Book Reviews

Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1500-1950, ed. by D. Quataert, State University of New York Press, Albany 1994, p. 175.

The State University of New York (SUNY) Series in the Social and Economic History of the Middle East continues its effort to provide the international scientific community with valuable and interesting books. The four contributions that are contained in the present volume were presented in a conference held at the State University of New York at Birnghampton in November 1990. The participants in this conference were scholars and were invited to comment on the contributions. Because of the variety of the fields of study at the participants and the contributing Ottomanists, the corollaries which were ultimately drawn up reflects the contribution at these fields of study.

The present volume touches upon a subject of Ottoman studies which has for all practical purposes been ignored: that of manufacturing. As the editor points out in the introduction, the concentration of the Ottomanists on the manufacturing sector of Ottoman economy indicates a new development in Ottoman studies. Until recently the Ottoman empire was considered by scholars as an agrarian or agriculture-based state. The present volume wishes to reverse this view. Unlike the older view, the problems inherent in this new view are abundant, beginning with the sparsity and scarcity of the sources for the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries and continuing with the variety of languages, with which most of the available material was written. Each of the contributors tries to surpass these problems and to form a composition according to the suitability of the sources.

S. Faroqhi examines the Ottoman manufacturing in the 16th and 17th centuries in her contribution under the title "Labor Recruitment and Control in the Ottoman Empire (Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries)". The major concern is the mobilization of the labor brought about by the state. The manufacture depended on the interchange of war and peace. At wartime a whole mechanism was mobilized in order to supply the army. Manufacturers played a significant role in this procedure, either by joining in the campaigns and transporting all their equipments, or by preparing and sending products for the army in the battlefields. As a matter of fact, in those periods, the dominant role in manufacturing was played by the state. The remuneration of the state to the manufacturers was low. Similarly, the craftsmen were called to participate in the operation of public works. Although these services were compul-

sory, the state gave the manufacturers the opportunity to buy out these services. Another aspect of the labor mechanism was slavery. Faroqhi, after examining the well-documented and prosperous silk-manufacture of Bursa in the 16th century, argues that the presence of slaves in the Ottoman manufacture of the 16th and 17th centuries was not important. Apart from the manufacturers, some candidate janissaries could work in the manufacture as unskilled laborers. The mining sector was also quite profitable for the Sultan, to whom belonged the ownership. In most cases —if not in all of them— the exploitation of the minings was granted to private conductors. Finally, Faroqhi gives some informations about the "civilian" factor in the manufacture. Although the sources almost without exception speak about the role of the state in the economy, there is a presence of private investors in manufacture. Most of them were putting-out merchants, who invested in the flourishing manufactures of silk (Bursa) and cotton (Aegean coastland of Asia Minor). Faroqhi concludes that during these centuries Ottoman manufacturing passed through a number of crises, for which we are bad-informed. The state played the basic role in manufacturing, especially in wartime. This fact does not differentiate the Ottoman state from states of Western Europe. The comparison between France, the Habsburg Empire and the Ottoman Empire in that field of research bears witness to this statement, so as to speak about a compatibility of the Ottoman economy to that of the Western states.

In his "Ottoman Industry in the Eighteenth Century: General Framework, Characteristics, and Main Trends" M. Genç determines firstly the three principles of the Ottoman economic policy, dominating in that century: *Provisionism* is the trend of securing supplies in the market, *traditionalism* states for the preservation of existing conditions and the avoidence of changes and *fiscalism* aims at maximizing treasury income. The import substitution policy of the state led to the limitation of expenses and gave rise to the *miri mubayaa* regime (provision of the state at a price lower than the market prices) and the *malikane sistemi* (life-term tax farming system). Although artisan organization tended to be more autonomous than the previous period, the state, following a protectionist policy, intervened in the activities of private ownership and controlled them. Furthermore, it created obstacles for capital accumulation and suppressed the *ayans*, the conveyors of the capitalistic process. The ban of exports affected the rural industry, which displayed a remarkable extension in production. The concentration of Ottoman industry on ordinary commodities rendered it completely dependent, for luxury products, on imports. The wars, that took place at the watershed of the eighteenth century, reduced the possibilities of importation (e.g. because of the rise of prices). Consequently, the state decided to invest in manufactures. Three such

manufactures are dealt with here by Genç: a) The woolen cloth manufacture, founded firstly in 1703 and finally —after the insurrection of August 1703— again in 1709, as a result of the difficulties put forward by the war of 1683-1699. This manufacture survived till 1732 when it was abandoned mainly because of international competition and the inappropriateness of raw materials. b) The silk manufacture established in İstanbul —as the previous one— in 1720, following the war of 1714-1718. Experts for this operation were found among the master weavers of Chios. Due to some privileges, granted to its non-Muslim weavers, and to the protection by imperial decrees, this industry flourished for at least forty years. Its disappearance from the market was caused by the stiff competition of the other silk producers of the Empire. c) The sail cloth manufacture was the most long-lived. Founded in 1709, it continued to be in operation till the mid-nineteenth century. Three factors were responsible for this endurance: the non-necessity of a new technology or qualified workers, the stable demand of the products by the navy and the handling of this manufacture by a manager, who acted for personal interest and under monopoly regulations.

Taking the textile industries as a case study, D. Quataert in his "Ottoman Manufacturing in the Nineteenth Century" tries to demonstrate that there was not a decline of the Ottoman manufacturing in nineteenth century, as it has been thought. To support this argument he presents the activities of the manufacture for the domestic market, claiming that the historiography has taken into consideration only the export-oriented production, although the nucleus of the nineteenth Ottoman industry was the domestic market. Before studying individual cases, Quataert exhibits the main reasons for the lack of mechanized factories in the Ottoman Empire. According to him, international politics, the lack of security in the early years of nineteenth century in the Empire, the lack of water resources, low population densities and the resistance of the Ottoman populace to factory formation were the reasons for this backwardness. Beginning with the study of the manufacturing for domestic market, he refers to yarn production. The founding of cotton yarn factories could be traced to two periods, firstly during the 1870s and 1880s and secondly after 1896. The majority of them were situated in the areas of İzmir, Adana and Salonica. Hand spinning pre-dominated for factory yarns were produced at a limited level. The replacement of British- with Ottoman-made yarn was the major concern of the manufacturers. Cloth manufacture remained one of the most productive fields. The Salonica region and east-central Asia Minor were centers of wool cloth production, whereas for cotton cloth manufacturing almost every region of the Ottoman Middle East was productive: Tokat in northern Asia Minor, Arapkir in the northwest of Harput, Aintab in the north

of Aleppo, Aleppo itself and the Diyarbakır region. The silk manufacture, especially in the domain of raw silk reeling, took a significant position in the export market. Mainly in Bursa, but equally in other regions such as Salonica, Amasya and İzmir, silk mills gained in achievements and after the imbalances caused by the price crisis between 1870-1892, the raw silk prices reached again the previous level and a period of stabilization was witnessed. Finally, the most well-known industrial export activity was carpet making. Because of the continuously increased demand for Ottoman rugs by the Western aesthetic taste, the production grew considerably from the 1850s till World War I. Having as a center the town of Uşak, where various nomadic Turkish tribes had arrived, rug-making extended to the whole of Western Asia Minor and challenged many of the İzmir merchant houses to involve themselves in the export management of rugs. Another center, around the town of Sivas, had been developed in the nineteenth century, introducing Khurasanian and Persian designs.

Ç. Keyder in "Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and in Republican Turkey, ca. 1900-1950" indicates firstly the three prevailing types of manufacturing in the nineteenth century and correlates them with the social groups which had been formed during that century. Traditional small industries were traced in the small towns and the countryside. Their basic unit of production was the household and they catered mosty to local markets. The social group, who worked in this type of manufacturing, was mainly the small peasantry of Ottoman Anatolia. The second type contained the state-owned enterprises, benefited by the protectionist policy of the state. The bureaucrats managed the majority of such industries, but were unable to respond to the changing conditions of the international market. Thirdly, the urban undustries had been undertaken by the emerging dynamic bourgeoisie of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. This type of manufacturing revealed a capitalistic mode of production organization. The intermediary class, which supported these enterprises, consisted of non-Muslim Ottoman subjects, namely Greeks and Armenians. After the ten-year war of 1912-1922, which brought as a result the transition of the Empire into a national-based state, the picture had changed. State enterprises took no part in the reconstuction of the 1920s. Despite this fact, the other two types also suffered from the consequences of the War. The departure of the major part of the non-Muslim businessmen (Greek, Armenians) created a vacuum both in the social structure and in the economic activity. Notwithstanding the fact that some of them stayed in Turkey, the Muslims could not fill in the void, because of the lack of previous experience. The local-market-oriented manufactures had been organized —before the War— by Greeks and Armenians (as the case of silk manufacture in the

region of Bursa indicates), whereas the Muslims who had come from Greece were not experienced in such activities. In urban industries, the new government, following a national-oriented policy, encouraged the promoting of Muslim-owned enterprises and, conversely, put limitations to Christian enterprises. The world economic crisis of the 1930s, only six years after the peace, had dismantled the import and export merchants. In order to recover from this bad situation the state imposed a protectionist policy. Apart from taking measures for the encouragement of Industry —such as a series of decrees and the formation of the first private bank (İş Bankası)— the state introduced a five-year plan for the promotion of manufacturing, modeled after the Soviet prototype. In the 1930s the state-enterprises succeeded in contributing to manufacture; the private sector had been represented only by the small group of the Salonician *dönme* with limited acquisitions in the process of industrialization, and the landlords of the Çukurova region (Cilicia), who were quite independent from State intervention. During World War II Turkey had witnessed the characteristics of a wartime economy: black-market, rise in prices, shortage of goods and accumulation of capital for some merchants. The imposition of the Wealth Levy (Varlık Vergisi) had affected principally the remaining non-Muslim bourgeoisie and caused the departure of almost all of them, except for the Jewish Salonicians of İstanbul. Post-war manufacturing was characterized mainly by the essential role of the United States in it. Mechanization of agrarian as well as urban industries, the inflow of American capital, the expansion of the role of private entrepreneurs in manufacturing were the basic principles of the American patronage in Turkish industry. In this way Turkey began to be incorporated into the world economic system.

As D. Quataert points out in "Afterward", the Ottoman Empire presents a plethora of variables, e.g. regarding state intervention, natural resources and market size, which influenced its manufacturing. There is a need to define the similarities and differences with other economies. Furthermore, Ottomanists should concentrate on the application of the basic points sketched out in this volume to local history case studies.

In our opinion the aims of this volume have been attained. The four contributions constitute a very good introduction to the question of Ottoman manufacturing. The scarcity of material is still the major obstacle for this endeavor, especially for the first centuries of Ottoman history. The contributors, four leading and prolific Ottomanists of the world, have approached the main subject from different points of view, according to the available material. Faroqhi gives a picture of the mobilization of labor in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, examining all its aspects and summarizing the recent international bibliography. Using largely primary sources, Genç concentrates

on the state-sponsored industries, failing, however, to refer to the social conditions which favoured these evolutions. Quataert examines a specific field of Ottoman manufacturing, trying to prove the dynamic presence of the private sector, forgetting to refer to the impact of Tanzimat on these evolutions; his treatment transgresses from the general character of the entire volume. Finally, the best contribution, that of Keyder, includes the social parameter in the economic conditions and offers a well-organized story of Ottoman and Turkish manufacturing during the first half of the twentieth century, applying its essential principles to some particular cases and/or examples. In spite of these peculiarities, the volume deserves the attention of the Ottomanists and the Economic historians as well. It opens new perspectives on the study of industry in a pre-modern state. Comparisons with other states and case studies in the Ottoman environment are of a great importance.

PHOKION KOTZAGEORGIS

The Magical and Aesthetic in the Folklore of Balkan Slavs: Papers of International Conference, Folkloristic Studies 1, edited by Dejan D. Ajdačić, Belgrade 1994, pp. 170.

This collection comprises 22 of the 26 papers delivered at a conference on *The Magical and Aesthetical in the Folklore of Balkan Slavs*, which took place in Belgrade on 9 and 10 October 1993 at the suggestion of Jasminka Dokmanović and Dejan Ajdačić. The focus of the conference was popular beliefs as reflected in the customs, traditions, and language of the Slavonic peoples of the Balkan peninsula, chiefly in Serbia, Bulgaria, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The papers are published in the writers' own English translations. Although the studies discuss various aspects of popular belief in magic, the thematic categories into which these aspects may be divided are not immediately apparent to the reader, for the order in which the papers are published contributes nothing to the thematic coherence and cohesion of the book as a whole.

Let me give some examples. Mirjana Detelić (pp. 39-44) analyses the common thread running through the Serbian *Ženidba Dušanova, Ženidba Sibinjanin Janka*, and *Ženidba Mata Srijemca*, and draws parallels between ancient myths and the story of the clever, handsome young man who conquers death through his wisdom and by his marriage produces life as a symbol of fertility. Hatidža Krnjević (pp. 45-53) analyses the semantic content and the origin of one variant of the story of the hero who, at his wife's behest, kills his