Fratantuono, Ella. 2024. *Governing Migration in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 288 pages. ISBN (e-Book): 9781399521864.

Reviewed by **Hikmet Çağrı Yardımcı**
Hasan Kalyoncu University, Gaziantep, Turkey
hcagri.yardimci@hku.edu.tr

In her influential book, Ella Fratantuono explores migration in the late Ottoman Empire, emphasizing how the regulation of mobility, related institutions, and prominent Ottoman officials contributed to the effort of establishing a rationalized, modern state. Fratantuono explicitly states throughout the book that she intends to move beyond the traditional dichotomy of *mülteci* (*voluntary* refugee(s)) and *muhacir* (*enforced* migrant(s)) found in the literature, or distinctions among the concepts that appeared in the Ottoman manuscripts such as *koloni*, *mülteci*, *muhacir*, or *firar*i, usually in flux. She argues that to fully comprehend the Ottoman migration regime, one must focus on the *outcomes* rather than the *motivations* or concepts behind migration. For this very reason, Fratantuono mainly employs the concept of *muhacir.*

She begins with the issuance of the *Muhaccirin Nizamnamesi* in 1857 to that end, which aligned with the 1858 Land Code and the Tanzimat edict's egalitarian promises. The Ottoman Empire sought to become a destination for colonists in the *age of migration* and engaged with Western embassies to attract colonists, promising agricultural concessions in arable lands. According to Fratantuono, the first *ideal muhacirs* were colonists whom Ottoman officials welcomed to boost agricultural production amid economic turmoil and strengthen ties within the fragmented *millet system*. However, Fratantuono notes a gap between these regulations and the state's organizational capacity, as land availability for new settlers was still unknown. Thus, mapping the lands became necessary, as exemplified in Captain Tahsin Efendi's seeking to identify suitable lands in West Anatolia and Rumelia (p. 38). The lands envisioned and planned to be productive with colonization and concessions, however, served to unanticipated *muhacirs* who were deported from the Caucasus by the Russian Empire. Nevertheless, the purpose of the Ottoman governance, which precedes the *outcomes* rather than motivation, remained unaltered. As in the Mecidiye example, Ottoman officials viewed immigration as an opportunity for urban planning and economic development, and it created an unambiguous Ottoman identity, whether it be European colonists or Muslim *muhacirs*.

Fratantuono portrays how the Ottoman Empire governed mobility in the 1850s and 1860s by focusing on an Ottoman official, Nusret Pasha, who 'defined space, organized population and collected data' (p. 63). Emerged as a problem that needed to be solved and, at the same time, a potential solution to the economic and political crisis, the question of *muhacir* became a tool for constructing domestic and international politics. The very attempt to forge legible populations who could obligate as well as contribute to the economy could bring, in Nusret Pasha's words, *order and politics* (p. 74), elimi-

nating nomadism and ignorance. However, challenges such as infrastructure, diseases, and large-scale Tatar and Circassian migration from Russia disrupted the envisioned developmentist and civilizing state. *Muhacir* became *a problem* to solve regarding settlement, distribution of resources, and coping with diseases in Rumelia and Anatolia. Fratantuono explicitly argues that this failure was not an accident but an outcome of the developmentalist ethos of Tanzimat, with social engineering and control of migration becoming priorities for good governance. Nusret Pasha's proposition of a mapping system rather than merely registration to categorize *muhacirs* based on wealth and productivity for reducing budget deficits epitomizes Fratantuono's perspective that prominent Ottoman officials dynamically sought to find new institutional and governing strategies.

In chapter three, Fratantuono highlights the portrayal of *muhacir as victims* used by the Ottoman Empire to improve its centralization and modernization efforts through health management, press portrayals, and philanthropy. Circassian migration following the Crimean War across the sea to the port cities around the Black Sea, such as Trabzon and Samsun, happened in very harsh weather conditions and caused the spreading of diseases. The overwhelming subsequent migration from the Balkans following the 1877–1878 Russo-Ottoman War deteriorated not only the conditions of *muhacirs* settled in the cities around the Black Sea but also the overland cities in the Rumelia and Anatolia. Fratantuono does not restate these environmental conditions or the spreading of epidemic diseases, but she uniquely draws attention to how officials approached these unfortunate events and how they influenced the institutional state-building project of the Ottoman Empire through two key concepts: Public health and philanthropy. Ottoman Quarantine Council (*Meclis-i Tahaffuz*) and Constantinople Superior Health Council influenced the attitude of the Ottoman Empire against plague and cultivated the image of a modern Muslim state. European physicians after the 1860s and 1870s often criticized Ottoman practices, pushing for an infectionist approach to combat disease. As a result, the confinement of *muhacirs* became a common public health measure aimed at reinforcing the Empire's civilized image. Simultaneously, the Ottoman Empire used philanthropic efforts, such as the *Turkish Compassionate Fund* and *İane Committee*, to manage the *muhacir* issue, framing it within the Eastern Question. This allowed officials to categorize and control the population, ultimately legitimizing decisions regarding their lives and assessing economic productivity by age and gender.

Fratantuono points out one more time in chapter four that *failure* should not be evaluated with the linear and basic perspective but with governing and social engineering. Instead, one should view this failure as inherent *to governmental projects*, a comprehensive hegemony through which not merely migrants but officials were disciplined. In the face of the displacement of Muslim people from the Balkan region following the war in 1877–1878, the land that would have been planned settlement for *muhacirin* in Rumelia fell short. Subsequently, a new idea emerged that the Anatolian cities could also be *productive* locations for migrants both economically and politically. However, the organised, regularised, and numbered spatial plans for the migrants encountered significant challenges as the relationship among the migrants, Turkish notables, and the local people was becoming chaotic. Thus, Fratantuono emphasizes mainly the

gap between the settlement plans the officials thought of and practices implemented throughout the Hamidian period. Again, novelly, by integrating actors such as official Muzaffer Pasha and commissioner Ahmed Pasha and structure, she seminally portrays that these failures and critiques caused the emergence of Anatolia as a new spatial, settlement location. Underlying the role of Muzaffer Pasha's and other commissioners' efforts in the process, Fratantuono shows how this failure led to the emergence of new alternatives and tools for making *muhacirin* productive.

In chapter five, Fratantuono discusses the Hamidian period, during which the migration regime was built into an ethos that the 'ideal *muhacir* was the Muslim *muhacir*' (p. 176). In the era of demographic change and nascent nationalism(s), the Ottoman Empire also sought new alternatives to govern to ensure its sovereignty and resist the European intervention following the Treaty of Berlin, in which predominantly Armenian and Macedonian Questions unfolded. Fratantuono accurately operates the concept of *Islamic Ottomanism* rather than *pan-Islamism* to highlight this centralizing and ethno-natinalist agenda. Migration politics likewise were influenced by the Empire's politico-ethical approach regarding mobility and its restriction. While Muslim immigrants were able to easily enter the empire, Armenians were not permitted to immigrate to the US due to suspicions that they might incite a rebellion upon their return. For that, Anatolia, especially Eastern Anatolia, gained importance as Armenian revolutionaries and Kurdish clans jeopardized the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, Muslim migrants from the Balkans could contribute to the economic progress of the state and break the superior place of non-Muslims in the economy. As explicitly appeared in the reports of Ahmet and Suleyman and the new institutions, such as the Commission for Muslim Migrants (*Muhacirin-i İslamiye Komisyonu*) in 1897, the Muslim population was prioritized to be settled in the agricultural areas. The concept of *hijra*, a religious/spiritual concept in Islam recalling the migration of prophet Muhammad and his followers to *Medina*, was used to justify this attempt, providing Ottoman practices with a rational ground.

In the final chapter, Fratantuono delves into the concept of the *muhacir* as a possibility, exploring its potential implications during the Second Constitutional Era, commonly referred to as the 1908 Revolution. Fratantuono discusses that the question, 'Who is a muhacir?' remains tied to the sixty years debate about 'who constitutes the ideal Ottoman subject' during this era. As revealed in the journal published by the Society for Rumelian Muslim Migrants (*Rumeli Muhacirin-i Islamiye Cemiyeti*), *muhacir* became a subject who could imagine himself or herself contributing to Ottoman society. On the other hand, the debates on the term *hijra* and *muhacirness* mainly unfolded during the Hamidian era were ongoing. The general idea was that hijra undermined Islam, and people who still live in the Rumelia should be connected to the country they reside in to preserve their religion. Ultimately, the main idea that *muhacirs* in the borders of the empire had emotional and material duty through 'sacrifice and willingness to participate' (p. 209) was stronger. In the debates in parliament, Ottomanism was still placed in a line of inquiry. With the aim of disengaging from the politics and migration regime of Abdulhamid II, the politicians lifted the ban on the return of Armenian and Bulgarian Ottoman citizens, also remaking the unity (*anasır*) of subject

of the Empire. However, the fact that Armenian MPs questioned the aid provided to Muslim immigrants from the Balkan Wars shows that the decision on who would be excluded and included in Ottoman modernization has not yet been made. The precise point is that even though some personally experienced suffering and losing their homes, Ottoman officials handled the migration issue in a way that allowed the Empire to gain more productivity and subjectivity ties.

In her comprehensive book, Fratantuono explores six decades of migration narratives to the Ottoman territories, meticulously examining the intricate interplay of laws, institutional frameworks, and structural dynamics that shaped these movements. She highlights the roles of key actors involved in this complex process, drawing on an extensive array of large-scale and richly detailed sources to provide a profound understanding of the historical context and implications of migration during this period. First, Fratantuono claims that while the tactics and strategies employed varied across different cases and regions, three core components of Ottoman governance strategy remained constant, as seen above: governmentality, social engineering, and failure. Secondly, she, throughout the book, underscores the importance of ascertaining outcomes over understanding motivations in order to fully grasp the narrative of emigration to the Ottoman Empire. Lastly, Fratantuono places Ottoman immigration in the late Ottoman Empire into a global context, comparing it with other state practices on mobility control. Overall, this engaging book merits high praise for inviting readers to explore the intriguing connections between migration and state-making by moving beyond the vicious dichotomies.