Chapter X Turkey between Pan-Islamism and Nationalism: The Activities of Ahmad Sharif al-Sanusi in Anatolia, 1918–1924.

KASUYA Gen

Introduction

The Anatolian resistance movement in the post-First World War period, was led by a circle of Ottoman military commanders under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal (1881–1938), who found the terms of the Mudros armistice of 1918 unacceptable. This movement has been characterized as the Turkish national struggle by official or orthodox historiography in Turkey, where the religious factor in the movement has been ignored.

In Turkey, particularly from the 1980s, the "Islamist" interpretation of modern Turkish history, which tends to emphasize the element of jihad of the Anatolian resistance movement, has become normal and acceptable as an antithesis of the Kemalist historical perspective. However, it would be fruitless to debate whether the Anatolian resistance movement—the so-called Independence War—was a national movement or a religious one. In this transition period, that is, on the eve of the formation of the Turkish Republic, the ideological and political situation was very complex, and the various ideological and political currents themselves were typically overlapping.

In order to avoid a one-sided characterization, I shall focus on a Libyan shaykh who supported the legitimacy of the Independence War and the Ankara (TBMM, i.e., Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi) government, that is, Ahmad Sharif al-Sanusi (1873–1933). In my opinion, a follow-up to his activities in the Independence War

¹ It is known by different names under the same bibliographical category, such as *İstiklal Harbi* (The Independence War), *Milli Mücadele* (The National Struggle), or *Kurtuluş Savaşı* (The War of Liberation) in modern Turkish history writing.

² For e.g., Kadir Mısıroğlu, *Kurtuluş Savaşında Sarıklı Mücahitler* (Turbaned fighters in the War of Liberation (İstanbul: Sebil Yayınevi, 1967); Cemal Kutay, *Kurtuluşun ve Cumhuriyetin Manevi Mimarları* (The spiritual architects of the liberation and republic) (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, n.d.); Ali Sarıkoyuncu, *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları* (Religious figures in the National Struggle), 2 vols. (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1995–97); Recep Çerik, *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları* (Religious figures in the National Struggle), 2 vols. (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1999).

could provide some new perspectives on the Turkish political and ideological stance during this period.

The fact that remains least known is that Ahmad Sharif, the third grand master of the Sanusiyya order in Libya, had escaped to Istanbul in 1918, and then left Istanbul for inner Anatolia to join the Independence War. In Anatolia, he moved from place to place to support the Ankara government until 1924, when he left for abroad.³ Incidentally, the activities of Ahmad Sharif in Turkey have been swept aside in modern Libyan history writing.

Why did Ahmad Sharif come to Turkey and then join the Independence War? Why did the Ankara government cooperate with him? What did he do in Turkey? Before answering these questions, I will briefly touch upon his life until 1918, that is, the year he came to Istanbul.

After acquiring leadership through succession in 1902, Ahmad Sharif immediately developed a political and military organization for the Sanusi community against the French expansion in the Sudan region. However, following a defeat, he decided to withdraw from Kuru to Kufra in 1902. In need of international recognition and support, he agreed to the establishment of direct Ottoman rule in Cyrenaica and Fazzan in 1910. In 1911, the Italians invaded Ottoman Libya and occupied a large area of the country. During this period, Ahmad Sharif raised a call for jihad and led a largely Bedouin force, in cooperation with the Ottoman troops, against the invaders. After the conclusion of the Italo-Ottoman peace agreement of Lausanne-Ouchy in 1912, Ahmad Sharif continued resistance against the Italians with the direct support of the Ottoman government, especially the Teskilât-1 Mahsusa.⁴ The Sultan-Caliph Mehmed Reşat approved of Ahmad Sharif's installation of a "Sanusiyya government" in Cyrenaica and Fezzan. From 1912 to 1915, Ahmad Sharif was occasionally able to defeat the Italian forces. When Italy joined the Entente Powers against the Ottoman Empire in 1915, Ahmad Sharif was secretly appointed as the *Naib ül-Sultan* (sultan's representative) with the rank of vizier (vezir) and the title of pasha (paşa). Although, 1915 onwards, regular financial and logistic support from Istanbul continued, the 1916 Sanusi guerrilla attack against

³ For a few studies, see Orhan Koloğlu, *Mustafa Kemal'ın Yanında İki Libya'lı Lider: Ahmet Şerif–Süleyman Baruni* (Two leaders from Libya with Mustafa Kemal: Ahmet Şerif–Süleyman Baruni) (Ankara: Ankara Halk Bürosu Kültür Merkezi Yayını, 1981); Kadir Özköse, "Seyyid Ahmed eş-Şerif'in Anadolu'daki Millî Mücadele'ye Katılışı ve Mustafa Kemal'i Desteklemesi" (Seyyid Ahmed eş-Şerif's commitment for the National Struggle in Anatolia and support for Mustafa Kemal), *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 5, no. 2 (2001): 317–28.

On the Teşkilât-ı Mahsusa, see Hüsameddin Ertürk, İki Devrin Perde Arkası (The backstage of the two periods), ed. Samih Nafiz Tansu, 2nd ed. (İstanbul: Pınar yayınevi, 1964), 109–14; Philip Hendrick Stoddard, "The Ottoman Government and the Arabs, 1911 to 1918: A Preliminary Study of the Teşkilât-ı Mahsusa" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1963).

the British in western Egypt failed. Ahmad Sharif maintained his relationship with the Ottomans; however, the influence of his cousin, Sayyid Muhammad Idris, had meanwhile increased. With Ahmad Sharif's permission, Idris opened negotiations with the British and the Italians in 1917. His political leadership was steadily declining; however, he remained the spiritual chief of the Sanusiyya order till his death.⁵

1. Ahmad Sharif's Stay in Turkey

On 21 August 1918, Ahmad Sharif left Libya and was transported to Istanbul by a German submarine, which passed Pula (in present-day Croatia) en route. On 30 August 1918, he arrived in Istanbul. Widely regarded as one of the foremost *mücahid* (fighters for Islam), he was well received by the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul. His long-lasting prestige is evident from the fact that he was chosen to officiate at the ceremonial girding of the sword of the new sultan-caliph, Mehmed Vahideddin, in place of the usual *Nakib-ül Eşraf* or *Çelebi Efendi*, the head of the Meylevi order.

According to Shakib Arslan, ⁸ who was in Turkey during this period and knew Ahmad Sharif during his stay in Turkey, the sultan-caliph apparently wanted Ahmad Sharif to return to Libya so that he might rally the Muslims of Africa in a final attempt to support the Ottomans and their German Allies. However, this did not seem feasible for more than one reason, the most important of which was the difficulty of transporting Ahmad Sharif to his country. ⁹

After a short stay at Istanbul, Ahmad Sharif moved to Bursa in November 1918. His stay at Bursa lasted almost two years. Many Turks, Kurds, Circassians, and Albanians came to visit him and apparently enrolled in the Sanusiyya order. He is a stay of the sanusiyya order.

Nicola A. Ziadeh, *Sanūsīyah: A Study of a Revivalist Movement in Islam*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983), 65–72; Koloğlu, *Mustafa Kemal'ın Yanında*, passim; A. H. de Groot, "Al-Sanūsī, Shaykh Sayyid Aḥmad," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 9 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 23–24; Hülya Küçük, *The Role of the Bektāshīs in Turkey's National Struggle* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002), 296–98.

⁶ Sebilürreşad (The straight path), 5 Sep. 1918 (5 Eylül 1334) (no. 368), 79. He also gave an interview with *Yeni Gün* (New day). See *Yeni Gün*, 4 Sep. 1918 (4 Eylül 1334) (no. 3).

The ceremonial girding of the sword was held on 31 August 1918. Details can be found in Ruşen Eşref, *İki Saltanat Arasında* (Between the two sultanates) (Dersaadet: Kanaat Kütüphane ve Matbaası, 1918 [1334]), 35–42; Ali Fuad Türkgeldi, *Görüp İşittiklerim* (What I saw and heard), 2nd ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1951), 145–47.

⁸ On Shakib Arslan, see William L. Cleveland, *Islam against the West: Shakib Arslan and the Campaign for Islamic Nationalism* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985).

⁹ Ziadeh, *Sanūsīyah*, 70–71.

¹⁰ Koloğlu, Mustafa Kemal'ın Yanında, 46.

¹¹ Ziadeh, Sanūsīyah, 71.

In the meantime, the Anatolian resistance movement's side wanted to take advantage of Ahmad Sharif's presence in Anatolia. In 21 April 1920, Ali Fuat Paşa, commander of the western front at that time, made contact with Ahmad Sharif as soon as he arrived at Bursa. Ali Fuat asked him to support the fatwa (*fetva*) of the Anatolian 'ulama' (*ulemalar*) as opposed to that of the *şeyhülislâm*, upholding all the Muslims and Turks who joined Mustafa Kemal's forces. During Ahmad Sharif's stay at Bursa, Mustafa Kemal had undoubtedly taken a great interest in him and invited him to reside at Ankara. It seems that Ahmad Sharif, at first, hesitated to support Mustafa Kemal. However, on probably realizing that Istanbul and its government were certainly counting days, Ahmad Sharif eventually decided to move to the inner part of Anatolia and to support the nationalists led by Mustafa Kemal. He left Bursa on 8 July 1920. Is

2. Support Lent by Ahmad Sharif to the Independence War

Ahmad Sharif arrived in Ankara on 15 November 1920,¹⁶ passing by Konya¹⁷ en route. He was well received by Mustafa Kemal with a banquet honoring him at Ankara.¹⁸ The British Intelligence Report, dated 16 December 1920, states the following:

The Sheikh of the Senussi was entertained to a banquet on the 25th November by the Great National Assembly, upon which occasion Mustapha Kemal made a long, laudatory speech concerning the importance of the sheikh as a leader of the Pan-Islamic movement. (...) The sheikh made a short speech in reply,

¹² [General] Ali Fuat Cebesoy, *Millî Mücadele Hâtıraları* (Memoirs of the National Struggle) (İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyatı, 1953), 354–56.

¹³ Muhittin Ünal, ed., *Miralay Bekir Sami Günsav'ın Kurtuluş Savaşı Anıları* (Memoirs of Miralay Bekir Sami Günsav in the War of Liberation) (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1994), 321–22.

¹⁴ At the end, Ahmad Sharif applied to go to Ankara. TİTE: Türk İnkilap Tarihi Enstitüsü Arşivi (Ankara), Kutu 330, Gömlek 26, Belge 26, 2 Temmuz 1336/1920. According to Hüsamettin Ertürk, one of the leaders of the Teşkilât-ı Mahsusa, the sultan government sent Ahmad Sharif to Ankara to mediate with the Ankara government. Ertürk, *İki Devrin Perde Arkası*, 194. However, its reliability is doubtful.

¹⁵ Koloğlu, Mustafa Kemal'ın Yanında, 114.

¹⁶ Hakimiyet-i Milliye (National sovereignty), 17 Nov. 1920 (17 Teşrinisani 1336) (no. 77).

¹⁷ Ahmad Sharif arrived in Konya on 12 July 1920. Caner Arabacı, *Milli Mücadele Dönemi Konya Öğretmenleri* (Teachers in Konya in the National Struggle's period) (Konya: Damla Matbaacılık ve Ticaret, 1991), 29. In Konya, Ahmad Sharif could have been of great help to the Ankara government when a local rebellion (*Delibaş İsyanı*) broke out in the fall of 1920.

¹⁸ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 27 Nov. 1920 (27 Teşrinisani 1336) (no. 80).

praising the "Jihad," or Holy War, which was being waged by the Turks, and terminated by saying that he was ready at all times to devote himself to one cause—the union of Islam.

It is worthy of note that the Sheikh of the Senussi has been mentioned as a possible candidate for the Khalifat. ¹⁹ There is also good reason to believe that the Nationalists are carrying on a careful but energetic campaign against the present Sultan. There is not at present sufficient evidence available, however, to permit the exact nature of the part to be played by the sheikh in the Pan-Islamic schemes of the Nationalists. ²⁰

Another instance of Ahmad Sharif's support for the Ankara government that can be cited includes his *beyanat* (statement) in the *Yeni Gün* (New day) of 21 January 1923.²¹ This *beyanat* was reprinted in a propaganda pamphlet, bearing the title *Hilafet ve Milli Hakimiyet* (The caliphate and national sovereignty), which was published by the Ankara government in 1923 to support the view of the so-called "spiritual caliphate." His activities in Turkey were introduced in other propaganda pamphlets distributed by the Ankara government.²² Ahmad Sharif also sent a telegram to the TBMM congratulating it on the opening of its second term.²³

3. The Pan-Islamic Congresses in Anatolia

In early 1921, a Pan-Islamic congress was held at Sivas under the presidency of Ahmad Sharif, evidently under the official auspices of the Ankara government. *Islamic News* on 27 January 1921 reported the following:

We also learn that during the early part of the present month a Pan-Islamic conference was held at Sivas under the presidency of El Seyid Ahmed, the Sheikh of the Senussi, who also acted as Turkish representative. Others present are said to have included the Emir Abdullah, Feisal's brother, an Emir of Kerbela, and also a representative of the Imam Yehia, the Emir of Sanaa in the Yemen. The object of the conference was to draw up a scheme of co-ordina-

¹⁹ The caliphate was after all not offered to him when Vahideddin was made to abdicate by the Ankara government in November 1922.

²⁰ FO (Public Record Office, Foreign Office Series) 371/6497/E477.

²¹ Anadolu'da Yeni Gün (New day in Anatolia) gave his statement under the headline: "A Very Important Statement of His Excellency Shaykh al-Sanusi: All Rights and Duties belong to the TBMM," Anadolu'da Yeni Gün, 21 Jan. 1923 (21 Kanunusani 1339) (no. 1080/703).

²² For e.g., *Anadolu Hediyesi* (Gift of Anatolia), no. 4 (Dersaadet, 1921 [1337]).

²³ *T.B.M.M. Zabit Ceridesi*: devre 2, cilt 1: içtima senesi 1 (Ankara: [T.B.M.M.], 1961), 71; meeting on 16 August 1923 (1339).

tion of the efforts of all Muslim States and communities for the purpose of creating a solid Islamic union.²⁴

Lothrop Stoddard also refers to this congress in his book, *The New World of Islam*—published in 1921.

A most remarkable portent in this direction is the Pan-Islamic conference held at Sivas early in 1921. This conference, called to draw up a definite scheme for effective Moslem co-operation the world over, was attended not merely by the high orthodox Moslem dignitaries and political leaders, but also by heterodox chiefs like the Shiah Emir of Kerbela, the Imam Yahya, and the Zaidite Emir of Yemen–leaders of heretical sects between whom and the orthodox Sunnis co-operation had previously been impossible. Most notable of all, the press reports state that the conference was presided over by no less a personage than El Sennussi. This may well be so, for we have already seen how the Sennussi have always worked for a close union of all Islam against Western domination.²⁵

Very few details are known with regard to the discussion, decisions and participants at this congress. As far as I know, there is unfortunately no corroboration in Turkish sources, except Ahmad Sharif's *hutbe* on 1 February 1921 at Cami-i Kebir in Sivas, which was published in the *Sebilürreşad* (The straight path), the Ankara govenment's organ of Pan-Islamism, on 31 March 1921. In his *hutbe*, he passionately called on jihad for the Muslim community (*cemaat*) and the union of Muslims to "*Anadolu Müslümanları*" (Anatolian Muslims) or "*Anadolunun kahraman İslam mücahidleri*" (Anatolian heroic fighters for Islam) or "*Müslüman kardaşlar*" (Muslim brothers). He never used the term "*Türk*" in his *hutbe*. We can find that the Anatolian movement was not the Turkish national movement but, in fact, jihad for the Muslim community in his *hutbe*.

Mustafa Kemal decided to organize Muslim sympathy in a structured congress of Muslims. The following report by the British Secret Intelligence Service dated 28 August 1922 made known another proposed Islamic congress:

According to information obtained from a member of the Kemalist Committee

²⁴ Islamic News, 27 Jan. 1921 (no. 13). On Islamic News, see Jacob M. Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994 [with additions and corrections]), 207.

Lothrop Stoddard, The New World of Islam (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), 236–37.

²⁶ Sebilürreşad, 31 Mar. 1921 (31 Mart 1337) (no. 474), 49–50.

in Constantinople, plans for the convocation of an Islamic Congress have been discussed of late by a Committee at Angora consisting of:—

Mustafa Kemal,

Abdullah Azmi, Commissioner for Religious Affairs of the Angora Government, Sheikh Senussi,

Ajemi Saadun Pasha,

Jevad Pasha, C-in-C. Diarbekir,

Fevzi Pasha,

Sultan Ahmed Khan, Afghan Ambassador,

Mumtaz ul Dowle, Persian Envoy,

Ibrahim Abiloff, Azerbaijan Envoy.

There were also present at the meetings of this Committee numerous deputies and journalists, including the editor of an Islamic review, published in Angora, entitled the "Sirat i Mustakim." The Sheikh Senussi, Ajemi Pasha and Jevad Pasha did not attend the meetings of the Committee in person as they were not in Angora, but expressed their opinions by correspondence.

Details of the proceedings of this Committee are not at present available, but it would appear that at the outset considerable differences arose concerning the place at which the proposed Islamic Congress should be held. The Afghan Envoy wished it to be held at Kabul, the Persian Envoy insisted upon its being held at Teheran, whilst Mustafa Kemal insisted, with equal vehemence, upon its being held in Angora, or at least in some city in Anatolia. As a result of these and other differences, it was decided that the question should be postponed for the time being.

This decision was probably brought about by the desire of the Angora Government to do nothing at present to arouse suspicion and resentment in Europe.²⁷

4. Ahmad Sharif's Activities at the Turco-Iraq Frontier

In April 1921, Ahmad Sharif was designated king of Iraq at the Assembly of Ankara (TBMM).²⁸ *The New York Times* on 20 April 1921 reported briefly about this:

Angora Chooses Mesopotamian Ruler.

²⁷ FO 371/7889/E9449.

²⁸ For the Iraqi reaction, see Qassam Kh. Al-Jumaily, *Irak ve Kemalizm Hareketi* (1919–1923) (Iraq and the Kemalism movement), ed. İzzet Öztoprak (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1999), 46–47.

The Turkish National Assembly at Angora has offered the throne of Mesopotamia to Ahmed, Sheik of the Senussi, according to advice received here today. The Nationalists declare that the British, under whose mandate Mesopotamia is, were preparing to offer the throne to Prince Feisal, son of the King of the Hedjaz.²⁹

On 15 December 1920, Italian ambassador communicated to the British government information that Mustafa Kemal has sent the ex-Senoussi to Mardin in order to create unrest and disturbances.³⁰ On 23 August 1921, Consul Palmer (Damascus) reported to the Lord Curzon that "the Alif Ba of yesterday states that the Sheikh Senousi is at Mardin."³¹

Early in 1922, Ahmad Sharif was found at Urfa, coming into contact with the great Bedouin tribes of 'Anaza and Shammar. *The Muslim Standard*³² on 26 January 1922 reported this as follows:

His Holiness Syed Ahmad Grand Shaikh of Sennusis in Irak.

(...) After blessing thousands of Arabs of Mesopotamia who had travelled enormous distances to welcome him at Urfa we learn from our own sources that His Holiness, with the help of the leaders of Beni Aneza and Beni Shamir, the two leading tribes of North Irak, who have already sent contingents to Angora, and those of other Arabs whose after-war disillusionment in consequence of their realising the real significance of Husain and Co.'s treacherous acts, is growing and deepening day after day—has called a general council of Arab elders at Urfa. (...)³³

In addition, The British Secret Intelligence Service Report dated 9 February 1922 mentioned the following:

According to information from a reliable agent, Sheikh Ahmed El Senussi was in Urfa in January. As already stated in previous reports, his chief occupation is the dissemination of pan-Islamic propaganda in Arab countries, and it is stated by informant that this propaganda is making considerable progress... The Director of the Damascus Committee is a Tripolitan named Naji Bey, first secretary of the province; with whom is associated Abdulghani el Bejegeni, son

²⁹ The New York Times, 20 Apr. 1921.

³⁰ FO 371/5041/E15678.

³¹ FO 371/6528/E10102.

³² The Muslim Standard is the continuation of the Islamic News. Landau, The Politics of Pan-Islam, 207.

³³ *The Muslim Standard*, 26 Jan. 1922 (no. 11).

of Izzeddin el Bejegeni, a former Kadi of Tripoli, who emigrated to Constantinople... Abdulghani stated that the Sheikh Senussi had recruited 20,000 trained men³⁴ and had been ordered by Mustapha Kemal to invade Iraq, but he had replied that as he was not yet ready, the attack would have to be postponed until April, 1922. Izzeddin believed the Sheikh Senussi to be secretly hostile to Mustapha Kemal but to be afraid to show it. Mustapha Kemal had made him many fine promises, but hitherto he had had nothing but his pains as a reward. The Sheikh, Izzeddin continued, wished to avoid bloodshed amongst Moslems and his object was to unite all the tribes of the Iraq in the Islamic cause against the British (...)³⁵

Later, Ahmad Sharif was at Mardin, making an attempt to reunite Syria to Turkey. From there, he went to live at Damascus. At a later period, Ahmad Sharif went to Diyarbakir, where he met a number of Arab and Kurdish chiefs and asked for their loyalty to the new Turkish government. Ahmad Sharif later moved to Tarsus and Mersin, and he occasionally paid short visits to Ankara. According to Shakib Arslan, during this period, an Italian emissary visited him and tried to conclude a treaty between him and the Italian government, but nothing came out of that.

5. Reinterpretation of Turkish Nationalism in This Period

A series of Ahmad Sharif's activities at the Turco-Iraq frontier in this period were closely related to the so-called "Mosul question." ³⁶

³⁴ This figure is almost certainly exaggerated. Informant has explained that the army recruited by Ahmad Sharif consisted of Arabs from Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and also of Kurds, many of whom were formerly in the Turkish army, while others were nomad tribesmen.

³⁵ FO 371/7790/E5336.

³⁶ For the Mosul question, see V. F. M. (Vladimir Fedorovich Minorsky), *The Mosul Question* (Paris: Reference Service on International Affairs of the American Library in Paris, 1926); Arnold J. Toynbee, *Survey of International Affairs 1925*, vol. 1, *Islamic World since the Peace Settlement* (London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press, 1927), 471–531; François Georgeon, "De Mossoul à Kirkouk: La Turquie et la question du Kurdistan irakien," *Monde arabe Maghreb Machrek*, no. 132 (1991): 38–49; Peter J. Beck, "A Tedious and Perilous Controversy': Britain and the Settlement of the Mosul Dispute, 1918–1926," *Middle Eastern Studies* 17, no. 2 (1981): 256–76; *Misâk-ı Millî ve Türk Dış Politikasında Musul, Kerkük, ve Erbil Meselesi [Misâk-ı Millî ve Türk Dış Politikasında Musul, Kerkük ve Erbil Meselesi Sempozyumu (1997: Konya)]* (The National Pact and Mosul–Kirkuk–Arbil in Turkish foreign policy) (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1998); Zekeriya Türkmen, *Musul Meselesi: Askerî Yönden Çözüm Arayışları (1922–1925)* (The Mosul question: The search for a military solution [1922–1925]) (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2003);

The possession of Mosul, or rather over the exact frontier line between Turkey and Iraq, under the British mandate, was a matter of compromise for neither Turkey nor Britain because of the area's oil potential and strategic value. In spite of the fact that Mosul had been occupied by Britain since the close of 1918, the territory still remained in a state of deadlock. The large number of Kurds residing within Mosul and the existence of the pro-Turkish committees in Mosul³⁷ further encouraged Mustafa Kemal to press for Mosul. In 6 January 1922, H. Rumbold reported to Lord Curzon that Mustafa Kemal sent a mission under Ahmad Sharif to Mosul to create pro-Ankara sentiments.

(Turkish) Nationalists had given up all idea of recovering former Arab dominions of the Sultan, but he (Signor Tuozzi) thought their idea was to intrigue for formation of a weak Mesopotamian state in alliance with them. They were using Sheikh-es Senoussi to carry on intrigues in Mesopotamia from (Gr. undec.) They wish to recover Mosul which they consider to be a Turkish town. They were very against King Hussein.³⁸

In addition, a series of Ahmad's activities at the Turco-Iraq frontier at the instance of Mustafa Kemal or his close associate require the reinterpretation of the National Pact (*Misak-ı Milli*) of 1920 and the Turkish nationalism itself during this period. Recent studies suggest that the first article of the National Pact³⁹ was far from being the complete renunciation of Arab territories as it is commonly assumed. It is quite natural for Turkey, which had deputies from Mosul and Kirkuk in the last Ottoman Parliament (Meclis-i Mebusan), to claim that Mosul was the inseparable

İhsan Şerif Kaymaz, Musul Sorunu: Petrol ve Kürt Sorunları ile bağlantılı Tarihsel ve Siyasal bir İnceleme (The Mosul question: A historical and political study on petroleum and the Kurdish question) (İstanbul: Otopsi Yayınları, 2003); Tahir Kodal, Paylaşılamayan Toprak: Türk Basınına göre (1923–1926) Musul Meselesi (Indivisible land: The Mosul question reported in the Turkish press from 1923 to 1926) (İstanbul: Yeditep Yayınları, 2005).

³⁷ For the pro-Turkish committees in Mosul, see Sakai Keiko 酒井啓子, "Iraku ni okeru kokka keisei to seiji soshiki" イラクにおける国家形成と政治組織 (Social Networks and State Formation in Iraq), in *Kokka, buzoku, Aidentitī: Arabu shakai no kokumin keisei* 国家・部族・アイデンティティー——アラブ社会の国民形成 (Social identity and national formation in the Arab world), ed. Sakai Keiko (Tokyo: Ajia keizai kenkūjo アジア経済研究所 [The Institute of Developing Economies], 1993), 118–20. (In Japanese)

Inasmuch as it is necessary that the destinies of the portions of the Turkish Empire which are peopled by Arab majorities, and which on the conclusion of the Armistice of October 30, 1918, were under occupation by enemy forces, should be determined in

³⁸ FO 371/7853/E320.

³⁹ The translation of article 1 of the National Pact by Ahmed Emin, the editor of the *Vatan*, is as follows:

territory which had been claimed in the National Pact. This was proven by a series of Ahmad Sharif's activities at the Turco-Iraq frontier. However, in 1926, the treaty of Ankara was finally signed and Mosul went to the British mandate of Iraq. This terminated the Turkish-Anglo conflict over Mosul, which had originated in 1918, and marked a territorial defeat for Turkey.

As previously mentioned, Ahmad Sharif was invited to Istanbul, where he became a guest of the Ottoman government. However, after his stay in Bursa, he chose to support the Ankara government, and became one of its emissaries in the provinces of Anatolia and Iraq, by preaching jihad against the Allies or the caliph forces and rallying the Arabs and Kurds to support the Ankara government. As a result, Ahmad Sharif played a role in integrating the Turks and non-Turkish Muslims.

Conclusion

From the beginning of the Independence War, the Anatolian nationalists had managed to be on cordial terms with the Muslim world, which could give at least moral and occasionally diversionary support. In addition, they did not wish to antagonize the Pan-Islamists within the assembly and the Turkish population. Hence, the Anatolian nationalists declared jihad for liberating the sultan-caliph and Istanbul from foreign occupation and showed respect for the Pan-Islamic sentiment, cooperating with influential Muslims, such as Ahmad Sharif, or organizing Pan-Islamic congresses. Consequently, Mustafa Kemal's contemporaries in Europe and the Muslim world considered him a Pan-Islamist. Mustafa Kemal continued the traditional Ottoman policy of Pan-Islam, just as the Committee of Union and Progress had continued that policy. In an India Office report dated 9 December 1921, D. Luke wrote "There would appear to be little real difference in aim between the Pan-Islamic policy of Mustafa Kemal and that of Enver Pasha." Sir Andrew Ryan, a British dragoman at that time, expressed a similar view in his memoir, *The Last of the Dragomans*.

accordance with a free plebiscite of the inhabitants, all such territories (whether within or outside the lines of the said Armistice) which are inhabited by an Ottoman Moslem majority, who are united in religion, in race and in aim, are imbued with sentiments of mutual regard, are prepared for individual sacrifice, and have an absolute respect for one another's racial rights and social circumstances, form a whole which does not admit of division for any reason in truth or in law.

Ahmed Emin, *Turkey in the World War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), 276. FO 371/6345/E13559.

I feared political Pan-Islamism. It looked as though Mustafa Kemal might make that his instrument as Enver had almost certainly dreamt of doing. I did not see much difference, so far as I remember, between Kemal's group and the old Committee of Union and Progress, apart from a struggle for leadership.⁴¹

However, Mustafa Kemal himself was no Pan-Islamist. Although he tacitly accepted such support for a while, Kemal never committed himself to any Pan-Islamic cause. In the *Vakit* (Times) dated 11 December 1921, Kemal elaborately commented on Pan-Islamism as follows:

What do we mean by Pan-Islamism? ...It would be illogical, however, to dream of a Utopia in which all Islamic countries would be united into one empire... Consider our position a few centuries ago in connection with Africa, Syria, Macedonia, Serbia and other countries, and then consider our present position. In our great empire of former days there were various nations, various climates, and various manners. Was it possible to administer all after the same manner, to submit them all to the same regime? ...Instead of running after chimeras, let us confine ourselves to our legitimate aims. 42

During the period, 1918–1923, the Turkish attitude proved to be ambivalent between Pan-Islamism (in Turkish "*İttihad-i İslam*") and Turkish nationalism. Kemal's welcome speech at the banquet, which was held on 25 November 1920 in honor of Ahmad Sharif's arrival, was published in the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* (National sovereignty) on 27 November 1920. It referred to the common ties of religion, although his emphasis on this issue was lesser than that of his visitor. In his speech, Kemal thanked Ahmad Sharif for his support to "the Turkish state (Turkiya Devleti) as the pillar of the Islamic world," while not mentioning the Islamic union at all.⁴³

The Treaty of Lausanne, which was finally signed on 24 July 1923, became a turning point for the Turkish ambivalent attitude. In many respects, it represented a victory for Turkey. Although the Mosul question still remained unsettled, Turkey succeeded in securing most of the boundaries of the National Pact and emerged as a sovereign state. The support of Muslims outside Turkey, which was a strategic Pan-Islamic policy, had become less important once the peace treaty was signed.

Of the various ideologies, Ottomanism had died a natural death with the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism were regarded as risky for the securing of peace with its neighbors. The young Republic of Turkey abolished the caliphate, a symbol of a universal Muslim community, on 3 March

⁴¹ Andrew Ryan, *The Last of the Dragomans* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1951), 171.

⁴² Vakit, 11 Dec. 1921 (11 Kanunuevvel 1337).

⁴³ Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 27 Nov. 1920 (27 Teşrinisani 1336).

1924. It ended the political legitimacy of Pan-Islamism. There remained secular nationalism, which was focused on the "Türk" within the boundaries of the new republic.

In late 1924, Ahmad Sharif was requested to leave Turkey. Ironically, this request came from Mustafa Kemal himself. It has been argued that Mustafa Kemal suspected that Ahmad Sharif was either inclined toward the Ottoman family or interested in the idea of becoming caliph. After leaving Turkey, Ahmad Sharif went to Damascus, however, here again, he was ordered to leave within twenty-four hours, because the French found his presence in Syria embarrassing. Thence, he went to the Hijaz, passing by Jerusalem en route. During the last years of his life took lesser interest in politics. Ahmad Sharif spent the remaining years of his life alternating between Mecca and Medina till his death on 10 March 1933, he never set foot on Libya again.

Bibliography

Archival Materials

FO: Public Record Office/Foreign Office Series (London), 371/5041, 371/6345, 371/6497, 371/6528, 371/7790, 371/7853, 371/7889.

TİTE: Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Arşivi (Archives of the Institute for the History of Turkish Revolution, Ankara), Kutu 330, Gömlek 26, Belge 26.

Official Documents

T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi (Minutes of the Turkish Grand National Assembly): devre 2, cilt 1: içtima senesi 1. Ankara: [T.B.M.M.], 1961.

Newspapers and periodicals

Anadolu'da Yeni Gün (New day in Anatolia). 21 January 1923 (21 Kanunusani 1339) (No. 1080/703).

Hakimiyet-i Milliye (National sovereignty). 17 November 1920 (17 Teşrinisani 1336) (No. 77), 27 November 1920 (27 Teşrinisani 1336) (No. 80).

Islamic News. 27 January 1921 (No. 13).

Sebilürreşad (The straight path). 5 September 1918 (5 Eylül 1334) (No. 368), 31 March 1921

⁴⁴ For the last years of Ahmad's life, see Muhammad Asad, *The Road to Mecca* (London: Max Reinhardt, 1954), 312–43.

(31 Mart 1337) (No. 474).

The Muslim Standard. 26 January 1922 (No. 11).

The New York Times. 20 April 1921.

Yeni Gün (New day). 4 September 1918 (4 Eylül 1334) (No. 3).

Vakit (Times). 11 December 1921 (11 Kanunuevvel 1337).

Books and Articles

Ahmed Emin. Turkey in the World War. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

Anadolu Hediyesi (Gift of Anatolia). No. 4. Dersaadet, 1921 (1337).

Arabacı, Caner. *Milli Mücadele Dönemi Konya Ögretmenleri* (Teachers of Konya in the National Struggle's period). Konya: Damla Matbaacılık ve Ticaret, 1991.

Asad, Muhammad. The Road to Mecca. London: Max Reinhardt, 1954.

Beck, Peter J. "'A Tedious and Perilous Controversy': Britain and the Settlement of the Mosul Dispute, 1918–1926." *Middle Eastern Studies* 17, no. 2 (1981): 256–76.

Cebesoy, [General] Ali Fuat. *Millî Mücadele Hâtıraları* (Memoirs of the National Struggle). İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyatı, 1953.

Cleveland, William L. Islam against the West: Shakib Arslan and the Campaign for Islamic Nationalism. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985.

Çerik, Recep. *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları* (Religious figures in the National Struggle). 2 vols. İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1999.

Ertürk, Hüsameddin. İki Devrin Perde Arkası (The backstage of the two periods). Edited by Samih Nafiz Tansu. İstanbul: Pınar yayınevi, 1964.

Georgeon, François. "De Mossoul á Kirkouk: La Turquie et la question du Kurdistan irakien." *Monde arabe Maghreb Machrek*, no. 132 (1991): 38–49.

de Groot, A. H. "Al-Sanūsī, Shaykh Sayyid Aḥmad." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 9, 23–24. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.

Kaymaz, İhsan Şerif. Musul Sorunu: Petrol ve Kürt Sorunları ile bağlantılı Tarihsel ve Siyasal bir İnceleme (The Mosul question: A historical and political study on petroleum and the Kurdish question). İstanbul: Otopsi Yayınları, 2003.

Kodal, Tahir. *Paylaşılamayan Toprak: Türk Basınına göre (1923–1926) Musul Meselesi* (Indivisible land: The Mosul question reported in the Turkish press from 1923 to 1926). İstanbul: Yeditep Yayınları, 2005.

Koloğlu, Orhan. *Mustafa Kemal'ın Yanında İki Libya'lı Lider: Ahmet Şerif–Süleyman Baruni* (Two leaders from Libya with Mustafa Kemal: Ahmet Şerif–Süleyman Baruni). Ankara: Ankara Halk Bürosu Kültür Merkezi Yayını, 1981.

Kutay, Cemal. *Kurtuluşun ve Cumhuriyetin Manevi Mimarları* (The spiritual architects of the liberation and republic). Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, n.d.

Küçük, Hülya. *The Role of the Bektā<u>sh</u>īs in Turkey's National Struggle*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002.

Landau, Jacob M. *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994 (with additions and corrections).

Mısıroğlu, Kadir. *Kurtuluş Savaşında Sarıklı Mücahitler* (Turbaned fighters in the War of Liberation). İstanbul: Sebil Yayınevi, 1967.

Misâk-ı Millî ve Türk Dış Politikasında Musul, Kerkük, ve Erbil Meselesi [Misâk-ı Millî ve

- Türk Dış Politikasında Musul, Kerkük ve Erbil Meselesi Sempozyumu (1997: Konya)] (The National Pact and Mosul–Kirkuk–Arbil in Turkish foreign policy). Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1998.
- M., V. F. [Minorsky, Vladimir Fedorovich]. *The Mosul Question*. Paris: The Reference Service on International Affairs of the American Library in Paris, 1926.
- Özköse, Kadir. "Seyyid Ahmed eş-Şerif'in Anadolu'daki Millî Mücadele'ye Katılışı ve Mustafa Kemal'i Desteklemesi" (Seyyid Ahmed eş-Şerif's commitment for the National Struggle in Anatolia and Support for Mustafa Kemal). *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* (Review of the Faculty of Divinity of Cumhuriyet University) 5, no. 2 (2001): 317–28.
- Qassam Kh. Al-Jumaily. *Irak ve Kemalizm Hareketi (1919–1923)* (Iraq and the Kemalism movement). Edited by İzzet Öztoprak. Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1999.
- Ruşen Eşref. İki Saltanat Arasında (Between the two sultanates). Dersaadet: Kanaat Kütüphane ve Matbaası, 1334/1918.
- Ryan, Andrew. The Last of the Dragomans. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1951.
- Sakai Keiko. "Iraku ni okeru kokka keisei to seiji soshiki" イラクにおける国家形成と政治組織 (Social networks and state formation in Iraq). In *Kokka, buzoku, Aidentitī: Arabu shakai no kokumin keisei* 国家・部族・アイデンティティー——アラブ社会の国民形成 (Social identity and national formation in the Arab world), edited by Sakai Keiko, 79–142. Tokyo: Ajia keizai kenkyūjo アジア経済研究所 (The Institute of Developing Economies), 1993. (In Japanese)
- Sarıkoyuncu, Ali. *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları* (Religious figures in the National Struggle). 2 vols. Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1995–97.
- Stoddard, Lothrop. The New World of Islam. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.
- Stoddard, Philip Hendrick. "The Ottoman Government and the Arabs, 1911 to 1918: A Preliminary Study of the Teşkilât-ı Mahsusa." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1963.
- Toynbee, Arnold J. Survey of International Affairs 1925. Vol. 1, Islamic World since the Peace Settlement. London: Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1927.
- Türkgeldi, Ali Fuad. *Görüp İşittiklerim* (What I saw and heard). 2nd ed. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1951.
- Türkmen, Zekeriya. *Musul Meselesi: Askerî Yönden Çözüm Arayışları* (1922–1925) (The Mosul question: The search for a military solution [1922–1925]). Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2003.
- Ünal, Muhittin, ed. *Miralay Bekir Sami Günsav'ın Kurtuluş Savaşı Anıları* (Memoirs of Miralay Bekir Sami Günsav in the War of Liberation). İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1994.
- Ziadeh, Nicola A. Sanūsīyah: A Study of a Revivalist Movement in Islam. 2nd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983.