From revolution to counter-revolution: Demonstrations in Macedonia in the era of the Young Turks
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“We want brotherhood between all peoples. We are all one without regard to religion or sect. Long live the fatherland! Long live freedom! There are no Greeks, Jews, or Bulgarians, there are only Ottomans”. By these words addressed the crowd in the just renamed Liberty (former Olympos) Square from the balcony of the Olympos Hotel in Thessaloniki the Dönme and Freemason Celal Dervish, just after the Young Turk Revolution, which inaugurated the decade-long Second Constitutional Period of the Ottoman Empire.¹ The regime change of July 23, 1908, officially ushered in a period of unprecedented freedom of thought, of expression and of association for all the nationalities of the Ottoman Empire. The climax of various political and diplomatic events in Macedonia has urged societies, parties and especially the Young Turk Committee itself to organize outdoor public assemblies involving the gathering together, either voluntarily or under the pressure of the Committee, of Turks, Greeks, Bulgarians, Albanians, Jews, Dönme (Islamized Jews of Thessaloniki), Serbs, Ramadanising Vlachs and others.

The foremost objective of this study is to demonstrate the manner in which the Young Turks tried to manipulate public opinion by organizing outdoor public assemblies, in order to extend their influence in certain population groups and thus get the Great Powers’ diplomats convinced that the empire’s public opinion was in agreement with their choices. The second objective is to demonstrate the nationalities’ attitude in the three vilayets (provinces) of Macedonia towards the various political and diplomatic developments as expressed through their participation in outdoor public assemblies organized by the representatives of the population groups themselves. The main sources for the recording of the assemblies are the reports drawn up by the British and Austro-Hungarian consuls in the capitals of the three Macedonian vilayets, i.e. Thessaloniki, Monastir (Bitola) and Skopje.

During the revolution and its aftermath the İttihad ve Terraki Cemiyeti (Committee of Union and Progress - CUP) officially adopted an ottomanising policy towards all the population groups of the Ottoman Empire. In the case of Macedonia, during the revolution

and in its aftermath, the leaders of the CUP espoused a clearer stand for Ottomanism, aiming first and foremost at preventing the Great Powers' interventions in favor of Christians. By putting forward Ottomanism, the Committee has decreased the aggressiveness exhibited by Turks and Muslim Albanians against Christians. In this way European diplomats as well as public opinion of the neighboring Balkan states welcomed the new regime.²

Furthermore, it should be noted out that the leaders of the CUP were not under any illusions that the different nationalities of Macedonia were not perfectly in line with their ideological and political choices. Well before the outbreak of the revolution, it was established, within the framework of their negotiations with the representatives of non-Turkish populations, that there was a general feeling that the Committee was primarily an organization representing only Turks.³ It should be also noted that, during the period under consideration, the choices of the Committee were not always in compliance with the Ottoman government. The latter often expressed its disagreement with the Committee’s policy which mobilized urban crowds with demonstrations and boycotts, and pursued the achievement of its own political goals. This is because the government feared that the adoption of these practices could become an excuse for the intervention of the Great Powers.⁴

The mass gatherings incurred since the revolution until April 1909 were organized by various actors, but mainly by the Committee, and were primarily related to: a. July’s regime change, b. strikes, c. Bulgaria’s declaration of independence and Austria-Hungary’s annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, d. the parliamentary elections and the opening of the Parliament, e. the Cretan Question, and f. the counter-revolution.

1. The regime change

The Young Turks’ revolution launched a period of numerous gatherings in different cities and towns of Macedonia, which involved representatives of all nationalities who wished to celebrate the prevalence of the new regime. This period lasted until late August. On Wednesday evening July 22, an army Major of Albanian origin, Ahmet Niyazi Bey, raided Monastir with 2,000 men. The next day at 11 a.m. the revolutionary officers gathered at the parade ground of the local army corps accompanied by the imams, as well as by Emiliano Lazaridis, acting Greek Metropolit (Bishop) of Monastir, in order to proclaim the restoration of the Constitution of December 23, 1876. Thousands of Monastir’s residents, Turks, Bulgarians, Greeks, Jews, Rumanising Vlachs and Albanians, took to the streets to celebrate. In fact, on the same afternoon every prisoner, either political or criminal, detained in the prisons of Monastir was released.⁵ The movement has spread on the very same day in almost every city and town of Macedonia, i.e. Thessaloniki, Serres, Drama, Edessa, Gevgelija, Ohrid, Tikves, Skopje etc. In all the above mentioned places, both crowd and officers of the

³ Ibid., p. 301.
⁵ HStA PA XXXVIII/395, Pósfai to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 48/23.7.1908, ibid., Pósfai to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 49/26.7.1908 and Mehmet Hacısalihoğlu, Die Jungtürken und die Mazedonische Frage (1890-1918), Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2003, p. 189.
Ottoman army were asking Sultan Abdülhamid II to restore the Constitution.\textsuperscript{6} Bowing to pressure, the Sultan decided, shortly after midnight, to accept the demands put forward by demonstrators and officers.

In Thessaloniki, on July 24, at 9 a.m., 10,000 people gathered in front of the Konak (Government House), where the Inspector General of the vilayets of Macedonia, Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha, read a telegram drawn up by the Grand Vizier (Prime Minister), Said Pasha, on the restoration of the Constitution. During the same gathering the floor took the Dönme Mayor of Thessaloniki Osman Adil Bey and a Turk, prominent member of the Committee, and future deputy for Thessaloniki, Rahmi Bey; following that, the crowd traipsed around the city the lawyer, chairman of the Young Turk Committee of Thessaloniki, and future Minister of Justice, Refik Maniaszade.\textsuperscript{7} On the afternoon, members of various Masonic lodges demonstrated on Liberty Square as many CUP members were Freemasons and the Thessaloniki-based Macedonia Risorta lodge contributed to the preparation of the Young Turk Revolution.\textsuperscript{8} The lawyer, CUP member and Grand Master of the Macedonia Risorta lodge

\textsuperscript{6} For the demonstrations and celebrations held in Thessaloniki in the days following the revolution see Yannis Megas, \textit{The Young Turk Revolution in Thessaloniki} [in Greek], Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2003, p. 99 et seq. and Hacisalihoğlu, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 192-202.

\textsuperscript{7} HHStA PA XXXVIII/409, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 146/24.7.1908. In November 1908 Grand Vizier Kamil Pasha appointed Refik Maniaszade Minister of Justice, see Feroz Ahmad, “The Young Turk Revolution”, \textit{Journal of Contemporary History}, vol. 3., no. 3, The Middle East (Jul. 1968), p. 24.

Emmanuel Carasso was the first to take the floor, and then Galib of the Perseverencia lodge, Ascer Salem and Russo delivered speeches. The celebrations continued over the following days with the participation of many army officers and soldiers as well as Greek and Bulgarian rebels (Antares and Comitadj, respectively) who abandoned their hiding places in Thessaloniki’s hinterland. According to an estimation, until August 5th in the three vilayets 105 armed bands (54 Bulgarian, 16 Greek, 32 Turkish and Albanian, 3 Serb) surrendered, comprising 600-700 men. In addition, 140 Antares of the Ioannis Karavitis, Georgios Makris, Georgios Volanis and Tsitos bands surrendered in Monastir two days later.

Within a month, about 30,000 people rushed in Thessaloniki from various parts of the empire and abroad, from Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, to join in the celebrations. The participation of delegations from neighboring countries indicates the positive endorsement of the new regime by the public opinion in these countries during the period immediately following the revolution. On August 2 the mayor well-received 1,500 Greeks from Volos and Larissa who arrived by sea and then they moved altogether at the Konak. Among others, on August 20 (or 22) about 600 Serbs excursionists arrived from Belgrade, after having spent a day in Skopje. Two days later an assembly was held in Liberty Square, in honor of the 1,200 excursionists who arrived from Smyrna (Izmir), involving a total of 12,000 people. Over the last week of August, 220 Albanians and some Christians from the Debar region, dressed up in traditional costumes and bearing weapons, as well as 100 law students from Constantinople (Istanbul) visited Thessaloniki.

Respectively, there was great rejoicing on the occasion of the prevalence of the revolution in Monastir. For three days, from July 23 up to July 25, the city was celebrating. Every mosque and main street was lighted up, bells have been placed in all Orthodox churches and adoring praises were rendered for the restoration of the Constitution. On July 25 a triumphant reception was organized in honor of the men of Niyazi Bey, the revolution’s Albanian hero, who was accompanied by the Albanian leaders Çerçis Topuli and Adem Bey. Bulgarians, Greeks and Jews organized victory processions towards the military academy and the barracks in order to thank the officers for their “freedom” and to bind themselves to the

---


10 FO 195/2298, Lamb to Lowther, Thessaloniki, 107/6.8.1908.


13 HHStA PA XXXVIII/409, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 115/3.8.1908.

14 Megas, op. cit., pp. 190-2. With regard to the Serbs’ visit see also Hacisalıhoğlu, op. cit., p. 192 note 121, where it is stated that they arrived in Thessaloniki on August 22 and the following morning they marched down the city’s main streets accompanied by a music band.

15 HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 192/1.9.1908.
Constitution before the commander of the Artillery Corps, Şükrü Pasha. On the contrary, Rumanising Vlachs did not have to undertake similar acts, as their leaders had taken the oath to go along with the Young Turks two months before the outbreak of the revolution. It is for that reason that Şükrü Pasha regarded Rumanising Vlachs as “Turkey’s most loyal Christian subjects”.\(^{16}\)

The Young Turk Committee also used the outdoor public assemblies as a means to demonstrate the positive attitude of the empire’s public opinion towards the Great Powers. To that effect, gatherings were organized in front of the respective consulates. The events that took place on August 14 at Monastir are rather enlightening. An enthusiastic crowd gathered outside the British and French consulates in order to express its solidarity with these two countries.\(^{17}\) Obviously, these gatherings were held so that the diplomats could inform London and Paris, respectively. Moreover, the timing was not irrelevant with regard to the effort of the CUP to gain a foothold in the powerful European states. Four days later, Ahmet Rıza sent from Paris, on behalf of the Central Committee of CUP, a letter to Edward VII of Britain. In his letter he urged the London’s government to provide support in order to force the Sultan to unreservedly accept the constitutional regime. Ahmet Rıza sent a similar letter on the same date to Wilhelm II of Germany.\(^{18}\)

Although the abovementioned gatherings were usually organized by the Committee, attendance of Macedonia’s population groups was rather spontaneous, and undoubtedly it was not enforced. However, the CUP, even at this early stage, tried to control participants by excluding several population groups, as was the case with many Albanians in Skopje on

---

\(^{16}\) HHStA PA XXXVIII/395, Pósfai to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 49/26.7.1908. Among the non-Turkish populations only Rumanising Vlachs and Jews could accept the interpretation of Ottomanism adopted by the Young Turks, avoiding thus the possibility to become a minority in a nation-state. Hanioğlu, op. cit., p. 301.

\(^{17}\) HHStA PA XXXVIII/395, Pósfai to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 53/16.8.1908.

July 25, where the prevalence of the revolution was celebrated in front of the Konak with the involvement of the crowd and numerous political and military officials.\textsuperscript{19} The local branch of the Committee ordered the transportation of 60 Albanian leaders by an extra train scheduled especially for this purpose in order to honor them for their substantial contribution to the success of the revolution; however the CUP branch denied their followers’ access in the city. Those who were denied access to celebrations amounted to 4,000 armed Muslim Albanian villagers.\textsuperscript{20}

This particular case is of great interest as the armed Albanians came from the assembled crowd in Ferizović (current Uroševac in Kosovo), between Pristina and Skopje. They were Ghegs who gathered there since the beginning of July in response to the involvement of Austrians in the reforms undertaken in Macedonia, as they considered that this effort was jeopardizing their national interests. The Young Turks exploited the gathering for their own benefit, in order to exert pressure to the Sultan on the restoration of the Constitution.\textsuperscript{21} According to the Albanian politician and future deputy Ismail Kemal Bey, the gathering in Ferizović made a more powerful impression on the Sultan than any other protest held by the Turks or the European diplomats, because he considered the Albanians to be his loyal subjects.\textsuperscript{22} Despite this, the Committee chose to exclude the armed men of Ferizović from the event held in Skopje on July 25. This was because the Young Turks knew that the Albanians were more interested in achieving their national targets, and far less in any regime change.\textsuperscript{23}

From the earliest days of the new regime it was abundantly clear that any cooperation between the Young Turks and the Albanians would cause great difficulties, despite the substantial contribution of the latter to the success of the revolution. In the coming months, many of the efforts undertaken by both sides in this direction were doomed to failure. The national awakening of the Albanians had progressed to such an extent that it was running up against the Young Turk’s policy that was based on the strengthening of the Sultan’s subjects’ ottoman identity.\textsuperscript{24}

\section*{2. Strikes}

Celebrations were followed by another phase that lasted about one and a half months until the second week of October; that period was sufficient enough to shake not only Macedonia but also the whole frame of the empire. It was an era of strikes caused by

\textsuperscript{19} FO 195/2298, Satow to Lamb, Skopje, 44/25.7.1908.
\textsuperscript{21} On July 20, the armed Albanians in Ferizović amounted to 10,000. For further details on the Albanian assembly in Ferizović see Bartl, \textit{Die albanischen Muslime}, pp. 156-7 and 160, idem, \textit{Albanien}, pp. 111-4 and Hacisalhoğlu, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 190.
\textsuperscript{23} According to Peter Bartl the Albanians intended to drive out of Skopje the gendarmerie officers and declare Albania’s autonomy, having Skopje as their centre. Bartl, \textit{Die albanischen Muslime}, p. 160 and idem, \textit{Albanien}, pp. 113-4.
various professional associations asking for higher wages in response to the significant increase in the prices of many products immediately following the revolution. Within two months, inflation peaked at around 20%-30%. From August to December, there were at least 111 strikes throughout the empire. In Thessaloniki, the first strike took place on August 23, when railroad, tram and Régie (the tobacco monopoly industry) workers were mobilized; at the same time, more strikes spread in various towns, such as in Kavala, where on September 14 12,000 tobacco workers went on a strike. Taking advantage of these mobilizations, almost every employee in Thessaloniki managed to cover the damage suffered due to inflation as there was a 20%-30% increase in their wages, while at the same time their working conditions improved.

The strikes held by Greek waiters in Thessaloniki and Monastir, on September 10-11 and September 13 respectively, were in themselves memorable. As it has been pointed out, taking into account the strikes throughout the empire in 1908, only the strike held in


26 Karakışla, *op. cit.* p. 31 but also pp. 22-5 on strikes of 1908.


28 HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 222/16.9.1908 and *Journal de Salonique*, "Lettre de Cavalla", 15 September 1908, Nr. 1290 [copies in the Library of the Jewish Museum of Thessaloniki].

29 FO 195/2328, Lamb to Lowther, Thessaloniki, 11/6.2.1909.
Thessaloniki by Greek waiters can be defined as being political, i.e. it was not based on financial incentives or working benefits, but on inter-ethnic tensions. Moreover, in addition to this strike it needs to be added the strike held in Monastir by Greek waiters as well; both strikes were based on the same factors of origin and were, in essence, the first organized actions put forward by a Macedonian population group against the Committee’s policy. Greek waiters of Thessaloniki went on a strike in response to the visit of 247 Bulgarians in the city who wanted to honor the new regime. The “excursionists” arrived from Sofia (via Skopje and Veles/Köprülü) on Thursday September 10 by a special train.

It is worth noting that Greek notables, the Greek Bishop and the Greek chairmen of trade unions and associations did not approve the waiters’ strike. According to the Greek Consul General in Thessaloniki, Andreas Papadiamantopoulos, following a request lodged by the Committee, the aforementioned representatives of the Greeks had promised to prevent any disruption during the Bulgarians’ visit. However, as stated by the diplomat to the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs: “It seems that a hothead encouraged the waiters of the Greek hotels, restaurants and cafes to go on strike, and as result they abstained from their duties at midnight and participated by groups in flag-waving demonstrations around the city on the next morning”. According to the Turkish newspaper Sabah (Morning), “the strikers were demonstrating around the streets accompanied by a music band.”

The “hothead”, whose name the consul deliberately avoided mentioning to Athens, was one of his subordinates. His name was Alexandros Mazarakis-Ainian, an army officer temporarily seconded to the Greek consulate in Thessaloniki who was responsible for organizing the Greek Antartes in Central Macedonia from 1905 onwards. Mazarakis-Ainian stated in his memoirs:

> While the Young Turks were about to solemnly welcome the Bulgarians, I have received the visit of the employees of all the Greek cafes, pubs and restaurants, which were the best in Thessaloniki, and many of them situated in the central square i.e. Eleutherias (Liberty) Square, where the reception [of Bulgarians] was to take place, in order to tell me that they did not wish to serve the Bulgarians because of the previous Greek-Bulgarian rivalry that has led to so much bloodshed, and that they were thinking of leaving their posts and go altogether on an excursion in the countryside to have fun. I have endorsed their posi-
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30 Karakişla, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 and 31. For a thorough description of the strikes carried out in Thessaloniki by waiters see Marina Angelopoulou, "Issues on the waiters’ strike of 1908 in Thessaloniki", in *Greek and Jewish workers in Thessaloniki after the Young Turks’ movement* [in Greek], Ioannina, 2004, pp. 61-125 and Megas, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-200 and 321.
31 HHStA PA XXXVIII/395, Tahy to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 62/22.9.1908.
32 HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 209/12.9.1908 and *Journal de Salonique*, “Nos voisins les Bulgares” and “Les Bulgares à Salonique”, 13 September 1908, Nr. 1289.
33 Angelopoulou, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-8 and 112-5, giving the report of August 31 (old style calendar) / 13 September 1908 drawn up by Papadiamantopoulos to the Greek minister of Foreign Affairs. According to the official organ of the CUP *Itihat ve Terraki* (Union and Progress) dated September 13, on September 11 Greek waiters “were handing out leaflets stating that the CUP has asked them to work on the day of the Sultan’s birthday”, see *ibid.*, p. 111.
34 *Sabah*, 15 September 1908, quoted *ibid.*, p. 111.
tions because I was in favor of a reaction against the spirit which prevailed especially among the Greek bourgeoisie and notables after the Young Turk movement, i.e. that there was absolutely no need for national activities. If this spirit was to prevail, the Greek morale that has finally woken up would be seriously damaged.

Mazarakis-Ainian’s testimony is of major importance with regard to the position of Thessaloniki’s Greeks against the CUP and to the changes brought about by the revolution. On the one hand it is clear that in mid-September Greek notables and representatives of various Greek associations were in favor of the new regime since they did not want to risk coming into conflict with the Committee, and above all they were concerned about safeguarding the interests of Thessaloniki’s Greeks. On the other hand, there was a group of Greeks who was not willing to forget the long term confrontation with Bulgarians, even though the Committee was indignant about their attitude. This group of Greeks was also supported by some organizers of the Greek struggle in Macedonia, such as Mazarakis-Ainian, who was right from the beginning suspicious about the July’s regime change by claiming that in the longer term it would seriously damage the Greeks’ interests in the region. This incident has worsened the relations between the Greek officers who were seconded to the Consulate and the Greek notables of Thessaloniki who were strongly criticizing the officers for encouraging strikers. As Mazarakis-Ainian wrote, “notables regarded us with mistrust in their effort to avert Turks’ concerns”.

However, the Young Turk Committee addressed promptly this situation, thus showing its incredible reflexes. In its effort to not displease the Bulgarian visitors, it forced, by putting pressure on local authorities, the owners of these enterprises to open their closed stores. The British Consul General in Thessaloniki, Harry Lamb, wrote that the Young Turks managed to convince entrepreneurs to open their stores just an hour before the train’s arrival and that, in order to serve dinner to the excursionists, volunteer waiters, mostly Turks, have been mobilized. He also noted that the anti-Bulgarian mobilization put forward by the Greeks had a negative effect on them, as the Young Turks extended a warm welcome to the visitors from Sofia. It should be pointed out that the Committee had to react firmly and cautiously to the challenge caused by the Greek waiters, as just four days later, on September 14, Dimitrios Rallis, former Prime Minister of Greece, was expected to arrive in the city, and as Pára mentions, the central concern of the Young Turks was to eliminate the tension stirred up between the various Christian elements.

36 Ibid., pp. 85-6.
37 HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 209/12.9.1908. Ittihad ve Terakki of 13 September wrote that at a dinner in honour of the Bulgarian excursionists in the White Tower’s garden on Thursday night, as well as on Friday, Muslims and Jews replaced the Greek waiters who were on strike (Angelopoulou, op. cit., p. 111). See also Journal de Salonique, “Les Bulgares à Salonique”, 13 September 1908, Nr. 1289, Rena Molho, The Jews of Thessaloniki, 1856-1919: A Unique Community [in Greek], Athens: Ekdoseis Themelio, 2001, p. 231 and Joëlle Dalègre, “‘Le plus beau rêve réalisé’. Le Journal de Salonique et les Jeunes-Turcs, 1er juillet 1908-30 juin 1909”, Cahiers balkaniques, 40 (2012), p. 4. URL: http://ceb.revues.org/1062; DOI: 10.4000/ceb.1062. On Saturday afternoon the Bulgarians were invited in the Jewish Club des intimes (HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 216/14.9.1908).
38 FO 195/2298, Lamb to Lowther, Thessaloniki, 123/10.9.1908.
40 HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 224/16.9.1908.
On Sunday, September 13, the excursionists from the Principality of Bulgaria headed by Babazanov, a member of the Bulgarian Parliament, traveled from Thessaloniki to Monastir. However, on the day of their arrival the waiters of all Greek restaurants and cafes in Monastir went also on strike, thus causing significant inconvenience to their hospitality. The Committee ordered the opening of certain restaurants to facilitate the excursionists. In this way, there was no further problem caused by the Greeks’ mobilization.41

Respectively, four days later and despite the aforementioned negative attitude taken by the Greeks, the Committee extended a warm welcome to Rallis in Monastir. Upon his arrival at the railway station, the Greek politician was welcomed not only by Greeks, but also by representatives of the CUP and of the local Albanian club. On the following day, Rallis visited the Greek schools of Monastir and the headquarters of the Albanian club. Before the members of the club the Greek politician delivered a speech aiming to bring together Greeks and Albanians. Rallis, as indicated by the Austrian Consul, underlined “the common interests of Greeks and Albanians and made a reference to the common origin of the two peoples”. However, the Albanians who were present, as they were not interested in a more substantive approach with the Greeks, greeted his speech with considerable skepticism;42 they were relentlessly working on the promotion of their national interests that were often in conflict with the Greek ones.43

3. Bulgarian independence and annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary

Some of the other major events of 1908 that led to a wave of demonstrations, though not solely, were diplomatic developments, i.e. Bulgaria’s declaration of independence on October 5 and the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary on the following day. On the contrary, the Cretan proclamation of Enosis (union) with Greece did not lead to a wide range of reactions, as it was not proved acceptable to Athens.

Demonstrations against Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria organized throughout the empire, on the participation of all population groups, were combined with a new medium used by the Young Turks to primarily mobilize urban crowds: the boycott.44 On October 8, an embargo was imposed on Austrian and Bulgarian products. The implementation of the boycott against Austria was launched in Thessaloniki on October 11 and lasted until February 28, 1909.45 The Committee ensured that all demonstrations were to take place simultaneously on Saturday afternoon, October 10 (around 2.30 p.m.), in the capital and all princ-

41 HHStA PA XXXVII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 216/14.9.1908 and HHStA PA XXXVIII/395, Tahy to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 62/22.9.1908. Georgios Modis described the visit of the Bulgarian excursionists in Monastir in his novel “Freedom” (G. Modis, Fifty Fatlings (Macedonian Stories) [in Greek], Athens: Papyros, n.d., pp. 160-4) and in his Memoirs, pp. 127-8.
42 HHStA PA XXXVIII/395, Tahy to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 62/22.9.1908.
pal provincial cities of the empire: Thessaloniki, Monastir, Skopje, Scutari, Ioannina, Adrianople (Edirne), Dardanelles, Bursa, Trabzon, Kastamonu, Erzurum, Smyrna, Konya, Adana, Aleppo, Beirut, Damascus and Jerusalem.

In Thessaloniki, the gathering was held in the Field of Mars Park in front of the administration building of the Third Army Corps. The British Consul General estimated that the assembled people amounted to 6,000, but he suggested that the overall number of people passed by the Field of Mars Park amounted to 12,000, as many Turks left the Park at the end of Rahmi Bey’s speech in the Turkish language. Upon the completion of Rahmi’s speech, the floor took the president of the Ethnikos Syndesmos (National League) Dr. Dimitrios Rizos in the Greek language, followed by Svetoslav Dobrev in Bulgarian, Nikovic in Serbian, the Rumanising Vlach G. Tsounga in Romanian, Jakob Kaze in Judeo-Spanish (Ladino), Midhat Bey Frasher in Albanian, and the Rumanising Vlach N. Batsaria (who was later elected Senator) in French.46

The gathering in Monastir involved 5,000 Turks, Greeks, Bulgarians, Albanians, Rumanising Vlachs and Serbs, while in Skopje around 7,000 to 8,000 people were assembled, during a well-organized and without any incidents demonstration in front of the Konak, in order to listen to the speeches in the Turkish, Serbian, Bulgarian and Greek languages. Especially in Skopje, the risk of incidents was particularly high because of the large number of

46 FO 195/2298, Lamb to Lowther, Thessaloniki, 140/11.10.1908. For the assembly that took place in Thessaloniki on October 10 see also Megas, op. cit, pp. 361-5. For Batsaria see HHStA PA XXXVIII/396, Posfai to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 17/7.4.1909.
Albanians. It is for this reason that the previous night Major Vasfi Bey, a leading member of the CUP, delivered a speech to his co-religionists, both inside and outside the central mosque, in order to ensure their peaceful turnout at the demonstration.47

It is worth emphasizing that, as Lamb noted, although the declaration of Bulgaria’s independence caused a feeling of “intense satisfaction” amongst “the great majority of Bulgarians” in Macedonia, Yane Sandanski and his followers of the left wing of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO), who cooperated close with the CUP, expressed their dissatisfaction with the action of the Bulgarian government.48 Thus, Bulgarians belonging to the opposite faction made an attempt on Sandanski’s life in Thessaloniki, on October 7.49 He survived another assassination attempt, committed also by Bulgarians in Thessaloniki next year, on August 28.50

4. Elections and the opening of the Parliament

As Lamb pointed out, the boycott was at the heart of public opinion until the end of 1908 and, in conjunction with strikes, overshadowed and pushed into the background any development arising on the parliamentary elections.51 More specifically, only the first phase of electoral processes attracted a considerable amount of attention amongst the different population groups. During this phase, which lasted until mid-October, there were the second degree electors to be elected. In mid-August a dispute between the Jews of Thessaloniki over the candidatures of their co-religionists captured the attention of the British Consul. Then, Nissim Mazliah’s followers, who was the vice-president of the Commercial Court of Thessaloniki, “on two successive evenings [...] interrupted meetings of Me. Carasso’s supporters. There were demonstrations and counter-demonstrations leading to free-fights and ending in broken windows and broken heads”. Finally, following a CUP’s intervention, the situation has been gradually normalized after it was agreed that Carasso would be the candidate in Thessaloniki and Mazliah in Smyrna.52

The second phase of elections, which was concluded in mid-November, did not attract the same attention.53 During that phase, 43 Members of the Parliament were elected in the Macedonian vilayets (12 in Thessaloniki, 14 in Monastir and 17 in Skopje): 6 Turks, 6 Greeks, 4 Bulgarians, 21 Albanians (13 in the Skopje vilayet), 3 Serbs, 1 Jew, 1 Dönme and 1 Rumanising Vlach.54 In general, the CUP “acted on the principle of representation for all el-

47 FO 195/2298, Edmonds to Lowther, Monastir, 59/10.10.1908, ibid., Satow to Lamb, Skopje, 67/11.10.1908.
49 According to Lamb, the murderous assault against Sandanski and his partisans (Mitchell and Tanchief were killed) was committed by Zapranoff, Tsane Nicoloff (former band leader in Perlepe) and Capitan Danoff, *ibid.* and Angelos A. Chotzidis, “Crime and punishment: Political violence in Young Turks’ Macedonia”, in Hellenic Association of Historical Sciences, 29th Panhellenic Historical Congress, 16-18 May 2008. Minutes [in Greek], Thessaloniki, 2009, p. 226. On this issue see also Hacisalihoğlu, *op. cit.*, p. 221 note 51 and idem, “Yane Sandanski as a political leader in Macedonia in the era of the Young Turks”, *Cahiers balkaniques*, 40 (2012), p. 7. URL: http://ceb.revues.org/1192; DOI: 10.4000/ceb.1192.
51 FO 195/2328, Lamb to Lowther, Thessaloniki, 11/6.2.1909.
52 FO 195/2298, Lamb to Lowther, Thessaloniki, 114/24.8.1908.
53 In Thessaloniki, the second round of the elections was held on November 9 and the results were announced three days later (Megas, *op. cit.*, p. 216).
ements so long as it was not uncongenial to the Committee” and succeeded in controlling the election in Macedonia. It failed only to control the elections in the Servia (Serfide) sanjak (district) (Monastir vilayet), where both elected deputies were Greeks (Georgios Bousios and Konstantinos Drizis).\textsuperscript{55} Although irregularities were reported at various different stages of the electoral process, no serious case of demonstrations against these irregularities in Macedonia was reported. On the contrary, a demonstration was held in Smyrna on November 15, when 30,000 Greeks, most of whom armed, marched in front of the seat of the Greek Metropolit in protest against the electoral process; seven days later 20,000 Greeks acting in the same way in Constantinople marched towards the Sublime Porte.\textsuperscript{56}

The celebration held on December 17, 1908 in Thessaloniki on the occasion of the opening of the Parliament is of exceptional interest. A great deal of effort has been made to organize a successful event; the closure of the market, of public services and of schools was mandated, as well as the flying of flags and the illumination of residencies during night time. Moreover, a parade has been organized with the involvement of different army units and numerous representatives of the city’s guilds. The event that was launched on the
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\caption{Greeks of Monastir are welcoming 140 Antartes and their leaders (G. Makris, G. Volanis, I. Karavitis and Tsitsos) on the afternoon of August 7, 1908. Acting Metropolit Emilios Lazaridis on horseback.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{55} FO 195/2298, Edmonds to Lowther, Monastir, 69/20.12.1908.
same morning and lasted until 3 p.m. was held in the Field of Mars Park; during the event
the floor took the Jew and lawyer Joseph Naar, acting Mayor of Thessaloniki, the chief editor
of the Yeni Asır (New Era) newspaper and CUP member Adil Bey, and the commander
of the Third Army Corps Mahmut Şevket Pasha. However, despite the efforts made by the
Young Turks, it was evident that, as Pára observed, the enthusiasm shown by the attend-
ants was not as great as the enthusiasm demonstrated during the July’s events.

Similar events were held on the same day, among other major towns, in Serres and
Kavala. In the former the opening of the Chamber of Deputies “was enthusiastically cele-
brated”, but in the latter the distance between Greeks and the Young Turks’ regime was
evident. The gathering took place in the courtyard of Kavala’s military camp in the pres-
ence of large crowds; however, the Greeks’ involvement was limited and the absence of the
Greek Archimandrite (acting Bishop) has left a deep impression. The Archimandrite al-
leged that his absence was due to the negative impact exerted by the Constitution’s imple-
mentation on the Greek element of the empire.

5. The Cretan Question
The Cretan Question was a particular concern of the Committee from early 1909 to
mid 1911. Over this period the Young Turks organized numerous demonstrations in many
cities of the empire in response to the political and diplomatic developments and the Cre-
tans’ request for Enosis with Greece. Their main objective was to mobilize the empire’s
public opinion against the Hellenic Kingdom. There have been numerous protests organ-
ized in Macedonia with regard to the Cretan Question. In the period under review and in view of the Cretan Question, a public rally against Greece was reported on January 16, 1909 in Thessaloniki (as well as in Constantinople and other
cities), under the tolerance of the Committee. The participation therein was rather weak:
around 2,000 people, although it was held on a Saturday, when the Jews were not working
and at times in which more than 30,000 Jews were taking a walk along the city’s main
streets and thus they could easily participate in an outdoor assembly.

57 Osman Adil Bey was forced to resign from his position as Mayor in mid-November 1908, following the in-
tervention of the CUP. Angelos A. Chotzidis, “The Young Turks and the Cretan Question (1908-1911): Na-
tional and financial parameters in Macedonia”, in Hellenic Association of Historical Sciences, 26th Panhel-
216-7 and 395.
58 HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára, Thessaloniki, 74/17.12.1908 (telegram), ibid., Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessalo-
niki, 303/18.12.1908.
60 HHStA PA XXXVIII/410, Pára to Aehrenthal, Thessaloniki, 304/21.12.1908.
61 For demonstrations organized by Young Turks in Macedonia in response to the developments in the Cretan
Question until 1911 see Chotzidis, “The Young Turks and the Cretan Question”, pp. 267-83.
62 FO 195/2328, Lamb to Lowther, Thessaloniki, 15/11.2.1909. According to the Greek newspaper Alitheia
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6. The counter-revolution

Taking into account the mobilizations against Austria-Hungary at the end of 1908, the Young Turk Committee realized that demonstrations were a powerful instrument in the manipulation of public opinion. This is why in the outbreak of the counter-revolution in Constantinople, on the night of April 12/13, 1909 known as “the 31 March incident” (according to the old style calendar), aiming, inter alia, to restore the Şeriat (Islamic law), the Young Turks used it as an instrument in order to rally together all the Macedonian population groups.63

In Thessaloniki, the followers of the counter-revolution movement were too few in number (less than 1,000) and their main request, further to the restoration of Şeriat, was the killing of Dönme, who were deemed to be “Pseudo-Muslims”, and of Muslim Freemasons. They have pinpointed as a target these two groups because, according to their beliefs, they conflicted with the principles of Islam.64 On the afternoon of Thursday April 15, the Committee organized a meeting against the counter-revolution, attended by nearly 1,000 representatives of almost all ethnic groups, except of the Greeks. Speakers included an editor of Yeni Asır, a Hodja, and several others, who gave their speeches in Albanian, Bulgarian, Serbian and Romanian. The participants decided to join the Hareket Ordusu (Action Army) and to march on Constantinople in order to “regain, with the last drop of their blood, their stolen freedom”.65

In Monastir, despite the call addressed by the Greek and Russian Consuls to the Christians for abstention, many Christians (and Jews) not only participated in the assemblies (one of them was held on April 16 at Liberty Square) organized by the Young Turks,66 but they were also among the 1,200 volunteers of the “Action Army”.67 It should be noted that both Bulgarian and Greek notables of Monastir were cautious and refused to endorse the telegram sent to Constantinople by the organizers of the April 16th assembly, in which the latter stated their refusal to recognize the new government.68

---
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66 HHStA PA XXXVIII/396, Posfai to Aehrenthal, Monastir, 20/16.4.1909; and FO 195/2328, Geary to Lowther, Monastir, 16/16.4.1909.
67 The volunteers of the “Action Army” (among them Sandanski and the Jewish socialist Avraam Benaroya) made a glorious entrance in Constantinople on the morning of April 24, see Zürcher, op. cit., p. 102.
68 FO 195/2328, Geary to Lowther, Monastir, 16/16.4.1909.
Albanians - as well as Greeks - had minimum participation in the repression of the briefly successful counter-revolution, although the preeminent Albanian hero of the Young Turk Revolution, Niyazi Bey, was the leader of the volunteers of the “Action Army”. In view of the above and due to the lack of trust, Young Turks had already taken steps towards preventing any participation of armed Albanians from the region of Skopje in the “Action Army”.69

In the light of the above overview on outdoor public assemblies organized by the Young Turks or by the representatives of various population groups in Macedonia over the first ten months of the new regime, it follows that the CUP enjoyed the support of a great part of Macedonia’s population throughout its political track. People in the three Macedonian vilayets expressed their full solidarity and greeted with enthusiasm July’s regime change. Even the irregularities observed during the elections did not shatter people’s confidence in the new regime. Furthermore, the vast majority of Macedonian population participated in the boycott against Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria, and even certain Bulgarians took active part in the demonstrations against the declaration of Bulgaria’s independence. In addition to the above, and although enthusiasm did not reach the unprecedented July’s levels, in mid-December, at the opening of the Parliament, the major part of the people in Macedonia was in favor of Young Turks.

However, Greeks and Albanians showed little trust in the new regime. Greeks appeared to be much less enthusiastic in the assemblies organized on the occasion of the opening of the Parliament, as well as in the protests against the counter-revolution, when they participated in the “Action Army” to a lesser extent compared to the Bulgarians, the Turks or the Jews. Albanians showed a more detached attitude towards the new regime, and respectively it seems that Young Turks have been deeply skeptical, from the earliest days of their activity, as they did not invite the Albanians of the surrounding areas to join their celebrations in Skopje (July 25, 1908). Albanians greeted with suspicion the Young Turks as they feared that the latter were planning to withdraw their tax privileges, but also as a sign of protest against Young Turks’ attitude towards other issues, such as the Albanian alphabet question.70 The mutual distrust between Albanians and Young Turks was particularly evident during the counter-revolution.