

Khilafat Movement and Ottoman Empire: Aspects of Success and Failure for Social Awareness

By

¹Fouzia Sultana, ² Dr. Noor Ahmed

Abstract:

This study attempts to look at the role of the Khilafat movement in India earlier this century. The study shows that the abolition of the institution of the Caliphate in Turkey, and the reasons given by the Turkish 'ulama for its abolition, provided food for thought to the Muslim elite in India. Muslims saw in the reasons for abolition of the Caliphate in Turkey, a process of (ijtihad) in which it was possible to update the institution of the Caliphate. This reflection made it possible to demand, from the British government and the Indian National Congress, an Islamic state. Such a development emerged as the legacy of the Khilafat movement. The Ottoman Empire was a valuable ruler on the time and its popularity, peace, justices and leadership as same like khilafat movement struggle. There were many aspects of its decline, defeat and division with Sultan Muhammad Fateh the emperor of Ottoman Empire. After tracing earlier views of the Caliphate this study looks at the connotations of the historical events, which occurred in the past, helped with Muslim Leaders in subcontinent. Finally, the comparative findings of Khilafat Movement and Ottoman Empire show that in the thinking of twentieth-century Indian Muslims the institutional rationale of the Caliphate seems to have evolved, from a one-man Caliph-emperor to a socially elected, democratic caliph state, from the idea of an individual Caliph to the concept of an Islamic state.

Keywords: khilafat, ottoman, Aspects, success, failure, social awareness

¹ Research Scholar at Pakistan study center, University of Balochistan Quetta Pakistan

² Assistant professor and Research Supervisor, Pakistan study center, University of Balochistan Quetta Pakistan noorahmeddpsc@yahoo.com

Introduction:

A territory under the Islamic leadership including principals and code of life, Islamic steward is known as caliph (Khalifa), the selected person follows the Islamic rules under the quote and supervision of Islamic prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and it should be leader of all Muslim community. (Kadi, Wadad; Shahin, Aram A (2013). The history is showed that caliphates were based on Islamic and other multi ethnic empires developed and continued long time, it was changed by time to time. (Al-Rasheed, Madawi; Kersten, Carool; Shterin, Marat (2012). The various periods different caliphates were existed: first (632-661) Rashidun Caliphate, second (661-750) Umayyad Caliphate and third were (750-1258) Abbasid Caliphate. The ottoman caliphate was fourth and major Ottoman Empire established on 1517, after this caliphate there were many Islamic states raise the voice and claimed for caliphates. (Kadi, Wadad; Shahin, Aram A, (2013). Muhammad (PBUH) give the lesson and the unification of the Arab tribes to serve their life's on Islamic principles and care there neighboring tribes and spread the message of peace and Islamic life (Rubin Barry, (2015). Under the supervision and history of Muhammad various tribes accept the Islam and adopted Islamic life. The Islamic first Caliphate Rashidun was established on 632. (Nigosian, Solomon A. (2004). The four caliphs, were directly famous and succeeded under the leadership of Muhammad (PBUH) who as leader of all Muslim communities. (The Roots of Democracy in Islam).Irfi.org. (2002).

The Ali was fourth caliph, some muslims like him and called shia, and history showed, the Ali was popular in all muslims called first caliph and Imam after Muhammad (PBUH). (Triana, Maria (2017). The Muslim states were continuing its work on the rights of Islamic principles and vision of our Holy Book (Quran Pak) and Muhammad's educations to all sahabaa and different tribes. The caliphate was working very well (Umayyad dynasty Islamic history)

The Islamic emperies were gradually famous everywhere and all Muslims followed Islamic rules and principles, these were widely spread and followed by all human (Holt 1984). The whole world like and follow the new Islamic principles and caliphate to make their society satisfactory and ideal as Muslim states (Dominique Sourdel, 1978). The unity and faith were key roles in caliphate moments; in these issues all Muslim's were selected a faithful persons to be Muslim's community representative (Googelberg.). Islamic principles teach us how to carry on a social community life and spread the message of Allah and its Messenger to the all peoples and whole world (Triana, Maria (2017).

Khilafat Movement:

The Muslims of British India launched khilafat movements in 1920 to defend the caliphate of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the First World War; this movement was spread widely in British territory. The leaders of this movement were Mohammad Ali Johar, Shaukat Ali, and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed Ansari and Muhammad Jan Abbasi were supported this movement. The movement lost its momentum after the arrest of all Muslim leaders.

The Khilafat movement in the early twentieth century had the same ingredients. It also had in it a pan-Indian content because after the 1857 uprisings, Muslims found themselves stripped of much that belonged to their Islamic culture in India.

They also found themselves in increasing competition with Hindus and other non-Muslims. But at the heart of the Khilafat movement was the idea of the preservation of that ideal Islamic symbol, the Caliphate that had the duty to create and defend an environment of the uncorrupted community of the time of the Prophet.

Since it was held that there would be no more Prophets, the majority Sunni Muslims came to believe that authority rested upon the Caliph, the successor to the Prophet Muhammad. The caliph's role would be to ensure the prevailing of divine justice on the earth. The caliph, therefore, was both the spiritual and the temporal ruler. It is of the essence of Sunni doctrine that the umma, the historic community, is based upon the Sharia, that its historical development is divinely guided, and its continuity guaranteed by the infallible authority of ijma. This being so, it was one of the duties of the jurists, as keepers of the public conscience, to demonstrate afresh for each generation the legality of its political constitution. This question was in their view bound up with that of the caliphate, which, as an institution, is essentially the symbol of the supremacy of Sharia. (Hamilton A.R. Gibb, (1962)

Khilafat Movement in India:

The Khilafat movement in India in the early part of the twentieth century was an attempt to save this Islamic symbol from collapse. Muslims in India looked up to the institution of caliphate as the prevailing Islamic symbol, the shadow of God on earth. During the Mughal period, the Mughal emperors had appropriated in India the title of Khalifa for themselves. This notion of the caliphate was ingrained in their psyche ever since the first Muslims set foot in India, as we shall see in the following paragraphs. With the collapse of the Ottoman Empire at the end of World War I in 1919, the victorious British Empire

and the European powers were about to sign the peace treaty that would divide the Ottoman lands. The temporal and spiritual authority of the cherished caliphate, the symbol of Islam, would vanish. In some ways, many Muslims in India also felt that they were accessories to the Ottoman defeat. They had sided with the British government and its allied forces to fight against the army of their caliph. This had to be redeemed by saving the whole institution of the caliphate from collapse.

But more than that, Muslims were always in the minority in India. With the collapse of the caliphate, they would be left orphans, at the mercy of the ruling British, in the milieu of a Hindu majority. In this regard, the Muslim Khilafatist leaders drew a clear distinction in their minds. When it came to describing their beliefs, they showed that they were Muslims with clearly extra-territorial loyalties. When it came to describing themselves and the politics they were dealing with, they clearly thought in the Indian terms. Muhammad Ali, for instance, had said that when it came to his Islamic beliefs, he was a Muslim first and a Muslim last and nothing but a Muslim. But when it came to India and its future, he was an Indian first, an Indian last and nothing but an Indian. It is noteworthy that even those Muslim leaders who championed the *muttawahid qawmiyyah* (the one-nation theory) were fully afflicted with this notion. (Rizwan Malik, (1955).

According to William Watson, as he stresses psychological support the movement offered to Muslims so that they could participate in the majority Hindu national movement; and repudiate their loyalty to Britain. Watson tells us that the Khilafat movement ended without accomplishing anything that it set out to do. The basic intention of Indian Muslims, as Watson sees it, was to bring about a world in which Indian Muslims could live Islamic as Indians. One opportunity accorded them, in this regard, was unity with Hindus in Gandhi's non-co-operation movement. At the level of expediency it was absolutely vital for Muslims to co-operate fully with Hindus to attain their objective.

Moreover, the world's Muslims' sentiments were not united with Indian Muslims on the issue of preserving an Ottoman emperor as the Caliph for all Muslims. The Middle Easterners were occupied with their own problems of nationalism. Also, British policies vis-à-vis the Ottoman Empire had been reversed. The treaties made with allies during war years had required of them to divide the Ottoman lands. The Khilafat demand to set the clock back to 1914 just would not make any sense. Watson dismisses the movement as unrealistic given the world situation of the time. The perplexity Watson shows about the movement is quite understandable. Clearly, he does not see how the

institution of the Caliphate domiciled in Turkey, defeated by the world powers, and would benefit the future of Muslims domiciled in the India of the 1920s. Instead, Muslims should have made it their priority to continue to foster and build unity with Hindus to achieve their goal. Watson concludes:

If Indians had been able to see any positive accomplishments resulting from their efforts, they probably would have worked on in unity. Probably then Indian Muslims would have discovered that the continued existence of the Khilafah was not a pre requisite to their ability to live Islamic as Indians. (William J. Watson, (1955). A.C. Niemeijer, in his dissertation on the Khilafat movement emphasizes on its pan-Islamic content and suggests that the Khilafat movement in India was a monolithic Indo-Muslim response to the fate of the caliphate. Niemeijer writes his thesis based on the theories of nationalism and suggests that the whole notion of pan-Islamism in the Khilafat movement meant that the movement started on the wrong foot. Had it shunned the idea of Pan- Islamism, it might have succeeded in forming for the Indian Muslims some kind of Muslim nationalism. (A.C. Niemeijer, (1972).

Gail Minault, another scholar on the Khilafat movement in India, picks up from where Watson left off. She argues that the mere pan-Islamic content in the Khilafat movement described by scholars is neither adequate nor simple to interpret. It shows extra-territorial loyalty and implies that Indians were not truly supportive of Indian nationalism in their hearts. In describing pan-Islamic sentiments these scholars neglected the most significant aspects of the movement. That is, they neglected the process of communication going on in India at the time of the Khilafat movement at various levels in the society. There were new methods of organizing political activity which were tried, and also, the styles of religious and political leadership were changing. Minault looks into the movement using some Urdu sources to show that it used pan-Islamic symbols to fuse a pan-Indian Muslim constituency. (Gail, Minault, (1982).

In 1919, the Khilafat leaders realized that in supporting Britain and the Allied forces, Muslims had actually helped weaken the only seat of the Islamic symbol of Islamic rule. Indian Muslim leaders came to fear that with Hindu demands for concessions from the British they might be reduced to insignificance even in India. In this context, the Khilafat Movement became for them a worthy cause. Not all Khilafat leaders thought along these lines, of course. There were leaders in the Khilafat committee who sincerely believed that their cause would redeem them from the sin they had committed to ally themselves with Britain and the Allied forces;8s and some others believed that Britain, as true

power for the Muslims in the world, would never infringe upon the caliphate, but on the contrary would promote it. For yet others, it was a true cause for Islam.

And then there were others like Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Muhammad Iqbal, who while supporting what the Khilafat movement stood for vehemently, opposed the style of the Khilafatist leaders. Their views were to emerge later in the Pakistan movement. In any case, it was felt that the restoration of the Caliphate was necessary. Besides the historical claims for legitimacy sketched so far, there were several other factors giving importance to this cause in the minds of Indian intellectuals. It is to these that we now turn.

Ottoman Empire and Ottoman Caliphate:

The sultan of Ottoman was claimed the caliphate and continued few years, (1362 to 1389), (Lambton, Ann; Lewis, Bernard (1995). The empires of various states follow the moments of Sultan Muhammad Fateh ottoman and began work in same way of caliphate. The popularity of this type of caliphate provide the rights to overall and spread the new thinking, policy, and justice in everywhere. The work and new type of managements was very familiar and keep as symbol. (Kemal H. Karpat (2001).

The Ottoman Empire was gradually stable because of its popularity and stability by the peoples (Kermeli, Eugenia (2009). The peoples on that time were in different religions, some accept the Islam and some remain constant on their ethnic groups (Lowry, Heath (2003). The followers of Ottoman Empire and its lover face many criticism and difficulties because of its theory (Finkel, Caroline (2005). The death of Osman in century it was very difficult to manage the all things. The son of Osman took the control of Anatolian city in northwest. After the capture of Anatolian city the son of Osman, Orhan make its capital of Ottoman stat on 1326. (Robert Elsie (2004). The Necropolis battle in 1396 was large-scale but failed to stop Ottoman Turks. (David Nicolle (1999).

The ottoman stat and other neighbor areas were constructed according on Turkish dominion and play a peaceful role. (Gabor Agoston, Bruce Alan Masters (2009). Ottoman some territories were permanently and few were temporarily recover from Murad II in 1430 to 1450s. (Mesut Uyar; Edward J. Erickson (2009).

Growth of the Ottoman Empire:

Ottoman Empire growth was increased with the passage of time and military influence was also produced effects on it. (Stone, Norman

(2005). The bad relations, Western Europe and ottoman stat case resistance between Italian and ottoman. (Hodgkinson (2005)).

The century of 15th and 6th Ottoman Empire was in expansion period and it proposed new rules and nominated Sultan and also connects bridge of trade between Europe and Asia. (Karpat, Kemal H. (1974). Empires eastern and southern fight sultan Salim with Shah Ismail and defeat him. (Savory, R. M. (1960)).

The Salim implement new rules in Egypt and it's expended to Portuguese empire and Ottoman Empire to maintain power in the region. (Hess, Andrew C. January (1973)).

Ottoman Empire Sultan Mustafa rules were stronger and followed by all peoples this type of stat widely spread throughout the western area of Egypt. (Imber Colin, (2002)). The empire of neighbor stats follows ottoman and other Egyptian rules to keep peaceful region environment. (Thompson Bard, (1996)). The western areas were taken by Baghdad and Persians in the year of 1535, the Ottoman Empire cannot resists against his violation and miss understanding in the region. (V.J. Parry, 1976) while the eastern areas also want to participate with dividing empire areas. (Spencer C. Tucker, ABC-CLIO, (2010)).

The various stats and regions of Egypt and Ottoman Empire make unity to construct a new environment and social system to control regional solidarity and living slandered. There were many problems and conditions faced Sultan and his empire to keep region peaceful. (E. H. M. Clifford, (1936)). It was approximately empire spanned 877,888 sq mi (2,273,720 km²), extending between three continents. (Ágoston Gábor, 2009). The extending areas of empire in continents make relationship between midtrial seas. (Mansel Philip, (1997)). The ground realities were completely against to Ottoman Empire and its performance but the popularity and a ruler system make it stronger, that's way the empire was extending quickly and regions were adding unanimously in Ottoman Empire. (Deringil Selim, (2007)).

Transformation of the Ottoman Empire:

The popularity of Ottoman Empire was increasing on 2nd half of 16th century to Europe and Middle East. (Faroqhi Suraiya 1994). The transformation of military, political and economic aspects was successfully divided by the powerful leadership of Ottoman Empire. (Hathaway, Jane (2008)). The historical back ground and ground realities support to Ottoman Empire and give him moral support, the other empires help to transfer different regions to small stat and empires for justices. (Faroqhi, Suraiya (1994)).

History of empires shows that battle were not only way of division but the peace, unity, justice and legal rights make it easy to transfer the power higher to lower empires. (Davies, Brian L. (2007). Therefore most of region wre transfer by wish of peoples and justice because the sultan of Ottoman empire know if he cannot transfer the power, peoples does not like him and they cannot follow his rules and empire anymore. (Orest Subtelny (2000).

The various regions were create happy movements and calibrations in the fever of sultan and its justices with peoples, finally the transformation process successful because of its popularity and love of empire peoples, (Kinross, (1979). Empire management and its military power were also distributed to the various small regions because it was demand of local peoples to transfer all sources and powers to the peoples of that region. (Halil Inalcık, (1997).

The Ottoman Empire transformation process were completed successfully, the peoples, other empires sultans and lovers of this revelation was appreciated and follow this system. Worldwide other empires also support this division especially Egyptian and western areas for peace and new system of empire. (Gabor Agoston, Bruce Alan Masters, (2009).

Factors Affecting the Ottoman Empire:

There were many factors directly influenced on ottoman empires such as Russian factor, this was time to warm seas expansion in large scale and cause disturbance illegal way for business and military sources came from different areas without legal permission. (Stone, Norman (2005). The peoples like this to control illegal way of coming because it was big problem which make social and environmental crises in a region. (Watson, William J. (1968).

Russian empires cannot support mostly, because they do not like the popularity and peaceful environment of ottoman and its neighbor empires. (Karsh (2006). This was a big conflict between Russian and other empires in the region. There are many other factors indirectly influence on empires, but passage of time many questions answered by himself and settled. The factors cannot kept prolong, after few years it were settled and comedown according on their bases, finally it was decreed and empire was worked as usual in the region. (Berend, Tibor Ivan (2003).

Decline Phase of the Ottoman Empire:

The history showed that decline phase of ottoman state and empire was come soon because of its big areas and increasing population in the

region. Ottoman rules were very famous and widely like by all areas in western and eastern territory. (Stone, Norman (2005). Peoples of ottoman were very disappointed when the decline time was started. (Rogan, Eugene (2011).

There was many hidden factors directly and indirectly effects on ending of ottoman and its surrounding empires. (Williams, Bryan Glynn (2000). The time shows that largest empire is slowly loss its image and military powerful source was divided with various official and leaders which were controlling the all aspect. (Amjad M. Jaimoukha (2001).

The history showed that on the period of ending empire all mattes were going wrong and peoples supported Ottoman Empire but its loosing and declining situation cannot stable the empire. The time was very limited to controlee internal and external crises but it cannot be smooth and normal. (Baten Jörg, (2016). In the historic books and writers explained very briefly that peoples and neighbors support Ottoman but it was too late to manage the complicated situation in the region. (Eugene, (2011). The neighbor empires and other territories support to ottoman but they also unable to deliver such support and military power which were desire to empire. (Taylor, (1955). Egyptian territories were spread and covered western and eastern all areas and make control by sultan and some military troops by the help of local peoples in ottoman empires. Russian and Egyptian areas make weak and unstable the ottoman and their neighbor area that's way this was a factor of decline the empires. (Akçam, Taner (2006). It was proof that in declining face there are many peoples were died and sacrificed to protect empire and support to military those are fighting with enemies. (Justin McCarthy, (1995).

It was a time Ottoman Empire was defeated by its neighbor empires and some internal and external stats enemies. The history showed that the struggle of ottoman was prolong and many people's like it and supported. Finally the division was happened and territories were free from ottoman empires and from its military. An even empire was defeated but still peoples love him and try to fight for him, financially, and military it was declined. The ottoman empires left a moral system for all empires.

The government of Ottoman Empire handover the all officially and economically power to the sultan and he took action to free its part and various territories and independent. (Kieser Hans Lukas, (2002). After the release of various part of ottoman they become free and independent empires as they want and government of peoples was takeover, (Schaller Dominik, (2008). The news of empire decline and

defeated was spared widely (Hakan Ozoglu, (2011). It was a peak time of difficulties and decisions to Ottoman Empire and their leaders to make region peaceful.

References:

- A.C. Niemeijer, *The Khilafat Movement in India 1919- 1924*, (1972) (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff,) , pp. 22-48, 164-178.
- Ágoston and Alan Masters, Gábor and Bruce (2009).*Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*. Infobase Publishing. p. 583.
- Akçam, Taner (2006). *A Shameful Act: The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility*. New York: Metropolitan Books. p. 42
- Akmeşe, Handan Nezir *The Birth of Modern Turkey The Ottoman Military and the March to World I*, London: I.B Tauris page 24.
- Al-Rasheed, Madawi; Kersten, Carool; Shterin, Marat. (2012). *Demystifying the Caliphate: Historical Memory and Contemporary Contexts*. Oxford University Press. p. 34.
- Baten, Jörg (2016). *A History of the Global Economy.From 1500 to the Present*.Cambridge University Press.p. 50.
- Berend, Tibor Iván (2003). *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long 19th Century*. University of California Press.p. 127.Ishtiaq, Hussain. "The Tanzimat: Secular reforms in the Ottoman Empire"
- Bryce, Viscount James; Toynbee, Arnold (2000), Sarafian, Ara, ed., *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915–1916: Documents Presented to Viscount Grey of Falloden (uncensored ed.)*, Princeton, NJ: Gomidas Institute, pp. 635–49.
- Buturovic, Amila (1 May 2010). *Islam in the Balkans: Oxford Bibliographies Online Research Guide*. Oxford University Press. p. 923.
- Carmichael, Cathie (12 November 2012). *Ethnic Cleansing in the Balkans: Nationalism and the Destruction of Tradition*. Routledge.p. 211.
- Charlotte Mathilde Louise Hille (2010). *State building and conflict resolution in the Caucasus*.BRILL.p. 50.
- Daniel Chirot; Clark McCauley (1 July 2010). *Why Not Kill Them All?: The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder (New in Paper)*. Princeton University Press.p. 23.

- Davies, Brian L. (2007). *Warfare, State and Society on the Black Sea Steppe: 1500–1700*. Routledge. p. 116.
- Deringil, Selim (September 2007). "The Turks and 'Europe': The Argument from History". *Middle Eastern Studies*. 43 (5): 709–723.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya (1994). "Crisis and Change, 1590–1699". In İnalcık, Halil; Donald Quataert. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1914*. 2. Cambridge University Press. pp. 413–417.
- Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, vol. II (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1995). Ottoman Empire.
- Finkel, Caroline (2005). *Osman's Dream: The History of the Ottoman Empire*. Basic Books. pp. 5, 10.
- Gábor Ágoston; Bruce Alan Masters (2009). *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*. Infobase Publishing. p. 363.
- Gail Minault, *the Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India* (New York: Columbia University Press), 198.
- Googelberg, compiled from Wikipedia entries and published by Dr. Islam. Lulu.com. p. 258. Fred Donner. *The early Islamic Conquests*. (1981).
- H. M. Clifford, "The British Somaliland-Ethiopia Boundary", *Geographical Journal*, 87 (1936), p. 289.
- Hakan Ozoglu (24 June 2011). *From Caliphate to Secular State: Power Struggle in the Early Turkish Republic*. ABC-CLIO. p. 128.
- Halil İnalcık (1997). *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, Vol. 1 1300–1600. Cambridge University Press. p. 24.
- Hamilton A.R. Gibb, ed. Stanford J. Shaw and William R Polk, (1962) *Studies on the Civilization of Islam* (Toronto: S.J. Reginald Saunders and Co., 1962), p. 141.
- Hathaway, Jane (2008). *The Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule, 1516–1800*. Pearson Education Ltd. p. 38.

- Hess, Andrew C. (January 1973). "The Ottoman Conquest of Egypt (1517) and the Beginning of the Sixteenth-Century World War". *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 4 (1): 55–76.
- Imber, Colin (2002). *The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1650: The Structure of Power*. Palgrave Macmillan. p. 50.
- Jelavich, Charles; Jelavich, Barbara (1986). *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804–1920*. p. 139.
- Justin McCarthy (1995). *Death and exile: the ethnic cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821–1922*. Darwin Press.
- Kadi, Wadad; Shahin, Aram A. (2013). Caliph, caliphate. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Islamic Political Thought*: pp. 81–86.
- Karpat, Kemal H. (1974). *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History: Introduction*. BRILL p. 21 (2015).
- Karpat, Kemal H. (1974). *The Ottoman state and its place in world history*. Leiden: Brill. p. 111.
- Kermeli, Eugenia (2009). "Osman I". In Ágoston, Gábor; Bruce Masters. *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*. p. 444.
- Kieser, Hans-Lukas; Schaller, Dominik J. (2002), *Der Völkermord an den Armeniern und die Shoah [The Armenian genocide and the Shoah]* (in German), Chronos, p. 114.
- Kunt, Metin; Woodhead, Christine (1995). *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age: the Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World*. Longman. p.53.
- Mansel, Philip (1997). *Constantinople: city of the world's desire 1453–1924*. London: Penguin. p. 61.
- Matsuki, Eizo. "The Crimean Tatars and their Russian-Captive Slaves". *Mediterranean Studies Group at Hitotsubashi University*.
- Mesut Uyar; Edward J. Erickson (2009). *A Military History of the Ottomans: From Osman to Atatürk*. ABC-CLIO. p. 29.
- Nigosian, Solomon A. (2004). *Islam: Its History, Teaching, and Practices*. Indiana University Press. p. 118.

- Richmond, Walter (29 July 2008). *The Northwest Caucasus: Past, Present, Future*. Taylor & Francis US.p. 79.
- Rizwan Malik, Mawlana Husayn Madani and Jam'iyat 'Ulama-i Hind 1920-1957: (1955) *Status of Islam and Muslims in India*, Thesis, University of Toronto, 1955, pp. 98.
- Robert Elsie (2004). *Historical Dictionary of Kosova*. Scarecrow Press. pp. 95–96.
- Rogan, Eugene (2011). *The Arabs: A History*. Penguin. Repin, Volume 1; Igor Emanuilovich Grabar'; 1948; p.391.
- Rubin, Barry (2015). *The Middle East: A Guide to Politics, Economics, Society and Culture*. Routledge.p. 478.
- Şahin, Kaya (2013). *Empire and Power in the reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*. Cambridge University Press.p. 10.
- Schaller, Dominik J; Zimmerer, Jürgen (2008). "Late Ottoman genocides: the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and Young Turkish population and extermination policies – introduction"). *Journal of Genocide Research*. 10 (1): 7–14.
- Stone, Norman (2005). "Turkey in the Russian Mirror".In Mark Erickson, Ljubica Erickson. *Russia War, Peace And Diplomacy: Essays in Honour of John Erickson*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.p. 94.
- Stone, Norman (2005). "Turkey in the Russian Mirror".In Mark Erickson, Ljubica Erickson. *Russia War, Peace And Diplomacy: Essays in Honour of John Erickson*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.p. 97.
- Taylor, A.J.P. (1955). *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848–1918*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 228–54.
- The Reign of Suleiman the Magnificent, 1520–1566*, V.J. Parry, A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730, ed. M.A. Cook (Cambridge University Press, 1976), 94.
- Thompson, Bard (1996). *Humanists and Reformers: A History of the Renaissance and Reformation*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing. p. 442.
- Triana, Maria (2017). *Managing Diversity in Organizations: A Global Perspective*. Taylor & Francis.p. 159.

- V. Necla Geyikdagi (15 March 2011). Foreign Investment in the Ottoman Empire: International Trade and Relations 1854–1914. I.B.Tauris. p. 32.
- Walker, Christopher J. (1980), *Armenia: The Survival of A Nation*, London: Croom Helm, pp. 200–213.
- Watson, William J. (1968). "Ibrahim Muteferrika and Turkish Incunabula". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. 88 (3): 435
- William J Watson, *Muhammad Ali and the Khilafat Movement*, (1955) (M.A. thesis, McGill university, 1955)
- Williams, Bryan Glynn (2000). "Hijra and forced migration from nineteenth-century Russia to the Ottoman Empire.