 27, *Bombay Gazette*, 16 January 1895.

local officials in Bombay. As he put it, "I was made to feel at once that the arrangement made by the Government of India with my firm was not kindly received by the Officials of the Government of Bombay, and that considerable reluctance was evinced to giving me the slightest assistance or information."[104] In the long run, Cook felt that the resistance of local officials in Bombay had led to collusion between Muslim members of the Governor General's Council with interests in the shipping business to set prices at a level that would force him out of the market.[105]

While there might be an element of truth in Cook's accusations, it would be a mistake to simply accept his attempt to shift the blame for his failures to his Bombay competitors and their political alliances. If the animosity toward the firm in Bombay had been so pervasive, why did Cook's market share continue to grow for four years? The steady growth of Cook's share of the market over those years suggests that its government-backed operation in Bombay was able to break into the Indian side of the trade. However, this ignores the question of whether or not Cook's was equally successful in imposing its will on Ottoman officials in Istanbul, Jidda, and Mecca. It also overlooks the degree to which India's Muslim shipping and brokerage industries were anchored to and influenced by the Hijaz's pilgrimage guilds.

Perhaps the most basic problem posed by the Ottoman administration in the Hijaz revolved around its policy toward passports. When the Ottoman state reversed its demand that pilgrims carry a passport, it gravely undermined the utility and necessity of British Indian efforts to impose passport controls. Despite this Ottoman reversal, the

---

[104] TC, Guardbook no. 27, John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894, p. 4.

[105] Ibid., 8.

government of India continued to issue pilgrim passports. Thomas Cook and Son were disappointed to learn, however, that the government of India stubbornly refused to make the passport compulsory. As John Mason Cook complained in 1887, "I always understood that *every* Pilgrim from ports of British India to the Hedjaz *must* take a passport." Yet, as his report for the 1887 pilgrimage season indicates, only 6,555 of the 9,389 pilgrims departing Indian ports were issued travel documents.[106] Cook had expected that by making passports compulsory, even if they were given unconditionally, intending pilgrims would be funneled to his agents, who had been granted the authority to issue them, ensuring that the firm would eventually gain a majority of the trade. However, without this critical element there was nothing to stop pilgrims from avoiding Thomas Cook-chartered ships altogether.

In addition to this critical flaw in the agreement between Cook's and the government, the Hijazi side of the arrangements also proved considerably more difficult than John Mason Cook had originally expected. In 1887, the company touted its pilgrimage reforms in *The Excursionist*, the company's official publication, predicting that "in years to come the firm will secure concessions from the Turkish Government; in which case the world may witness the astounding spectacle of the *Infidel piloting the True Believer* through the dangers that beset the former's path to salvation."[107] Cook believed that he would be able negotiate the same kind of exclusive concessions that his tourist operations had so successfully concluded with the Khedival government in

[106] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Report of the Arrangments carried out by Thos. Cook and Son in connection with the movement of Pilgrims for the Hadj of 1887.

[107] TC, Guardbook no. 27, "The Mecca Pilgrimage," *The Excursionist*, 26 March 1887.

Egypt.[108] Cook vastly underestimated how sensitive Istanbul had become to the threat of European extraterritorial encroachment upon the Hijaz. An early indication of the frosty reception that awaited the Cooks in Jidda came in October 1886 when the firm's representative in Istanbul attempted to get Ottoman Board of Health to endorse their plans. After multiple attempts by the British Embassy and Dr. Patterson, the British delegate to the board, Cook's failed to secure a letter of introduction. In the end, Cook's received a reply stating that the Ottoman state would instruct the governor of the Hijaz to assist the British consul. However, they flatly refused to work directly with Thomas Cook and Son.[109]

Recognizing both the political and economic opportunities presented by the pilgrimage trade, the Ottoman state was contemplating going into competition with Cook's. In 1887 the Ottoman *İdare-i Mahsusa* steamship company began operating a service between Istanbul and Jidda. From Istanbul's perspective, not unlike the Indian Thomas Cook scheme, the *İdare-i Mahsusa* provided a more efficient means of enforcing the empire's sanitary regulations and a way to free pilgrims, mostly from Black Sea and Mediterranean ports, from coercive brokerage systems.[110] The *İdare-i Mahsusa* service was also repeatedly called upon to aid in the repatriation of stranded indigent pilgrims.[111]

---

[108] F. Robert Hunter, "The Thomas Cook Archive for the Study of Tourism in North Africa and the Middle East," *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin* 36, no. 2 (2003): 157-164; Donald Malcolm Reid, *Whose Pharoahs?: Archaeology, Museums, and Egyptian National Identity from Napoleon to World War I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 89-92.

[109] TC Guardbook no. 27, J. Caesar, Istanbul, to Messrs. Thomas Cook and Son, London, 15-23 October 1886.

[110] Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı*, 41-42, 51-52. On the *İdare-i Mahsusa*, see also Ali İhsan Gencer, *Türk Denizcilik Tarihi Araştırmaları* (İstanbul: Türkiye Denizciler Sendikası, 1986), 17-18; Şakır Batmaz, ed., *Abdülhamid Donanmasında Bir Bahriyeli: Donanma Zabiti Emin Yüce'nin Hatıraları* (İstanbul: Timaş, 2010).

As early as 1888, British intelligence reported that the *İdare-i Mahsusa* was considering opening Bombay and Calcutta to Jidda routes. The scheme was rumored to have been proposed by the infamous Sayyid Fadl bin ‘Alawi (see Chapter 2). Sayyid Fadl proposed sending an intermediary (since he himself could not travel to India) with letters of recommendation persuading Muslim leaders in India to book with the proposed Ottoman service. In an attempt to counter British claims of extraterritorial consular authority, Sayyid Fadl reportedly proposed that the Caliph claim his brand of maritime extraterritorial authority. He proposed that: “as soon as Indian pilgrims had embarked on board Turkish vessels and had left the shores of India they should be considered as under the protection of the Turkish Government and treated as its own subjects. As they would be glad to be under the special protection of the Head of the Mohammedan religion and have nothing more to do with the British Government until their return to India again.”[112] Although Fadl’s notion of Ottoman extraterritorial protection over the Indian steamship hajj was never realized, the *İdare-i Mahsusa* did open a Bombay to Jidda service in 1894. However, the scheme was suspended in 1896.

Monopolizing Mecca

In 1886, when John Mason Cook sent his son Frank to Jidda in order to plan the firm’s operations in the Hijaz, they would quickly discover that their own official ticketing scheme in Bombay paled in comparison with the massive monopoly on pilgrimage services being run from Jidda. At the top of this pyramid sat the Sharif of

---

[111] For representative examples, see BOA, İ. DH, 1248/97784 (14 Ra 1299/18 October 1891); BOA, MV, 70/32 (4 Z 1309/30 June 1892); BOA, A. MKT. MHM, 578/11 (5 M 1317/16 May 1899); BOA, MV, 102/65 (16 Ra 1319/24 February 1902).

[112] TNA: FO 78/4601, Cecil Wood, Consul, Jidda to the Secretary to Government of India, Foreign Department, 3 December 1888.

Mecca ‘Awn al-Rafiq, a handful of the Jidda’s commercial elites, and a rotating cast of Ottoman and European consular officials. Among them they controlled every aspect of the pilgrimage experience from steamships and boatmen to pilgrimage guides and camel brokers.

In 1883, the principals of this scheme approached the Sharif to gain his cooperation. In order to make the system work the Sharif was asked to force pilgrimage guides and camel drivers (*devecilier*) to force Southeast Asian pilgrims to book their return passage home at Mecca, where neither European consular authorities nor rival steamship interests could intervene. Thus, ‘Awn al-Rafiq waged a determined campaign to tighten his control over the mutawwifin guild system. Prior to his tenure as Sharif theoretically anyone had been free to purchase a lifetime license for a particular region. From the mid-1880s onward ‘Awn al-Rafiq began to exclude non-Ottoman citizens, especially those from Java, the Straits Settlements, and India, from being appointed as mutawwifs. The Sharif also instituted a new licensing procedure, known as the *taqrir* system. Under this system individual mutawwifs were no longer free to compete for pilgrims from a particular region. Instead, ‘Awn al-Rafiq began auctioning licenses for control of each region. Also, rather than issuing lifetime licenses, the Sharif forced the shaykhs competing for control over their respective regions to renew their claims whenever the Amir’s administration declared a new round of bids. As the bids for control of the Jawi and Indian divisions of the guild became more expensive, it became necessary for the mutawwifs to pass the cost on to the pilgrims, leading to inflated prices for boats, housing, camels, tents, and almost every other necessity.[113]

[113] ‘Anqawi, *Makkah: al-Ḥajj wa-al-tawafah*, 280-285, 330-333; Ibrahim Rif‘at Basha, *Mir’at al-Haramayn*, vol. 1 (Cairo: Dar al-Kutub al-Masriyya, 1925), 63-64; Mary Byrne McDonnell, “The Conduct

With the organization of this system in 1883, competition for transporting pilgrims was restricted, prices were rigged, and the resulting profits were shared among the members of the members of the pool. Once the Sharif had been secured, pilgrimage guides and camel brokers began to funnel all steamship business to the monopoly. Owing to the restriction of competition, prices quickly doubled. The extra profits were divided as follows: 25 percent went to the Sharif, 40 percent went to the guides and brokers, and the remaining 35 percent went to the founders of the monopoly. The original principals included J.S. Oswald (Lloyd's agent in Jidda) and his partner Hassan Jawhar (a wealthy Indian merchant), 'Umar al-Saqqaf (the "native" agent for the Ocean Steamship Company or Stoomvaart Maatschappij Nederland), P.N. Van der Chijs (the Jidda agent for Holt's and its subsidiary, the Ocean Steamship Company) and his business partner Yusuf Kudzi (the British consulate's translator), and J.A. Kruijt (the Dutch consul).[114] In addition to this core group, a rotating cast of governors and other representatives of the central government were brought into the scheme or sufficiently bribed to look the other way.[115]

When Frank Cook arrived in Jidda in 1886, the monopoly only targeted pilgrims from the Straits Settlements and Java. This did not mean that their power did not spill over into the management of Indian pilgrims. Indeed, even Frank Cook's brief tour of Jidda was so completely orchestrated by the monopoly that the report he forwarded to his father is almost comical. When he arrived at the docks he was met by none other than

---

of Hajj from Malaysia and Its Socio-Economic Impact on Malay Society: A Descriptive and Analytical Study, 1860-1981," vol. 1. (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1986), 58-60.

[114] TNA: FO 78/4533, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Acting Consul, Jidda to the British Ambassador, Istanbul, 25 August 1893. See also Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 101-102.

[115] Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 101-106, 193-195.

Yusuf Kudzi. Kudzi and Hassan Jawhar were more than happy to show Cook the ropes. In what was likely an attempt to convince Cook that too much outside meddling would not be tolerated, they explained the monopoly system in great detail.

In order to secure the Sharif's cooperation in the monopoly all non-Ottoman citizens were excluded from the Jawi guild of the mutawwifin.[116] In this way, he was able to exercise complete control over the pilgrimage guides without the prospect of Dutch or English interference. Each mutawwif was instructed to collect $40 (Straits dollars) from each pilgrim, preferably before leaving Jidda. This amount secured the pilgrim's passage home. The mutawwif would collect a commission of as much as $9 and then turn over the remaining amount to the shipping agents for the pilgrims return fare. As Frank Cook explained to his father:

> One great cause of the business being in the hands of these three men is that many of the pilgrims pay part or all of their passage in bonds, to be worked out in plantation labour on their return, and some even get money advanced on these bonds. Mr. Omer Sagoff has estates in Singapore and can therefore use these bonds and no else in Jeddah can. The bonds are supposed to be worth about 40% of their face value. It is calculated that one third of the Javanese pay for their passage, one third work it out on their return home, and one third give bonds then clear out on their return without redeeming them.[117]

From the perspective of Ottoman officials on the spot, however, this monopoly achieved far better results than the flood of stranded pilgrims produced by British India. In a revealing passage from Mehmed Şakir's *layiha* to the Sultan he compares pilgrims travelling through Singapore with their Indian coreligionists. He cites role of the Jidda-

[116] Ibid., 101-102.

[117] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Frank Cook, Jidda, to John Mason Cook, October 1886.

based businessman, 'Umar al-Saqqaf.[118] As Mehmed Şakir enthused, if by chance a Dutch subject runs out of money, al-Saqqaf would cover their expenses. Thanks to this access to credit, Mehmed Şakir claimed that no Jawi paupers ever found themselves stranded in the Hijaz.[119] However, this was no coincidence. Al-Saqqaf was not merely acting for the sake of pious charity. He was arguably the most important figure in the Indian Ocean-spanning pilgrimage cartel that dominated the market that Thomas Cook and Son were charged with "cleaning up." Thus, while Ottoman officials lavishly praised al-Saqqaf for his generous charity, in reality, Jawi pilgrims never became stranded because they paid for their return passage in bonded plantation labor.

'Umar al-Saqqaf: Benevolent Banker or Unscrupulous Steamship Broker?

While it is often assumed that the transition to steam navigation virtually killed indigenous shipping interests across the Indian Ocean, the history of the al-Saqqaf family shatters this stereotype. In many respects, Hadrami shipping enjoyed its golden age as European colonists steadily suppressed piracy in Southeast Asia. In the 1820s, Sayyid Abdul Rahman al-Saqaff established the family in Singapore. In 1848, the family trading firm, Alsagoff and Co. was established. By the 1850s the al-Saqqafs had started transporting pilgrims using sailing vessels. By the early 1870s, Sayyid Abdul Rahman's son Sayyid Ahmad successfully transitioned into steam navigation. Upon his death in 1875, his son Muhammad al-Saqaff took over his father's Singapore Steamship

[118] In 1884, the Hijaz's provincial yearbook acknowledged al-Saqqaf as the premier merchant in Jidda. See *Hicaz Vilayeti Salnamesi*, 1301 (Hicaz: Vilayet Matbaası, 1884), 134. And in 1885, al-Saqqaf had been given a *nişan* by the Ottoman state. See BOA, İ. DH, 937/74183 (20 Ra 1302/7 January 1885).

[119] Sarıyıdız and Kavak, eds., *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 300.

Company. By the mid-1870s the Saqqafs were also making their presence felt in the pilgrimage shipping industry on both ends of the Indian Ocean.[120]

Sayyid Muhammad sent his nephew 'Umar to Jidda to look after the family's stake in the pilgrimage trade. 'Umar al-Saqqaf's handling of the family business seemed ill fated in the wake of the infamous *Jeddah* episode in 1880, immortalized in *Lord Jim*, but by the mid-1880s 'Umar had become, perhaps aside from the Grand Sharif in Mecca, the most powerful person in the hajj services industry. While the Sharif's influence over the pilgrimage industry within the Hijaz should not be diminished, it should also be pointed out that his influence paled in comparison to the Saqqafs' multi-regional role in the coordination of labor migration, money-lending services, and steamship brokerage. Although the Sharif had the market cornered by sheer virtue of Mecca's sacred geography, by comparison al-Saqqaf was an ocean-bestriding magnate, whose operations resembled a global octopus. First and foremost, Saqqaf was in effect the primary moneylender associated with the Indian Ocean pilgrimage system.[121] Probably the single greatest contributor to Indonesian migration to Singapore and the Malay Peninsula was the desire to make the pilgrimage to Mecca. The vast majority of pilgrims traveling from Indonesia to Mecca traveled via Singapore. There were several reasons for this. First, the Dutch government was distrustful of what it perceived to be the subversive political influence of returning hajjis. Even before concerns over cholera emerged in the 1860s, the Dutch had already pioneered pre-departure means testing and an examination system

---

[120] Alsagoff, *The Alsagoff Family in Malaysia*, 9-11; Freitag and Clarence-Smith, *Hadhrami Traders, Scholars, and Statesmen in the Indian Ocean, 1750s-1960s*, 288, 298-300; Lee, *The British as Rulers*, 165-166; Mohammad Redzuan Othman, "The Arabs Migration and Its Importance in the Historical Development of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Malaya," 15th Annual World History Association Conference, Los Angeles, June 2006, pp. 20-22.

[121] Jacob Vrendenbredgt, "The Haddj: Some of Its Features and Functions in Indonesia," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- enVolkenkunde* 118, no. 1 (1962): 127-129.

upon return. However, would-be pilgrims soon learned that they could avoid Dutch restrictions by traveling via Singapore. In order to pay for their journey would-be pilgrims frequently lived for several years in Singapore or the Peninsula. But many never achieved their goal of making the hajj and settled permanently. This migration pattern became so common that even today, the term *Haji Sinapura*, is still understood by Indonesians to refer to someone who has fallen short of his own goals in life.[122]

Alternatively, many Jawi pilgrims engaged in an indentured labor scheme not unlike the Chinese credit-ticket system, constituting a kind of hybrid category of *hajji-coolie*. Typically these indentured pilgrims were accompanied to Mecca by a shipping agent. On their return, that agent would hand the pilgrim over to a *shaykh* who would find work on plantations across the Peninsula in order for them to pay off their passage debts.[123]

Sayyid 'Umar perfected this system, creating a monopoly system, integrating all functions of *the hajji-coolie* circuit under the al-Saqqaf banner. Since most pilgrims could only afford a one-way ticket from Singapore to Jidda, when pilgrims became destitute and stranded in Jidda upon completion of their pilgrimage, 'Umar al-Saqqaf would advance the pilgrims money in exchange for a promissory note in which they undertook work as agricultural laborers on the Saqqaf family's plantation on Kukup Island, the Constantinople Estate.[124] As Sayyid Muhammad explained it in 1887 to the Colonial Secretary:

---

[122] William Roff, *Studies on Islam and Society in Southeast Asia* (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2009), 79-80.

[123] Abdur-Razzaq Lubis, "Traders, Teachers, Pressmen and Pilgrim Brokers: Penang Arabs in the Regional Network," Rihlah: Arabs in Southeast Asia Conference, Singapore, April 2010, p. 49.

> The pilgrims usually require about fifty dollars, Straits currency, to get them clear from Jeddah and to pay their passage money to Singapore. As there are old men and boys as well as women among them, it has been the practice for them to join in parties of from two to three, to seven or eight in giving a Promissory Note for the total advances, and they enter into an agreement to work off their debts on arrival at Singapore, by serving at fixed charges, from which a stipulated sum per month is deducted in reduction of the debt. On arrival in Singapore, some of the Hadjees get their debts paid by their friends, and the agreement is cancelled so far as they are concerned, but I have to find work for the bulk of them in my plantation. The men would work off their debit, if not more than fifty dollars, in two or three years…[125]

From the perspective of the British consul at Jidda and the authorities in Singapore, however, the Saqaff hajji-coolie system was an exploitative racket. According to the Jidda consul, a pilgrim contracting with the Saqaffs would "seldom [be] able to free himself from the clutches of his employers at the end of the two or three years named in the contract… On one occasion inquiries conducted at the request of the government revealed that men had been detained at Kukup (Cocob) Island beyond the maximum period allowed by their contract." Starting in 1896, the government refused to recognize the contracts for servitude concluded by pilgrims at Jeddah, and following the tip-offs from Her Majesty's consul at Jeddah concerning ships due to arrive at Singapore conveying hajis under contract to the al-Saqqafs, the British Protector of the Chinese looked out for these hajjis to explain that their contracts were not binding as far as the government was concerned.[126] With the direct cooperation of the Jidda consulate and the Protector of the Chinese, in a sense the interconnected nature of pilgrimage and labor mobility regulation across the Indian Ocean had come full circle.

---

[124] Lee, *The British as Rulers*, 167; Redzuan, "The Arabs Migration and Its Importance in the Historical Development of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Malaya," 22.

[125] TNA: Colonial Office (CO) 273/145, Despatch 187, Governor F. Weld to Holland, Colonial Office, 7 May 1887, enclosed letter from Sayyid Muhammad al-Saqqaf, 30 April 1887.

[126] Lee, *The British as Rulers*, 166-167; Vredenbredgt, "The Hadjj: Some of Its Features and Functions in Indonesia," 130.

Despite British claims of exploitation, the Dutch consul-General in the Straits Settlements painted a very different picture. In 1889, he claimed that "out of 200 pilgrims from Indonesia who entered into such a contract with Alsagoff all but ten redeemed their debts within a fortnight. The ten pilgrims who had not paid their debts left for Kukub to redeem the debt by working on the estates, but within a couple of months they had paid what they owed with the assistance of their countrymen…"[127] This assessment lends credence to the enthusiastic endorsements of Ottoman officials in Jidda and a fair number of historians, who have argued that the Saqqafs filled a critical niche, as the Indian Ocean pilgrimage economy's most important moneylender. The contract-tickets served as a security for the money that had been lent to the pilgrim; particularly when the labor force on the estates increased, the function of moneylender became the main function and the contract was seldom carried into effect.[128]

This sort of reinterpretation of al-Saqqaf's hajj-related enterprises has become fashionable in Southeast Asian historiography. As Eric Tagliacozzo has recently written, powerful Hadrami families in Singapore, especially the al-Saqqaf and al-Kaf, both of whom had strong genealogical ties to the Hijaz, were critical to the organization of *awqaf* (pious endowments), which extended financial benefits to ordinary Southeast Asian pilgrims. These endowments functioned as lenders, paid for steamship tickets, extended cash advances or credit for housing in the Hijaz, and offered a network of brokers and handlers. Ideally this system was meant to insulate pilgrims from the most "rapacious groups of capitalists in Singapore, both foreign and indigenous." Despite repeated investigations by colonial administrators into abuses connected to these operations, many

[127] Vredenbredgt, "The Haddj: Some of Its Features and Functions in Indonesia," 128.

[128] Ibid., 127-130.

Southeast Asian Muslims felt that arranging their pilgrimages through these endowments would insure that they would not fall prey to cheats and other coercive schemes.[129] In the eyes of Southeast Asian pilgrims these benefits may very well have been real. However, a more holistic view of how these operations intersected with and spilled over into other aspects of the pilgrimage trade in the Hijaz makes it harder to accept Tagliacozzo's more charitable interpretations.

'A nice piece of meat everyone likes to take a piece of it'

As Thomas Cook's Chief Egyptian Dragoman Mohammed Abou-Elwa aptly put it in his 1886 report on the hajj, "A pilgrim in the Hedjaz lands is just as grass and a nice piece of meat everyone likes to take a piece of it."[130] Although Frank Cook was made aware of Southeast Asian monopoly, he was initially not allowed to understand the full extent of the ring. He appears to have thought that the scheme only involved Van der Chijs, al-Saqqaf, and Kudzi. While it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which Cook was being purposefully misled, at least one clue comes from his conversations with Hassan Jawhar. Despite his personal involvement and intimate knowledge of the ring, Jawhar coyly suggested that he "was certain that the Governor Genral of the Hedjaz, the Cherif, and the chief Motaouf [*sic*] were interested in the monopoly, by their readiness to give every assistance to the clique, but it is simply impossible to get proof of it." In the end, it is clear that Frank Cook understood that he was swimming in treacherous waters and was unsure who to trust. He was especially concerned that the firm would not be

[129] Tagliacozzo, *The Longest Journey*, 72-73.

[130] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Appendix no. 9, Translation from the Arabic Journal of Mohammed Abou-Elwa's Pilgrimage, Cairo to Meccah, Medinah, and back, 1886, in John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894.

able to handle return tickets without a local contact with the proper connections.[131] Thus, in another almost absurd twist, despite learning of his role in the monopoly on Jawi pilgrims, Frank suggested to his father that Kudzi might be the firm's best prospect for a local booking agent. As a result, in February 1888, Kudzi agreed to take a five percent commission on all return tickets to India and became Cook's agent in Jidda.[132]

Kudzi's involvement with Thomas Cook's operations in the Hijaz was a harbinger of things to come. That same year the Sharif attempted to extend the monopoly on Southeast Asian pilgrims to Indian pilgrims. The Sharif instructed the head of the mutawwifin not to allow any Indian pilgrim to leave Mecca for Jidda without having already booked their return ticket to India with one of the members of the monopoly. As a result, the price of a return ticket increased by 60 percent.[133] Not coincidentally, in 1888 and 1889, Indian Muslims holding return tickets issued by Thomas Cook and Son began to complain that upon their return from Mecca to Jidda they were unable obtain passage home. As Ata Mohammed, then the British vice-consul at Hudayda, and Acting consul Abdur Razzack in Jidda reported, Kudzi and his associates were forcing Indian pilgrims to book their return tickets with steamship companies tied to the Southeast Asian monopoly. Even more disturbingly, the Indian mutawwifs were forcing Indian pilgrims, even illiterate ones, to purchase special Ottoman-printed Qur'ans at inflated prices. If the pilgrims refused either to book their return tickets through the mutawwif's preferred

---

[131] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Frank Cook, Jidda, to John Mason Cook, October 1886. While it is clear that Frank was being lied to by Hasan Jawhar, Mohammed Abou-Elwa's report on the hajj from that same month indicates that the company did eventually become aware of the Ottoman governor and Sharifal administrations' involvement in the monopoly. See Appendix no. 9, Translation from the Arabic Journal of Mohammed Abou-Elwa's Pilgrimage, Cairo to Meccah, Medinah, and back, 1886, in John Mason Cook to H. Luson, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department-Sanitary), 1894.

[132] TC, Guardbook no. 27, Yusuf Kudzi, Jidda, to G. Dattari, Cairo, 8 February 1888.

[133] Ochsenwald, *Relgion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 102-103.

steamer or to purchase their Qur'ans, they were not allowed to secure a camel for the return to Jidda or continue on to Medina.[134]

As it turned out, the Sharif had overreached. He had failed to include the new Ottoman governor, Nafiz Paşa and J.S. Oswald. Oswald had long since fallen out with the monopoly and had tried repeatedly to draw attention to the nefarious acts of the pool's main actors. As a result of having overlooked these key figures, the Sharif exposed the monopoly to greater scrutiny from the British consulate and the Ottoman governor. On 11 August 1889, Nafiz Paşa issued a public notice in the name of the Sultan guaranteeing absolute freedom of choice to all pilgrims:

> … notice is hereby given to all Javanese and Indian pilgrims and to the whole body of the pilgrims in general that hiring for passage by steamers should be done at Jeddah. In Mecca it is forbidden and no one shall book here but in Jeddah where they can secure a passage by any steamer which they may find cheap and suitable to them. Also that no one shall force the pilgrims to book any particular steamer but the pilgrims shall be at liberty to take their passage by any steamer which may be agreeable to them.[135]

On 23 August 1889, the governor then arrested the Indian mutawwifin in Mecca. He also moved to dismantle the monopoly on Javanese and Malay pilgrims by abolishing the post of chief pilgrimage guide (*shaykh al-masha'ikh*) for Jawi pilgrims. With the Indian and Southeast Asian monopolies crashing down, Van der Chijs, then acting as the consul for Sweeden and Norway, committed suicide and his company went out of business.[136]

Despite the Governor's apparent victory, the collapse of the monopoly would be brief. The attempt to extend the monopoly to Indian pilgrims exposed new depths of

---

[134] TNA: FO 78/4263, Turkey, Pilgrim Traffic, 1888-1889, Sheikh Ata Mohammed, Vice-Consul, Hudayda to Dr. Abdur Razzack, Acting Consul, Jidda, 14 September 1888.

[135] TNA: FO 78/4328, Translation of the public notice issued by Nafiz Paşa, 14 Z 1306/11 August 1889.

[136] Ochsenwald, *Relgion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 102-103.

corruption not only in the Hijaz, but also in Istanbul. The Indian pool and Qur'an extortion scheme had included Yusuf Kudzi, 'Umar Nasif, and 'Abdullah Banaja. Nasif and Banaja represented two of the most prominent members of the Hadrami merchant community in Jidda. Banaja was an agent of the Ocean Steamship Company. More broadly speaking, the Banaja family not only represented one of the region's most important shipping houses, it was also a major lender for the Ottoman administration in the Hijaz.[137] Nasif, on the other hand, had long served as the Sharifate's agent in Jidda and on the provincial administrative council. Owing to his service on behalf of the Sharifate and his generous donations for the construction of the Ruşdiye school in Jidda, in 1882 he received a promotion in rank and was honored (*Nişan-ı Mecidi*) by the Sultan.[138] However, Nasif also had a checkered record of corruption and scandal. In 1883, he was accused by Said Fehmi, then the deputy governor, of inciting the Bedouin and fomenting tensions between local Jiddawis and foreign subjects. Convinced of Nasif's complicity in inciting a Bedouin uprising, Osman Nuri attempted to destroy his influence in the region. Nasif was arrested, sentenced to 15 years in prison, transferred to Istanbul, and his property was confiscated.[139] However, Nasif had a protector in Istanbul. Ahmed Esad Efendi, who held the ceremonial post of Sweeper of the Prophet's Mosque in Medina (*Feraşet-i Şerife Vekili*), was among the circle of Arab dignitaries advising Abdülhamid, and often acted as a back channel intermediary between Istanbul and

---

[137] Ibid., 102-103 109.

[138] BOA, Y. PRK. ASK, 10/144 (21 S 1299/12 January 1882); BOA, İ. DH, 871/69603 (11 S 1300/22 December 1882).

[139] BOA, Y. PRK. UM, 6/34 (9 S 1301/10 December 1883). See also Ochsenwald, *Relgion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 109.

Hijazis, was successful in securing an imperial pardon for Nasif.[140] After a brief hiatus in Istanbul, Nasif kept his government salary, returned to his role as the Sharif's agent in Jidda, and reemerged as a leading figure in the pilgrimage services ring.

In 1889, when Nafiz Paşa dismantled the Indian and Jawi monopolies, the Sharif was enraged. Once again, working through Ahmed Esad, the Sharif successfully lobbied the Sultan to dismiss the governor. Following Nafiz's removal, the cartel was once again reconstituted under the leadership of al-Saqqaf, Nasif, and C.R. Robinson, who had taken over the late Van der Chijs's roles as agent for Holt's and the Ocean Steamship Company. Having learned from past mistakes, the new group modified its prices and began to farm a percentage of the overall trade to other companies in order to avoid further inquiries from the Ottoman state or the European consulates. However, when the London-based Gellatly, Hankey, Sewell and Co. took over the steamship interests of J.S. Oswald, the group continued to operate at a competitive disadvantage to the Sharif's officially-backed al-Saqqaf ring.[141]

In 1893, the pilgrimage transport monopoly reached altogether shocking levels of inhumanity and exploitation. In the midst of a cholera outbreak estimated to have struck down more than 30,000 souls, killing as many as 4,000 a day at its height, a new monopoly emerged.[142] Prior to the 1893 pilgrimage season, Messrs. Knowles and Company of Batavia had bribed 'Awn al-Rafiq to oust the old al-Saqqaf monopoly on

---

[140] On the role of Ahmed Esad Efendi and his connections to the Sharifate, see Mahmud Nedim Bey, *Arabistan'da Bir Ömür*, 71-72; Tufan Buzpınar, "Abdulhamid II, Islam and the Arabs: The Cases of Syria and the Hijaz, 1878-1882," (Ph.D. diss., Manchester University, 1991), 102; Numan, "The Emirs of Mecca and the Ottoman Government of Hijaz, 1840-1898," 141.

[141] TNA: FO 78/4533, Dr. Abdur Razzack, Acting Consul, Jidda to the British Ambassador, Istanbul, 25 August 1893.

[142] İzzeddin, *Mekke-i Mükerreme'de Kolera ve Hıfzıshha*, 80-83. See also Sarıyıldız, *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı,* 66-67.

Jawi pilgrims. The new operation was headed by a certain Mr. Herklots, a Dutch subject, described as a "Javanese half-caste," who on his arrival in Jidda purportedly converted to Islam and took the name 'Abd al-Hamid. In exchange for a lump sum of $60,000 Mexican dollars 'Awn al-Rafiq and the governor, Ahmed Ratip Paşa, agreed to instruct all of the Southeast Asian pilgrimage guides to funnel their charges to Herklots and Messrs. Knowles and Co. In order to achieve this, pilgrims were not allowed to leave Mecca without first having obtained written permission from Herklots. Without this receipt, the camel drivers were forbidden to supply transport back to Jidda. Worse still, Knowles did not have the capacity to handle the numbers that they had booked. As a result, despite excess capacity and reduced fares being offered by other providers, British and Dutch subjects from Java and the Straits Settlements were trapped in a cholera-stricken Mecca. Although British pressure eventually forced the governor to break the monopoly, many pilgrims were detained for weeks or were swept away by the raging epidemic before the conspiracy was broken up and Herklots was arrested.[143] However, Ahmed Ratip was hardly chastened. He flatly rejected the notion that the pool was exploitative, pointing out that the system had been in place for decade. And in his correspondence with the British consul he even went on the offensive, questioning why the European consulates had raised their concerns before. From Ahmed Ratip's perspective, the revolving involvement of European consular employees, shipping agents,

[143] On the Herklots affair, see TNA: FO 78/4532, Turkey, Pilgrim Traffic, 1892-1893; TNA: FO 78/4533, Turkey Pilgrim Traffic, September to December 1893; BOA, HR. SFR. (3), 409/76 (3 August 1893); Mahmud Nedim Bey, *Arabistan'da Bir Ömür*, 73-77.

and colonial subjects from the monopoly's inception rendered European complaints hollow, even hypocritical.[144]

In the wake of these naked and flagrant abuses, in April 1894 the Sultan once again issued a proclamation guaranteeing complete freedom of choice to all pilgrims and the positions of the chief pilgrimage guides were abolished.[145] The 1890s also saw multiple commissions sent to investigate the region's health conditions, extortionate camel prices, and to explore the numerous claims of malfeasance against 'Awn al-Rafiq.[146] However, as Mahmud Nedim Bey, the last Ottoman governor of Yemen, explains, these commissions were inevitably corrupted by bribery and influence pedaling before those appointed to investigate the situation in the Hijaz had even departed from Istanbul.[147] Thus, when Hasan Hilmi replaced Ahemd Ratip as governor in June 1894, he was immediately paid some 2,000 lira in return for his willingness to allow the shipping monopolies and pilgrimage guild system to continue. In turn, Hasan Hilmi spread this largesse to officials in Istanbul so that they would continue to tolerate the monopoly system. Even in the face of consistent diplomatic pressure on the Grand Vizier, the monopoly system endured and continued to reinvent itself with each pilgrimage season. By 1896, the Sharif and his associates had worn the down their opposition. Upon arriving in the Hijaz in 1896, the new British consul G.P. Devey promptly announced that the monopoly had become part of the customary organization of the hajj. In his opinion,

---

[144] TNA: FO 195/1805, Abdur Razzack, Vice-Consul, Jidda to the British Embassy, Istanbul, 25 Augst 1893.

[145] TNA: FO 78/4600, Translation of Sultan's Public Notice, 1 L 1311/7 April 1894.

[146] Ochsenwald, *Relgion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 103, 194-195.

[147] Mahmud Nedim Bey, *Arabistan'da Bir Ömür*, 72.

"the pilgrims were not fleeced any more than tourists would be elsewhere in the world."[148]

Conclusion

Should we view the multiple layers of institutionalized corruption surrounding the administration of the hajj as a direct result of 'Awn al-Rafiq's ability to appeal to the venality of a revolving cast of Ottoman governors? In many respects, this is the interpretation that we find in the memoirs of Ottoman bureaucrats writing in the aftermath of World War I. From this perspective, the intricacies of the hajj and the late Ottoman Hijaz are boiled down to anecdotal stories of the infighting and drama between Ottoman governors and the Sharifate in which the Sultan presides with benign neglect.[149] As an alternative to this approach, this chapter has proposed the policing of bodies and borders as a more fruitful starting point. From this perspective, the failure to adequately regulate individual pilgrims or the pilgrimage transportation industry stemmed from a more complex constellation of causes. It was not a matter of local corruption. Rather, it stemmed from the weakness of both Ottoman and colonial governmentalities. Contrary to previous studies emphasizing colonial enthusiasm for the biopolitical surveillance of the hajj, this chapter has shown how the mutually constructed discourses of Hamidian pan-Islamic legitimacy and British guarantees of non-intervention in Muslim religious affairs deeply compromised the biopolitical policing of the hajj. Similarly, while the Hijaz and hajj have generally been framed as fundamental assets of Hamidian pan-

---

[148] Ochsenwald, *Relgion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 103-104.

[149] For example, see Mahmud Nedim Bey, *Arabistan'da Bir Ömür*, 71-78; Süleyman Kâni (Bey) İrtem, *Osmanlı Devletli'nin: Mısır Yemen Hicaz Meselesi*, edited by Osman Selim Kocahanoğlu (İstanbul: Temel, 1999), 185-207.

Islamic legitimacy and accepted as prime outlets for Ottoman anti-colonial propaganda, in the biopolitical context of the debate on poor pilgrims and passport controls, Pan-Islam proved an enormous liability. The expectations raised by the Sultan-Caliph's public image made it virtually impossible for the Ottoman state to impose the kind of documentary practices and border exclusions that could have strengthened public health protections. The imposition of passport controls revealed a deep tension between the universalizing goals of Pan-Islam and the secular imperatives of territorial sovereignty. The end result was an almost total inversion of Ottoman sovereignty. The threat of turning away intending pilgrims landing in Jidda without passports and visas was deemed legally unjustifiable and a grave political risk. Likewise, demanding passports only strengthened European claims of extraterritorial jurisdiction over pilgrims. Thus, the Ottoman state was left with a hollowed out pilgrimage visa system, which functioned only as revenue generator.

As it turns out, however, these failures of governmentality were not limited to the Hijaz itself. Rather, the failure to impose effective passport and border controls had a cascading effect felt throughout the Indian Ocean pilgrimage services market. Thus, even British efforts to regulate the interlocking steamship transportation markets and their intimate connections with the webs of brokers, financial services, labor migration, and pilgrimage guides on both ends of the Indian Ocean turned out to be deeply dependent on the imposition of passports and round-trip tickets. Without these instruments, individual pilgrims remained imbedded in a continuous supply chain of pilgrim services that spanned the entire length of their journey. These market systems were integrated, but the government regulations devised to check the abuses of the marketplace were not. The

pilgrim's journey was segmented between British, Dutch, Ottoman, and Sharifal administrations.

The wide autonomy granted to the Sharifate in the administration of the pilgrimage services industries on the ground placed much of the pilgrimage experience beyond either the tenuous grasp of the Ottoman provincial administration or the extraterritorial influence of the European consulates. Thus, while the Hijaz's autonomous status has traditionally been framed primarily as a problem of Bedouin disorder, both the cartelization of water discussed in the previous chapter and pilgrimage transport monopolies dealt with here point to the autonomy of the Hijaz's urban elite. The Hijaz's pilgrimage services economy became a partnership anchored by Hijazi political elites, Hadrami financial concerns (both Ottoman and non-Ottoman), and a mixed cast of European subjects with the ability work both within and around the political, financial, and legal frameworks of the Ottoman, British, and Dutch empires.

Thus, as Osman Nuri warned in 1885, the presence of large numbers of non-Ottoman Muslims in the Hijaz's urban spaces, especially in Jidda, not only opened the door to European extraterritorial influence, it also placed the province's commercial and financial resources beyond Ottoman control or even taxation. Thus, by the time that the Ottoman center began to take serious steps to bring the Hijaz under more centralized control in the early to mid-1880s, the mechanisms governing the industrializing hajj had already been devised. The enormous profits generated by this system proved more than sufficient to bribe any governor or commission intent on dismantling it.

Epilogue

A Most "Privileged" Province: Autonomy and the "Incomparability" of the Hijaz

Despite the Hamidian strategy of gradually narrowing the Sharif's autonomy, pursuing a kind of indirect rule, mixed with technological, sanitary, and infrastructural centralization, a number of the Sultan's advisors (echoing Osman Nuri's earlier attempts to centralize the Hijaz) counseled him to dismiss 'Awn al-Rafiq or abolish the Sharifate entirely.[1] As Ottoman intelligence reported, as early as 1889, 'Awn al-Rafiq had begun to openly express his opinion that the Amirate should be made hereditary. 'Awn al-Rafiq was reported to have favored the abolition of the unwieldy overlapping jurisdictions of the governor and the Amirate, arguing that it should be replaced by a truly "autonomous administration" (*idare-i muhtare*).[2] From Istanbul's perspective, following Mehmed Ali's creation of a hereditary dynasty in Egypt, this ambition was viewed as the worst possible outcome for a semi-autonomous province.

In the years following Osman Nuri's tumultuous tenure in the Hijaz, perhaps the most notable opponent of the Sharifate was Gazi Ahmed Muhtar Paşa, the Ottoman Special Commissioner in Egypt (*Fevkalade Komiser*) between 1892 and 1908.[3] Between 1888 and 1905, Ahmed Muhtar wrote to the Sultan on numerous occasions urging him to abolish the Amirate, transfer the Sharif to Istanbul, and place the Hijaz solely under the governor's control. As Ahmed Muhtar explains, although the Hijaz fell well beyond his own jurisdiction, he had repeatedly heard about the abuses of 'Awn al-Rafiq from

---

[1] Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid and the Sharifs of Mecca," 5.

[2] BOA, Y. PRK. AZJ, 16/13 (13 Ra 1307/8 November 1889).

[3] Feroz Ahmad, "Mukhtar Pasha," *EI2*.

pilgrims traveling through Egypt.[4] Ahmed Muhtar and others had pointed out that the mistreatment and extortion of pilgrims was a running scandal in the Indian and Egyptian presses and a constant source of aggravation for the British Embassy. These reports warned that the Sharifate's oppressive and unjust administration of the hajj was providing Britain, France, and the Netherlands with perfect pretexts to intervene more directly in the affairs of the Hijaz.[5]

As Ahmed Muhtar also pointed out, the governor at the time, Ahmed Ratib Paşa (1892-1894, 1895-1908), had been utterly corrupted and coopted by 'Awn al-Rafiq, leaving the local government in a state of complete chaos.[6] Having been brought into 'Awn al-Rafiq's pilgrimage-transport monopoly, at its height Ahmed Ratip was receiving a five-lira kickback from every camel rented during pilgrimage season. With approximately 100,000 camels rented each year, Ahmed Ratip was pulling down some 500,000 lira annually. As a result of this pecuniary interest, Ahmed Ratip ultimately came to ally himself with 'Awn al-Rafiq against Ottoman centralization in all forms, but most notably in opposition to the Hijaz Railway's extension from Medina or Jidda to Mecca.[7]

From Ahmed Muhtar's perspective, there was absolutely nothing to be gained from indirect rule via the sharifs. Drawing on his experiences from the campaigns to re-conquer Yemen in the early 1870s, during which a number of sharifs were sent to assist

---

[4] Numan, "The Emirs of Mecca and the Ottoman Government of Hijaz," 144-147, 158-160.

[5] BOA, Y. PRK. TKM, 28/68 (29 Z 1310/14 July 1893); BOA, Y. PRK. AZN, 11/52 (10 L 1312/6 April 1895).

[6] On the corrupt relationship between Ahmed Ratib Paşa and 'Awn al-Rafiq, see also Mahmud Nedim Bey, *Arabistan'da bir Ömür*, 71-78; Süleyman Kani İrtem, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Mısır Yemen Hicaz Meselesi*, 185-207.

[7] Özyüksel, *The Hejaz Railway and the Ottoman Empire*, 162-164.

him, he remarked that contrary to government's opinion the sharifs have little authority over the Bedouin tribes of the region due to their noble ancestry.[8] He explained that whatever influence they might have over the Bedouins was only a pale reflection of the imperial government's sovereignty. Moreover, "if they were stripped" (*tecrid edildikleri halde*) of this connection to the empire, they would have no more "power" (*kudret*) or "influence" (*nüfuz*) than an "ordinary Arab shaykh" (*adi bir Arab şeyh*).[9]

In addition to his low opinion of the effectiveness of the Sultan's continued reliance on semi-autonomous power-sharing arrangements with the sharifs and sayyids of the Hijaz and Yemen, Ahmed Muhtar's experiences on the overlapping frontiers of the Ottoman and British empires provided another dimension to his strident calls for the abolition of the Sharifate. Having been forced to preside over the occupation of Egypt alongside the British had impressed upon him the dangers posed by the Khedivate and the Sharifate's privileged statuses. It also left him with a keen sense of how the scramble for Africa had put the Hijaz in a completely indefensible position at the heart of the colonial world, sandwiched between Egypt, the Suez Canal, Sudan, and the road to India. In light of the increasing British presence in the Red Sea, Ahmed Muhtar pleaded that the Hijaz, the very "object of pride" (*medar-ı iftihari*) of the Caliphate, was in imminent danger. In order to compensate for the loss of Egypt and British naval dominance, Ahmed Muhtar urgently advocated the establishment of a land-based rail link to the Hijaz.[10]

---

[8] For more on Ahmed Muhtar Paşa role in the reconquest of Yemen and his pessimistic views on the Ottoman state's reliance local notables, see Gazi Ahmed Muhtar Paşa, *Anılar: Sergüzeşt-i Hayatım'ın Cild-i Evveli* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996). See also Kuehn, *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference*, chapters 1-3.

[9] BOA, Y. PRK. MK, 4/42 (23 Ra 1306/27 November 1888).

[10] BOA, Y. EE, 118/10 (3 C 1315/30 October 1897).

As Ahmed Muhtar's reports reveal, the Sultan was not alone in imagining the interconnectedness of the threats posed by British expansion along the empire's Red Sea frontiers or their possible solutions. On the question of the Sharifate, however, his suggestions gained no traction. In response to his proposals, the imminent Ottoman statesmen, Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, was consulted. Cevdet cautioned that to transfer the Sharif to Istanbul would not have been prudent because he might have become a focal point for discontent and anti-Ottoman intrigues. Moreover, Cevdet worried that any hint that Istanbul was considering abolishing the Sharifate might cause a backlash not only among Ottoman subjects but global Islamic public opinion as well. Once again, questions of territorial sovereignty collided with Hamidian Pan-Islamic legitimacy structures. Indeed, Ahmed Muhtar's opinion was so poorly received that it was even suggested that his proposal might have been the product of foreign influence.[11] In the end, Abdülhamid viewed Ahmed Muhtar's proposal as wholly unrealistic. As he noted, if the Sharifate were to become dysfunctional, holding sway over the Arab public only with appointed governors would be impossible" without turning the region over to a full military occupation.[12]

To be sure, Ahmed Muhtar's position was completely out of step with post-1885 Hamidian frontier policies of indirect rule and "sayyid sovereignty," but this does not mean that his analysis had no validity. Even Cevdet's dismissal of Ahmed Muhtar's suggestions referred back to the Hijaz's precarious status. Cevdet argues that the Ottoman state must prevent any foreign interference in the Hijaz. As he explains, "it is

[11] Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid and the Sharifs of Mecca," 5; Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia*, 213.

[12] Özyüksel, *The Hejaz Railway and the Ottoman Empire*, 161-162.

clear that the administration of the holy land of the Hijaz, the cradle of Islam, could never be comparable to any of the considerations put forward by foreign powers concerning some [other] imperial provinces" (*Mehd-i İslamiyet olan kıta-ı mübareke-i Hicaziye-i umur-ı idaresi hakkında düvel-i ecnebiyece bir takım mütalaat dermeyan kılınan bazi vilayat-ı şahaneye asla mukayyes olmadığı bedihidir*).[13] No matter how firm the Ottoman state's conviction concerning the "incomparability" of the Hijaz, as even previous Ottoman administrations had admitted, Britain and other European colonial powers would never fully concede that any sovereign territory of the Ottoman state was not subject to the Capitulations and consular protection. In essence, Cevdet's firm declaration belied the Ottoman dilemma in the Hijaz. By asserting the incomparability of the Hijaz and the special status of the Sharif, the Ottoman state only drew greater attention to the Hijaz's irregular, semi-autonomous status and its failure to live up to all of the promises of the Tanzimat-style sovereignty and the Capitulations, which were effectively enshrined in international law.

In hindsight, the privileged status of the Hijaz was not as unique as either Cevdet or most present-day scholars would have it. In light of the difficult lessons of the Eastern Question in the Balkans, the British Foreign Office's support of autonomous decentralization across the Ottoman Empire, the British occupation of Egypt, the scramble for Africa, and the extraterritorial threat posed by non-Ottoman Muslims in the Hijaz, it is difficult to overlook all of the province's similarities to other privileged

[13] BOA, Y. EE, 5/59, "Mısır Fevkalade Komiseri Muhtar Pasa hatt-ı [*sic*: hıtta-ı] Hicaziye'de Mekke emiri sıfatıyla bulundurulmakta olan vazifenin kaldırılması ile hatt-ı [*sic*: hıtta-ı] mezkur idaresinin kamilen Hicaz vilayeti makamına devrini teklif ediyorsa da Cevdet Pasa'nın buna muhalif olduğu, orada böyle bir makam bulunması muvafık olacağını bildirdiği ve bunların nezdi sahanecede makul görüldüğü, ayrıca atlı ve develi bir süvari kıtasının hazır bulundurulması, nizami mahkemeler tesisi, belediyer kurulması hakkında" (9 R 1323/13 June 1905).

provinces on the vulnerable frontlines of European intervention and partition. And just as Ahmed Muhtar's reports on the scramble for Africa suggest, by the end of the nineteenth century the Hijaz was as completely encircled by the European colonial world. And while it is unfair and probably unwise to second-guess the wisdom of Cevdet's cautious approach to the Sharifate and centralization in the Hijaz, as Ahmed Muhtar tried to warn, in the long run the Sharifate's privileged status and autonomy more generally would always fuel the potential for separatism and provide tempting pretexts for British intervention in the Hijaz. In the end, too tempting.

A Train to Nowhere?: Rethinking the Origins and Outcomes of the Hijaz Railway

While Osman Nuri and Ahmed Muhtar failed to drag the Hamidian regime into an all-out conflict with the Sharifate, this did not mean that their concerns completely fell on deaf ears. Between 1884 and 1900, a growing chorus of Ottoman officials repeatedly warned of the need to bolster the Hijaz's territorial sovereignty, narrow the Sharifate's autonomous privileges, and better protect foreign pilgrims from the harsh Hijazi environment and the predations of the region's other mobile population, the Bedouins. But above all else, these proposals all warned of the desperate need to insulate the Hijaz and Yemen from British naval dominance in the event of a future war in which communications via the Suez Canal would almost certainly be cut. In their respective reports and proposals, Osman Nuri Paşa (1884, 1892), Dr. Mehmed Şakir (1890), Süleyman Şefik Söylemezoğlu (1892), Arap İzzet Paşa (1892), and Gazi Ahmed Muhtar Paşa (1897) all came to similar conclusions.[14] The construction of a rail link between Anatolia, Syria, and the Arabian Peninsula was the only way to bring Ottoman military

[14] On the early proposals advocating the construction of the railway, see Gülsoy, *Hicaz Demiryolu*, 31-55; Özyüksel, *The Hejaz Railway and the Ottoman Empire*, 63-68; Ömer Faruk Yılmaz, *Sultan İkinci Abdülhamid Han'ın Hicaz Demiryolu Projesi* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2011), 30-35.

power to bear on the Hijaz and Yemen, build modern forms of governmentality and territorial sovereignty, and shelter the peninsula from the intertwined dangers of autonomy and foreign intervention.

There was also an equal recognition of the need to build a rail link from Jidda to Mecca in order to speed up the pace of the hajj experience. As Osman Nuri argued, by eliminating camel transport the problems of Sharifal-Bedouin domination of pilgrimage transportation, exploitative pricing, and caravan banditry could all be alleviated.[15] By modernizing the transportation infrastructure of the hajj it was also hoped that the duration and costs of the hajj circuit would have been driven down. On this point, Dr. Mehmed Şakir drew a clear connection between the reduction of the financial and physical strains of ground transport and the sanitary defense of the Hijaz against cholera. Likewise, by eliminating the camel-transport leg of the hajj, another perennial source of European colonial complaint would also be taken off the table.[16]

Over the course of the final decades of the nineteenth century, the steamship-era hajj had helped to catapult the once isolated imperial backwater of the Hijaz to the heart of international public health consciousness and the European colonial imagination. As the annual hardships facing Muslim colonial subjects making the hajj became ever more notorious, the Ottoman state's modernizing technocrats, military men, and physicians became increasingly aware of relationship between the Hijaz's compromised sovereignty and the potential for European intervention. In this sense, the colonial hajj became a midwife to the penultimate expression of Ottoman frontier technopolitics, the construction of the nearly 1,500-kilometer Hijaz Railway.

---

[15] BOA, Y. MTV, 59/38 (18 B 1309/17 January 1892).

[16] Sarıyıldız and Kavak, *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti*, 70-71, 333.

The Hijaz Railway project has conventionally been associated with Hamidian Pan-Islamic symbolism, foreign policy, and propaganda. However, this tends to overshadow the project's intellectual origins, which were very clearly an outgrowth of the technopolitical solutions to the Hijaz and the Sharifate's autonomous statuses in all their legal, jurisdictional, and biopolitical manifestations. Thus, as this study has argued, the Hijaz rail project was not conceived at Yıldız Palace. Rather, it bubbled up from the technocratic experiences of officials grappling with the challenges of provincial rule and pilgrimage administration on the empire's extreme southern frontier. For figures like Osman Nuri and Ahmed Muhtar, the construction of the Hijaz Railway (and the earlier telegraph links) represented a war on two fronts. These projects were seen as the technological means by which the Sharifate and the Hijaz's Bedouin population could gradually be settled and placed under direct Ottoman rule. They were also essential to producing the kind of territoriality and military communications needed to protect against European military intervention.

At the same time, however, these core military and strategic goals could also be masked by propaganda claims that the project was primarily designed to modernize pilgrimage transportation and ease the hardships of pilgrims fulfilling their religious duties. This supported the public image of the Sultan-Caliph as dutiful Servitor of the Two Holy Places. The project would make extensive use of the modern propaganda and fundraising methods that had developed since the Russo-Ottoman War onward in order to signal to Muslims and non-Muslims alike that the empire was capable of properly organizing the hajj, maintaining the holy places of Islam, and protecting Arabia from foreign attack. Thus, even though construction started without any accumulated capital it

was hoped that Muslims would rally together to raise the necessary funds. In India, a central committee for the Hijaz Railway was founded in Hyderabad and branch offices were established across the subcontinent. Ottoman consuls, the Muslim press, clerics, heads of local religious orders, notables, and merchants led a determined campaign to persuade Indians to give liberally by stressing how the plight of suffering pilgrims had spurred Abdülhamid to personally act on behalf of all Muslims.[17] Similar campaigns were waged in Egypt, Java, Sumatra, Russia, Morocco, and even China. Although this aspect of the project's financing and construction has long occupied an outsized share of the scholarly imagination surrounding not only this railroad, but Hamidian Pan-Islamic ideology more generally, in reality, foreign contributions amounted to only 9.5 percent of all donations and were even less than projected.[18] This is not to say that Pan-Islamic ideology and international propaganda should be ignored. However, as I continue this research in my book manuscript, I hope to rebalance the existing historiography and reorient the story of the Hijaz Railway around material, biopolitical, and environmental frames.

When the Hijaz Railway reached Medina in 1908, it became possible to travel directly from Damascus to Medina. In part, this 1,464-kilometer section of track had fulfilled the military and strategic visions of its early advocates. However, it did not achieve the grand promises made by its propagandists in India and elsewhere. The 74-kilometer branch line between Mecca and Jidda had not been built. Thus, the bulk of pilgrims travelling via steamship from the Indian Ocean would see no relief from the new railway. And the fifteen-day camel journey through Bedouin territory between Mecca

[17] Low, "Empire and the Hajj," 280.

[18] Özyüksel, *The Hejaz Railway and the Ottoman Empire*, 216-217.

and Medina remained as perilous as ever. As Muhammad Inshaullah, the project's most enthusiastic Indian supporter warned in 1910, if these lines were not launched immediately, Indian fundraising efforts would grind to a halt. Had the Hijaz Railway been primarily aimed at easing the suffering of foreign pilgrims, as its supporters had promised, the Jidda-Mecca line would have received top billing. In reality, however, neither the Jidda-Mecca nor Medina-Mecca lines would ever come to fruition.[19]

If the Hijaz Railway was viewed as a central pillar of Hamidian plans for technopolitical centralization in the Arabian Peninsula, then it was doubly so for the Sultan's successors in the Committee of Union and Progress. In the summer of 1908, the Young Turk Revolution coincided neatly with the completion of the Damascus-Medina line and the wholesale removal of the Ottoman administration in the province, including governor Ahmed Ratip and Sharif 'Ali (r. 1905-1908). Almost overnight, the battle lines over the railway and the looming centralization of the region became clearer. Although the CUP was eager to extend the railway to Mecca, Jidda, and even to Yemen, Medina was ultimately the end of the line. In the summer of 1910, Istanbul changed the administrative status of Medina from a *sancak* of the Hijaz *vilayet* to an independent *sancak*. The separation of Medina from the rest of the Hijaz signaled the integration of the northern Hijaz into the mainstream of Ottoman provincial administration, threatening to finally usurp the Sharifate's traditional position.[20]

Between 1900 and World War I, sharifs 'Awn al-Rafiq, 'Ali, and Husayn did everything in their power to stall the extension of the railway past Medina. Bedouin tribesmen repeatedly sabotaged both the Hijaz telegraph lines and railway construction.

---

[19] Ibid., 150-151.

[20] Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks*, 156-161.

From the Bedouin perspective, it was well understood that once the railway began to operate they would lose all economic leverage. Their principal sources of income came from renting camels to pilgrims and supplying them with food and water. Likewise, they rightly feared that the large subsidies paid by the Ottoman state to prevent the raiding of caravans would also dry up. As it turned out, their suspicions were correct. The CUP government did cut the *surre* allowances and refused to pay them if the safety of the railway was maintained. As a result, the railway became the principal focal point of Hashemite and Hijazi resistance to Ottoman centralization between 1908 and World War I.[21]

With the outbreak of World War I, Sharif Husayn's resistance to Ottoman centralization was launched onto the stage of global political intrigue. On 9 June 1916, Husayn's tribal forces cut the Hijaz Railway near Medina, on the following day the Arab Revolt began with an attack on the Ottoman garrison at Mecca. By September of that same year most of the Hijaz had been wrested from Ottoman control, with the exception of Medina, which would remain under siege for the remainder of the war. When Sharif Husayn decided to enter of the war as a British client, a new front had to be opened in the Hijaz. From then on, the already crippling costs of operating the Hijaz railroad skyrocketed. In the face of the formidable odds arrayed against them, Ottoman forces in Medina were able to retain control of the city until the end of the war. Despite the stubborn resistance of Fahreddin Paşa's troops in Medina, however, by the time Ottoman forces withdrew from Medina in January 1919, the political landscape of the entire Middle East had been completely reordered.[22]

---

[21] Özyüksel, *The Hejaz Railway and the Ottoman Empire*, 152-173.

With the assistance of a small cadre of British military advisors, among them the famous Captain T.E. Lawrence, and a group of Iraqi ex-Otttoman officers, Sharif Husayn's forces would eventually capture Damascus in 1918. With the Arab Revolt the British Empire would embark on a chimerical scheme to install Sharif Husayn as alternative client-Caliph and his sons as the rulers of rest of the Arab Middle East.[23] As a result, centuries of shared history between the Turkish leadership of the Ottoman Empire and their Arab subjects would be irrevocably severed.

As I revise this dissertation as a monograph manuscript, I plan to add a final full-length chapter fleshing out the material history of the Hijaz Railway and Hijazi resistance to Ottoman centralization. Ultimately, I plan to bring my analysis of the Ottoman technopolitical frontier and European colonial interest in the hajj up through World War I and its immediate aftermath.

---

[22] Ibid., 192-204.

[23] Timothy J. Paris, *Britain, the Hashemites and Arab Rule, 1920-1925: The Sherifian Solution* (London: Frank Cass, 2003), 1-48.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA, Istanbul, Turkey):

A. DVN. MKL	Sadaret Divan-ı Hümayun Kalemi Mukavele Kısmı Belgeleri
A. MKT. MHM	Sedaret Mektubi Kalemi Mühimme Kalemi (Odası) Belgeleri
A. MKT. NZD	Sadaret Mektubi Kalemi Nezaret ve Devair Yazmışmalarına Belgeler
A. MKT. UM	Sadaret Mektubi Kalemi Umum Vilayet Yazmışmalarına Ait Belgeler
BEO	Bab-ı Ali Evrak Odası
DH. MKT	Dahiliye Nezareti Mektubi
DH. SAİD. d	Dahiliye Nezareti Sicill-i Ahval Komisyonu Defterleri
HAT	Hatt-ı Hümayun Tasnifi
HR. HMŞ. İŞO	Hukuk Muşavirliği İstişare Odası
HR. SFR. (3)	Hariciye Nezareti Sefaretler Evrakı (Londra)
HRT. h	Haritalar
İ. DH	İrade, Dahiliye
İ. HR	İrade, Hariciye
İ. HUS	İrade, Hususi
İ. MMS	İrade, Meclis-i Mahsus
İ. MVL	İrade, Meclis-i Vala
İ. ŞD	İrade, Şura-yı Devlet
MV	Meclis-i Vükela Mazbataları
ŞD	Şura-yı Devlet
Y. A. HUS	Yıldız Sadaret Hususi Maruzat Evrakı
Y. A. RES	Yıldız Sadaret Resmi Maruzat Evrakı
Y. EE	Yıldız Esas Evrakı
Y. MTV	Yıldız Mütenevvi Maruzat Evrakı
Y. PRK. ASK	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Askeri Maruzat
Y. PRK. AZJ	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Arzuhaller ve Jurnaller
Y. PRK. BŞK	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Mabeyn Başkitabeti
Y. PRK. EŞA	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Elçilik ve Şehbenderlikler Tahriratı
Y. PRK. SH	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Sıhhiye Nezareti Maruzatı
Y. PRK. ŞD	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Şura-yı Devlet Maruzatı
Y. PRK. TKM	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Tahrirat-ı Ecnebiye ve Mabeyn Mütercimliği
Y. PRK. UM	Yıldız Tasnifi Perakende Evrakı, Umum Vilayetler Tahriratı

The British Library (London, United Kingdom):
Asia, Pacific, and Africa Collections
India Office Records (IOR)

Thomas Cook Group Archives (TC, Peterborough, United Kingdom):

Guardbook no. 27

The National Archives (TNA, Kew, United Kingdom):

Colonial Office (CO):
273/145

Foreign Office (FO):
7/982; 78/4093; 78/4094; 78/4328; 78/4335; 78/4532; 78/4533; 78/4600; 78/4601; 78/4692; 78/4788; 78/4882; 195/375; 195/2350; 195/1415; 195/1451; 195/1457; 195/1482; 195/1514; 195/1583; 195/1610; 195/1730; 539/21; 412/58; 424/18; 424/159; 685/1; 686/68; 881/848; 881/3079; 881/4942X; 881/5011; 881/5155X; 881/5172X

Periodicals

The Excursionist
The Lancet
The London Quarterly Review
Science
Tercüman-ı Hakikat
The Times

Published Primary and Secondary Sources

Abdülhamid II. *Devlet ve Memleket Görüşlerim*. Edited by A. Atilla Çetin. 2 Vols. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2011.

_____. *Siyasi Hatıratım*. İstanbul: Hareket Yayınları, 1974.

Abu Manneh, Butrus. "Sultan Abdülhamid II and the Sharifs of Mecca, 1880-1890." *Asian and African Studies* 9, no. 1 (1973): 1-21.

'Afif, Ahmad Jabir, ed. *Mawsu'at al-Yamaniyya*. 4 vols. 2nd ed. San'a': Mu'assasat al-'Afif al-Thaqafiyya, 2003.

Agrawal, Arun. *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005.

Ahmad, Feroz. "Ottoman Perceptions of the Capitulations, 1800-1914." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 11, no. 1 (2000): 1-20.

Ahmed Midhat. "Devlet-i Aliye-i Osmaniye'de Karantina Yani Usul-ı Tahaffuzun Tarihçesi." In *Salname-i Nezaret-i Hariciye, 1318*, 436-471. İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Osmaniye, 1318 (1900/1901).

Ahmed Muhtar Paşa. *Anılar: Sergüzeşt-i Hayatım'ın Cild-i Evveli*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996.

al-Ansari, Abdul Qaddous. *History of Aziziah water supply, Juddah & Glimpses on Water sources in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*. Translated by Fayez Audeh Ilyas. Jidda: Administration of the Aziziah Water Supply, 1972.

Akpınar, Alişan. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Aşiret Mektebi*. İstanbul: Göçebe Yayınları, 1997.

Alsagoff, Syed Mohsen. *The Alsagoff Family in Malaysia: A.H. 1240 (A.D. 1824) to A.H. 1382 (A.D. 1962)*. Singapore, 1963.

Alavi, Seema. "'Fugitive Mullahs and Outlawed Fanatics': Indian Muslims in nineteenth-century trans-Asiatic Imperial Rivalries." *Modern Asian Studies* 45, no. 6 (2011): 1337-1382.

Anderson, M.S. *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923: A Study in International Relations*. London: MacMillan, 1966.

Anghie, Anthony. *Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

'Anqawi, Fu'ad al-Hamid. *Makkah: al-Hajj wa-al-tawafah*. Saudi Arabia, 1994.

Anscombe, Frederick F. *The Ottoman Gulf: The Creation of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Arnold, David. *The Cambridge History of India: Science, Technology, and Medicine in Colonial India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

_____. "Cholera and Colonialism in British India," *Past and Present* 113 (1986): 118-151.

_____. *Colonizing the Body: State Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth-Century India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

_____. "Social Crisis and Epidemic Disease in the Famines of Nineteenth-Century India." *Social History of Medicine* 6, no. 3 (1993): 385–404.

Arslan, Shakib. *al-Irtisamat al-litaf fi khatir al-Hajj ila akdas mataf*. Cairo, 1931.

Atıf Paşa. *Yemen Tarihi*. Vol. 2. Dersaadet/İstanbul: Manzume-i Efkar Matbaası, 1326 (1908/1909).

Ayar, Mesut. *Osmanlı Devletinde Kolera: İstanbul Örneği (1892-1895)*. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2007.

Aydın, Cemil. *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Baldry, John. "The Ottoman Quarantine Station on Kamaran Island, 1882-1914." *Studies in the History of Medicine* 2 (1978): 3-138.

Baldwin, Peter. *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Barak, On. *On Time: Technology and Temporality in Modern Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.

Barnes, David S. *The Great Stink of Paris and the Nineteenth-Century Struggle against Filth and Germs*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Barry, Andrew. "Technological Zones." *European Journal of Social Theory* 9, no. 2 (2006): 239-253.

Batmaz, Şakır, ed. *Abdülhamid Donanmasında Bir Bahriyeli: Donanma Zabiti Emin Yüce'nin Hatıraları*. İstanbul: Timaş, 2010.

Bayly, C.A. "Distorted Development: The Ottoman Empire and British India, circa 1780-1916." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 27, no. 2 (2007): 332-344.

Bektaş, Yakup. "The Sultan's Messenger: Cultural Constructions of Ottoman Telegraphy, 1847-1880." *Technology and Culture* 41, no. 4 (2000): 669-96.

Bilsel, M. Cemil. *Lozan*. 2 vols. İstanbul: Ahmet Ihsan Matbaası, 1933.

bin Aziz, Hamdi. *Kolera*. İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tibbiye-i Şahane Matbaası, 1311 (1893-1894).

Blumi, Isa. *Foundations of Modernity: Human Agency and the Imperial State*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

_____. *Rethinking the Late Ottoman Empire: A Comparative Social and Political History of Albania and Yemen, 1878-1918*. Istanbul: Isis Press, 2003.

_____. "Thwarting the Ottoman Empire: Smuggling through the Empire's New Frontiers in Yemen and Albania, 1878-1910." *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 9, nos. 1-2 (2003): 251-270.

Blunt, Wilfrid Scawen. *The Future of Islam*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1882.

Blyth, Robert. *Empire of the Raj: India, Eastern Africa and the Middle East, 1858-1947*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan, 2003.

Bovard, Alice May. "The Abolition of the Capitulations in the Ottoman Empire." M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1926.

Brendon, Piers. *Thomas Cook: 150 Years of Popular Tourism*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1991.

Brower, Daniel. "Russian Roads to Mecca: Religious Tolerance and Muslim Pilgrimage in the Russian Empire." *Slavic Review* 55, no. 3 (1996): 567-584.

Brown, L. Carl. *International Politics and the Middle East: Old Rules, Dangerous Game*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Bulmuş, Birsen. *Plague, Quarantines and Geopolitics in the Ottoman Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Burckhardt, Johann Ludwig (John Lewis). *Travels in Arabia*. London: Henry Colburn, 1829.

Burton, Richard. *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to al-Medinah and Meccah*. Vol. 2. London, 1855. Reprint of the 1893 ed., New York: Dover, 1964.

Buzpınar, Ş. Tufan. "Abdulhamid II and Amir Hussein's Secret Dealings with the British, 1877-1880." *Middle Eastern Studies* 31 no. 1 (1995): 99-123.

_____. "Abdülhamid II and Sayyid Fadl Pasha of Hadramawt: An Arab Dignitary's Ambitions, 1876-1900." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 13 (1993): 227-239.

_____. "Abdulhamid II, Islam and the Arabs: The Cases of Syria and the Hijaz, 1878-1882." Ph.D. diss., Manchester University, 1991.

_____. "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate in the Early Years of Abdülhamid II: 1877-1882." *Die Welt des Islams* 36, no. 1 (1996): 59-89.

Cevdet Paşa. *Tarih-i Cevdet*. Vol. 7. İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Osmaniye, 1309 (1893).

_____. *Tezakir*, 1-12. Edited by Cavid Baysun. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1986.

Chiha, H. Nedjib. "Osmanlı Devletinde Gayrimenkul Mülkiyeti Bakımından Yabancıların Hukuki Durumu." Translated by Halil Cin, *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 24 (1967): 246-274.

Cohn, Bernard. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Cole, Juan R. I. "Of Crowds and Empires: Afro-Asian Riots and European Expansion, 1857-1882." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31, no. 1 (1989): 106-133.

Coleman, William. "Koch's Comma Bacillus: The First Year," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 61, no. 3 (1987): 315-342.

Commins, David. *The Wahhabi Mission and Saudi Arabia*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2006.

Conrad, Joseph. *Lord Jim*. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Sons, 1900. Reprint ed. Mineola, NY: Dover, 1999.

Cunningham, J.M. *Cholera: What Can the State Do to Prevent It?*. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India, 1884.

Çadırcı, Musa. "Tanzimat Döneminde Çıkarılan Men'-i Mürur ve Pasaport Nizamnameleri. *Belgeler* 25, no. 19 (1993): 169-181.

Çetinsaya, Gökhan. "The Ottoman View of British Presence in Iraq and the Gulf: The Era of Abdulhamid II." *Middle Eastern Studies* 39, no. 2 (2003): 194-203.

Çoksun Çakır, *Tanzimat Dönmi Osmanlı Maliyesi*. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2001.

Dahlan, Ahmad bin Zayni. *Khulasat al-Kalam fi Bayan Umara' al-Balad al-Haram*. Cairo, 1305 (1887). Reprint edited and introduced by Muhammad Amin Tawfiq, *Tarikh Ashraf al-Hijaz, 1840-1882: Khulasat al-Kalam fi Bayan Umara' al-Balad al-Haram*. Beirut: Dar al-Saqi, 1993.

Dale, Stephen. *Islamic Society on the South Asian Frontier: The Mappilas of Malabar, 1498-1922*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1980.

Davis, Diana K., and Edmund Burke III, eds., *Environmental Imaginaries of the Middle East and North Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2011.

Davis, Mike. *Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño and the Making of the Third World*. New York: Verso, 2001.

DeGaury, Gerald. *Rulers of Mecca*. New York: Dorset Press, 1991.

de L. Rush, Alan, ed., *Records of the Hajj: A Documentary History of the Pilgrimage to Mecca*. 10 vols. London: Archive Editions, 1993.

Deringil, Selim. *Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

_____. "Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State: The Reign of Abdülhamid II (19876-1909)." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 23 (1991): 345-359.

_____. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*. London: I.B Tauris, 1999.

_____. "'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): 311-342.

Dirks, Nicholas. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

D'Souza, Rohan. "Water in British India: The Making of a 'Colonial Hydrology'." *History Compass* 4, no. 4 (2006): 621-628.

Duguet, Firmin. *Le pélerinage de la Mecque au point de vue religieuse, social et sanitaire.* Paris: Reider, 1932.

Dyson, Tim. "On the Demography of South Asian Famines: Part I," *Population Studies* 45, no. 1 (1991): 5–25.

El Bakri, Alia. "'Memories of the Beloved': Oral Histories from the 1916-1919 Siege of Medina." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46, no. 4 (2014): 703-717.

Elshakry, Marwa. *Reading Darwin in Arabic, 1860-1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Eraslan, Cezmi. *II. Abdülhamid ve İslam Birliği: Osmanlı Devleti'nin İslam Siyaseti, 1856-1908*. İstanbul: Ötüken, 1991.

Evans, Richard J. *Death in Hamburg: Society and Politics in the Cholera Years, 1830-1910*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Evered, Emine Ö. "Rereading Ottoman Accounts of Wahhabism as Alternative Narratives: Ahmed Cevdet Paşa's Historic Survey of the Movement." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 32, no. 3 (2012): 622-632.

Eyüp Sabri Paşa. *Esbab'l-İnaye fi Tercemeti Bidayeti'n-Nihaye*. İstanbul: Bahriye Matbaası, 1306 (1888).

_____. *Mirat ül-Haremeyn*. 3 vols. İstanbul: Bahriye Matbaası, 1301-1306 (1883-1888).

_____. *Tarih-i Vehhabiyan*. İstanbul: Kırk Ambar Matbaası, 1296 (1879). Reprint, edited by Süleyman Çelik. İstanbul: Bedir Yayınevi, 1992.

Fahmy, Khaled. *All the Pasha's Men: Mehmed Ali, his army, and the making of modern Egypt*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Fahmy, Ziad. "Jurisdictional Borderlands: Extraterritoriality and 'Legal Chameleons' in Precolonial Alexandria, 1840-1870." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 55, no. 2 (2013): 305-329.

Farah, Caesar. *The Sultan's Yemen: Nineteenth-Century Challenges to Ottoman Rule*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2002.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans, 1573-1683*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1994.

Fassbender, Bardo, and Anne Peters, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the History of International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Fidan, Mehmet Akif. *Eyüp Sabri Paşa ve Tarihçiliği*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2011.

Findley, Carter Vaughn. *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire: The Sublime Porte, 1789-1922*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

_____. *Turkey, Islam, and Modernity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Fortna, Benjamin. *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

_____. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*. New York: Picador, 2007.

Freitag, Ulrike. "Helpless Representatives of the Great Powers? Western Consuls in Jeddah, 1830s to 1914." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40, no. 3 (2012): 357-381.

_____. *Indian Ocean Migrants and State Formation in Hadhramaut: Reforming the Homeland*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

_____, and William Clarence-Smith, eds., *Hadrami Traders, Scholars, and Statesmen in the Indian Ocean*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

_____, Nelida Fuccaro, Claudi Ghrawi, and Nora Lafi, eds., *Urban Violence in the Middle East: Changing Cityscapes in the Transition from Empire to Nation*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, 2015.

Fromkin, David. *A Peace to End All Peace*. New York: H. Holt, 1989.

Gavin, R.J. *Aden under British Rule, 1839-1967*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1975.

Gelvin, James, and Nile Green, eds. *Global Muslims in the Age of Steam and Print* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Gencer, İhsan. *Türk Denizcilik Tarihi Araştırmaları*. İstanbul: Türkiye Denizciler Sendikası, 1986.

Genell, Aimee M. "Empire by Law: Ottoman Sovereignty and the British Occupation of Egypt, 1882-1923." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2013.

_____. "Practicing International Law in the Late Ottoman Empire." Unpublished paper presented at "The 'Subjects' of International Law: Autonomy, Extraterritoriality, and the Making of Ottoman Citizens," CUNY Graduate Center, New York, 7 January 2015.

Gervais-Courtellemont, Jules. *Mon voyage á la Mecque*. Paris: Hachette, 1896.

Ghubashi, 'Adil Muhammad Nur 'Abd Allah. *al-Munsha'at al-ma'iyya li-khidmat Makka al-Mukarrama wa-al-masha'ir al-muqaddasa fi al-'Aṣr al-'Uthmaani: Dirasa hadariyya* (Makka: al-Mamlakat al-'Arabiyya al-Sa'udiyya, Wizarat al-Ta'lim al-'Ali, Jami'at Umm al-Qurá, 2005.

Gilmartin, David. "Scientific Empire and Imperial Science: Colonialism and Irrigation Technology in the Indus Basin." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 53, no. 4 (1994): 1127-1149.

Gong, Gerrit. *The Standard of Civilization in International Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Great Britain, Naval Intelligence Division. *Western Arabia and the Red Sea*. Oxford: Naval Intelligence Sub-Centre, 1946.

Green, Nile. "The Hajj as its Own Undoing: Global Infrastructure and Integration on the Muslim Journey to Mecca." *Past & Present* 226, no. 1 (2015): 193-226.

Gutman, David. "Armenian Migration to North America, State Power, and Local Politics in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 1 (2014): 176-190.

Gül, Murat. *The Emergence of Modern Istanbul: Transformation and Modernisation of a City*. London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009.

Gülsoy, Ufuk. *Hicaz Demiryolu*. İstanbul: Eren, 1994.

Gündoğdu, Raşit. *Jurnallerin Tahkik Raporlar, 1891-1893*. İstanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2010.

Günergun, Feza. "XIX. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Osmanlı Kimyager-Eczacı Bonkowski Paşa, 1841-1905." In *I. Türk Tıp Tarihi Kongresi*, 229-248. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1992.

al-Hadrawi, Ahmad bin Muhammad. *al-Jawahir al-Mu'adda fi Fada'il Jidda*. Cairo: Maktaba al-Thaqafa al-Diniyya, 2002.

Hallaq, Wael B. *The Impossible State: Islam, Politics, and Modernity's Moral Predicament*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.

_____. *Sharī'a: Theory, Practice, Transformations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Hamlin, Christopher. *Cholera: The Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

_____. "Cholera Forcing: The Myth of the Good Epidemic and the Coming of Good Water." *American Journal of Public Health* 99, no. 11 (2009): 1946-1954.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Harrison, Mark. *Contagion: How Commerce Has Spread Disease*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

_____. "Quarantine, pilgrimage, and colonial trade: India 1866-1900," *The Indian Economic and Social Review* 29, no. 2 (1992): 117-144.

Headrick, Daniel. *The Tentacles of Progress: Technology Transfer in the Age of Imperialism, 1850-1940*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

_____. *The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Hecht, Gabrielle. *The Radiance of France: Nuclear Power and National Identity after World War II*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998.

Hicaz Vilayeti Salnamesi, 1301. Hicaz: Vilayet Matbaası, 1301/1884.

Ho, Engseng. "Empire through Diasporic Eyes: A View from the Other Boat," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 2 (2004): 210-246.

_____. *The Graves of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility across the Indian Ocean*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Hobsbawn, Eric, and Terence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hourani, Albert, Phillip Khoury, and Mary Wilson, eds. *The Modern Middle East: A Reader*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1993.

Howard-Jones, Howard. *The Scientific Background of the International Sanitary Conferences, 1851-1938*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1975.

Huber, Valeska. *Channelling Mobilities: Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1969-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

_____. "The Unification of the Globe by Disease? The International Sanitary Conferences on Cholera, 1851–1894." *The Historical Journal* 49, no. 2 (2006): 453–76.

Hunter, Robert F. "The Thomas Cook Archive for the Study of Tourism in North Africa and the Middle East." *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin* 36, no. 2 (2003): 157-164.

Hunter, W.W. *A Brief History of the Indian Peoples*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.

_____. *The Indian Musalmans*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1871.

_____. *Orissa*. 2 vols. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1872.

Hurewitz, J.C., ed. *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*. Vol. 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Hurgronje, Snouck. *Mekka in the Latter Part of the Nineteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Hülagü, M. Metin. "Topal Osman Nuri Paşa Hayatı ve Faaliyetleri, 1840-1898." *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi* no. 5 (1994): 145-153.

Ibrahim Rif'at (Pasha). *Mir'at al-Haramayn*. 2 vols. Cairo: Dar al-Kutub al-Masriyya, 1925.

Issacs, Jeremy D. "D.D. Cunningham and the Aetiology of Cholera in British India, 1869-1897," *Medical History* 42, no. 3 (1998): 279-305.

Issawi, Charles. *The Fertile Crescent, 1800-1914*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

İrtem, Süleyman Kani. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Mısır Yemen Hicaz Meselesi.* Edited by Selim Kocahanoğlu. İstanbul: Temel, 1999.

İzzeddin, Kasım. *Hicaz'da Teşkilat ve Islahat-ı Sıhhiye ve 1330 Senesi Hacc-ı Şerifi: Hicaz Sıhhiye İdaresi Senevi Rapor.* İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Amire, 1330 (1911/1912).

_____. *Mekke-i Mükerreme'de Kolera ve Hıfzıshha*. İstanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 1327 (1909/1910).

_____. *Rehber-i Zabıta-i Sıhhiye*. İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Amire, 1331 (1912/1913).

Jacob, Wilson Chacko. "Of Angels and Men: Sayyid Fadl bin Alawi and Two Moments of Sovereignty." *Arab Studies Journal* 20, no. 1 (2012): 40-73.

Jalal, Ayesha. *Partisans of Allah: Jihad in South Asia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Jones, Toby Craig. *Desert Kingdom: How Oil and Water Forged Modern Saudi Arabia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Kandemir, Feridun. *Fahreddin Paşa'nın Medine Müdafaası: Peygamberimizin Gölgesinde Son Türkler*. İstanbul: Yağmur Yayınevi, 2012.

Karaca, Ali. *Anadolu Islahatı ve Ahmet Şakir Paşa (1838-1899)*. İstanbul: Eren, 1993.

Karpat, Kemal. *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State*. New York: Oxford, 2001.

Kasaba, Reşat, ed., *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

_____. *A Moveable Empire: Ottoman Nomads, Migrants, and Refugees*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009.

Kayalı, Hasan. *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Kayaoğlu, Turan. *Legal Imperialism: Sovereignty and Extraterrioriality in Japan, the Ottoman Empire, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Keane, John F. *Six Months in Mecca: An Account of the Muhammedan Pilgrimage to Mecca*. London: Tinsley Brothers, 1881.

Kern, Karen M. *Imperial Citizens, Marriage and Citizenship in the Ottoman Frontier Provinces of Iraq*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2011.

Khoury, Dina Rizk, and Dane Keith Kennedy. "Comparing Empires: The Ottoman Domains and the British Raj in the Long Nineteenth Century." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 27, no. 2 (2007): 233-244.

Killingray, David, Margarette Lincoln, and Nigel Rigby, eds. *Maritime Empires: British Imperial Maritime Trade in the Nineteenth Century*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2004.

Kimche, David. "The Opening of the Red Sea to European Ships in the Late Eighteenth Century." *Middle Eastern Studies* 8, no. 1 (1972): 63-71.

Klein, Ira. "Death in India, 1871-1921." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 32, no. 4 (1973): 639-659.

Koskenniemi, Martti. *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law, 1870-1960.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Kostopoulou, Elektra. "Armed Negotiations: The Institutionalization of the Late Ottoman Locality." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 3 (2013): 295-309.

Kuehn, Thomas. *Empire, Islam, and Politics of Difference: Ottoman Rule in Yemen, 1849-1919*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Kuhnke, LaVerne. *Lives at Risk: Public Health in Nineteenth-Century Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Kurşun, Zekeriya. "Hicaz: Osmanlı Dönemi." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 17, 437-439. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vafkı, 1998.

_____. *Necid ve Ahsa'da Osmanlı Hakimiyet: Vehhabi Hareketi ve Suud Devleti'nin Ortaya Çıkısı*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1998.

Küneralp, Sinan. *Son Dönem Osmanlı Erkan ve Ricali, 1839-1922: Prosopografik Rehber*. İstanbul: İsis Press, 1999.

Landau, Jacob. *The Hejaz Railway and the Muslim Pilgrimage: A Case of Ottoman Political Propaganda*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1971.

Latour, Bruno. *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Lee, Edwin. *The British as Rulers: Governing Multiracial Singapore, 1867-1914*. Singapore: National University of Singapore, 1991.

Lewis, Mary Dewhurst. *Divided Rule: Sovereignty and Empire in French Tunisia, 1880s-1930s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.

Lieven, Dominic. *Empire: The Russian Empire and Its Rivals from the Sixteenth Century to the Present*. London: Pimlico, 2003.

Long, David E. *The Hajj Today: A Survey of the Contemporary Makkah Pilgrimage*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1979.

Low, Michael Christopher. "Empire and the Hajj: Pilgrims, Plagues, and Pan-Islam under British Surveillance, 1865-1908." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40, no. 2 (2008): 269-290.

_____. "The Indian Ocean and Other Middle Easts." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 3 (2014): 549-555.

Lubis, Abdur-Razzaq. "Traders, Teachers, Pressmen and Pilgrim Brokers: Penang Arabs in the Regional Network," Unpublished paper presented at "Rihlah: Arabs in Southeast Asia Conference," Singapore, April 2010.

Luqman, Hamza 'Ali. *Tarikh al-Juzur al-Yamaniyya*. Beirut: Matba'a Yusuf wa Filib al-Jumayyil, 1972.

Mahmud Nedim Bey. *Arabistan'da Bir Ömür: Son Yemen Valisinin Hatıraları veya Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Arabistan'da Nasıl Yıkıldı?*. Edited by Ali Birinci. İstanbul: İsis Yayıncılık, 2001.

Makdisi, Ussama. *The Culture of Sectarianism: Community, History, and Violence in Nineteenth-Century Lebanon*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

_____. "Ottoman Orientalism." *The American Historical Review* 107, no. 3 (2002): 768-796.

Mann, Michael M. "Ecological Change in North India: Deforestation and Agrarian Distress in the Ganga-Jamna Doab, 1800-1850," *Environment and History* 1, no. 2 (1995): 201-220.

McDonnell, Mary Byrne. "The Conduct of Hajj from Malaysia and Its Socio-Economic Impact on Malay Society: A Descriptive and Analytical Study, 1860-1981." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1986.

McKeown, Adam. "Global Migration, 1846-1940." *Journal of World History* 15, no. 2 (2004): 155-189.

_____. *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

McMeekin, Sean. *The Berlin-Baghdad Express: The Ottoman Empire and Germany's Bid for World Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

McNeill, William H. *Plagues and Peoples.* New York: Anchor Books, 1976.

el-Mekki, Muhammad el-Emin. *Hulefa-yı İzam-ı Osmaniye Hazaratının Haremeyn-i Şerifeyn'deki Asar-ı Mebrure ve Meşkure-i Hümayünlarından Bahis Tarihi Bir Eserdir*. Dersaadet/İstanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1318. Reprint in Latin transcription. *Osmanlı Padişahlarının Haremeyn Hizmetleri.* İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008.

Meyer, James. "Speaking Sharia to the State: Muslim Protesters, Tsarist Officials, and the Islamic Discourses of Late Imperial Russia," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 14, no. 3 (2013): 485-505.

_____. *Turks Across Empires. Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Mikhail, Alan. *Nature and Empire in Ottoman Egypt: An Environmental History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

_____, and Christine Philliou. "The Ottoman Empire and the Imperial Turn." *Comparative Studies of Society and History* 54, no. 4 (2012): 721-745.

Miller, Michael. "Pilgrims' Progress: The Business of the Hajj," *Past and Present* 191, no. 1 (2006), 189-228.

Minawi, Mostafa. "Lines in the Sand: The Ottoman Empire's Policies of Expansion and Consolidation on Its African and Arabian Frontiers, 1882-1902." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2011.

Mishra, Saurabh. "Beyond the Bounds of Time?: The Haj Pilgrimage from the Indian Subcontinent, 1865-1920." In Bisamoy Pati and Mark Harrison, eds. *The Social History of Health and Medicine in Colonial India*, 31-44. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil*. London: Verso, 2011.

_____. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

_____. "The Life of Infrastructure," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 3 (2014): 437-439.

_____. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

al-Muwayhlihi, Ibrahim. *Ma Hunalik*. English translation and introduction by Roger Allen. *Spies, Scandals, and Sultan's: Istanbul in the Twilight of the Ottoman Empire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008.

Numan, Nurtaç. "The Emirs of Mecca and the Ottoman Government of Hijaz, 1840-1908." M.A. thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2005.

Ochsenwald, William. *The Hijaz Railroad*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1980.

_____. "The Jidda Massacre of 1858," *Middle Eastern Studies* 13, no. 3 (1977): 314-326.

_____. *Religion, Society, and the State in Arabia: The Hijaz under Ottoman Control, 1840-1908*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984.

Ogawa, Mariko. "Uneasy Bedfellows: Science and Politics in the Refutation of Koch's Bacterial Theory of Cholera," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 74, no. 4 (2000): 671-707.

Onley, James. *The Arabian Frontier of the British Raj: Merchants, Rulers, and the British in the Nineteenth-Century Gulf*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Orhonlu, Cengiz. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğ'nun Güney Siyaseti: Habeş Eyaleti*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1974.

Osmanoğlu, Ahmed Emin. "Hicaz Eyaletinin Teşekkülü, 1861-1864." M.A. thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2004.

Othman, Mohammad Redzuan. "The Arabs Migration and Its Importance in the Historical Development of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Malaya," Unpublished paper presented at the World History Association Conference, Los Angeles, June 2006.

Özcan, Azmi. *Pan-Islamism: Indian Muslims, the Ottomans and Britain, 1877-1924*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Öztuna, Yılmaz. *II. Abdülhamid: Zamanı ve Şahsiyeti*. İstanbul: Kubbealtı, 2008.

Özyüksel, Murat. *The Hejaz Railway and the Ottoman Empire: Modernity, Industrialisation and Ottoman Decline*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2014.

Paris, Timothy J. *Britain, the Hashemites and Arab Rule, 1920-1925: The Sherifian Solution*. London: Frank Cass, 2003.

Pearson, Michael. *Pilgrimage to Mecca: The Indian Experience, 1500-1800*. Princeton, NJ: Markus Weiner, 1996.

Peters, F.E. *The Hajj: The Muslim Pilgrimage to Mecca and the Holy Places* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

_____. *Mecca: A Literary History of the Holy Land*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

von Pettenkofer, Max. *Cholera: How to Prevent and Resist It*. Translated by Thomas W. Hime. London: Ballière, Tindall, and Cox, 1875.

Powell, Eve Troutt. *A Different Shade of Colonialism: Egypt, Great Britain, and the Mastery of the Sudan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Pudney, John. *The Thomas Cook Story*. London: Michael Joseph, 1953.

Qureshi, M. Naeem. *Pan-Islam in British Indian Politics: A Study of the Khilafat Movement, 1918-1924*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Rabinow, Paul. *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Reid, Anthony. "Ninteenth Century Pan-Islam in Indonesia and Malaysia." *Journal of Asian Studies* 26, no. 2 (1967): 267-283.

Reid, Donald Malcolm Reid. *Whose Pharoahs?: Archaeology, Museums, and Egyptian National Identity from Napoleon to World War I.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Reynolds, Michael A. *Shattering Empires: The Clash and Collapse of the Ottoman and Russian Empires, 1908-1918*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Ridwan, Nabil. *al-Dawlat al-'Uthmaniyya wa Gharbi al-Jazirat al-'Arabiyya ba'da Iftitah Qanat al-Suways* (1286-1326 H./1869-1908 M). Jidda: Tihama, 1983.

Robinson, Francis. *Islam and Muslim History in South Asia* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Rodogno, Davide. *Against Massacre: Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Roff, William, ed. *Islam and the Political Economy of Meaning*. London: Croom and Helm, 1987.

_____. "Sanitation and Security: The Imperial Powers and the Nineteenth Century Hajj." *Arabian Studies* VI (1982): 143-160.

_____. *Studies on Islam and Society in Southeast Asia* (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2009.

Rogan, Eugene. "Aşiret Mektebi: Abdulhamid II's School for Tribes (1892-1907)." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 28, no. 1 (1996): 83-107.

_____. *Frontiers of the State in the Late Ottoman Empire: Transjordan, 1850-1921*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Saban, Suhail. *Murasalat al-Bab al-'Ali ilá Wilayat al-Hijaz (Makkah al-Mukarrama-Madinah al-munawwara), 1283-1291 H.* (The Correspondences of the Ottoman Sublime Porte to al-Hijaz Province, Makkah and Madinah, 1283-1291 H.). London: al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation, Encyclopedia of Makkah and Medina Branch, 2004.

Salim, Sayyid Mustafa *al-Bahr al-Ahmar wa-l-Juzur al-Yamaniyya: Tarikh wa Qadiyya* San'a': Dar al-Mithaq li-l-Nashr wa-l-Tawzi', 2006.

Salter, Mark B. "The Global Visa Regime and the Political Technologies of the International Self: Border, Bodies, Biopolitics." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 31, no. 2 (2006): 167-189.

Sarınay, Yusuf, et al., eds. *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 2010.

_____. *Osmanlı Arşiv Belgelerinde Yemen*. İstanbul: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2008.

Sarıyıldız, Gülden. II. Abdülhamid'in Fakir Hacılar İçin Mekke'de İnşa Ettirdiği Misafirhane." *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 14 (1994): 121-145.

_____. *Hicaz Karantina Teşkilatı, 1865-1914*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1996.

_____. "Karantina Meclisi'nin Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetleri." *Belleten* 222 (1994): 329-376.

_____. "XIX Yüzyılında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kolera Salgını." In *Tarih Boyunca Anadolu'da Doğal Afetler ve Deprem Semineri*, 309-318. İstanbul: Globus Dünya Basımevi, 2000.

_____, and Ayşe Kavak, eds. *Halife II. Abdülhamid'in Hac Siyaseti: Dr. M. Şakir Bey'in Hicaz Hatıraları.* İstanbul: Timaş, 2009.

Satia, Priya. "Developing Iraq: Britain, India and the Redemption of Empire and Technology in the First World War." *Past and Present* 197, no. 1 (2007): 211-255.

Schmitt, Carl. *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985.

Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Sedes, Halil. *1876-1878 Osmanlı-Rus ve Romen Savaşı*. Vol. 9. İstanbul: Askeri Matbaa, 1950.

Sezer, Hamiyet. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Seyahat İzinleri (18-19. Yüzyıl)." *Tarih Araştırma Dergisi* 21, no. 33 (2003): 105-124.

Sha'afi, Muhammad Sa'id. *The Foreign Trade of Juddah during the Ottoman Period, 1840-1916*. Riyadh, 1985.

Shahvar, Soli. "Tribes and Telegraphs in Lower Iraq: The Muntafiq and the Baghdad-Basrah Telegraph Line of 1863-65." *Middle Eastern Studies* 39, no. 1 (2003): 89-116.

Singha, Radhika. "Passport, ticket, and India-rubber stamp: 'The problem of the pauper pilgrim' in colonial India c. 1882-1925." In Ashwini Tambe and Harald Fischer-Tiné, eds. *The Limits of British Colonial Control in South Asia: Spaces of Disorder in the Indian Ocean region*, 49-83. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

Slight, John. "The Hajj and the Raj: From Thomas Cook to Bombay's Protector of Pilgrims." In Venetia Porter and Liana Saif, eds. *The Hajj: Collected Essays*. London: The British Museum, 2014.

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. "Osman Nuri Paşa'nın 17 Temmuz 1885 Tarihli Hicaz Raporu." *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* (1996): 1-38.

Sonyel, Salahi R. "The Protégé System in the Ottoman Empire." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 2, no. 1 (1991): 56-66.

Sousa, Nasim. *The Capitulatory Régime of Turkey: Its History, Origin, and Nature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933.

Soydemir, Selman, Kemal Erkan, and Osman Doğan, eds. *Hicaz Vilayet Salnamesi, H. 1303/M. 1886*. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008.

Söylemezoğlu, Süleyman Şefik. *Hicaz Seyahatnamesi*. Edited by Ahmet Çaycı and Bayram Ürekli. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012.

Spagnolo, John T. "Portents of Empire in Britain's Ottoman Extraterritorial Jurisdiction." *Middle Eastern Studies* 27, no. 2 (1991): 256-282.

Stephens, Julia. "The Phantom Wahhabi: Liberalism and the Muslim fanatic in mid-Victorian India." *Modern Asian Studies* 47, no. 1 (2013): 22-52.

Sunyal, Usha. *Devotional Islam and Politics in British India: Ahmad Riza Khan and his Movement, 1870-1920*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Tagliacozzo, Eric. *The Longest Journey: Southeast Asians and the Pilgrimage to Mecca*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Tahsin Paşa. *Sultan Abdülhamid: Tahsin Paşa'nın Yıldız Hatıraları*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1999.

Takashi, Oishi. "Friction and Rivalry over Pious Mobility: British Colonial Management of the Hajj and Reaction to It by Indian Muslims, 1870-1920." In Kuroki Hidemitsu, ed. *The Influence of Human Mobility in Muslim Societies*, 151-176. London: Kegan Paul, 2003.

Toledano, Ehud. *The Ottoman Slave Trade and Its Suppression: 1840-1890.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Torpey, John. "Coming and Going: On the State Monopolization of the Legitimate Means of Movement." *Sociological Theory* 16, no. 3 (1998): 239-259.

Turna, Nalan. *19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Osmanlı Topraklarında Seyahat, Göç ve Asayış Belgeleri: Mürur Tezkereleri*. İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları, 2013.

Uludağ, Osman Şevki. "Son Kapitülasyonlardan Biri Karantina." *Belleten* 2, no. 7/8 (1938): 445-467.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Mekke-i Mükerreme Emirleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1972.

_____. *Midhat Paşa ve Taif Mahkumları*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1992.

Ünver, Süheyl. "Osmanlı Tababeti ve Tanzimat Hakkında Yeni Notlar." In *Tanzimat*. Vol. 2, 933-966. İstanbul: MEB Yayınları, 1999.

Vassaf, El-Hac Hüseyin. *Hicaz Hatırası*. Edited by Mehmet Akkuş. İstanbul: Kubbealtı, 2011.

Vrendenbredgt, Jacob. "The Haddj: Some of Its Features and Functions in Indonesia." *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- enVolkenkunde* 118, no. 1 (1962): 91-154.

Wasti, Syed Tanvir. "Muhammad Inshaullah and the Hejaz Railway." *Middle Eastern Studies* 34, no. 2 (1998): 60-72.

Watts, Sheldon. *Epidemics and History: Disease, Power and Imperialism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

_____. "From Rapid Change to Stasis: Official Responses to Cholera in British Ruled India and Egypt, 1860 to c. 1921," *Journal of World History* 12, no. 2 (2001): 321-374.

Willis, John M. "Making Yemen Indian: Rewriting the Boundaries of Imperial Arabia." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 41 (2009): 23-38.

Worboys, Michael. *Spreading Germs: Disease Theories and Medical Practice in Britain, 1865-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Yasamee, F.A.K. *Ottoman Diplomacy: Abdülhamid II and the Great Powers, 1878-1888*. Istanbul: Isis Press, 1996.

Yılmaz, Ömer Faruk. *Sultan İkinci Abdülhamid Han'ın Hicaz Demiryolu Projesi*. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2011.

_____. *Hicaz'da Deniz Suyu Arıtma Tesisleri Projesi*. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2012.

_____, ed. *Belgelerle Osmanlı Devrinde Hicaz*. 2 vols. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008.

Yoong, Ng Siew. "The Chinese Protectorate in Singapore, 1877-1900." *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 2, no. 1 (1961): 76-99.

Yurdakul, İlhami. *Aziz Şehre Leziz Su: Dersaadet (İstanbul) Su Şirketi (1873-1933)*. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2010.