

84. Foreign Office, 78/401, Erzeroum, October 15th 1840.
 85. Ibid.
 86. Ateş, *The Ottoman-Iranian Borderlands: Making a Boundary, 1843-1914*, pp.86-139.
 87. Aykun, 'Erzurum Konferans (1843-1847) ve Osmanlı-Iran Hudut Antlaşması'.
 88. Ateş, *The Ottoman-Iranian Borderlands: Making a Boundary, 1843-1914*, pp.86-138.
 89. BOA, I.MVL, 121/3044, 9 R 64, (15 March 1848) and Hurşid, *Seyâhatnâme-i Hudud*, p.265.
 90. Beck, 'Tribes and the State in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Iran'. For the tribal chiefs and notables of the Ottoman-Persian border, see Fasih Dinç, 'Osmanlı-Iran Sınır Boyunda Sadakat Sağlama Biçimi Olarak Rehine Siyaseti' [Hostage Policy as a Mean of Providing Loyalty in the Ottoman-Iranian Borderland], in İbrahim Özcoşar and Şahab Vali (eds), *Osmanlı Devleti ve Kürtler* [The Ottoman State and the Kurds], (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2017), pp.97-134.
 91. Averyanov, *Osmanlı İnan Rus Savaşlarında Kürtler - 19. Yüzyıl*, p.51.
 92. Foreign Office 424/7B, Representation of Hussein Agha, Chief of the Kurdish Tribe of Zeelaun, to the Governor General of Erzeroum, May 1843, p.123.
 93. BOA, I.MVL 121/3044, 7 Ra 64 (12 February 1848), 'bu tarafda kaffe aşâir gerek Zilan ve Cunuki ve Cemadanlı bi'l-cümlemiz ale't ittifak yek dil ve yek cihet olarak merhûm mağfurin mahdumu Ahmed Aga kullarında inkiyâd-ı külliyyemiz derkâr olunarak...' Among the signers of the petition were Ali Agha of Cemalîni, Nebi Agha of Cunuki, and his son Serhenk, Pertev Bey of Kaskanlı.
 94. Hurşid, *Seyâhatnâme-i Hudud*, p.265.
 95. BOA, I.MVL 131/3502, 21 ZA 64 (19 October 1848).
 96. Hurşid, *Seyâhatnâme-i Hudud*, p.265.
 97. BOA, A.MKT 168/63, 19 Z 64 (16 November 1848), 'aşâirimizin müteberanından Resul Agazade Cafer Ağa kulları her vechle sadk kullarından aşâir ve aşîret halkı kendüsünden razı olduğundan mumailiyh Cafer Ağa kullarının müdür nasb olunmasına müsâde buyurulması...'
 98. For provincial administration during the Tanzimat Period, see Musa Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Sürecinde Türkiye: Ülke Yönetimi* [Turkey during the era of Tanzimat: Government of the Country] (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2007).
 99. BOA, A.MKT 168/63, 21 Z 64 (18 November 1848).
 100. BOA, I.MVL 148/4171, 19 Ca 65 (12 February 1849).
 101. BOA, MVL 31/45, 19 Safer 65 (14 January 1849).
 102. BOA, HR.SYS 80/22, 29L 66 (7 September 1850).
 103. Ibid.
 104. Ibid.
 105. Ibid.
 106. Ibid.
 107. BOA, HR.SYS 80/22, 29L 66, (7 September 1850).
 108. BOA, İ.HR 61/2959, 6 Ra 1266, (20 January 1850), 'İranludan berüye müracaat eden adamların mu'amelât-i lütfiye ile bir kat daha celb-i kulûbleri...'
 109. BOA, A.MKT.UM 59/97, 18 B 1267, (19 May 1851).
 110. BOA, MVL 331/105, 24 Ş 1268 (13 June 1852).
 111. Averyanov, *Osmanlı İnan Rus Savaşlarında Kürtler - 19. Yüzyıl*, pp.86-88. See also Candan Badem, *The Ottoman Crimean War (1853-1856)* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), pp.365-66 and Celilî Celil, *XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kürtler* [Kurds in the Nineteenth Century Ottoman Empire] (Ankara: Öz-GE Yayınları, 1992), p.159.
 112. Averyanov, *Osmanlı İnan Rus Savaşlarında Kürtler - 19. Yüzyıl*, p.88.
 113. Ibid. p.89.
 114. Ibid. p.283.
 115. Ibid. pp.283-87.
 116. Ibid. p.106.
 117. Ibid. p.107.
 118. It is not however clear whether this Cafer Agha was the rival of Kasım Agha, who was mentioned in the Ottoman archives as Resul Aghazade Cafer Agha.
 119. Badem, *The Ottoman Crimean War (1853-1856)*. See also BOA, A.MKT.UM 205/94, 8 Z 71 (10 August 1855).
 120. BOA, I.DH 324/21108, 1271 (1855).
 121. Ibid.

MADDE YAYIMLANDIKTAN
SONRA GELEN DOKÜMAN



05 Haziran 2024

Gagauzlar

070018

Was there room for Christian Turks in early Republican Turkey? Debates on the migration and Turkishness of the Gagauz

Gözde Emen-Gökatalay^a and Semih Gökatalay^b

^aInternational Relations, Atılım University, Ankara, Turkey; ^bDepartment of History, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, California, USA

The dissolution of the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional Ottoman Empire was followed by the formation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. A novel understanding of national identity came into existence in the interwar period as a result of the nationalist and secular policies of Kemalists, the ruling elite of the period. Scholars have suggested that, despite secularism and radical reforms, there was still continuity between the empire and the nation-state regarding the role of Islam in the construction of nationhood. They have taken a special interest in and presented the Gagauz as the most vivid example of this continuity. Unlike most other Turkic groups in the Balkans and the Middle East, the Gagauz were Christian.¹ The conventional historical wisdom is that the Gagauz were not accepted to Turkey because they were not Muslim; thus, there was no room for non-Muslim Turks in early republican Turkey. Scholars have used the case of the Gagauz to counter the presumption that the role of Islam in the Turkish national identity declined after the formation of the republic and to point to the enduring Ottoman legacy. The present article challenges such received arguments. Drawing upon a diverse range of primary sources, it reassesses the Turkishness of the Gagauz – the publicly perceived quality of being Turkish – and proposes a new view on the room for non-Muslim Turks in Turkey.

The foundational study that explores the relations between the Gagauz and the formation of national identity in post-Ottoman Turkey belonged to Kemal Karpat, who was an émigré from Romania. In his thorough study of the political transformation of Turkey after the Second World War, Karpat argued that the Gagauz 'were not encouraged to migrate *en masse* to Turkey' though he quoted no contemporary sources.² Future scholarship corroborated Karpat's claims.³ The assertion that there was no space for Christian Turks stayed but the wording radically changed over time. 'Not encouraged to migrate *en masse*' was replaced by 'not accepted' and 'excluded'.⁴ Soner Cagaptay who offered one of the most detailed existing narratives of the relations between nationalism and Islam in republican Turkey, exemplified this change.⁵ In his analysis of the Gagauz, Cagaptay refers to the Treaty of 1936 that regulated the migration of Muslim Turks from Dobruja, Romania to Turkey. According to Cagaptay, 'the specific mention of "Muslim Turks" in this text excluded the Greek-Orthodox Gagavuz Turks from the scope of this emigration. Once again, the government recognized Islam as a prerequisite for immigration to Turkey'.⁶ Although Cagaptay devoted only two paragraphs to the Gagauz and cited no sources to prove how they were excluded, he used the treaty and the supposed exclusion of the Gagauz to support the dominant narrative that there was no room for Christian Turks in early Republican Turkey throughout the entirety of his book. Cagaptay's arguments have been generally agreed upon in later historiography.⁷ For example, Umut Uzer asserted that 'Christian Turks were still considered to be a misnomer' in post-Ottoman Turkey.⁸