

Chapter 2

DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSIONS IN OTTOMAN: AGRICULTURE OR INDUSTRY? WILLIAM CHURCHILL AND MEHMET ŞERİF EFENDİ

Kenan DEMİR¹

PROLOGUE

During Mahmud II period, revolutionary changes have been made in the country in order to stop regression. Many reforms have been made in terms of economic, cultural and social aspects, especially political. The purpose of bureaucrats was to strengthen the country in sense of economy and in this direction to increase the sources of wealth of the state. In order to level up Ottoman financially to European states' level, bureaucrats started important investments in state's income sources agricultural and industrial sectors with developmental psychology. Aware of the importance of both sectors, bureaucrats wanted the state to play an active role in both sectors for the total development of the country. Accordingly, the state approached many attempts. Knowing that it was an opportunity that the state to be bearable as land and geographical for state's agricultural development, bureaucrats made necessary legal arrangements in order to increase the agricultural export. They removed monopolization and purchase system. For propagation of agricultural technology, bureaucrats waived importation of these products from customs and they encouraged the cultivation of agricultural products with high commercial gain.

Bureaucrats expressed that it was also necessary to develop in industrial sector. They embarked directly to movement of setting up factories in order to increase production of declining products. In this direction, they opened a lot of factories as from 1830s. Bureaucrats emphasized that the main problem of the state was originated from industrial production rather than agriculture and the amount of foreign products increased in the country. Accordingly, in order to prevent the capital supplied to the products imported from abroad to go out, the factory movement has been given importance and the sector has provided all kinds of facilitation. Beside establishing direct factories by the state, the craftsman class who

¹ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi, İşletme ve Yönetim Bilimleri Fakültesi

made production was supported and in order to combat artisans with Western products on the market, bureaucrats have made initiatives to unite tradespeople under a company.

In Mahmud II period, a press association came to existence with the publishing of *Takvim-i Vekayi* by the state. People were informed about state policies. *Takvim-i Vekayi's* aim was to direct public opinion towards a state-oriented direction, the public to learn and adopt the modernization movements that the state had done and to increase the knowledge level of the people by giving encyclopaedic information to the public in the fields such as science and technology developing in the West. After *Takvim-i Vekayi*, two newspapers were also published: first *Ceride-i Havadis*, and later *Tercüman-ı Ahval*. The main purpose of these newspapers was to inform and brighten the public. With the proliferation of newspapers in the country, an environment for the evaluation of state policies has emerged and the non-bureaucrats have also been able to put forward their thoughts on what the state policy should be. An independent public opinion was formed in the country with the evaluation and discussion of state policies in press. In this direction, evaluations were made on the initiatives that the country has shown for its economic development and various proposals have been made about the state's development policy in the press. In this study, the debates on development in the period of the press on the development policies of the government are mentioned and it is reported that agricultural development or industrial development is important.

OTTOMAN EMPIRE'S AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

In the 19th century, bureaucrats first sought to establish an agricultural bureaucracy that would form and run agricultural policies. The main purpose of increasing numbers and efficiency of the bureaucrats was to increase and diversify production, to extend production based on export and modernization of agricultural production means and methods (Güran 1992a: 219). Agricultural policies implemented and the increasing demand in internal and external markets led to the expansion of the agricultural lands. Parallel to the increase in agricultural production, production for the market began to take place in place of the subsistence production style of the villagers. In this period, producers' dependence on the world market has increased and agricultural production for export has been encouraged (Tabakoğlu 2000: 219). There has also been an increase in commercial agricultural products produced for the market, not an overall increase in agricultural production. A guiding and supportive study has been carried out in the sense of increasing the quality of silk and tobacco production and expanding the

production of these products. This was also observed in figs, raisins, olives and cereals. Along with these developments, it has been seen that Ottoman agriculture has provided a great change and development (Arıcanlı 2010: 136). In general, commercial farming areas were first seen in areas that were easily accessible by river transport, such as in the Danube basin, in the river valleys of Bulgaria, in coastal areas of Macedonia, and on the Aegean coast. In the beginning of the 19th century, such regions expanded, and starting from the second half of the century, commercial products were gradually being cultivated in the inner regions as well (Quataert 2004: 198- 199). Within the century, the demand for cotton and tobacco in the world market increased, and the producers of İzmir started to cut olive trees which brought less profit and cultivate commercial agricultural products to agricultural lands (Quataert 1985: 1557). As a consequence of exporting large quantities of cotton in İzmir, the agricultural production of the region has mainly been shaped in the direction of foreign trade (Syrett 2010: 101). In the Ottoman Empire, the production of agricultural industry plants has not been given importance except for some provinces. Industrial plants were produced in a third of the cultivated land in the Adana region, and cotton production was one-third of this. Tobacco and cotton production was also important in Elazığ and Thessaloniki provinces (Güran 1987: 239).

The significant change that the Tanzimat brought to promote agricultural production was the abolition of monopolies and state purchases to a great extent, two major obstacles in front of the liberalization of agricultural commodity trade. These two steps were important for the removal of barriers to trade of agricultural products and raw materials and for the transition to a market economy. The changing of these two goods, which shaped traditional economic policies, with economic preferences instead of administrative and political preferences showed that economic concerns were given importance in this period (Güran 1998: 50). One of the important innovations in agriculture in this period was the transformation of “*debauchery and barren*” places into agricultural land with a change in a title in law of deed in order to enlarge the production areas. It was ensured that these lands were given outrightly to the farmers by taking a low title deed fees. Another application of agricultural incentive measures was the exemption of customs duty on agricultural machinery and equipments to be imported from foreign countries (Güran 2000: 38). In addition, in 1846, the government granted the first agricultural loans worth of 10 million piastre (kuruş) to the farmers in order to encourage agricultural production (Karpas, 2002: 96). One of the agricultural incentives was the introduction of tithe exemption for these crops in order to increase exported agriculture (Güran 2011: 781).

In the 19th century, an increase was observed on agricultural production for market. Over time, the number of producers producing to sell to domestic and international consumers has also started to increase. The reason for the increase in agricultural production for the market was the increase in demand both at home and abroad. There has been a great improvement in the level of living and purchasing power in Europe, especially after 1840. These developments allowed the Europeans to buy various and surplus goods. In addition, the demand for domestic markets increased with the increase of urbanization and personal consumption within the state (Quataert 2004: 196). The placement of the immigrant population from the Caucasus to Anatolia and the Balkans in the 19th century in the rural areas also increased the agricultural production of the country. The state had granted tax exemption for immigrants in the Balkans for 6 years, immigrants in Anatolia for 12 years, for the purpose of familiarising them into farming (Pamuk 2005a: 217). Depending on the developments in trade in the 19th century, great increases were seen in the production of Ottoman agriculture. According to the records of 1864-1869, tithe incomes increased by 22% and cattle tax incomes increased by 38% (Tezel 2002: 75). In the 19th century, the Ottoman export to Europe grew by more than 5% per year on average, and in every decade the trade volume doubled (Pamuk 2005b: 30). Since Ottoman exports based on agricultural products, the growth of exports has been realized with the export of agricultural products to a large extent (Quataert 1985: 1557). Because of the high profitability of exported products such as figs, dried fruits, tobacco and poppy, after the development of trade and railways the production of these products increased and agricultural development was experienced (Karpat 2002: 97). The exports of agricultural crops in the 1840s were 4.7 million pounds sterling, but in 1913 this amount rose 28 million sterling. Contrary to what had been seen in the colonial countries, no specialization was seen in a single product in agricultural production. During the period 1840-1880, agricultural products and the export of these products were diversified in exported agricultural products instead of concentrating on a single product (Ortaylı 2000: 220). Agricultural export products were raw cotton, tobacco, grapes, figs, cereals, oak, hazelnut and olive oil and agricultural production of these products increased (Quataert 2008a: 41). Despite the huge increase in agricultural production and exports of agricultural products, there was no significant leap in agricultural technology used during the period. The agricultural growth in the 19th century was achieved not by technological developments, but by the production of agricultural land in new fields and by the opening of new agricultural land. Successful transitions of nomadic communities to agricultural production was recorded, which had a positive impact on the increase in production (Güran 1998: 59). However, in the 19th century, the

use of modern agricultural tools also increased. When it came to 1900, tens of thousands of iron plows, thousands of harvesters and examples of advanced agricultural technology were also seen in the rural areas of Balkan, Anatolia and Arab geography (Quataert 204: 199).

A modern agrarian bureaucracy began to be established in the 19th century in order to increase agricultural production, to diversify its products and to encourage agricultural production with high demand in the foreign market, domestic production of domestic industrial raw materials and development of agriculture according to the times (Tabakoğlu 2000: 219). The first development in this respect was the establishment of the Agricultural and Industrial Assembly in 1838. This parliament began to work to increase agricultural production. Later on, the name of the assembly was changed to Meclis-i Umur-u Nafia (Public Works Assembly) (Mardin 2002: 126-127). The Agricultural Assembly was established in 1843 in the Ministry of Finance and then transferred to the Ministry of Trade. The Assembly's objective was to increase agricultural production, increase trade, conduct agricultural research and submit project proposals. The establishment of the Ministry of Public Works (Nafia Hazinesi) in 1846 was another important development (Güran 1998: 45-46). In 1876, a Trade and Agricultural Assembly was established under the Ministry of Trade and Agriculture. The task of this council was to manage the grant funds, open schools for agriculture education, to open new agricultural land, to distribute high-quality seeds for farming, to organize exhibitions and competitions to increase the demand for agricultural products, and to propose necessary changes in the abolition of tax-prohibiting taxes and institutions (Güran 2000: 34-35). In addition to the state organization, the establishment of private institutions to deal with agricultural development was worked on and Agriculture and Industry Chambers established in 1880 in order to support farmers in this direction (Güran, 2000: 35). Another important work on agriculture in the 19th century was the establishment of agricultural education and training institutions. These institutions aimed to provide practical training on cotton production in order to ensure the production of cotton, the raw material of the printed fabric factory, which was thought to be established in Istanbul, in the country. Accordingly, the Agriculture Training School was opened in Istanbul under the direction of an American expert in 1848 (Güran 1992a: 221). In this school, 15 students, including nine Muslims and six non-Muslims, began to be trained in agriculture. The school was closed in 1851 due to the fact that the students who came from province didn't want to return to their provinces and apply the education they had received and the failure of the new sowing attempts at the school (Güran 1998: 47). But the school was reopened in 1871 (Karpat 2002: 96).

STATE'S INDUSTRIALIZATION EFFORTS IN OTTOMAN EMPIRE

After the 1820s, the spread of the products imported from Western Europe to Anatolia affected the domestic industries badly. Because of the improved transportation possibilities, at first the coastal regions of Istanbul and Anatolia, afterwards the internal regions, as well as the development of the railway network, were affected by this situation (Tabakoğlu 2000: 223). In this period, domestic industry producers continued their production by adapting to new conditions. Local industrial producers tried to get rid of this effect by using imported yarn goods, working with low wages and profit and using labor intensively (Tabakoğlu 2000: 223). As a result of the development of the railway in the 1860s and the expansion of the free market brought by the 1838 Trade Agreement foreign products began to penetrate into the inner parts of the country (Tezel 2002: 72-73). Domestic industries in the inner regions were also started to collapse and the Ottoman economy became unable to produce (Şirin 1996: 285). In the 19th century, most of the Ottoman industrial production took place by hand labour while the products made in Europe came into being by mechanization. In the 19th century, women's labor became increasingly involved in production in rural areas, while manufacturing centers, which were organized by guilds, lost their importance in cities (Quataert, 2004: 200). Towards the end of the century, the industrial sector turned into increasingly smaller producers. It was seen that one person worked in most of Anatolia's manufacturing. In the mid-century, however, big capitalists had factories operating with hand labours in the centers such as Ottoman Rumelia, Bursa, Aleppo and Tripoli (Ortaylı 2000: 211).

During the Selim III period, an attempt was made to open a factory in order to be able to produce paper and broadcloth, over consumed in the domestic market, in the country. While the demand for broadcloth was met with domestic production at first, then imports started to increase with demand in the market. Even if attempts were made to set up a factory twice in the previous years due to the fact that the surplus from broadcloth brought more burden to the treasure, they were not successful. During Selim II period, the attempts to open a broadcloth factory were ended up badly (Önsoy 1988: 48). Although the attempt to set up the first paper factory to reduce paper imports and increase domestic production took place in Yalova in 1742, the factory had to close down because it could not compete with the papers produced in Europe. During the Selim III period, a paper factory was established in Beykoz to meet paper demand. The factory, which operated until 1836, had to close because its produced paper was inferior in quality and cost when compared to imported products (Önsoy 1988: 48-49). In the nineteenth century, two methods different from the Ottoman industrialization policies were

applied. The first method was the industrialization period directly operated by the state in 1830-1850. The second method was the period in which the government played a supporting and incentive role for the private sector in the 1860s and was carried out by the activities of the Islah-ı Sanayi Komisyonu (Industrial Reformation Commission) (Martal 2000: 215). The first factory, which was the result of the state industrialization policy, was the opening of the Feshane in 1835 in order to satisfy the consumption after the soldier's decision to wear fez. Other state factories established during the 2nd Mahmud period were İzmit and İslimye Broadcloth Factories (Sarç 1999: 435), İzmit Paper Factory, Beykoz Army Factory, Tophane, Beykoz-İnceköy Porcelain Factory (Ortaylı 2000: 203). The state supplied the raw material needs of many factories within the country, mainly Marmara region (Quataert 2004: 1012). Other industrial facilities established by the state after Mahmut II were Hereke Fabric Factory in 1843, İzmit Broadcloth Factory in 1843, Paşabahçe Porcelain Factory in 1845 and Zeytinburnu Iron Factory in 1846 (Seyitdanlıoğlu 2011: 722-725). Starting from the mid-19th century, private factories were opened by entrepreneurs in the weaving sector. These factories were; Tırhala Silk Factory in 1846, Balıkesir Wool Factory in 1847, İstanbul Silk Factory in 1847 and Zeytinburnu Printed Fabric Factory in 1850 (Tepekaya 2000: 205). In 1848-1849, Veliefendi Printed Fabric Factory was established in İstanbul. For this factory, Steam machines and various tools and equipment were introduced from the UK. 24 foreign craftsmen from Europe were recruited for employment in the factory. The number of European workers was reduced to 9, and 146 indigenous citizens started to work as an employer (Güran 1992b: 247-248).

In addition, during the Tanzimat period, some industrial production branches were granted licenses and concessions to encourage production. The concessions and licenses granted were generally located in major ports and road routes in the Rumelia, Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean regions (Ortaylı 2000: 204). In the 19th century, industrialization movements in the industry continued until the end of the 1850s. The number of factories established by the State in the industrialization process was around 160, and some of the factories were destroyed due to sabotage, earthquake and fire (Önsoy 1988: 55). Some of them were closed in a short period of time because the equipment was old technology that Europe did not use, because more foreign personnel were employed and not supported by the state effectively (Buluş-Mercan 2002: 249). Due to lack of knowledge and lack of modern technology in the country, both the government-led industrialization policy and the government-supported private sector creation policy have not been successful (Yayla-Seyitdanlıoğlu 1988: 56). The most important reason why the bureaucrats attempted to establish the state factories was that the military

needs of the state were to be produced in the country. With the internal production of the military supplies, both military expenditures would be saved and the capital would stay in the country rather than flow out (Güran 1992b: 236). The bureaucrats thought that the industrialization in the country would make important contributions to the country. With the factories established in the country, qualified workers would grow in the country. In this direction, Western masters employed were aimed to teach modern technology to local workers and masters (Güran 1992b: 237-238). By a decision taken by the government in 1851, in order to close the underemployment, the state implemented many incentives such as opening of vocational training schools, customs and tax exemption from the necessary machinery and other equipment, exemption of tax on the sale of manufactured goods on the internal market and exemption of personnel working in factories from military service (Güran 1992b: 238).

Another important initiative in terms of industrialization was the establishment of the Industrial Reformation Commission. With the establishment of this commission, it was aimed to sustain the existence of the indigenous industry in the transition period between the removal of the guild and the breach system that lost its influence and the establishment of commercial and industrial chambers in the following years (Martal 2000: 219). Established in 1863, Commission aimed to increase the customs rates in the country, to open exhibitions to encourage the industry, to open industrial schools in Istanbul and other cities and to establish various companies by merging the artisans into companies (Şener 1999: 554). It was not possible for the Ottoman Empire to unilaterally increase customs duties because it was not possible to implement a new customs policy against foreign countries due to the 1838 trade agreement and capitulations. For this reason, the commission did not take any steps in the first measure (Şener 1999: 554). Another aim of the commission was to bring together the small artisans who worsened day by day and unite them into companies. In this direction, goldsmith, tanner, loriner, fabric, moulding and blacksmith artisans were brought together and merged into separate companies (Önsoy 1988: 31). One of the works that the Commission made in the direction of industrialization was the initiatives to open exhibitions and fairs. The Ottoman state first attended an international exhibition organized in London in 1851. In the exhibition, handicrafts and agricultural products were exhibited and collected great interest. After seeing the benefits of the first exhibition the state attended, Ottoman joined the exhibition opened in Paris in 1855 and the second international exhibition in London in 1862 (Tepekaya 2000: 197). The government participating in the international exhibitions decided to open an exhibition in the country and opened the first exhibition in 1863 in Istanbul in

this direction. Istanbul fair remained open for 5 months, foreign merchants, businessmen and journalists followed the exhibition (Martal 2000: 219). Thanks to the exhibition, the quantity and quality of the products grown in the country could be determined, and the craftsmen, artisans and businessmen who were producer classes met each other. In addition, producers from rural areas had the opportunity to directly communicate their sectoral problems to government officials (Önsoy 1988: 126). One of the goals of the Commission was to raise qualified personnel needed in industrial facilities. For this purpose, firstly the industrial school was opened in Istanbul. During the training period of five years, craftsmanship such as blacksmithing, carpentry, weaving, machine tinker, tailoring and shoemaking were taught. Over time, industrial schools were opened in other regions of the country as well, and these schools had important benefits in the industrialization process (Önsoy 1988: 126).

The industrialization initiatives started by the Ottoman state didn't succeeded because the cost of manufactured goods were more than the European countries due to the concession of trade contracts and the liberal policies it implements. In additions, value judgments such as disdaining professions of production, despising the workers and the demand to be civil servant constituted important obstacles in the industrialization of the Ottoman Empire (Tepekaya 2000: 206). At the beginning of the 19th century, all of the industrial production in the Ottoman Empire was handcrafted. The production was made in terms of tight and strict rules in small workshops within the occupational groups separated into small groups. Western-style production began to be implemented in the country since it was impossible to close the difference with the West through the continuation of this production style (Önsoy 1994a: 260). One of the reasons for the failure of factory attempts in the 19th century was the dependence on foreigners. The engineers, workers and craftsmen employed in the factory were also brought from outside as well as the machinery and workbenches needed for the fabrication of the plants (Önsoy 1988: 54). Another reason for the state could not form industrialization with state support was its inability to transfer peasant's labor to industrial investments as in Russia, Japan and Prussia as well as it could not compete with European products produced with steam power (Ortaylı 2000: 205). Even though factory movements in the country failed, small workshops that realized industrial production survived, supplied some of the domestic consumption, and succeeded in adapting to the conjuncture of the period (Quataert, 2008- b: 46- 49). Carpet weaving and silk manufacturing continued strongly in the workshops, and these two manufactured products maintained their importance in the 19th century as important industrial export goods of the country (Keyder 2000: 191).

THE ORIGIN OF PRESS IN OTTOMAN: *TERCÜMAN-I AHVAL* AND *CERIDE-I HAVADIS*

The first newspaper in the Ottoman Empire was *Takvim-i Vekayi*, which was issued in 1831 with a direct attempt of the state (Özgen 2004: 5). Esat Efendi took over the administration of newspaper, while Sarım Efendi and Sait Bey carried out the correspondence (Şapolyo 1971: 101). The newspaper explained the purpose of the publishment as to announce the modernization movements that the state had made to the public, and to inform the people and to promote people to adopt the state's reform movements (Özbyay 2014: 147). It was also stated that the newspaper would fulfill functions such as informing Ottoman citizens about internal and external events, ensuring public order and security by preventing the spread of false news, informing people about modern science, craft, industry and trade and informing people about state initiatives and making sure everyone complies (Koloğlu 1981: 6-7). *Takvim-i Vekayi* also aimed to train people in commercial, scientific and cultural matters in Western sense (Koloğlu 1981: 7). The newspaper wasn't popularized by the public since the newspaper was not in a form that the people could understand. Arabic and Persian compositions and words were more common than Turkish words (Koloğlu 1981: 57). For this reason, the reader's perimeter of the journal was limited to Ottoman officers, ambassadors and businessmen (Mardin 2006: 286). In addition to official notices and state news, news about internal and external events were also given in *Takvim-i Vekayi* (Yazıcı 1983: 19). The contents of the news were mostly related to the Sultan's travels and visits, decoration ceremonies, developments from newly found Asakir-i Mansure, army and bureaucrat appointments, translation of Ottoman news in European press, encyclopedic information on science and technology in Europe, market prices, The East and the Islamic world (Berkes 2003: 200). The newspaper published articles on the economic issues that were translated from British newspapers under the title "*Ticaret and Esar*" (Mardin 1994: 73). Despite the fact that the newspaper was decided to be published once a week, it appeared irregularly, which caused it to lose its influence over time (Baykal 1990: 50). The newspaper maintained its publishing policy as a state newspaper, which transmitted official news rather than being a thought and idea newspaper (Berkes 2003: 200). The French copy of *Takvim-i Vekayi* came out under the guidance of Blak Bey (İnuğur 1999: 179-180).

Ceride-i Havadis was published by W. Churchill in 1840, and the first three issues were distributed free for the adoption of the newspaper (Ertuğ 1970: 163). The reason for the granting of newspaper concession to W. Churchill was to end a crisis with the UK arose after he accidentally shot a person in Kadıköy and imprisoned in 1836 (İskit 1937: 8). Although the newspaper announced that it would

be published once a week, there were disruptions in the continuity of publication and it did not go out regularly (İnuğur 1999: 183). The newspaper took great care not to move away from the Ottoman state line in the political issues of foreign news, but acted totally dependent on British economic interests in trade news. In internal events, instead of acting independently, it has been published directly in the direction of official policy (Koloğlu 2010a: 60). W. Churchill, who went to England during the Crimean War, increased the interest towards the newspaper thanks to the news he sent and the sales of the newspaper also increased in this direction (Baykal 1990: 55). After the war, W. Churchill dwelled on economic news, dominated by foreign affairs and trade, in newspaper's columns, and later on writings on literature were seen in the newspaper (Matbaacılığın 1979: 47). Victor Hugo's *Les Miserables* was translated and given on the columns of *Ceride-i Havadis* (Mardin 2002: 168). From the first issue, by giving sales and rental advertisements such as house, shop, horse carriages, the newspaper gave first examples of commercial advertising to the Ottoman society that had not used the free market regulation in the country (Koloğlu 2010b: 104). *Ceride-i Havadis* had reporters in foreign countries (Şapolyo 1971: 110). Under the heading of foreign news, the newspaper gave encyclopedic information about Europe, America, India, modern travel methods, insurance and paleontology (Mardin 2006: 287). The newspaper serialized an economic book explaining the principles of economic liberalism, advocated economic liberalism in its columns (Berkes 2003: 260). The authors of the journal included Ali Ali Efendi, Sami Efendi, Hafız Müşfik Efendi and Nüzhet Efendi (Mardin, 2006: 143- 144). The newspaper did not succeed in creating and directing public opinion, despite it formed its policy of publication in the direction of political, economic and foreign news (Çakır 1998: 21). The release of *Tercüman-ı Ahval* worried W. Churchill, and in the autumn of 1860 he published the newspaper daily with a new name *Ruzname-i Ceride-i Havadis* and acted unwelcoming on the columns (Matbaacılığın, 1979: 53).

Tercüman-ı Ahval, the first newspaper published by private enterprise, appeared in 1860 under the management of Agah Efendi and Şinasi (Koloğlu 2006: 43). In the introduction article by Şinasi, it was stated that the journal would publish educational and informative articles and it was stated that a simple language would be used so that the public could easily understand these articles (Girgin 2001: 31). *Tercüman-ı Ahval*, according to the previous newspapers, actualized a policy of publishing that had the characteristics of a newspaper, served as an independent public opinion and started the idea journalism in the country (Hayta 2002: 9). In addition to domestic and foreign news; official news, statutes, instructions and agreements were also included in the newspaper, and market prices of Istanbul

were also on the last page of the journal along with market and stock market news, industry, banking, transportation and communication issues (İnuğur 1999: 187). The newspaper pursued an opposing publishing policy, and the newspaper was charged by the government for two weeks closure because Ziya Bey expressed the education problems of the country and criticized the government's educational policies (Girin, 2001: 33). In *Tercüman-ı Ahval*, the economic issues played an important role and they used a critical style about the financial problems of the country, borrowing policies, intervention of the foreign economists in the country's economy, and money ambitions of moneylenders (Koloğlu 2010-a: 63). In *Tercüman-ı Ahval*, Şerif Efendi published an article introducing the economy in the territory of the country and a book named *İlm-i Emval-i Milliye* serialized (Ertuğ 1970: 174). In the newspaper, Şerif Efendi defended the industrialization of the country against the development of the agriculture sector and emphasized that the development of agriculture was in need of industrialization (Şener 1994: 227). External issues such as Karadağ (Montenegro) and criticism of the Caucasus and Polish politics of Russia were extensively involved on the foreign news page of the newspaper (Koloğlu 1985: 77). In the introduction article of *Tercüman-ı Ahval*, it was stated that there were no free press for Muslims to defend their rights and *Tercüman-ı Ahval* would shape its publishing policy in this direction. This statement sparked a debate and *Ruzname-i Ceride-i Havadis* and other French, Armenian and Greek newspapers in Istanbul also participated in the debate (Koloğlu 1985: 77). The newspaper voiced that the 1838 trade agreement destroyed the domestic industry and also warned the bureaucrats by showing a national stance against Russia's attempt to change the Iranian transit route against Trabzon (Yerlikaya 1995: 6). Şinasi first published his work *Şair Evlenmesi*, later published the story of Yorgancı Mehmet to adopt the newspaper to the public. He also published chemistry and physics articles (Tanpınar 2006: 198). Important intellectuals like Hasan Suphi, Şerif Efendi, Refik Bey, Şinasi, Namık Kemal and Ziya Bey were among the editorial staff of the journal (İskit 1937: 27). Published until 1866, the newspaper was an important contribution to the cultural development of the Ottoman society and its political awakening (Matbaacılığın 1979: 53).

WILLIAM CHURCHILL AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Doing business and being the representative of British trade houses in Istanbul in the year 1838 when the trade agreement was signed, a British citizen named W. Churchill was arrested because he accidentally shot a child during a hunt. In face of the reaction, W. Churchill was given a right to publish a journal in the country and as a result *Cerie-i Havadis* was issued (Berkes 1976: 331). W.

Churchill employed Armenian writers who understood business in Istanbul and had a knowledge about finance. Through Armenians, W. Churchill made a discussion between protectionism and liberalism, and suggested free economic notion (Berkes 1976: 331). He wanted Ottoman to be a stock exporter in accordance with British trade interests. He defended that the Ottoman soil was suitable for agriculture, and the state to export agricultural products (Mardin 1994: 73-74). According to W. Churchill, Ottoman was an agricultural state having loam and broad lands. If the loam would be tamed, Ottoman could be an exporter state of agricultural products. On the other hand, industrialization in the country was in an early stage due to lack of technical data and lack of funding. The state would be able to correspond to industrial productions from a board by means of agricultural incomes (Önsoy 1994b: 92-93). W. Churchill defended Ottoman to be an exporter of agricultural products in accordance with British industrial class' remark. He shaped the idea that Ottoman's earnings from agricultural export would increase the market of British industrial products (Mardin 1994: 74-75). He wrote the article starting the development discussion in Ottoman and defended the agriculture based development (Sayar 2000: 273). W. Churchill reported the agriculture etc industry discussions from the British parliament in *Ceride-i Havadis*, and emphasized Ricardo's call for the import of agricultural products to be freed in England (Sayar 2000: 274). Here in after, W. Churchill's thoughts on development published in *Ceride-i Havadis* will be submitted.²

W. Churchill stated that Ottoman's industrialization policy in 1840s was wrong and in this direction he defended agriculture based development. He emphasized that some patriotic individuals had told that with the foundation of new factories, important products would be able to provided in the country. And also the community would get used to these crafts and would work on these jobs. Accordingly, the capital of the state would stay in the country and the state would benefit. However, W. Churchill expressed that some others were saying that even though industrialization was important, the agricultural sector should be invested instead of industry. Setting up factories should be the next step. Because lots of the fertile soil were not planted and all of the food were being provided from the foreign countries (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1840c: 2).

W. Churchill said that, if a person would provide all of the needs, there wouldn't be any craftsmanship. But if a person would engage in a profession, he could provide his other needs from the earnings of his own profession. W. Churchill also expressed that if a person would oppose this idea, this person would end up a loser. He indicated that states should do the same. If a state would attempt to

² William Churchill did not provide any information on agricultural production in his articles.

produce every product at once, they would fail. He said that if a state would enhance agriculture, they could exchange the goods and the product prices would decrease. With this method, the state could make huge profits by marketing with other nations. He specified that as long as European states would supply cotton from inside rather than non-European countries, the factory production wouldn't be extensive and cheap (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1840c: 2).

W. Churchill stated that the USA set up factories in order to produce manufactured goods in the country, and even though the state demonstrated any kind of promotion and laid 30 percent of customs duty on imported products, they couldn't produce cheap good in comparison with exterior goods. He asked for a state not to leave its profession and plug away in a new sector. Ottoman state intended to produce broadcloth and fabric. However, W. Churchill expressed that if the state would produce agricultural products like cotton, raw silk, and sell those to Europe, the state could provide cheaper fabrics and broadcloths from Europe by the earnings of the selling. If the state would adopt this policy, the manufactured products would be gained cheaper, and the agricultural production of the state would increase. If an agricultural development would be actualized, the state would gain much more than it would gain from industrialization. W. Churchill stated that in Europe the cheapest products had been producing in England. And because the owners of the factories were powerful investors, they easily procured technological equipment. Hereby, they produced a lot. He expressed that rather than producing small amounts and selling with high interest, industrialists in England produced huge amounts and sold with small interest. As a result, they gained huge amounts of profit. He also expressed that having rich coalfields, England was bringing cost on the cheap and the prices were also low in the country. W. Churchill emphasized that, in the Ottoman, the weather was convenient for farming, the soil was rich and fruitful. By cultivating, the state would develop agriculturally and build factories. He suggested the state to give priority to agriculture thereby exploiting the stability started after the announcement of Tanzimat. Thus, W. Churchill said that it would be more suitable to establish factories from time to time with the earnings from agriculture (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1840c: 3).

After emphasizing that the agriculture would be better for state's development, W. Churchill started to write about agriculture's significance on development. He said that agriculture was the primary source of state's wealth and means, and the state's treasury was full thanks to agricultural activities. He expressed that agricultural nations were improved and developed, so it was necessary to work for this cause. W. Churchill explained how far a state's agriculture would reproduce, the strength of the state would increase to the extent. And then, a wealth and

welfare would come into existence as such. He said that even though a state had high amounts of production in other areas, it wouldn't benefit from it due to low production in agriculture. In such case, the state would have to throw money at extra in order to buy agricultural products. He expressed that doing an agricultural work would of help to both a person and a state, and with the increase in agriculture, the state's taxes would also increase. As so, the treasury would be full and the country would prosper as well. He said that the Ottoman Empire was also aware of the significance of the agriculture and making efforts, and established Meclis-i Umur-ı Nafia (Council of Public Works). W. Churchill emphasized that this council made many attempts in order to incentive of agriculture, supplied the implements for agricultural activities, and took other agricultural measures. He said that the state would be rewarded for its efforts in a little while (*Ceride-i Havadis*, 1840a: 2).

Approving the removal of the monopolization in agriculture, and sanction of the exportation of agricultural products by the state, W. Churchill expressed that this policy would make a huge contribution to agricultural development of the state. He indicated that it had been forbidden to export agricultural products due to fear of famine. According to W. Churchill, this prohibition had been reasonable for that time because there had been difficulties in providing wheat. However, since the state had declared exemption on provisions, there were wideness for vittles. W. Churchill emphasized that it was a primary obligation for a state to improve agriculture because it was a main source of a state's economic power and in this direction he stated that it was also necessary for Ottoman to increase agricultural activities and not to be in need to other countries. He said because the purchasers of cereal had been pulled huge amounts of wheats from the market and hindered the production if Istanbul would be without wheat or the prices would be high, price of the cereal increased and production decreased. He indicated the more a product would be on the market, the more it would increase in value. He stated that the European countries were promoting export for increasing the production of the state's provision, restricting the import of these products and putting high custom taxes on them in fear that the eagerness of the farmers' for working would be demotivated. He expressed that if the old method would be continued, whole of the agricultural land would remain idle. W. Churchill mentioned even though it had three times more population than Istanbul, London didn't have distress on provisions. Because the state didn't interfere in, the country had wideness in cereals. He expressed as long as a state wouldn't interfere in, market would redress the balance, wideness would occur and cheapness would be provided. W. Churchill said if policies of a state would be managed in accordance with the law, the repu-

tation of the state would increase, trade would develop and the abundance would be seen. He emphasized the agricultural trade had improved since the announcement of Tanzimat (*Ceride-i Havadis*, 1840- b: 3). W. Churchill encouraged cultivation of cotton in Ottoman. He stated that there was a high demand for cotton from the European countries and the cotton from Ottoman was found approval. He wanted the state to work and promote the farmers for increasing the demand (*Ceride-i Havadis*, 1840e: 2).

While defending agricultural development for the country, W. Churchill also wanted free trade to be more common in the country. He emphasized if a state wouldn't attach importance to trade, it wouldn't be strong. According to W. Churchill, the more the reputation of the trade, the more the country's strength increases. He stated that after the Rescript of Tanzimat, Ottoman state established Ticarethane-i Amire (Directorship of Business) for development of trade and attempted to remove the problems of traders. He stated that commercial courts was established to remove the troubles of merchants. W. Churchill underlined that the reputation given to the merchant in one country would positively affect the development of the country (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1840d: 2).

In order to indicate the significance of agriculture, thereby using the example of developed England, W. Churchill told contribution of agriculture to English economy. He expressed that because the English community had attached importance to agriculture and had made an effort, they gained huge amount of profits. Accordingly, they paid taxes in high numbers and stocked capitals of high amount. W. Churchill stated that as the capitalist farmers gave their residual fund to producers, they benefited from it and as the producers gave profit shifting to farmers, the welfare of the farmers prospered further. He emphasized that therefore the production of factory increased the demand within the country. He indicated that the main source of English development was the fund from agriculture. If there would be any degression in agriculture, the producers and merchants in the country would be damaged, the subsistence of the whole community would be effected. He expressed that if the public would be broke, the taxation of the state would decrease and the state would get weak. As W. Churchill mentioned, a regression in agriculture would decrease the indifference of public towards agriculture and this would effect other sectors as a vicious circle. He stated that the state would take a knock. He stated that the vast majority of the taxes received by the British government were given by the agriculturists and that the source of income for a state to generate the most income was agriculture (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1841a: 2).

Recommending the state to work on agricultural sector, W. Churchill mentioned the benefits of agricultural development to the state by exemplifying an

event in the country. He stated that a person obtained a farm from a ruined area of Anatolia and started to cultivate. In this direction, this person employed 14 people from the village. While tolling with part of his earnings, this farmer put aside the rest of the money as fund to work the soil next year and to drum up his businesses by hiring unemployed people around. He explained that thereby working fertile soils, entrepreneurs who had fund were gaining huge profits and were providing jobless villagers to gain for themselves by hiring them. Even though free trade would enhance the welfare of the state, W. Churchill needed that the agricultural domestic consumption to be covered within the country. If this happened, the Ottoman Empire would make a great profit for the farmers and ensure that the agriculture would develop in every region (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1841b: 1). W. Churchill gave some advices to farmers in order to improve agriculture in the country. He articulated noteworthy rules. According to W. Churchill; 1) Farmers should be careful about if the land is fertile; 2) Seed should be clean and of good quality; 3) Equipment should be of good quality and neat; 4) There should be sufficient number of oxes and other animals to plow; 5) A farmer should hire enough employee; 6) A farmer should have forage and sufficient number of sheeps. He should benefit from sheep's wool; 7) For animal production, a farmer must provide meadows, stallions and mares; 8). Farmer must have a good helping manager (*Ceride-i Havadis*, 1842a: 2).

W. Churchill suggested agricultural sector in order to form capital stock in the country. He stated that the capital needed for the management of a country could be obtained from agriculture, and it would not be able to buy an external product if the capital would not exist. He emphasized that in this direction agriculture must be extended because if agriculture would develop, the trade of the country would also increase. He wanted Ottoman state to work for this cause (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1842b: 1). W. Churchill continued to talk about the benefits of agriculture thereby describing the success story of European states in this sector. As the public in Europe lionized to this sector and worked, the states progressed. They left the old methods and used modern agricultural equipments and consequently the production increased and they obtained huge amount of goods in a short time. He expressed the importance of modern agricultural equipments. He said that these tools provided good processing of the soil and reduced the costs. W. Churchill stated that farmers in Europe were attempting new methods in order to increase production and they found out the importance of fertilizer and used fertilizer in abundance (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1842c: 1).

W. Churchill mentioned that it was necessary for the government to support agriculture in the country, to control if there were agricultural activities or not

and to determine and solve if there were any problems. He stated that a country's fortune would form from agriculture and he wanted the state to work on that in order to benefit from it. He stated that supporting the agriculture and strengthening farmers was to strengthening the state. He emphasized that the agrarian assemblies were established for the development of agriculture in Europe and that the state had developed an agriculture policy according to the agricultural geography and that bigger advantages were obtained (*Ceride-i Havadis* 1843: 1).

MEHMET ŞERİF EFENDİ AND INDUSTRIALIZATION

Industrialization problem was discussed in details in newspapers due to Ottoman Empire was remained behind from European countries. It was emphasized in the newspaper that Ottoman should develop in industry rather than agriculture. It was mentioned that a development in industry would bring along progress in agriculture. Stating lack of education as a reason to lag in industry, newspapers insistently indicated the advantages of industrial schools. Writing that the Ottoman state had been using old methods in industrial sector and had been remaining behind the necessities of the time, writers also emphasized the importance of incorporation in their articles. The most important article on this topic was "About Which One is the Good For Us: Industry or Agriculture" (*Sanayi ve Ziraatten Hangisinin Hakkımızda Hayırlı Olduğuna Dair*) by Mehmet Şerif Efendi published in *Tercüman-ı Ahval*. In this article, Şerif Efendi compared industry and agriculture and mentioned the advantages of both. He stated that industrial development would be better for the state and he advised state to improve in industrial sector. Şerif Efendi opposed W. Churchill's idea about this topic and expressed that an industrial development would contribute further on development of the state. Here below, Şerif Efendi's thoughts on which policy would be better for development were given.³

Şerif Efendi mentioned state's success on military technology at first. He stated that Sultan Mahmud II desired to complete the deficiencies in the arms industry and to keep weapons technology equal to Europe. Şerif Efendi emphasized that the end result of diligent work in this way, military technology has been brought to the body within a short period of time. He indicated that the military supplies and technology that European countries had were brought to the country and Ottoman foot soldiers' and artillerymen' knowledge on science and technology increased. He said that authorities from European military also confirmed this development through Crimean War. Şerif Efendi believed that Ottoman would realize the same success on industrial sector. He said that European states gained the

³ Mehmet Şerif Efendi did not give any information about industrial production in his articles.

development of industry through working for a long time. Even though it would seem against logic for Ottoman to reach Europe's achievements, Şerif Efendi stated that it was clear that the Ottoman Empire would be able to accomplish this with its geographical position and the ability and talent that the nation would show (Şerif Efendi 1861a: 3).

Şerif Efendi said that there were people in the country who were opposing the state's industrial development. He stated that some of the citizens were indicating that the country trying to imitate the European fabrication would result in disappointment, that the state would never reach their final level and would not be able to produce goods at this level because the country was lagging behind in comparison with Europe in industry and commerce. He emphasized that these citizens were promoting the state to agriculture and farming rather than industry and education. These citizens also expressed that it would be more beneficent that Ottoman to produce raw materials like provisions, cotton and silk and to sell those to Europe and buy manufactured goods with obtained fund. They told that it would take too much time even though they would bring being fabricator into action. Besides, these citizens said that if state to promote agriculture, a huge profit would be gained in a short amount of time rather than industry (Şerif Efendi 1861a: 3).

After quoting the defenders of agricultural developments in the country, Şerif Efendi mentioned the importance of industry for state's development. He stated that European countries had gained industry due to their working and efforts only. Even though nature hadn't assisted them, they managed to develop. If Ottoman wouldn't outdid Europe on industrialization, with the geographical position and the natural sources of the country, the state could easily actualize industrialization and would reach a level as much. Even though the production of manufactured goods was more expensive in comparison with products came from Europe, Şerif Efendi wanted that the conditions to be improved in order to grow crops equal to imported products. He stated that Europe was insistent about this. He stated that European countries produced textiles and tried to manufacture Turkish carpet and Indian scarf. They couldn't managed to do the same product however they were insistent about it. He also emphasized that they were close to achieve their goals (Şerif Efendi 1861a: 3-4).

Şerif Efendi attributed to French economy expert Josef Garner's views on agriculture and industry. Sharing Garner's statement, Şerif Efendi stated that human beings dominated the nature by the products they created with their intelligence and ability, they revealed the forces in the nature and reached wealth and richness with this way. After observing and researching nature, human beings produced

goods, which were scattered and fragmented in the nature, by working. He stated that factories emerged because human beings had been specializing in production over time, and production here was carried out quickly and easily (Şerif Efendi 1861b: 2). He expressed that despite the fact that the Eastern peoples had been reluctant to craft and trade for centuries, the European nations had worked hard with efforts, had increased their strength and accordingly they developed in craft and trade. He emphasized it was wrong to say that the Ottoman Empire would not be able to show the same success as Europe showed in industrialization. In terms of talent and capability, he stated that the Ottoman Empire was superior that day as it had been from Europeans, and that the state was powerful enough to realize industrialization (Şerif Efendi 1861b: 2- 3). He stated that the advance of the Asian peoples in the past had been at a higher level than the level reached that day by Europe, and even history books have written about it. He expressed that Europeans faced the watch an educational and industrial product, which was sent to King Charlemagne by Abbasid Khalifat Kharun Rashed, as a tool they had never met. He stated that later on Europeans started to import this product. He emphasized that industry had been developed in the past in Ottoman Empire but they couldn't maintain. Ottoman regressed in industrial sector day by day. Şerif Efendi expressed that the factories haven't been closed in one day. They regressed in a process (Şerif Efendi 1861b: 3).

Şerif Efendi wanted those who wished Ottoman to improve should embrace the need for industrial development and to encourage both sectors. He expressed that with the improvement of industry, the state could easily accumulate fund and in this direction, the collected fund would provide resources to develop agriculture. Şerif Efendi explained that the development of agriculture would take place in a very short time by means of facilitating the ways of transportation of provisions and raw materials in the country (Şerif Efendi 1861b: 3). Later on, Şerif Efendi cited development examples from Europe. He stated that the reason why Russian nation lagged behind French nation was because French nation out-classed Russian nation in science and industry not because Russian nation was behind in terms of wealth and civilization. Even though Russians outnumbered Frenchs and outclassed them in land, the Russians stayed behind economically. He explained that Brits developed agriculturally because they had a high knowledge level about agriculture and there were lots of agricultural products being diffused in the UK. He emphasized that it was clear that the Brits were also improved in industry and science. Şerif Efendi enumerated the reasons of Brits' development in agriculture in two articles: 1) discovery of agricultural tools and their use in agriculture; 2) construction of roads and channels required for transportation

of grain and other products (Şerif Efendi 1861b: 3). He stated that the invention of agricultural machinery and tools, construction of canals and roads and scientific methods of agriculture were the result of improvement of science. He indicated that the development of science and technical education in a country would lead to the development of industry and agriculture. As for that, he expressed that the formation of capital in a country would be achieved through the advancement of industry and agriculture (Şerif Efendi 1861b: 3).

Şerif Efendi stated that the production realized by a country was the national wealth of that country and that the nations who would not understand the production function would lose their national wealth within a short period of time. As a consequence, these nations would be subjected to persecution and injustice from foreign states. He explained that after the exploration of America, the Spain thought the gold and silver as the reason of abundance in the country. They began to ignore the national industry and trade and that as a consequence the money was transferred to foreign countries in a short time and that the country was regressed (Kurdakul 1990: 59). Şerif Efendi emphasized that it was impossible for the nations, who didn't have industrial sector but only had agriculture. He stated that the first and most important condition of the development of an country was industrialization (Kurdakul 1990: 59).

CONCLUSION

From the second half of the 18th century, the state changed its economic policy in order to stop the regression of the state and make it developed economically. The state began to manage the economy from an economic standpoint rather than financially. In this direction, priority was given to increasing the production of the country rather than increasing the incomes, and encouraged the manufacturer to be able to benefit more from the wealth resources of the state and also started to operate directly as a producer. The statesmen, who knew the countries in Europe developed as a result of high production, stated that increasing the production in the country would provide the development by itself. Bureaucrats established state economic enterprises in order to intervene in agriculture and industry sectors in the country and provide all kinds of incentives to producers and to be a producer state. Firstly, agricultural and industrial bureaucracies were formed and the necessary legal environment was created so that the agricultural and industrial sectors could function quickly. These bureaucrats implemented customs exemption for these crops in order to over-utilize the country's fertile land and to spread modern agricultural technology in the country. The farmers were given loans to solve the capital problem, and agriculture schools were established to increase the level of

knowledge of farmers. In addition, products with high earnings were encouraged to be planted, and commercial exemption from commercial agricultural products was provided. The state received a recompense for its support for agricultural activities due to fertile soil, and the agricultural potential of the state increased during 1840-1880. The production of agricultural industry products, which have high commercial value in the country, increased as well as the use of modern technology in some parts of the country.

Bureaucrats discoursed on industry much more than they did on agriculture because the industrial sector was in a worse condition. They stated that the fact that the western products were inexpensive was the result of the big enterprises there, and by the establishment of such enterprises, the production in the country would increase. Due to the weakness of the capitalist class, bureaucrats directly intervened to this sector to establish factories and they established state factories. The bureaucrats who initiated the industrialization movement in order to meet the important expenditures of the state, especially the military, on the domestic market, to be an example to the private sector and to accelerate the expansion of the factories in the country, could not achieved the desired success in the industrialization policy. Within 25-30 years, all the factories that the state had opened had to close down. The factories had failed management and the most important reason was that there were no good managers to manage factories in the country. Other reasons for the failure of the fabrication movements included the high cost of the products, the lack of trained workforce, the complete outsourcing of the technology, and the lack of engineers to operate them.

The economic development initiatives of the state were widely mentioned in the newly emerging newspapers and the proposals about the state policies were published in the newspapers. After the publication of the first newspaper in the country, newspapers published by private individuals also appeared over time. The second published paper was issued by the British merchant W. Churchill, who resided in the country. Because of W. Churchill's trade in the country and he was British, the publication policy of the journal was shaped by British economic thought. In this respect, the application of free trade policies in the country was vigorously defended and it was stated that the country needed to develop in the agricultural sector. While forming the publication policy of the journal, W. Churchill acted economically not in the interests of the country but in the direction of the British government to increase the product market and to meet the raw material needs of the industrialist class. According to W. Churchill, the Ottoman government would acquire the capital to buy British manufactured products through agricultural development, and in this direction, plenty of British prod-

ucts would flow to the country. Therefore, W. Churchill opposed the fabrication movement in 1840s, and wanted the state to transfer its investments to the agriculture sector, and stated that the state would gain more from it.

In the 1840s, only the official newspaper *Takvim-i Vekayi* and W. Churchill's *Ceride-i Havadis* were the only two newspapers in the country. Articles about industrialization in the country were clearly publicized with the publication of *Tercüman-ı Ahval*, the third newspaper of the Ottoman Empire. The intellectuals and bureaucrats expressed the importance of the industry for the development of the country and stated that the industry was the most requisite in the development of the country. The person who received the most comprehensive article in this regard was Mehmet Şerif Efendi, who was known as the first indigenous economist of the Ottoman state. After considering the issues of agricultural development and industrialization in *Tercüman-ı Ahval*, Şerif Efendi stressed that industrialization was more important for the development of the country, and emphasized that the development of agriculture would accelerate with the industrialization.

In order to become a developed country like European countries, Ottoman Empire aimed to develop economically as soon as possible. Accordingly, the state wished to be industrialized, and for this reason, in 1840s, industrialization moves were realized. These industrialization movements were criticized by *Ceride-i Havadis*, the only official non-newspaper publication of the period, and it was emphasized that it would be more beneficial to spend the less capital of the country for agricultural development instead of being spent on industrialization investments. It has been stated that the country had a relative development in agriculture and that if the state would show the incentives to increase agricultural production, the country would earn higher income and the necessary fabricated products would be gained with low price from foreign states. The views of *Ceride-i Havadis* about the development of the country occupied the agenda until the collapse of the state, and many articles were received in the press in this direction. The most important criticism in the first period was made by Şerif Efendi, who was an industrialist, in 1860. He expressed the importance of industrialization in the economic development of the country, and stated that the more industry would develop, agricultural sector would develop as well.

BIBLIOGRAPGHY

- Arıcanlı, T. (2010). 19. Yüzyılda Anadolu'da Mülkiyet, Toprak ve Emek. Der. Ç. Keyder-F. Tabak, *Osmanlılarda Toprak Mülkiyeti ve Ticari Tarım*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Baykal, H. (1990). *Türk Basın Tarihi 1831-1923*. İstanbul: Afa Matbaacılık.
- Berkes, N. (1976). *100 soruda Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 2*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi.
- Berkes, N. (2003). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Buluş A.-Mercan, B. (2002). Son Dönem Osmanlı İktisat Politikaları. *Liberal Düşünce*, 7/28.
- Çakır, H. (1998). Türkiye'de Serbest Gazeteciliğe İlk Adım: Yarı Özel Gazete Ceride-i Havadis. *İ. Ü. İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7.
- Ertuğ, H. R. (1970). *Basın ve Yayın Hareketleri Tarihi*, Birinci Cilt. İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi.
- Girgin, A. (2001). *Türk Basın Tarihinde Yerel Gazetecilik*. İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınları.
- Güran, T. (1992a). Ziraat Politikası ve Ziraatta Gelişmeler. *150. Yılında Tanzimat*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Güran, T. (1998). *19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Tarımı*. İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık.
- Güran, T. (2000). Tarım Politikası (1839-1913). *Yeni Türkiye Osmanlı Özel Sayısı 2*, 6/32.
- Güran, T. (1987). Osmanlı Tarım Ekonomisi 1840-1910. *Türk İktisat Tarihi Yıllığı*, 1.
- Güran, T. (1992b). Tanzimat Döneminde Devlet Fabrikaları. *150. Yılında Tanzimat*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Güran, T. (2011). Tanzimat Döneminde Tarım Politikası. Der. H. İnalçık-M. Seyitdanlıoğlu, *Tanzimat*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Hayta, N. (2002). *Tasvir-i Efkâr Gazetesi*. İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- İnuğur, M. N. (1999). *Basın ve Yayın Tarihi*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- İskit, S. (1937). *Hususi İlk Türkçe Gazetemiz Tercüman-ı Ahval ve Ağah Efendi*. Ankara: Ulus Basımevi.
- Karpat, K. (2002). *Osmanlı Modernleşmesi*. İstanbul: İmge Yayınevi.
- Keyder, Ç. (2000). Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda XVIII. ve XIX. Yüzyıllarda İmalat Sektörü. *Osmanlı Özel Sayısı 2*, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 6/32.
- Koloğlu, O. (1981). *Takvim-i Vekayi Türk Basımında 150. Yıl 1831-1981*. Ankara: Çağdaş Gazeteciler Derneği Yayınları.
- Koloğlu, O. (2010a). *Osmanlı Dönemi Basımın İçeriği*. İstanbul: İ. Ü. İletişim Yayınları.
- Koloğlu, O. (2010b). *Osmanlı Döneminde Basın Teknikleri ve Araçları*. İstanbul: İ. Ü. İletişim Yayınları.
- Koloğlu, O. (2006). *Osmanlı'dan 21. Yüzyıla Basın Tarihi*. İstanbul: Pozitif Yayınları.
- Koloğlu, O. (1985). Osmanlı Basını: İçeriği ve Rejimi, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1.
- Kurdakul, N. (1990). 19. Yüzyılda İktisat Kitapları. *Tarih ve Toplum*, 13/15.
- Mardin, Ş. (2002). *Türk Modernleşmesi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Ş. (1994). *Siyasal ve Sosyal Bilimler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Ş. (2006). *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Martal, A. (2000). 19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Sanayileşme Çabaları. Ankara, Yeni Türkiye, Osmanlı Özel Sayısı 2, 6/32.
- Matbaacılığın 250. Kuruluş Yıldönümüne Armağan, (1979). *Türkiye'nin Sosyo-politik ve Kültürel Hayatında Basın*. Ankara: Basın Yayın Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Ortaylı, İ. (2000). *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Önsoy, R. (1988). *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Sanayii ve Sanayileşme Politikası*. Ankara: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Önsoy, R. (1994-a). Tanzimat Dönemi İktisat Politikası, *Tanzimat'ın 150. Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyumu*, 31 Ekim-3 Kasım 1989. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Önsoy, R. (1994-b). Tanzimat Döneminde İktisadi Düşüncenin Teşekkülü, *Mustafa Reşit Paşa ve Dönemi Semineri Bildiriler Ankara 13-14 Mart 1985*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Özby, C. (2014). *Dünyada ve Osmanlı'da Basının Tarihsel Gelişimi*. İstanbul: Doğu Kitabevi.

- Özgen, M. (2004). *Türkiye'de Basının Gelişimi ve Sorunları*. İstanbul: İ. Ü. İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Pamuk, Ş. (2005-a). *Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadi Tarihi 1500-1914*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Pamuk, Ş. (2005-b). *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Sarç, Ö. C. (1999). *Tanzimat ve Sanayimiz, Tanzimat 1*. Komisyon, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları
- Sayar, A. G. (2000). *Osmanlı İktisat Düşüncesinin Çağdaşlaşması*. İstanbul: Ötügen Yayınları.
- Seyitdanhoğlu, M. (2011). *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Sanayii*. Der. H. İnalçık-M. Seyitdanhoğlu, *Tanzimat*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Syrett, E. F. (2010). *İzmir'de Pamuk ve Kumaş Ticareti (18. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısından 19. Yüzyılın Başlarına)*. Der: Çağlar Keyder-Faruk Tabak, *Osmanlılarda Toprak Mülkiyeti ve Ticari Tarım*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Şapolyo, E. B. (1971). *Türk Gazeteciliği Tarihi Her Yönüyle Basın*. Ankara: Güven Matbaası.
- Şener, A. (1999). *Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'te İktisadi ve Mali Politikalar, Osmanlı 3*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları.
- Şener, A. (1994). *Osmanlı Mali Düşüncesinin Çağdaşlaşması, Tanzimat'ın 150. Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyumu*, Ankara, 31Ekim-3 Kasım 1989. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Şirin, V. (1996). *Osmanlı Tarihi, Siyasi ve Kültürel*. İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları.
- Tabakoğlu, A. (2000). *Türk İktisat Tarihi*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2006). *XIX. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Tepekaya, M. (2000). *Sanayi Devrimi Döneminde Osmanlı İktisadi Yapısı, Osmanlı Özel Sayısı 2*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 6/32.
- Tezel, Y. S. (2002). *Cumhuriyet Dönemi İktisadi Tarihi*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Quataert, D. (1985). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Tarımsal Gelişme, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi 6*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Quataert, D. (2004). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu (1700-1922)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Quataert, D. (2008-a). *Anadolu'da Osmanlı Reformu ve Tarımı 1876-1908*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Quataert, D. (2004). *19. Yüzyıla Genel Bakış Islahatlar Devri 1812-1914*, Edi: H. İnalçık-D. Quataert, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi 2*, İstanbul. Eren Yayıncılık.
- Quataert, D. (2008b). *Sanayi Devrimi Çağında Osmanlı İmalat Sektörü*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Yazıcı, N. (1983). *Takvim-i Vekayi*. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Basın Yayın Yüksekokulu Basımevi.
- Yayla-Seyitdanhoğlu, A.-M. (1998). *Türkiye'de Liberalizm. Liberal Düşünce, 3/11*.
- Yerlikaya, İ. (1995). *Tercüman-ı Ahval Gazetesi ve Hükümet Destekli Habercilik Anlayışı. Toplumsal Tarih, 4/21*.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (31 Temmuz 1840a). 1, 2.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (29 Ağustos 1840b). 4, 3.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (18 Eylül 1840c). 6, 2.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (28 Eylül 1840d). 7, 2.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (25 Aralık 1840e). 19, 2.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (11 Nisan 1841a). 29, 2.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (13 Mayıs 1841b). 34, 1.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (23 Nisan 1842a). 83, 2.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (25 Haziran 1842b). 92, 1.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (13 Kasım 1842c). 112, 1.
- Ceride-i Havadis*, (25 Eylül 1843). 132, 1.
- Mehmet Şerif Efendi, (19 Ağustos 1861a/22 Ağustos 1861b). *Sanayi ve Ziraatten Hangisinin Hakımızda Hayırlı Olduğuna Dair. Tercüman-ı Ahval, 68/3-4; 69/2-3*.