

## PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: THE MACEDONIA CONFLICT VERSUS YOUNG TURK REVOLUTION/

AUTHORS: A Baran DURAL

PAGES: 1317-1326

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/510816>



## THE MACEDONIA CONFLICT VERSUS YOUNG TURK REVOLUTION<sup>1</sup>

JÖN TÜRK DEVRİMİNDE MAKEDONYA SORUNU

A.Baran DURAL<sup>2</sup> 

### Abstract

Young Turk Revolution in 1908 was seen very promising both for Muslim and Christian population of the Ottoman State in order to overcome the ethnic conflict within the state at first sight. The Young Turk Revolution trying to find an interconnection within the ethnical groups by gathering the minorities in an unity under the “*Ottoman citizenship*” with the ideology called “*Ottomanism*.” The Jewish population and the Albanian leadership were only two groups supporting the “*Ottoman identity*” being proposed by Young Turks where as Serbian, Greek, Bulgarian, Macedonian groups either trying to unify themselves with their fatherlands or getting ready to win their freedom over Turkish rulers. Getting rid of the “*Turkish Yoke*” was the main parole for the Balkan national identities so it was clearly soted out the Balkan leaderships neither settle down nor build a strong relationship with the Progress and Union Party, came into power after the Young Turk Revolution. In this article the “*rockyroad*” of the Balkan nations will be examined under the scope of the Young Turks Revolution’s attitude towards the Macedonia Conflict.

**Keywords:** Young Turk Revolution, The Progress and Union Party, Balkan leaderships, Macedonia conflict, Ottoman State.

### Öz

1908 yılında İttihat Terakki Hareketi tarafından gerçekleştirilen Jön Türk Devrimi, ilk bakışta, Osmanlı devletini saran etnik sorunların çözümü ve unsurlar arasında kardeşlik- barışın sağlanması yolunda oldukça iddialı- umut verici bir başlangıç yapmıştı. Ülkedeki farklı etnik kimliklerin, “*Osmanlı yurttaşlığı*” adı altında, tek bir ortak kimlikte birleştirilmesi düşüncesi, aynı zamanda İttihat Terakki önderliğinin görünüşte sürdürdüğü ve I. Jön Türk hareketinden miras aldığı, “*Osmanlılık*” politikalarının da bir gereği idi. Ne var ki devrimin ardından, “*Osmanlı*” kimliğini kabul eden yahudi ve Arnavut unsurlar dışında kalan, diğer etnik grupların gerçek amaçlarının, Osmanlı’dan ayrılarak kendi ulusal birliklerini kurmak inşa etmek olduğu görüldü. Osmanlı hakimiyetini simgeleyen, “*Osmanlı barışı*”nı aşarak, uluslar çağının gereklerini yerine getirme mücadelesi veren etnik önderliklerin, Jön Türk Devrimi’yle birlikte bir taraftan Meşrutiyet’in getirdiği politik haklardan azami ölçüde yararlanırken diğer yandan İttihat Terakki önderliğine karşı güttükleri soğuk tavır, Osmanlı kimliği altında devletin sürdürülmesi yolunun, genelde Türk devlet aklı tarafından güdülen muhafazakar bir siyaset olduğu tanıtıldı. Bu makalede, Balkan milliyetçiliklerinin bağımsızlıklarını kazanmadan önce Osmanlı devletiyle sürdürdükleri gerilimli ilişkiler, İttihat Terakki önderliği ve Makedonya sorunu üzerinden tartışmaya açılacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Jön Türk Devrimi, İttihat ve Terakki Partisi, Balkan milliyetçiliği, Makedonya sorunu, Osmanlı Devleti.

<sup>1</sup> This article is the re-newed version of the paper- presentation made but not published at, “Reinvestigation Culture in Arts Humanities&Social Sciences” Conference at Belgrad 2016.

<sup>2</sup> Prof.Dr., Trakya Üniversitesi, [b\\_dural@yahoo.com](mailto:b_dural@yahoo.com)

## Introduction: A short Ottoman History in the Balkans

Balkan Peninsula consists of mountainous terrain which is in South-east of Europe. It is named from the Balkan Mountains in this region. Balkan's strategic importance is so big that it is indisputable. Basic reasons of this are that region marks Europe's border with Middle East, Balkan lands separates into different poles in hierarchy and power fight in the world, religion factor with ethnic accumulation.

From another point of view, it is seen that peace has not been gained in this region anytime neither in ethic ways nor in religious ways as a result of having different religious/ethnic origin groups together. So Balkan hinterland has witnessed serious conflicts, debates, wars and migration waves. In this historic process, first Turkish migration to Balkans started to be done after conquering of Thrace and Macedonia. Especially it is outstanding that nearly ten thousand Turkish from Aydın and Karesi surroundings migrated to Balkan lands in this region. (Uzunçarşılı, 1988:157)

Until II. Vienna defeat, it can be said that Ottoman Empire got strong in Balkan lands and after this term it started to lose its existing power. The Empire which could not carry out needs of globalisation process that enforced itself after new inventions/discoveries, empire which did not have possibility of founding and coping with capitalist market economic conditions, came to forefront as "shared" not as "sharer" in world's new system. With Karlowitz Treaty which was signed in 1699, Turk's run-off process from Europe were realized step by step, ordinary result of this in Balkan geography was nations' unfurling riot against Ottoman in 19. century. Riots were being supported by Russians from time to time and by Austria-Hungary from time to time by European's other states. "Being supported" possibility for the societies who had different religious-ethnic groups was unmissable chance. Societies who wrote their historic liberation process by scoring with Ottoman Empire were starters of Balkan secret societies successively by accommodating centuries' needs (Öztuna, 2006:21)

II. Vienna Defeat was a moment which revealed Greece's freedom in 24 April 1830 and Rumelia's history was going to be written again after nearly 150 years passed over swirl that was experienced with Karlowitz. This development made an irrecoverable blow to Turkish existence in Balkans. So "Muslim Rome" or "III. Rome" policy which formed "empire" backbone of Ottoman Empire went bankrupt actually, Ottoman's historical tie with West broke.

With Treaty of Kucuk Kaynarca, Russian's starting to have more tight relations with Balkan Slavs added a link to chain which treated Turkish existence in the region. Russians dealing with the region marked a religion-politics based relation not a trade focused process. In this period where Russian Tzarism which had more successful modernization process compared to Ottoman Empire in parallel to Russian Tzarism's reformation in state structure where Russian tied Slav nationalism that was uprising in Balkans and national passions with its own politics by helping Slav rooted nations, Slav nationalism had chance to build ethnic bloody Balkan secret society struggle. (Nayır, 1993:5)

Ortaylı expresses new alliance in the Balkans with these words. "Bulgarians and Serbians are important for Russians. Slovenian and Croatian are always close to Austria-Germany; Albanian and Bosnian are always close to Turkey. Among these Russia and Turkey's classification have reasons for themselves and it is based on true somehow. Coreligionist and co ethic of Balkans important part is Russia. Coreligionist of some is Turkish." (Ortaylı, 2015:16) Ortaylı puts ethic-religionist struggle idea to forefront in this situation in Balkan by evaluating this situation as Slav-Turkwar.

Muslims in Rumelia after the war 93 were settled in cities like Kosovo, Manastır, and Thessaloniki by leaving the regions which were under the rule Bulgaria and Serbia, Muslims in other regions of empire migrated to Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. Bulgaria who struggled against Ottoman Empire most gained autonomy in Berlin Treaty in 1878 and added Eastern Rumelia city to its lands. After II. Constitutional Monarchy, Ottoman could not react to Bulgaria who announced its freedom in 5 October 1908 except protest. It is needed to evaluate Bulgaria's being out of Turks' hands different from other countries that left Ottoman lands. Because freedom of Bulgaria was the most significant indicator which showed Balkans left Turkish autonomy. Total loss of Balkans in following terms would abolish Ottoman Empire mission. Balkan nations would return the problems that they forgot- that were years ago and "Ottoman Peace" would disappear in this region as other regions of Empire (Ağanoglu, 2001:33-38)

### **Party of Union and Progress comes to stage of History**

While the most significant real success of Ottoman Union and Progress Party which was founded by Military Medical Students in 1889 which was 100. Anniversary of French Revolution was providing the basic Ottoman law to come into force again. Its political success was bringing concepts like "liberty, fraternity, equality, justice, administration mechanism which is responsible for people" into Turkish politics life permanently (Gökbayır, 2012:62). Founders of the party were Ibrahim Temo (Albanian), Abdullah Cevdet (Kurdish), İshak Sükuti (Kurdish), Mehmet Reşit (Cherkes), and Hüseyinzade Ali (emigrant of Turkish-Azeri). While Founders' of party's not having any Turkish and other names' coming from nations that were close to Ottoman was so coherent with Empire-Ottomanism politics, it is very important that Kurdish highbrows were in close relations not only with Ottoman Empire but also with Turkish state construction in general. Albanian leaders who shared the same common fate with Ottoman until the end of Balkan wars, decided to be free country in fact "by sweating" not to share the sorrow which led to Ottoman in Balkans (Dural, 2013: 85-98)

1319

Union and Progress Party announced II. Autonomy and reached "Supervision Power" as a fruit of nearly twenty years of political struggle after exile, prosecution-raid, recurrently rule changing and coup attempt. Until Babiali Raid, the party which did not reach "Full Power" although it seemed so powerful took the lead of settling democratic conventions intuitively although it appealed to assassination-force policies from time to time. From this point, II. Constitutional Monarchy which was announced in Macedonia in 23 July without waiting for the permission of Palace can be thought to mean "The powers which integrates the society (Union and Progress Leadership) not people announcing self- management/ settling their own fate that includes all components of Ottoman" Gökbayır's evaluation urges the writer of this article not only "self management right" but also that Progress and Union leadership had common values that could be shared with all societies in the country.

*"However Union and Progress with people (especially minorities) wanted the announcement of Constitutional Monarchy and celebrated it like a festival. After the announcement of constitutional monarchy 'Lowering of Sultan' was realized with a decision that was prepared by government and 'General Amnesty' was announced... the people in Anatolia dismissed the directors who did not want it hardly in addition to celebration."* (Gökbayır: 74)

As mentioned before as rise of Ottoman Empire period, Ottoman Empire continued to pay attention to select basic staff from Balkan lands like the Regression and the Collapse periods. Especially it is outstanding that Rumelia which was the last place of Ottoman from Balkan lands had an important place in especially high-ranking and militarybureaucracy.

Losing of Balkan lands'sorrow being much more then the losing of lands in other regions was because it was very important to defend capital city and Ottoman Empire selected Rumelia as a place to product and reproduce its core. Rumelia was the place where Christian components struggledagainst Turkish State and struggled with themselves and it was like the lands where *"people sit on thorns"*. Muslims always squabbled with Christians, Greeks always squabbled with Slavs. The Christians in the region provided important support from western powers thatwere in the same idea with *"Crescent does not return the place where cross enters."* According to major idea in Europe, the idea while sharing Ottoman should be as follows: *"The places where the Christians are in majority are candidates for annexation or freedom. The places where the Muslims are majority are candidates for being colony in the hands of big countries. - because they were not Christians, so they were not Europeans and at the same time they were in the back level compared to Europe."* (Akşin: 21) Aydemir expresses the Rumelia in that period *"There were gangs, terrorists cohering around our city Edirne like in all Rumelia which was Europe Turkey at that time. Half bandit, half politician terrorists... Greek terrorists, more Bulgarian terrorists and Bulgarians... For example, one day a dervish who had beautiful voice was reading Koran and community were listening in rows and headlong. Then when the voice of Muezzin is heard, the community started praying. The Dervish who has beautiful voice closed the Koran, put his table and got swing into people."*

### **The End of "Ottoman Peace"**

*But bombs exploded under that table. Then mosque became wrack. Dead and wounded people were one on the other. However the Dervish was not among these. He was a gang... however the study of our dreams could not stop with sleep. Reign of gangs and terrorists started in our dreams. In my dreams, lights were flaring out in my dreams. Water was flowing, ambush and raids were following each other. Gangs sometimes were hugging me in white angel clothes and were calling me to their hugs. However a big calpac appears on the head of that angel. Under that, bloodshot eyes and hard moustache and beard melded with each other. Sometimes I was a gang in my own dreams. I wore bombs and wedges to my waist or I struggled with my enemies with my sword."* (Aydemir, 1999:12-15)

However after Young Turk Revolution, an artificial *"hugging- peace"* appeared like calm before storm. Aydın expresses the situation before the announcing constitutionalmonarchy as *"Bulgarian and Greeks gangs and party's significant secret forces became brothers. All Muslim and non-Muslim people and different nations made peace and all problemsdisappeared for some time. We went to villages, town and cities to celebrate each other like blind drunks in constitutional monarchy. After the announcement of conditional monarchy, clubs started to be foundered."* (Aydın, 2013:54-55) Enver Pasha, one of the leaders of the revolution, expresses his opinions as fellows:

*"While Apost Captain among Greek gang leaders came with his group, Voyvoda Apostol and Gevgili who were famous Bulgarian gang leaders, Vodina hospodar and Sandaski who was the leader of Sanralist Party and Master Pasice and his friends came. Their outfit and discipline were magnificent. All gangs were being applauded by all society consisting of Muslims and non-Muslims and they were coming back after few days of rest and they were dispersing to villages. Those were followed by Greek neighbours and they were followed by Serbians and Bulgarian neighbours. All celebrated this event honestly and these celebrations affected the society in positive way."* (Enver Paşa: 96)

*"Macedonia Problem"* is one of *"fatty"* parts of projects which were called as *"East Problem"* which aimed to share Ottoman Empire between Imperialist countries. Ottoman Empire which grew as a *"Balkan State"* and which aimed to fulfil the place of Roman Empire by making Balkan lands as the place of basic *"breathing"* area, being spelled from



Balkans and Rumelia meant “*Ottoman Peace*” (Turkish yoke) that was a small part of name that Ottoman valued for itself come to an end. (Dural 63-65) Macedonia problem was also the result of fertile and large lands which were desired most and could not be shared by Balkan states on the path to leave from Ottoman Empire and win their own freedom. Macedonia lands consisting of cities such as Thessaloniki, Kosovo and Manastir were the lands that Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia claimed on. (Jelavich, 2006:33) In fact Greek’s and Serbian’s efforts did not exist against persistence of Bulgarians which forced Ottoman Empire in Balkan Wars mostly, however their countries’ “*Balkan Gang*” which they did against Ottoman state power eased the region from “*purifying*” from Turkish autonomy in a big degree.

It is needed to tie “*Ottoman Peace*” losing power with church and school problem which was combined with minority rights. Sultan Abdulmecit was the manager who bored empire’s centralist minority policies by willing his autonomy in school-church problem which came across Abdulmecit-Abdulaziz period in 1850. Especially Armenian community whom American missionary priest who tried to carry Protestantism to inner parts of Anatolia was closely interested in proved that they were going to support the Prescript of Gulhane on the condition of religious equalitarian prerogatives that would be provided to them. Reformist statesman of Ottoman Empire thought that this demand will lead to meet around “*Ottoman Identity*” in positive way. As a result after the talks among Ottoman bureaucracy and Armenian community and American missionaries, Sultan Abdulmecit recognized Protestant community as a member which had a character in national system (Canyaş, 2014: 5682). Contrary to common belief, Canyaş mentioned that in the period when Ottoman mind dealt with budget problems, Ottoman Empire tried to get benefit from these missionary activities in order to decrease educational-religious expenses. Canyaş summarized this topic with reference to Ahmad:

1321

### Churches-Minority Schools Problem

*“However as a natural result of this tender, managers’ ideas to found inter-sect Ottomanist school net which were organized by central government stayed only as utopia. Instead these schools powered nationalism rather than powering Ottomans”* (Canyaş: 5683-6684) (Ahmad, 2007:44) this optimist perception was one of the basic mistakes which combined I. Young Turk Movement with II. Young Turkish movement.

Especially Russian administration who was mediator between Bulgaria and Serbia provided to sign an agreement which foresaw that if one of the sides made war against Ottoman, the other side would help the other (Halaçoğlu, 1995:13). Introducing “*The Law of Churches*” which reinforced the unity of Slav communities, at first, closed Union and Progress Party and Fener Greek Patriarch with each other and built up religious ties. According to law, “*problematic church, school and holy belongs to the component whose population is the most in that area.*” (Balkan War, 2015) (Kerimoğlu, 2007:5-8)

But Greek minority was not represented by all Fener Greek Patriarchy. While traditional Greek minority leaders was defending all rights that Ottoman Empire gave to Greeks on Patriarchy and while they were defending Sultan Hamid before he was deposed, especially young politic leaders of minority were in the aim of making alliance in medium or long period with Greek Kingdom which would be founded. Greek historian Panayiotopoulos who mentioned that Greeks used hesitant and dividedness of Ottomans on the behalf themselves says “*The leaders of Progress and Union Party’s talks with Greek leaders goes back to an old date like 1902. In the first days when the young Turks made their first congress in exile in Paris they got thought with Greeks and they said they were in the aim of collaboration against Bulgarian Principdom which was growing rapidly. Important Greek*

leaders were among 40 delegates who joined the Young Turk Congress. These were Sathas, Adossidis and Musurus Paschas. Sathas was selected to vice presidency and Adossidis was selected to clerkship and this manner can be interpreted as Young Turks were in the aim of collaboration with Greeks.” (Panayiotopoulos, 1980: 87) (Toros, 1978:3)

### **“Hesitant” Manner of Local Greek Leadership**

One of the basic reason why Greek Kingdom approached negatively to Union and Progress policies was not only “Pan-Hellenic” that Greek aimed, but also Constitutional Monarchy Project was bloating the nationalism of not only Balkan nations but also Turks’ ethnic feelings. As a result, Union and Progress Party which would enter the elections as “Turks’ Party” was going to be address of Turkish nationalism. Greek Kingdom who understood that struggling against Progress and Union Party in their most powerful period would conflict with the aims of Greece in Ottoman Empire let the nationalists Greek leaders in Istanbul and Izmir to have binary politics. On the other hand, Greek Kingdom did not refrain from forming armed gangs in Macedonia. The Greek minority succeeded to get over this period with least damage from both “banishment period” of Progress and Union Party and from Balkan Wars. Panayiotopoulos summarizes the period as follows:

*“Young Turk leadership had contact with Greek leaders in every opportunity and mentioned about frank alliance. However they did not give enough information about what this ‘concrete’ alliance would include. On the other hand, it was not possible for Union and Progress party who planned to keep Ottoman alive for Greek leaders who planned to unite with Greek Kingdom to share the same idea... At last, Young Turks suggested that privilege of Fener-Greek Patriarchy would go on and their life conditions would be enhanced. However suggestions of Sultanate which they would propose on nation system were wider than Young Turks’. Continuation of Caliph was better for Fener-Greek Patriarchy than nationalist Turkish management. Because the rights that were given to Fener-Greek Patriarchy during the history were more emphatic than nationalist Turkish management. Greek Kingdom suggested Greek leaders to support Sultan Hamid and Caliphate as much as he lived, however not to stay behind modernization of Young Turks.”* (Panayiotopoulos: 93-95)

1322

### **Ulah and Serbian Components**

Ulah local leadership who used the gangs they founded against Greek gangs because of incapability in numbers made alliance with Union and Progress party from time to time, they got freedom to found schools and churches and they developed their relations with Roman Kingdom. So in 1904 Roman government said to Ottoman management that they would support the services in the area of educational-religious in accordance with Ottoman policy. (Ünlü, 2009: 12-19)

Meanwhile Serbian nationalistic who gained from the this process gained autonomy of Serbian Orthodox Church after they got their freedom with Berlin Treaty in 1878. (Academic Perspektif, 2013) Serbian gangs who were active in Macedonia after 1904 started to make war with groups who were in favour of Bulgarian and Ottoman with the support that they got from Serbian Church. Intimacy of Serbian-Bulgarian towards Balkan War resulted that Serbian forced Sandanski who supported Ottomans in the region (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2008: 104) (Dural, 2016: 221-224) So Slav components who left Fener-Greek Patriarchy and gathered under the flag of Bulgarian management came together after starting to get their own freedom after leaving Bulgarian management in spite of disintegration after the acceptance of Church Law. Slav groups who had chance to move together in spite of nationalist feelings wanted to move

with Greek minority which they had problems about church topic in spite of expectations of Union and Progress Party. (Dural- Eseler, 2016: 17)

### **Bulgarian-Greece Alliance**

Ottoman Empire firstly detected the alliance between Bulgaria-Greece in 1911 May. On this date Greek Patriarchy and Bulgarian management did a consensus about military and education topics and reported it Ottoman together and they opposed against the issue that Union and Progress Party took minority schools under the control of Ministry of Education. These two minority instructions who objected the issue of schools which were taken under the control because it was not right for national system of Ottoman said that privileges of national system should be done in next term also. (Ergin, 1977: 1473-1474) The management of Union and Progress who objected to the decision that gave privilege to Orthodox's in military area had to accept this decision because of Libya problem which started to be a big problem in Balkans. They had to accept all wishes of Patriarchy and Bulgarian Management Hacısalihoglu who pays attention to conditions of period thinks that the privileges that were given to Greek-Bulgarian Management was concrete indicator and gain of Greek-Bulgarian alliance. (Hacısalihoglu: 120)

All these developments created alliance environment between Slav communities and the meetings of the sides against Ottoman interrupted their gathering. Slav leaders tried to come closer with Greece which was far away with them until that date. The prime minister of Bulgaria Gusov in the middle of July met with Greek ambassador in Sofia and said *"Turks are living their most difficult period. Greek Assembly should accept Crete deputies as the representatives of island. So we can irritate Turks and their starting war would be easier for us."* Bulgarian Chief of Defence Staff General Fitsef affected the meetings saying: *"Bulgaria is determined to make war against Turks with Serbians and Montenegrins. We are going to start this war with 500.000 soldiers and 1.500 cannonballs. Turks have 300.000 soldiers and 850 cannonballs. Bulgarians soldiers are going to gather in Meric and they will attach Turkish lands."* (Balci, 2006:34) Montenegro which was the smallest country of region was very determined to make war against Ottoman without doubt. While they were talking about alliance, Bulgarian and Serbian gangs' bloody activities caused Turkish military existence and state affairs to be questioned. The same year Albanians conquering Uskup turned the region into a burning volcano. (Armaoglu, 1997:337) Meanwhile Turco-Italian War which occupied Ottoman, Aegean's being surrounded and 12 islands problem made the regions difficult in terms of defending.

### **"Balkan Federation" Proposal**

In this term, while plans were being prepared about the future of Macedonia by four countries, a new revolutionist leader who thought that all people from all religious/ethnic groups regardless of Christian and Muslim would gather under the identity of *"Macedonian"* in the republic so that they would save from being backyard of imperialist countries appeared on the stage. The leader who complained about the situation of Macedonia which was jammed between big and small imperialisms was thinking that a Balkan Federation should be formed under the leadership of the Ottomans, against the imperialist countries who wanted to share Balkan lands. This revolutionary leader was absolutely nobody other than Yane Sandanski who was greeted in the national anthem of Macedonia after freedom. (Hacısalihoglu, 2012:2-3)

Sandaski who moved with the motto that *"Macedonia is Macedonians"* supported the leadership of Union and Progress Party with whom he had good relation in 1908 Revolution in 31 March Incident and he became one of the revolutionary leaders who came to Istanbul



with Movement Army. (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2007: 57-64) Yane Sandaski on his speech to Muslim and Christian components in Macedonia after Constitutional Monarchy Revolution said that the captive societies who were thought to be enemies with each other until that that gathered under the flag of freedom and liberation and they got the idea that they were brothers in fact. (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2008: 114) The call of Sandaski who offered “*Balkan Federation*” which was headed by Ottoman Empire instead of taking supports of any imperialist countries can be studied as:

*“Balkan Federation option that was suggested to Ottoman which is not empire anymore by Sandaski is giving empire a chance to regional superpower not turning into empire again. It is same meaning for Ottoman Empire’s clinging in Balkan lands which reached its glorious days as Balkan Empires with being a big country. Balkan Federation which can include Macedonia even old favourite Albania under the leadership of Turks would provide Ottoman Empire to keep its power in main hutments and also making the imperial as regional superpower whose ideas should be asked. This option does not only mean Ottomans ‘honourable peace’ with European countries but also it would let the region as a market for British-French goods so that trading volume of British-French would not decrease totally and Ottomans would be let to exist in the region. Sandaski made this suggestion to Union and Progress Party leadership and he only wanted to be legal leader of Macedonia which was not a big price.”* (Dural: 228)

### **Conclusion: Dreams and Reality**

On the other hand, Ottoman lands in Europe marked both power and weak part of Union and Progress Party. Slav and Greek nationalist leaders who were not in favour of “*nation system*” in every reform movement of Ottoman were searching the ways the realize their national goals by tying Macedonia to Greece, Bulgaria or Serbia. From this point Union and Progress was not in powerful in Euro lands as supposed in spite of anachronism historians. The aims of Jewish leadership and Ulahs, Albanian and Macedon leaders who understood that Slav-Greek aggression would belly their aims was to have decentralist regime under Ottoman modernization so that they can ask their rights. These groups were as important as the groups who had nationalist aims. Union and Progress leadership who was a “*gang*” organization and tested itself with other gangs in Macedonia was the most organized of all leaderships and organized among a free program and a movement who succeeded to end up with a revolution from being a gang. (Hanioglu, 2014-b)

However sides’ becoming different from each other in terms of aim and method was the main important thing rather than their being close to each other in Macedonia problem. Union and Progress who provided to have constitutional monarchy as the centre of country in 1908 Revolution who decreasing the traditional policies of Ottoman by saving oppression of Sultan by increasing the rights of minorities thought that Ottoman would continue its existence at the end of empire century. The leadership of Union and Progress who had positive persuasion policy in order to combine all components and add them to regime was bewildered after the decentralism request of Federalist Sandanski and his team which was the closest to them and they hardened the policies of Macedonia policies. Union and Progress Party who thought all the problems could not be solved with a liberal constitution (Kinross, 1964:31) adapted a uncompromising policy by taking power from rising Turkish nationalism which got power in the society like increasing gangs activities of Balkan components with ethic requests.

Union and Progress leadership who tried to represent separatist political movements which had open relations with Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece as well as the groups which were in favour of Ottoman Empire, even they faced up with some concessions for this aim

encouraged Arab components leaders to take place in Constitutional Monarchy Assembly. They made the Ulahs who had not a chance to get a representative because of population have a representative by giving a seat from their list. In spite of this, Union and Progress leadership gave priority to groups who were in alliance with them in 1912 elections which were called “*Elections with sticks*”. They supported Serbian, Ulah and Macedon demands against Greek-Bulgarian alliance which was foreseen and they succeeded that Greek minority represented 8 less, Albanian 9 seat less when compared with 1908. So although they did not have “*overall*” in Macedonia, they could find stuff that they could make alliance with them among minorities who could transfer Turkish demands. Albanians’ 6 representatives being among the ones who wanted the freedom the region in the region where Albanians voted in the elections which was done under the shadows of 1911-1912 Albanian Attempt brought the solution of Macedonia problem to “*banishment-war stage*”

If the leaders of Union and Progress listened the decentralist demands of Sandaski and his friends and believed him honestly, can “*Balkan Federation*” live with financial support from Jewish minority leaders or can Ottoman Empire who is non-assertive however important federative toy in the world politic where empires will be wiped of the map continue to live? These kind of questions stays like wallowing in anachronism marsh however it seems that the fate of Balkan societies will be designated by the components’ reaching aim-profit union in new imperialism era.

## References

- Ağanoğlu, H. Yıldırım (2001), *Osmanlıdan Cumhuriyete Balkanların Makus Talihi Göç* (Kumsaati, İstanbul)
- Ahmad, Feroz (2007), *Bir Kimlik Peşinde Türkiye* (Bilgi Üniversitesi, İstanbul)
- Akşin, Sina (1998), *Jön Türkler ve İttihat Terakki* (İmge, Ankara)
- Armaoğlu, Fahir (1997), *19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789-1914)* (T.T.K, Ankara)
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya (1999), *Suyu Arayan Adam* (Remzi, İstanbul)
- Aydın, B. Demir (2013), *Muhacir Olmak Da Varmış: Rumelili Bir Kalem Efendisinin Anıları* (Türkiye İş Bankası, İstanbul)
- Balcı, Ramazan (2006), *Sarıkamış Yolun Sonu* (Bâbüalî Kültür, İstanbul)
- Canyaş, F. Orkunt (2014), “Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Son Döneminde Bürokratik Elitin Modernleşme Çabaları ve Misyonerlik Faaliyetleri”, *Journal of Yaşar University* (Yaşar Üniversitesi, İzmir)
- Dural A. Baran- Eseler Bahriye (2016), “İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Rumeli’de Yaşanan Türk Göçleri ve Muhacirlik Sorunu”, *Savaş ve Toplum* (Eğitim, Konya)
- Dural, A. Baran (2016), “Makedonya Sorunu Ya Da Yakın Tarihin İlk Kızılma Koalisyonu”, *TURAN SAM c: 8 s: 29* (TURAN SAM, Kars)
- Dural, A. Baran (2013), "Balkan Nationalism in Considiretion of Nationalist-Revolutionary Leadership and Nationalist Turkish Literature: The Loss of Western Rumelia/ Freedom Problem/ Events/ Portraits", *Eastern Question, Imperial Diplomacy and Nationalism in the Balkans* (Rota Pechat, Bourgas)
- Enver Paşa (2011), *Enver Paşa'nın Anıları* (Türkiye İş Bankası, İstanbul)

- Gökbayır, Satılmış (2012), "Gizli Bir Cemiyetten İktidara: Osmanlı İttihat ve terakki Cemiyetinin 1908 Seçimleri Siyasi Programı", *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi c: III n:1* (TC Karatekin Üniversitesi SBE, Çankırı)
- Ergin, Osman (1977), *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi-IV: II. Meşrutiyet Ya da Bocalama ve Duraklama Seneleri* (İstanbul)
- Hacısalıhoğlu, Mehmet (2012), "Yane Sandanski as a Political Leader in Macedonia in the Era of the Young Turks", *CahiersBalkaniques* 40
- Hacısalıhoğlu, Mehmet (2008), "Jön Türklerin Balkan Politikası (1908-1913)", *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışma Dergisi c. 13 sayı: 24* (Bilim ve Sanat Vakfı, İstanbul)
- Hacısalıhoğlu, Mehmet (2007), "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Zorunlu Askerlik Sistemine Geçiş: Ordu Millet Düşüncesi", *Toplumsal Tarih s: 164* (Tarih Vakfı, İstanbul)
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü (2004-a), "Çeteler, Vatanseverlik, Kahramanlar" *Zaman Gazetesi Yazıları* (Feza, İstanbul)
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü (2004-b), "Doksan Altı Yıl Sonra 10 Temmuz", [http://www.zaman.com.tr/yorum\\_doksan-alti-yil-sonra-10-temmuz\\_74934.html](http://www.zaman.com.tr/yorum_doksan-alti-yil-sonra-10-temmuz_74934.html), Erişim Tarihi: 02-03-2016
- Kerimoğlu, Hasan Tamer (2007), "Kilise ve Mektepler Kanunu Örneğinde II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İttihatçı- Rum İlişkileri", *ÇTTAD VI/14 Bahar 2007* (Dokuz Eylül, İzmir)
- Kinross, P (1964), *Rebirth of a Nation* (WeindenfeidandNicholson, Londra)
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1993), *Değişen Dünyamız (Balkanlar ve Türklük)* (Varlık, İstanbul)
- Olgun, Kenan (2014), "1912 Sopalı Seçimlerinde Ermeniler", *Yeni Türkiye s:60* (Yeni Türkiye, Ankara)
- Ortaylı, İlber (2015), *Yakın Tarihin Gerçekleri* (Timaş, İstanbul)
- Öztuna, Yılmaz (2006), *Avrupa Türkiye'si'ni Kaybımız Rumeli'nin Elden Çıkışı* (BâbıalîKültür, İstanbul)
- Panayotopoulos, A. J. (1980), "Early Relations Between the Greeks and the Young Turks", *Balkan Studies n:21*
- Şimşek, Halil (2002), "Askeri ve Stratejik Açısından Balkanlar", *Türklerin Rumeli'ye Çıkışının 650. Yıldönümü: 650. Yıl Sempozyumu* (Rumeli Türkleri Kültür ve Dayanışma Derneği, İstanbul)
- Toros, Taha (1978), "Doğumunun 100. Yılında Gurbette Ölen Fikir Adamımız Prens Sabahattin", *Milliyet 18.02.1978* (Milliyet, İstanbul)
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı (1988), *Osmanlı Tarihi* (TTK, Ankara)
- Ünlü, Macide (2009), "Uluslararası Diplomasi ve Ulahlar", *Karadeniz Araştırmaları Dergisi-7* (Serander, Trabzon)
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2013), "Makedonya'da Etnik Sorunların Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Günümüze Yansımaları", <http://akademikperspektif.com/2013/05/03/makedonyada-etnik-sorunlarin-tarihsel-gelisimi-ve-gunumuze-yansimalari/>, Erişim Tarihi: 31.03.2016